



**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report Fall 2014
Academic Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014**

Institution	Point Loma Nazarene University School of Education
Cohort	none
Date report is submitted	11/14/14
Program documented in this report	Master in Special Education
Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)	Traditional
Credential awarded	Education Specialist Clear Added Authorizations in Special Education
Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes	
If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered	Arcadia Inland Empire
Program Contact	Dr. Conni Campbell
Title	Associate Dean, Clear and Other School Professional Credentials
Phone #	619.563.2842
E-Mail	ccambel@pointloma.edu
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:	
Name	Dr. Shirlee Gibbs
Title	Director
Phone #	619.563.2852
E-mail	sgibbs@pointloma.edu

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
EDUCATION SPECIALIST CLEAR/INDUCTION PROGRAM
ADDED AUTHORIZATIONS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

PART I – Contextual Information:

On April 21, 2011 PLNU received CTC approval for its IPR for the new Clear/Induction Education Specialist credential program that included the Added Authorization for the Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). Added Authorizations are an integral part of the PLNU Clear/Induction program. Candidates are offered the choice of one or more Added Authorizations as part of the professional development requirement within the overall design of the program. In addition to the Autism Added Authorization, PLNU received approval for the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) and Emotional Disturbance (ED) Added Authorizations in November, 2011. Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), and Other Health Impairments (OHI) Added Authorizations were approved by CTC in October, 2013.

Constituency for the program is composed of candidates who have completed their Preliminary Education Specialist credential with PLNU and continue on to complete the Clear credential program, which includes an AASE. An additional portion of candidates comes to PLNU for one of the Added Authorizations after having completed either the Preliminary credential or Clear credential in other settings or at other institutions.

Point Loma Nazarene School of Education has undergone several changes since the last accreditation activity. Our regional center in Arcadia has closed. All candidates were finished out with individual plans of completion, with several candidates now in their final culminating project toward completion.

The SOE received NCATE/CAEP accreditation as a result of the last accreditation site visit in the fall of 2012. A new Dean, Dr. Deb Erickson, has been leading the SOE efforts since July of 2013. The SOE has experienced a decrease in the number of candidates enrolled, as well as a reduction in force in full-time faculty. Additional positive changes include the revision in the number of *Dispositions of Noble Character* that are assessed for each candidate several times a year from eight to four. Several courses are offered in an on-line format to serve candidates across regional centers, and there has been a university-wide commitment to increase transparency in the data collection process, analysis of data and program improvement plans.

Through the 2012-2013 school year three regional centers (Arcadia, Bakersfield and Mission Valley) were in operation with full-time special education faculty responsible for supporting the program at each site. An additional regional center in Inland Empire was supported by adjunct faculty in special education. For the 2013-2014 school year only three regional centers (Bakersfield, Mission Valley, and Inland Empire) continued offering education specialist programs. The Arcadia regional center was closed.

The program has a Program Director who is responsible for collaborating with all the centers to insure that the program is coherent and aligned. A team of Point Loma full time faculty and approximately 24 adjunct faculty served this cohort of Clear Education Specialist credential

candidates with close communication and collaboration among them regarding candidate proficiency, data collection, and analysis. The Special Education programs fall under the responsibility of the Associate Dean for Advanced Graduate Programs.

Education Specialist Clear Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2012-2013		2013-2014	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
Arcadia Regional Center	15	13	0	0
Bakersfield Regional Center	43	42	21	18
Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center	3	3	15	13
Mission Valley Regional Center	20	18	20	17

Autism Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2012-2013		2013-2014	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
Arcadia Regional Center	11	8	0	0
Bakersfield Regional Center	10	5	2	0
Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center	34	34	22	9
Mission Valley Regional Center	22	22	28	28

TBI Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2012-2013		2013-2014	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
Arcadia Regional Center	0	0	0	0
Bakersfield Regional Center	13	0	34	15
Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center	0	0	2	0
Mission Valley Regional Center	7	0	15	3

OHI Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2012-2013		2013-2014	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
Arcadia Regional Center	0	0	0	0
Bakersfield Regional Center	0	0	0	0
Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center	0	0	0	0
Mission Valley Regional Center	0	0	0	0

EBD Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2012-2013		2013-2014	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
Arcadia Regional Center	0	0	0	0
Bakersfield Regional Center	10	0	5	0
Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center	0	0	0	0
Mission Valley Regional Center	0	0	6	1

EC Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2012-2013		2013-2014	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
Arcadia Regional Center	2	2	0	0
Bakersfield Regional Center	24	18	16	7
Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center	2	1	0	0
Mission Valley Regional Center	7	6	15	8

Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity (Biennial Report, Program Assessment or Site Visit).

Changes have occurred in the education specialist programs since the last Biennial Report in 2011. The years between 2011 and 2014 have been active and busy. Highlights of those changes are given below:

- The School of Education received NCATE accreditation in fall, 2012.
- A new Dean (Dr. Deborah Erickson) was appointed in the 2013-2014 school year following a year of Interim Dean (Dr. Carol Leighty).
- Decreasing candidate enrollment was seen between the 2011-2013 academic enrollment.

- Arcadia Regional Center was closed due to low enrollment in 2012.
- The School of Education began offering on-line courses in 2012-2013.
- Increased focus and transparency in data collection and analysis across the university in 2012-14
- Masters in Special Education was approved by PLNU as a new degree in 2011-2012.
- PLNU approved by CTC to offer Added Authorizations in Special Education in Traumatic Brain Injury , Other Health Impairments , Early Childhood Special Education, and Emotional Disturbance.
- Since the last report, the Disposition Assessment Instrument was modified. Faculty changed the indicators to provide more specificity and required candidates to provide a rationale on their ratings of each indicator. This was developed to further enhance the specificity of responses to the Disposition Data. Prior to this modification candidates did not consistently provide a rationale when they rated themselves high on the instrument. The instrument needed improvement to understand candidate self-perception on the Dispositions.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
EDUCATION SPECIALIST CLEAR/INDUCTION PROGRAM
ADDED AUTHORIZATIONS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

a) What are the primary candidate assessment(s) the program uses up to and through recommending the candidate for a credential?

Clear Core Evaluation Instrument (Direct)	Description	Data Collected: 2 years	Standards Assessed
GED622 Signature Assignment	Advanced Special Education Assessment	2012 and 2013	2,5,7
GED650 Signature Assignment	Universal Access: Equity for All Students	2012 and 2013	6
GED656 Signature Assignment	Shared Leadership, Legislation, and Due Process	2012 and 2013	5,6
GED658	Reflective Coaching/ Induction	2012 and 2013	4, 7

AASE Evaluation Instrument (Direct)	Description	Data Collected: 2 years	Standards Assessed
GED651 Signature Assignment	Understanding Emotional/Behavioral Disorders	2012 and 2013	EDAA 1, 2,3
GED652 Signature Assignment	Methods for Teaching Students with ASD	2012 and 2013	ASDAA 1, 2,3
GED653 Signature Assignment	Methods for Teaching Students with TBI	2012 and 2013	TBIAA 1,2, 3,4
GED654 Signature Assignment	Methods for Teaching Students with OHI	2012 and 2013	OHIAA 1,2,3,4,
GED661 Signature Assignment	Early Childhood Special Education Curriculum & Services	2012 and 2013	ECSEAA 1,2,3,4

b) What additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making?

With a commitment to the principle of ongoing assessment and data analysis driving continuous improvement, the School of Education collects data in two additional areas: 1) candidate Dispositions of Noble Character and 2) exit surveys from program completers. Candidates self-assess their Dispositions and are verified by the professor of record in the following courses: *GED 656 Shared Leadership, Legislation, and Due Process; GED 658 Reflective Coaching and Induction for Special Education; GED 659 Independent Study in Special Education*; Professors

of record conduct candidate assessments in *GED 658 Reflective Coaching and Induction for Special Education*.

The purpose of the exit survey is to give program completers an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the School of Education's preparation program. The exit survey probed candidates' overall satisfaction with the program, course of study, course content, and instructional delivery.

Additional Evaluation Instruments (Indirect)	Description	Data Collected: 2 years	Use
Disposition Assessment	Form-based Author Responses	2012 and 2013	Monitor candidates development of professional dispositions
Exit Survey	Form-based Author Responses	2012 and 2013	Feedback used for quality assurance and program improvement

c) Include aggregated data from 4-6 instruments that were described in (a) and (b).

The evaluation mechanism currently in place to assess signature assignments uses a four point scale: 1 = No Evidence; 2 = Some Evidence; 3 = Adequate Evidence; and 4 = Clear Evidence. Summaries and interpretation of these measures are reported in Part III.

It is important to note that at times, courses are populated with candidates from other programs (change in program, taken as an elective, not properly identified in the system, option of dual credentialing, etc.). If these candidates have submitted a signature assignment using a different program's folio (DRF) based on one of these situations, the data would be reported as such and result in uneven numbers of participants in the program's assessment.

CORE COURSE ASSESSMENTS

GED 622: ADVANCED ASSESSMENT AND BEHAVIORAL ANALYSIS

Table 1 (2012) and Table 2 (2013) report the performance of Clear Education Specialist candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. The signature assignment in GED 622 Advanced Assessment and Behavior Analysis requires candidates to develop their comprehensive philosophy of assessment and positive behavior support that addresses the following:

- their personal beliefs and philosophy about their approach to assessment and behavior interventions/supports.
- identification of a viable set of rules and expectations based on this philosophy for their classroom (specify the grade level, number of students and types of disabilities involved) along with specific consequences for noncompliance with rules .
- how the rules/expectations are taught and are used to establish a positive classroom environment for students.
- established guidelines for individual behavioral needs, procedures, room arrangement, and behavior supports as appropriate.

Table 1**Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates**

Key Assessment: GED 622												
Year: 2012												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Personal beliefs/philosophy about assessment and behavior supports	2	4	0	19	3.42	.61	8	3.63	.74	11	3.91	.3
Identification of a viable set of rules/expectations along with reinforcements & consequences	2	4	0	19	3.63	.5	8	3.75	.71	11	3.82	.4
How rules/expectations are taught and used to establish a positive classroom environment	2	4	0	19	3.32	.48	8	3.5	.93	11	3.91	.3
Established guidelines for individual behavioral needs, room arrangement, procedures & positive supports	2	4	0	19	3.37	.5	8	3.5	.93	11	3.82	.4

Table 2**Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates**

Key Assessment: GED 622												
Year: 2013												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Personal beliefs/philosophy about assessment and behavior supports	0	0	0	9	3	0	2	3.5	.71	15	3.47	.74
Identification of a viable set of rules/expectations along with reinforcements & consequences	0	0	0	9	3	0	2	4	0	15	3.8	.41
How rules/expectations are taught and used to establish a positive classroom environment	0	0	0	9	3	0	2	4	0	15	3.6	.51

Established guidelines for individual behavioral needs, room arrangement, procedures & positive supports	0	0	0	9	3	0	2	3	1.41	15	3.47	.64
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	----	------	-----

The 2012 average overall scores in Arcadia, Bakersfield, Inland Empire, and Mission Valley Regional Centers showed strong performance with mean scores ranging between 3.32/4 - 4.0/4. In *Identification of a viable set of rules/expectations along with reinforcements & consequences*, candidates demonstrated a strong performance with scores ranging from 3.63/4 in Bakersfield, 3.75/4 in Inland Empire, 3.82/4 in Mission Valley, and 4.0/4 in Arcadia.

Comparison of scores in 2012 and 2013 showed consistent levels of success on this signature assignment across the regional centers. The criteria area of *Identification of a viable set of rules/expectations along with reinforcements & consequences* was the strongest area of candidate performance in Bakersfield (3.0/4), Inland Empire (4.0/4), and Mission Valley (3.8/4). Although scores for all criteria were at 3.0/4 or higher, *Established guidelines for individual behavioral needs, room arrangement, procedures & positive supports* showed itself to be relatively lower than other criteria with scores in Mission Valley (3.47/4), Inland Empire (3.0/4), and Bakersfield (3.0/4).

GED 650: UNIVERSAL ACCESS:EQUITY FOR ALL STUDENTS

Table 3 (2012) and Table 4 (2013) report the performance of Clear Education Specialist candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. The signature assignment in *GED 650 Universal Access: Equity for All Students* requires candidates to **design** (rather than retrofit) a standards-based curricular lesson for a unit of study. This assignment will demonstrate candidates deepened understanding of equitable access and implementing differentiate strategies (content, product, process) to form powerful standards-aligned lesson responsive to the needs of diverse learners (special education, English learners with assessed ELD levels, advanced learners, culturally diverse, at risk, etc.)

Table 3
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 650 Year: 2012												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
CA state standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0
Gathering facts about the learners	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3.83	.41	0	0	0
Considerations for differentiating: CONTENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3.83	.41	0	0	0

Considerations for differentiating: PRODUCT	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3.83	.41	0	0	0
Considerations for a differentiated instructional PROCESS	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3.83	.41	0	0	0
Identification of implementation stage	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3.67	.52	0	0	0
Reflection	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3.67	.52	0	0	0

Table 4
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 650 Year: 2013												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
CA state standards	0	0	0	11	3.41	.49	3	3.33	.58	13	3.08	.28
Gathering facts about the learners	0	0	0	11	3.55	.52	3	3.33	.58	13	3.15	.38
Considerations for differentiating: CONTENT	0	0	0	11	3.41	.49	3	3.67	.58	13	3.08	.28
Considerations for differentiating: PRODUCT	0	0	0	11	3.55	.52	3	3.33	.58	13	3.08	.28
Considerations for a differentiated instructional PROCESS	0	0	0	11	3.55	.52	3	3.33	.58	13	3.08	.49
Identification of implementation stage	0	0	0	11	3.45	.52	3	3.33	.58	13	3	.41
Reflection	0	0	0	11	3.45	.52	3	3.33	.58	13	2.92	.49

The 2012 average overall scores show a small N (N=6) with only one regional center (Inland Empire) reporting data. It is difficult to draw conclusions however overall scores ranged from 3.67 – 4 across all criteria showing strong performance among the candidates.

The 2013 data yielded performances from Bakersfield, Inland Empire, and Mission Valley regional centers. The majority of scores across all three regional centers were at 3.0 or better across all criteria. The criteria area of *Considerations for differentiating: CONTENT* was a relatively strong area of candidate performance in Bakersfield (3.41/4), Inland Empire (3.67/4), and Mission Valley (3.08/4). However, the criteria of *Reflection* showed itself to be somewhat lower than other criteria with scores in Mission Valley (2.92/4) which may have implications for the special education program team as it looks to program improvement issues based on this data.

GED 656: SHARED LEADERSHIP, LEGISLATION, AND DUE PROCESS

Table 5 (2012) and Table 6 (2013) report the performance of Clear Education Specialist candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. The signature assignment for *GED 656 Shared Leadership, Legislation, and Due Process* requires candidates to complete a School Scan wherein they examine, collect and utilize data, artifacts, and informational elements from their school site/district to produce the following:

- a. A Description of Policy and Procedures related to IDEA:
 - identification, assessment, and eligibility of special education services for students with disabilities
 - inclusive practices and programming
 - parent involvement, parental rights, and due process
 - collaborative teams and shared leadership decision-making
 - effective collaboration, consultation, and special education programming
- b. An Analysis of School Resources related to :
 - enhancing effective leadership skills in special education personnel
 - effective lesson planning/design, classroom instruction, lesson delivery
 - progress monitoring, assessment, and program evaluation
- c. A Personal Reflection related to:
 - the strengths of the school as they relate to policy, procedures, and resources
 - the perceived areas of need for improvement as they relate to policy, procedures, and resources

Table 5
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 656												
Year: 2012												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Description of Policy and Procedures	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	4	0
Analysis of school resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	4	0
Personal reflection	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	4	0

Table 6**Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates**

Key Assessment: GED 656 Year: 2013												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Description of Policy and Procedures	1	4	0	49	3.69	.58	21	3.5	.45	29	4	0
Analysis of school resources	1	4	0	49	3.69	.51	21	3.55	.47	29	4	0
Personal reflection	1	4	0	49	3.78	.47	21	3.64	.42	29	3.97	.19

The 2012 average overall scores were reported from one regional center, the Mission Valley regional center. Candidates showed a strong performance across all criteria with 4.0/4 on each criteria element.

The 2013 data yielded performances from Arcadia, Bakersfield, Inland Empire, and Mission Valley regional centers. The majority of scores across all three regional centers were at 3.5 or better across all criteria. The criteria area of *Personal Reflection* was a relatively strong area of candidate performance in Arcadia (4.0/4) , Bakersfield (3.78/4), Inland Empire (3.64/4) , and Mission Valley (3.97/4). Comparison of the 2012 and 2013 data for Mission Valley regional center showed consistent strong performance on this signature assignment.

GED 658: REFLECTIVE COACHING AND INDUCTION FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

Table 7 (2012) and Table 8 (2013) report the performance of Clear Education Specialist candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. The signature assignment for *GED 658 Reflective Coaching and Induction for Special Education* requires candidates to develop a personal development plan in the form of an individual induction plan. The plan requires the candidate to determine what they already know and what they need to know and be able to do, examine research and apply new learning to their teaching assignment, and reflect and apply this action plan for their future.

Table 7**Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates**

Key Assessment: GED 658 Year: 2012												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Focus: determining what the candidate needs to know and be able to do	17	3.71	.47	22	3.55	.51	4	3.5	.58	13	4	0

Action plan: examining research and applying new learning in their assignment	17	3.71	.47	22	3.36	.49	4	3	0	13	3.92	.28
Implementation steps: applying new learning in their assignment	17	3.71	.47	22	3.5	.51	4	3.25	.5	13	4	0
Reflection/application regarding instructional strategies and student attainment of goals/objectives	17	3.53	.51	22	3.45	.51	4	3.5	.58	13	4	0

Table 8
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 658 Year: 2013												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Focus: determining what the candidate needs to know and be able to do	0	0	0	16	3.63	.5	5	3.6	.55	23	3.96	.21
Action plan: examining research and applying new learning in their assignment	0	0	0	16	3.63	.5	5	3.2	.45	23	3.72	.45
Implementation steps: applying new learning in their assignment	0	0	0	16	3.56	.51	5	3.6	.55	23	3.83	.39
Reflection/application regarding instructional strategies and student attainment of goals/objectives	0	0	0	16	3.63	.5	5	3.8	.45	23	3.78	.42

The 2012 data showed strong performance overall with average mean scores ranging between 3.0/4 – 4.0/4 on all criteria. The criteria of *Focus: determining what the candidate needs to know and be able to do* showed scores closely group between 3.55 – 4.0 across all four regional centers. Arcadia (3.53/4), Bakersfield (3.45/4), Inland Empire 3.5/4), and Mission Valley (4.0/4) were also closely matched on the *Reflection/application regarding instructional strategies and student attainment of goals/objectives* criteria.

The 2013 data showed three regional centers reporting data on this signature assignment. Overall, candidate performance was above 3.5/4 on all criteria across the three regional centers with the notation that in Inland Empire the criteria of *Action plan: examining research and applying new learning in their assignment* showed a score of 3.2/4, which was relatively lower than Bakersfield and Mission Valley. In comparing 2012 and 2013 data, candidate performance was consistently strong with scores over 3.0/4 indicating competency in this area.

ADDED AUTHORIZATION IN SPECIAL EDUCATION
COURSE ASSESSMENTS

GED 652: METHODS FOR TEACHING STUDENTS WITH AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER

Table 9 (2012) and Table 10 (2013) report the performance of Clear Education Specialist candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. The signature assignment for *GED 652 Methods for Teaching Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder* requires the candidate to develop an Organizational/Self-Regulation System for an individual student with autism spectrum disorder to include:

- 1.) Daily Class/ Subject-Schedule
- 2.) Task Completion-Due Dates
- 3.) Long-Short-Term Assignments Planning
- 4.) DIS services
- 5.) Sensory Diet
- 6.) Assignment Notification
- 7.) Anticipation of Change
- 8.) Relaxation System
- 9.) Communication of Needs/Questions

Table 9
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 652 Year: 2012												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Daily class schedule, task completion, & long-short term assignments and planning	11	3.45	.52	10	4	0	12	3.75	.45	10	3.95	.16
Identification of DIS services and a sensory diet	11	3.45	.52	10	4	0	12	3.5	.52	10	3.85	.34
How the anticipation of change and a relaxation system are addressed	11	3.55	.52	10	4	0	12	3.42	.51	10	3.9	.21
How a communication system of needs/questions is taught and utilized	11	3.55	.52	10	4	0	12	3.25	.45	10	3.55	.69

Table 10**Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates****Key Assessment: GED 652****Year: 2013**

Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Daily class schedule, task completion, & long-short term assignments and planning	0	0	0	2	4	0	22	3.77	.43	11	4	0
Identification of DIS services and a sensory diet	0	0	0	2	4	0	22	3.82	.39	11	4	0
How the anticipation of change and a relaxation system are addressed	0	0	0	2	4	0	22	3.73	.46	11	3.97	.09
How a communication system of needs/questions is taught and utilized	0	0	0	2	4	0	22	3.68	.48	11	3.64	.64

The 2012 data showed the four regional centers of Arcadia, Bakersfield, Inland Empire, and Mission Valley reporting mean scores ranging from 3.45/4 – 4.0/4 on all criteria. The criteria of *Daily class schedule, task completion, & long-short term assignments and planning* showed scores closely grouped with 3.45/4 in Arcadia, 4.0/4 in Bakersfield, 3.75/4 in Inland Empire, and 3.95/4 in Mission Valley. On *How a communication system of needs/questions is taught and utilized*, Bakersfield (4.0/4) candidates showed a strong performance while Inland Empire (3.25/4), Arcadia (3.55/4) and Mission Valley (3.55/4) were more closely matched

The 2013 data showed three regional centers reporting data on this signature assignment. Overall, candidate performance was above 3.6/4 on all criteria across the three regional centers. The criteria of *Identification of DIS services and a sensory diet* was the area of strongest performance overall with Bakersfield at 4.0/4, Inland Empire at 3.82/4, and Mission Valley at 4.0/4. In comparing 2012 and 2013 data, candidate performance was consistently strong with scores over 3.0/4 indicating competency on this signature assignment.

GED 653: METHODS FOR TEACHING STUDENTS WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY

Table 11 (2012) and Table 12 (2013) report the performance of Clear Education Specialist candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. The signature assignment for *GED 653 Methods for Teaching Students with Traumatic Brain Injury* requires the candidate to conduct a comprehensive case study on a student with TBI. An extensive report is completed and presented in class using power point format.

The candidate is given the neuropsychological and academic assessment reports of a child who has Traumatic Brain Injury in a classroom. After reviewing the assessments and analyzing the results, each candidate will:

- Review and analyze the neurological and academic assessment reports
- Identify areas of strengths and areas of need
- Generate classroom recommendations of services and supports for IEP
- Goals /objectives for a Positive Behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues
- Assistive technology goals/objectives
- Academic goals/objective
- Goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team

Table 11
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 653 Year: 2012												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Review and analyze the neurological and academic assessment reports	0	0	0	13	3.38	.77	0	0	0	7	3.86	.38
Identify areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues	0	0	0	13	3.54	.52	0	0	0	7	3.43	.53
Generate classroom recommendations of services and supports for IEP	0	0	0	13	3.46	.52	0	0	0	7	3.43	.53
Goals/objectives for a positive behavior support plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues	0	0	0	13	3.31	.63	0	0	0	7	3.86	.38
Assistive technology goals/objectives	0	0	0	13	3.38	.65	0	0	0	7	3.86	.38
Academic goals/objectives; shared by a collaborative team	0	0	0	13	3.46	.66	0	0	0	7	3.86	.38

Table 12
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 653 Year: 2013												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Review and analyze the neurological and academic assessment reports	0	0	0	34	3.46	.68	2	3.5	.71	15	3.93	.26
Identify areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues	0	0	0	34	3.34	.81	2	3.5	.71	15	3.73	.46
Generate classroom recommendations of services and supports for IEP	0	0	0	34	3.19	.78	2	3	0	15	3.33	.49
Goals/objectives for a positive behavior support plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues	0	0	0	34	3.4	.72	2	3	0	15	3.2	.41
Assistive technology goals/objectives	0	0	0	34	3.38	.64	2	3.5	.71	15	3.47	.83
Academic goals/objectives; shared by a collaborative team	0	0	0	34	3.44	.6	2	3.5	.71	15	3.73	.46

The 2012 data showed the two regional centers of Bakersfield and Mission Valley reporting mean scores ranging from 3.31/4 – 3.86/4 on all criteria. The criteria of *Academic goals/objectives; shared by a collaborative team* showed the highest mean scores for Bakersfield (3.46/4) and Mission Valley (3.86/4). On *generate classroom recommendations of services and supports for IEP*, candidates in Bakersfield (3.46/4) and Mission Valley (3.43/4) were more closely matched in performance.

The 2013 data showed the three regional centers of Inland Empire, Bakersfield, and Mission Valley reporting data on this signature assignment. Overall, candidate performance was above 3.0/4 on all criteria across the three regional centers. The criteria of *Review and analyze the neurological and academic assessment reports* was an area of strong performance with Bakersfield at 3.46/4, Inland Empire at 3.50/4, and Mission Valley at 3.93/4. Another important criteria of *Identify areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues* showed mean scores of 3.34/4 for Bakersfield, 3.50/4 in Inland Empire, and 3.73/4 in Mission Valley. In comparing 2012 and 2013 data, candidate performance was consistently strong with scores over 3.0/4 indicating competency on this signature assignment.

GED 654: METHODS OF TEACHING STUDENTS WITH OTHER HEALTH IMPAIRMENTS

There is no data to report on *GED 653 Methods of Teaching Students with Other Health Impairments* because the Added Authorization, although approved by PLNU and CTC, has not been made available and offered to candidates to date. It will be offered in the late Summer of 2014 for the first time and will continue to be offered in the annual graduate course schedule for the 2014-2015 school year. Data will be collected from that time forward and reported in the next Biennial Report to CTC.

GED 661: EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM, SERVICES, AND SUPPORTS

Table 13 (2012) and Table 14 (2013) report the performance of Clear Education Specialist candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. The signature assignment for *GED 661 Early Childhood Special Education Curriculum, Services, and Supports* requires the candidate to develop an Individual Activity Plan with inclusive strategies based on a given child description (age, gender, special learning needs, developmental level). Candidates work in small collaborative groups to identify at least two instructional objectives in four different domains. Each group will describe two activities that would be appropriate in addressing these objectives across domains.

For each activity, describe:

- The objectives and their relationship to the IEP goals
- The adaptations and accommodations needed for the child including EL
- The environment/setting and materials needed
- The data collection system
- The way that family members are included in the activity
- Inclusive strategies for accomplishing curriculum adaptation, scheduling, class composition, grouping, and transitioning
- The roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in instruction.

Table 13
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 661 Year: 2012												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Description of the objectives and their relationships to the IEP goals	2	4	0	24	3.63	.49	0	0	0	11	3.82	.4
Statements about the adaptations and accommodations needed for the child including EL	2	4	0	24	3.58	.58	0	0	0	11	3.91	.3

Description of the environment/setting and the materials needed	2	4	0	24	3.63	.58	0	0	0	11	3.82	.4
Specifications about the data collection system used	2	2.5	.71	24	3.33	.76	0	0	0	11	3.36	1.03
Discussion about the way in which family members are included in the activity	2	3	1.41	24	3.54	.66	0	0	0	11	3.55	.93
Strategies for inclusion to accomplish curriculum adaptation, scheduling, class composition, grouping, and transitioning	2	2.5	.71	24	3.33	.76	0	0	0	11	3.82	.4
Description of the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in instruction	2	2.5	2.12	24	3.67	.56	0	0	0	11	3.55	.93

Table 14
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 661 Year: 2013												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Description of the objectives and their relationships to the IEP goals	1	4	0	16	4	0	2	4	0	12	4	0
Statements about the adaptations and accommodations needed for the child including EL	1	4	0	16	4	0	2	3	0	12	4	0
Description of the environment/setting and the materials needed	1	4	0	16	3.94	.25	2	3.5	.71	12	3.83	.39
Specifications about the data collection system used	1	4	0	16	3.63	.5	2	2.5	2.12	12	3.5	.8
Discussion about the way in which family members are included in the activity	1	4	0	16	3.88	.34	2	3	1.41	12	3.75	.45
Strategies for inclusion to accomplish curriculum adaptation,	1	3	0	16	3.88	.34	2	3	0	12	3.75	.45

scheduling, class composition, grouping, and transitioning												
Description of the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in instruction	1	4	0	16	3.94	.25	2	3	0	12	3.83	.39

The 2012 data showed the three regional centers of Arcadia, Bakersfield and Mission Valley. Three criteria areas in Arcadia scored below standards at 2.5/4 : *Specifications about the data collection system used; Strategies for inclusion to accomplish curriculum adaptation, scheduling, class composition, grouping, and transitioning; Description of the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in instruction*. Clearly, these scores and the candidate performance on these three criteria should receive consideration from the special education program team.

The criteria of *Description of the objectives and their relationships to the IEP goals* showed strong mean scores for Arcadia (4.0/4), Bakersfield (3.63/4), and Mission Valley (3.82/4). Similarly, on the criteria of *Statements about the adaptations and accommodations needed for the child including EL*, candidates scored well in Arcadia (4.0/4) , Bakersfield (3.58/4) and Mission Valley (3.91/4).

The 2013 data showed the four regional centers of Arcadia, Inland Empire, Bakersfield, and Mission Valley reporting data on this signature assignment. Overall, candidate performance was above 3.0/4 on all criteria across the regional centers. The criteria of *Description of the objectives and their relationships to the IEP goals* was the area of uniformly strong performance with Arcadia at 4.0/4, Bakersfield at 4.0/4, Inland Empire at 4.0/4, and Mission Valley at 4.0/4. Another important criteria of *Description of the environment/setting and the materials needed* showed mean scores of 4.0/4 for Arcadia, 3.94/4 for Bakersfield, 3.50/4 in Inland Empire, and 3.83/4 in Mission Valley. In comparing 2012 and 2013 data, candidate performance was consistently strong with scores over 3.0/4 indicating competency on this signature assignment.

GED 651 UNDERSTANDING EMOTIONAL/BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS, INTERVENTIONS, AND SUPPORTS

Table 15 (2012) and Table 16 (2013) report the performance of Clear Education Specialist candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. The signature assignment for *GED 651 Understanding Emotional/Behavioral Disorders, Interventions, and Supports* requires the candidate to conduct a comprehensive case study on a student with emotional and behavioral challenges. An extensive report will be completed and presented in class using power point format. This is the Signature Assignment for the course and will be submitted through Task Stream at the completion of the course. The report should include the following components:

- Demographic data on the student
- Description of the school and community

- Educational history (schools attended, reason for initial referral, pre-referral interventions, results of multi-disciplinary evaluation, disability category, placement decisions, IEP goals and objectives, behavior support plan)
- Family system elements
- Classroom accommodations
- Observational information related to goals and objectives
- Teacher/paraeducator interviews
- Summary and synthesis (comparison of student's characteristics with those described in textbook or other research, i.e. Which characteristics were identified in the student? Integrate at least three (3) sources from the literature with what you observed in your case study)
- Appendices – to include student work samples, teacher/paraeducator interview questions/answers.

Table 15
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 651												
Year: 2012												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Discussion of relevant demographic data on student	0	0	0	10	3.1	.32	0	0	0	0	0	0
Description of the school and community	0	0	0	10	3.2	.42	0	0	0	0	0	0
Educational history including schools attended, reason for initial referral, disability category, placement decisions, IEP goals, behavior support plan	0	0	0	10	3.2	.42	0	0	0	0	0	0
Statements about family system elements important to understand the student's behavior	0	0	0	10	3.1	.32	0	0	0	0	0	0
Description of classroom accommodations needed to support the student	0	0	0	10	3	.47	0	0	0	0	0	0
Observational information related to goals and objectives in IEP	0	0	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Description of outcomes from teacher/paraeducator interviews regarding the student	0	0	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Summary and synthesis statements indicating the comparison of student's characteristics with those described in textbooks or research	0	0	0	10	2.9	.74	0	0	0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---

Table 16
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Key Assessment: GED 651 Year: 2013												
Criteria	Arcadia Regional Center			Bakersfield Regional Center			Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center			Mission Valley Regional Center		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Discussion of relevant demographic data on student	0	0	0	5	3.4	.55	0	0	0	6	4	0
Description of the school and community	0	0	0	5	2.8	.45	0	0	0	6	4	0
Educational history including schools attended, reason for initial referral, disability category, placement decisions, IEP goals, behavior support plan	0	0	0	5	3.2	.45	0	0	0	6	4	0
Statements about family system elements important to understand the student's behavior	0	0	0	5	2.8	.84	0	0	0	6	4	0
Description of classroom accommodations needed to support the student	0	0	0	5	2.4	.55	0	0	0	6	4	0
Observational information related to goals and objectives in IEP	0	0	0	5	2.8	.45	0	0	0	6	4	0
Description of outcomes from teacher/paraeducator or interviews regarding the student	0	0		5	2.8	.45	0	0	0	6	4	0
Summary and synthesis statements indicating the comparison of student's characteristics with those described in textbooks or research	0	0		5	2.8	.45	0	0	0	6	4	0

The 2012 data showed the regional center of Bakersfield reporting data. ALL criteria areas in scored at the standard of at 3.0/4 or better with the exception of the criteria of *Summary and synthesis statements indicating the comparison of student's characteristics with those described in textbooks or research* (2.9/4). Clearly, this score and the candidate performance on this criteria should receive consideration from the special education program team.

The 2013 data showed the two regional centers of Bakersfield and Mission Valley reporting data on this signature assignment. In Bakersfield, only the two criteria of *Discussion of relevant demographic data on student* (3.4/4) and *Educational history including schools attended, reason for initial referral, disability category, placement decisions, IEP goals, behavior support plan* (3.2/4), showed competency on this data report. All the remaining criteria were below 3.0/4. In Mission Valley, candidates scored 4.0/4 on all criteria. The Special Education program team needs to review this data to determine ways to support candidate learning overall in the course based on the data from this signature assignment. In comparing 2012 and 2013 data, the special education program team must examine the candidate performance differences between Bakersfield and Mission Valley to determine how best to proceed with this signature assignment.

DISPOSITION ASSESSMENT

Candidates self-assess their Dispositions and are verified by the professor of record in the following courses: *GED 656 Shared Leadership, Legislation, and Due Process; GED 658 Reflective Coaching and Induction for Special Education; GED 659 Independent Study in Special Education*; Professors-of-record conduct candidate assessments in *GED 658 Reflective Coaching and Induction for Special Education*.

Table 17
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Disposition Data 2012						
Rated Item	Total	Distribution %				Average
		1	2	3	4	
Indicator 1: Dignity and Honor. The candidate honors and respects the worthiness of all individuals in word and deed based on PLNU's Wesleyan heritage: We are individuals created in the image of God, committed to civility, respect, hospitality, grace, and service.	97	0	0	24.74	75.26	3.75
Indicator 2: Honesty and Integrity. The candidate demonstrates honesty, integrity, and coherence in attitudes, and actions, and is accountable to the norms and expectations of the learning community	97	0	0	21.65	78.35	3.78
Indicator 3: Caring, Patience, and Respect. The candidate demonstrates caring, patience, fairness and respect for the knowledge level, diversity, and abilities of others, ensuring that all students have the opportunity to achieve.	97	0	0	18.56	81.44	3.81
Indicator 4: Spirit of Collaboration, Flexibility and Humility. The candidate actively participates in and contributes to the achievement of the learning community, explaining own thought process with humility and considers those of others with a positive, open-minded attitude.	97	0	3.09	30.93	65.98	3.63
Indicator 5: Harmony in Learning Community. The candidate takes responsibility for resolving conflicts or issues with others, and teaches students those skills, in a	97	0	2.06	31.96	65.98	3.64

way that sustains and enhances a healthy and safe learning community.						
Indicator 6: Self-Awareness/Calling. The candidate shows awareness of areas of strength, interests, learning style, and areas for continuing growth; generates and follows through on personalized growth plans. The candidate demonstrates that serving as a professional educator is a confirmed calling to equip, to transform and to empower every student to fulfill his or her full potential.	97	0	1.03	24.74	74.23	3.73
Indicator 7: Perseverance with Challenge. The candidate perseveres, remains engaged, and persists as a life-long learner, especially when academic and professional assignments are perceived as challenging.	97	0	3.09	23.71	73.2	3.7
Indicator 8: Diligence in Work Habits & Responsibility for Learning. The candidate attends to the roles and responsibilities of the learning community, and is well-prepared and on time. The candidate completes required assignments on time and is reflective and receptive to formative feedback.	97	1.03	4.12	37.11	57.73	3.52

Table 18
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Disposition Data 2013						
Rated Item	Total	Distribution %				Average
		1	2	3	4	
Indicator 1: Dignity and Honor. The candidate honors and respects the worthiness of all individuals in word and deed based on PLNU's Wesleyan heritage: We are individuals created in the image of God, committed to civility, respect, hospitality, grace, and service.	39	0	0	17.95	82.05	3.82
Indicator 2: Honesty and Integrity. The candidate demonstrates honesty, integrity, and coherence in attitudes, and actions, and is accountable to the norms and expectations of the learning community	39	0	0	7.69	92.31	3.92
Indicator 3: Caring, Patience, and Respect. The candidate demonstrates caring, patience, fairness and respect for the knowledge level, diversity, and abilities of others, ensuring that all students have the opportunity to achieve.	39	0	0	17.95	82.05	3.82
Indicator 4: Spirit of Collaboration, Flexibility and Humility. The candidate actively participates in and contributes to the achievement of the learning community, explaining own thought process with humility and considers those of others with a positive, open-minded attitude.	39	0	0	17.95	82.05	3.82
Indicator 5: Harmony in Learning Community. The candidate takes responsibility for resolving conflicts or issues with others, and teaches students those skills, in a way that sustains and enhances a healthy and safe learning community.	39	0	5.13	20.51	74.36	3.69
Indicator 6: Self-Awareness/Calling. The candidate shows awareness of areas of strength, interests, learning style, and areas for continuing growth; generates and follows through on personalized growth plans. The candidate demonstrates that serving as a professional educator is a confirmed calling to equip, to transform and to empower every student to fulfill his or her full potential.	39	0	2.56	7.69	89.74	3.87
Indicator 7: Perseverance with Challenge. The candidate perseveres, remains engaged, and persists as a life-long learner, especially when academic and professional assignments are perceived as challenging.	39	0	2.56	10.26	87.18	3.85
Indicator 8: Diligence in Work Habits & Responsibility for Learning. The candidate attends to the roles and responsibilities of the learning community, and is well-prepared and on time. The candidate completes required assignments on time and is reflective and receptive to formative feedback.	39	0	10.26	10.26	79.49	3.69

Table 19
Signature Assignment Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Disposition Data (New Dispositions effective 08.27.13)						
Rated Item	Total	Distribution %				Average
		1	2	3	4	
Indicator 1: Honor. The candidate honors and respects the worthiness of all individuals in word and deed based on PLNU's Wesleyan heritage: We are individuals created in the image of God, committed to civility, respect, hospitality, grace, and service, demonstrating coherence in attitudes and actions.	28	0	0	35.71	64.29	3.64
Indicator 2: Spirit of Harmony and Collaboration. The candidate actively contributes to the learning community with caring, patience and respect for the diversity of learners. The candidate takes responsibility for resolving conflicts or issues with others, and teaches students those skills, in a way that sustains and enhances a healthy and safe learning community. The candidate's flexibility and humility assures that all students have the opportunity to achieve to their potential.	28	0	7.14	39.29	53.57	3.46
Indicator 3: Reflective Learner. The candidate shows awareness of areas of strength, interests, learning style, and areas for continuing growth; generates and follows through on personalized growth plans. The candidate demonstrates that serving as a professional educator is a confirmed calling to equip, to transform and to empower every student to fulfill his or her full potential.	28	0	3.57	50	46.43	3.43
Indicator 4: Professional and Positive Perseverance. The candidate displays passion for teaching and learning by remaining positive, engaged and accountable to the norms and expectations of the learning community, especially when academic or professional assignments are perceived as challenging. The candidate is reflective and receptive to formative feedback.	28	0	7.14	32.14	60.71	3.54

Table 17 indicates the distribution percentage of how candidates evaluated themselves throughout the program on scoring rubric of 1 to 4 in the 2012 school year. Candidates scored higher than 3.5/4 on all dispositional criteria. Candidates scored relatively higher on Indicator 2 *Honesty and Integrity* (3.78/4) than they did on Indicator 8 *Diligence for Work Habits and Responsibility for Learning* (3.52/4). Table 18 shows how candidates evaluated themselves relative to the Dispositions in the 2013 school year. Candidates scored higher in this data set with 6 of the 8 criteria at 3.85/4 or higher. *Diligence in Work Habits and Responsibility for Learning* (3.69/4) and *Harmony in the Learning Community* (3.69/4) were scored relatively lower when compared to the other dispositional criteria. Table 19 reflects Disposition assessment after the

changes made in the number of Dispositions and the description of the Dispositions. Table 19 reflects the change from 8 Dispositions to 4 Dispositions.


Within Table 19 candidates demonstrated that *Disposition 1 Honor* (3.64/4) was the highest score and relatively lower was *Disposition 3 Reflective Learner* (3.43/4). Since the recent change from 8 Dispositions to 4 Dispositions, it would be useful for the program team to review the Table 19 findings and identify ways in which support for Dispositions can be increased in coursework across the program.

EXIT SURVEYS

The exit surveys for 2012 (Table 20) and 2013 (Table 21) are presented below. The exit survey which, upon program completion, probed candidates' overall satisfaction with the program, course of study, course content, and instructional delivery gives responses uploaded into Task Stream.

Table 20
Exit Survey 2012 for Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Advising, Scheduling, Teaching Faculty

*** Overall Program:** 

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 14 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as Count					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
During my time of enrollment, my experience with PLNU was positive.	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	85.71%	4.86
The Admissions staff was accessible, knowledgeable and helpful.	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	85.71%	4.86
The advising and scheduling services were accessible and helpful.	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
The teaching faculty was accessible and helpful.	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
The teaching faculty was well prepared for classes.	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	85.71%	4.86
The teaching faculty demonstrated their subject matter expertise.	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	85.71%	4.86
The teaching faculty helped me become more knowledgeable and sensitive in my preparation to work with diverse students, including students with exceptionalities.	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	85.71%	4.86
The teaching faculty modeled appropriate and professional dispositions.	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79

[The teaching faculty demonstrated a variety of instructional strategies and modeled teaching excellence.](#) 14 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 14.29% 85.71% 4.86

[Course syllabi were clear and helpful.](#) 14 0.00% 7.14% 14.29% 21.43% 57.14% 4.29

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

Pedagogy & Differentiation

✳️ [The MA SPED \(Clear/Induction\) program increased my ability to:](#) 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 14 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as Count					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
Present content to students in challenging, clear, and compelling ways, using real-world contexts and integrating technology appropriately	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	42.86%	57.14%	4.57
Provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that each student can learn	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	71.43%	4.71
Refine my teaching philosophy and integrate it more fully into my teaching practices	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
Use research regarding how students learn and how to make instruction accessible to them	14	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%	14.29%	78.57%	4.71
Demonstrate and apply content proficiencies to issues impacted by disability	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	71.43%	4.71
Demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to adjusting the instructional process to meet the academic needs of English Language Learners who have disabilities	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
Demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to providing multi-leveled content to meet the academic needs of students with exceptionalities	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	71.43%	4.71
Demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to implementing instructional strategies to positively impact all student learning	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	71.43%	4.71
Demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to scaffolding assignments to meet	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	71.43%	4.71

[the needs of all students](#)

Contextualize teaching by utilizing student's own experiences and cultures	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
--	----	-------	-------	-------	--------	--------	------

Provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students can learn	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
---	----	-------	-------	-------	--------	--------	------

Actively and effectively participate instructional teams and professional decisions	14	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%	7.14%	85.71%	4.79
---	----	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	------

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

Progress Monitoring

* [The MA SPED \(Clear/Induction\) program increased my ability to:](#) 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 14 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as Count					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
Reflect on my professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions and apply them in a variety of settings	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
Reflect on my practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	71.43%	4.71
Consider school, family and community context in connecting concepts to students' prior experience and real world issues to develop meaningful learning experiences for all	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
Apply professional expectations of the teaching profession	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
Analyze and monitor all student learning and make appropriate adjustments to instruction	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	85.71%	4.86
Differentiate student assessment products and use a variety of research-based formative and summative assessment strategies to increase learning for all students	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
Address students' preconceptions that hinder learning	14	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	14.29%	71.43%	4.57

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

Collaboration

✳️ [The MA SPED \(Clear/Induction\) program increased my ability to:](#)

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 14 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as Count					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
Create caring and supportive classroom environments by identifying individual student supports and services, dispositions, and learning styles to maximize their learning	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
Collaborate with other professionals to analyze student data for continuous adjustment and improvement of instructional planning	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
Work collaboratively to critique and reflect on each other's practice and effects on student learning	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
Regularly interact with other teachers, families of students, administrators, and university faculty	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79
Take on leadership roles in the professional learning community and collaborate with colleagues to contribute to school improvement and renewal	14	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%	21.43%	71.43%	4.64
Share my expertise in pedagogical content knowledge through mentoring roles in my school and community	14	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	14.29%	71.43%	4.57

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

Reflective and Lifelong Learner

✳️ [The MA SPED \(Clear/Induction\) program increased my ability to:](#)

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 14 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as Count					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
Reflect on my content, professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and connect my knowledge and awareness of the range of specific disabilities with the needs of my students	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.43%	78.57%	4.79

Critique and synthesize educational research and theories related to teaching, learning, and classroom practice based on my own applied research	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	4.50
Develop an expertise in certain aspects of disability through pedagogical knowledge, research, and field experience	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	35.71%	64.29%	4.64
Reflect on professional dispositions and develop plans to adjust dispositions when necessary	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	42.86%	57.14%	4.57
Participate in a variety of activities directed at improving teaching and learning	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	71.43%	4.71

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

Table 21
Exit Survey 2013 for Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

Advising, Scheduling, Teaching Faculty

 **Overall Program:**

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 1 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as Count					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
During my time of enrollment, my experience with PLNU was positive.	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
The Admissions staff was accessible, knowledgeable and helpful.	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
The advising and scheduling services were accessible and helpful.	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
The teaching faculty was accessible and helpful.	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
The teaching faculty was well prepared for classes.	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
The teaching faculty demonstrated their subject matter expertise.	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
The teaching faculty helped me become more knowledgeable and sensitive in my preparation to work with diverse students, including students with exceptionalities.	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
The teaching faculty modeled appropriate and professional dispositions.	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00

[The teaching faculty demonstrated a variety of instructional strategies and modeled teaching excellence.](#)

1 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 4.00

[Course syllabi were clear and helpful.](#)

1 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 4.00

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

Pedagogy & Differentiation

***The MA SPED (Clear/Induction) program increased my ability to:** 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 1 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as Count					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
Present content to students in challenging, clear, and compelling ways, using real-world contexts and integrating technology appropriately	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
Provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that each student can learn	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00
Refine my teaching philosophy and integrate it more fully into my teaching practices	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
Use research regarding how students learn and how to make instruction accessible to them	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00
Demonstrate and apply content proficiencies to issues impacted by disability	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00
Demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to adjusting the instructional process to meet the academic needs of English Language Learners who have disabilities	1	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.00
Demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to providing multi-leveled content to meet the academic needs of students with exceptionalities	1	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.00
Demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to implementing instructional strategies to positively impact all student learning	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
Demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to scaffolding assignments to	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00

[meet the needs of all students](#)

[Contextualize teaching by utilizing student's own experiences and cultures](#)

1 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 4.00

[Provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students can learn](#)

1 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 4.00

[Actively and effectively participate instructional teams and professional decisions](#)

1 0.00% 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 0.00% 3.00

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

Progress Monitoring

✱ [The MA SPED \(Clear/Induction\) program increased my ability to:](#) 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 1 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % Display as Count					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
Reflect on my professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions and apply them in a variety of settings	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00
Reflect on my practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00
Consider school, family and community context in connecting concepts to students' prior experience and real world issues to develop meaningful learning experiences for all	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
Apply professional expectations of the teaching profession	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00
Analyze and monitor all student learning and make appropriate adjustments to instruction	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
Differentiate student assessment products and use a variety of research-based formative and summative assessment strategies to increase learning for all students	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00
Address students' preconceptions that hinder learning	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

Collaboration

*The MA SPED (Clear/Induction) program increased my ability to: 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 1 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution %					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
Create caring and supportive classroom environments by identifying individual student supports and services, dispositions, and learning styles to maximize their learning	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
Collaborate with other professionals to analyze student data for continuous adjustment and improvement of instructional planning	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
Work collaboratively to critique and reflect on each other's practice and effects on student learning	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	4.00
Regularly interact with other teachers, families of students, administrators, and university faculty	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00
Take on leadership roles in the professional learning community and collaborate with colleagues to contribute to school improvement and renewal	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00
Share my expertise in pedagogical content knowledge through mentoring roles in my school and community	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

Reflective and Lifelong Learner

*The MA SPED (Clear/Induction) program increased my ability to: 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 1 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution %					Average
		1	2	3	4	5	
Reflect on my content, professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and connect my knowledge and awareness of the range of specific disabilities with the needs	1	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00

of my students

Critique and synthesize educational research and theories related to teaching, learning, and classroom practice based on my own applied research

1 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 2.00

Develop an expertise in certain aspects of disability through pedagogical knowledge, research, and field experience

1 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 2.00

Reflect on professional dispositions and develop plans to adjust dispositions when necessary

1 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 4.00

Participate in a variety of activities directed at improving teaching and learning

1 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 4.00

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

An analysis of the responses from the 2012 Exit Survey indicate strong confidence and satisfaction with the overall program. Candidates scored the area of *Teaching faculty helped me become more knowledgeable and sensitive in my preparation to work with diverse students* with 4.86/5. However, although 90.5% were in agreement and strong agreement , 7.14% indicated they were “*unsure*” about their *capacity to actively and effectively participate in instructional teams and professional decisions*. Similarly, 14.29% were “*unsure*” about their *competency to share their knowledge about pedagogical content through leadership roles in school and community*. Clearly these may be areas to address for program improvement by the special education program team.

One of the critical aspects of the design of the Clear/Induction program is to give candidates the opportunity to develop deeper understanding of specific disability areas. On the Exit Survey, they are asked to respond to this issue of building and deepening expertise in special education. Given the prompt of *Develop an expertise in certain aspects of disability through pedagogical knowledge, research, and field experience* , candidates demonstrated a mean score of 4.64/5 with 64.29% *strongly agreeing* and 35.71% *agreeing* with the statement.

Analysis of the 2013 data is more limited with a much smaller N (N=1). This data shows continued satisfaction with key outcomes and elements. Most criteria were viewed as “agree/strongly agree” with an “unsure” score for *competency to share knowledge about pedagogical content through leadership roles in school and community*.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
EDUCATION SPECIALIST CLEAR/INDUCTION PROGRAM
ADDED AUTHORIZATIONS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Table 22

Analysis of Candidate and Program Assessment Data from Tables 1-21
Clear/Induction Education Specialist Candidates

GED 622 Advanced Assessment and Behavior Analysis

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Personal beliefs/philosophy about assessment and behavior supports	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.0 – 3.5/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Identification of a viable set of rules/expectations along with reinforcements & consequences.	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.0 - 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
How rules/expectations are taught and used to establish a positive classroom environment	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.0 - 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Established guidelines for individual behavioral needs, room arrangement, procedures & positive supports	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.0 – 3.47 /4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.

GED 650 Universal Access: Equity for All Students

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
CA state standards/ Common Core	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.08 – 3.41/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Gathering facts about the learners.	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.15 – 3.55/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Considerations for differentiating: CONTENT	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.08 – 3.67/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.

Considerations for differentiating: PRODUCT	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.08 – 3.55/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Considerations for a differentiated instructional PROCESS	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.08 – 3.55/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Identification of implementation stage	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.0 – 3.45/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Reflection	Candidates showed a range of mean scores between 2.92 – 3.45/4 on this criteria	The Special Education program team needs to review this data to determine ways to support candidate learning.

GED 656 Shared Leadership, Legislation, and Due Process

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Description of Policy and Procedures	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.5 - 4.0/4	No improvement needed.
Analysis of school resources.	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.55 - 4.0/4	No improvement needed.
Personal reflection	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.64 - 4.0/4	No improvement needed.

GED 658 Reflective Coaching and Induction for Special Education

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Focus: determining what the candidate needs to know and be able to do	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.63 – 3.96/4	No improvement needed
Action plan: examining research and applying new learning in their assignment.	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.20 – 3.72/3	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.

Implementation steps: applying new learning in their assignment	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.80 – 3.83/4	No improvement needed.
Reflection/application regarding instructional strategies and student attainment of goals/objectives	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.63 – 3.80/4	No improvement needed.

GED 651 Understanding Emotional/Behavioral Disorders, Interventions, and Supports

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Discussion of relevant demographic data on student	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.40 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Description of the school and community.	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 2.80 – 4.0/4	The Special Education program team needs to review this data to determine ways to support candidate learning.
Educational history including schools attended, reason for initial referral, disability category, placement decisions, IEP goals, behavior support plan	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.20 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Statements about family system elements important to understand the student's behavior	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 2.80 – 4.0/4	The Special Education program team needs to review this data to determine ways to support candidate learning.
Description of classroom accommodations needed to support the student	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 2.40 – 4.0/4	The Special Education program team needs to review this data to determine ways to support candidate learning.
Observational information related to goals and objectives in IEP	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 2.80 – 4.0/4	The Special Education program team needs to review this data to determine ways to support candidate learning.

Description of outcomes from teacher/paraeducator interviews regarding the student	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 2.80 – 4.0/4	The Special Education program team needs to review this data to determine ways to support candidate learning.
Summary and synthesis statements indicating the comparison of student's characteristics with those described in textbooks or research	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 2.80 – 4.0/4	The Special Education program team needs to review this data to determine ways to support candidate learning.

GED 652 Methods for Teaching Students with Autism Spectrum Disorders

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Daily class schedule, task completion, & long-short term assignments and planning	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.77 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed.
Identification of DIS services and a sensory diet.	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.82 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed.
How the anticipation of change and a relaxation system are addressed	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.73 – 3.97/4	No improvement needed.
How a communication system of needs/questions is taught and utilized	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.64 – 3.68/4	No improvement needed.

GED 653 Methods for Teaching Students with Traumatic Brain Injury

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Review and analyze the neurological and academic assessment reports	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.46 – 3.93/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Identify areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.34 – 3.73/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.

Generate classroom recommendations of services and supports for IEP	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.00– 3.33/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Goals/objectives for a positive behavior support plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.0 – 3.40/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Assistive technology goals/objectives	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.38 – 3.50/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis needed to candidates.
Academic goals/objectives; shared by a collaborative team	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.44 – 3.73/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.

GED 661 Early Childhood Special Education Curriculum, Services, and Supports

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Description of the objectives and their relationships to the IEP goals	Candidates passed this criteria with a mean score of 4.0/4	No improvement needed.
Statements about the adaptations and accommodations needed for the child including EL	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.0 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Description of the environment/setting and the materials needed	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.50 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed.
Specifications about the data collection system used	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 2.50 – 4.0/4	The Special Education program team needs to review this data to determine ways to support candidate learning.
Discussion about the way in which family members are included in the activity	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.0 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.

Strategies for inclusion to accomplish curriculum adaptation, scheduling, class composition, grouping, and transitioning	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.0 – 3.88/ 4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.
Description of the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in instruction	Candidates passed this criteria with a range of mean scores between 3.0 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis given to candidates.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
EDUCATION SPECIALIST CLEAR/INDUCTION PROGRAM
ADDED AUTHORIZATIONS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

PART IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Data Source	Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made	Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)
Signature Assignments	<p>Candidates performed strongly on the signature assignments. Recommendations to be considered are as follows:</p> <p>Continue and Monitor:</p> <p>GED 622 - Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that support candidate development of how assessment, and specifically analysis of behavior, affects daily instruction and positive relationships with students.</p> <p>GED 650 – Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that support candidate development of understanding critical issues in equity of access for all students.</p> <p>GED 656 - Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that emphasize the value and usefulness of understanding the multiple roles of education specialist as teacher and leader within the IEP process, including assisting parents with instructional decisions and due process.</p> <p>GED 658 - Continuation of the activities and assignments in this course as supported by this signature assignment, This course is the defining aspect of the Induction process and the signature assignment captures key information for the candidates as they move forward in their careers as professional educators.</p> <p>GED 652 – Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that support candidate development of understanding and instruction of students with autism spectrum disorder.</p> <p>GED 653 – Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that support candidate development of understanding and instruction of students with traumatic brain injury</p> <p>GED 661 – Continuation of activities and</p>	<p>2, 5, 7</p> <p>6</p> <p>5,6</p> <p>4,7</p> <p>EDAA 1, ASDAA 1,2</p> <p>TBIAA 1,2,4</p>

	<p>assignments in this course that support candidate development of understanding and instruction of students in early childhood special education programs and services.</p> <p>Recommendation: GED 651 – The current signature assignment needs to be reviewed to determine if it is an adequate measure or if another measure might be more appropriate. It is also recommended that priority be given to a calibration activity before the course is offered again in the coming school year. The calibration process will increase greater alignment between regional centers on scoring of the assignment.</p>	<p>ECSEAA 1,2,3</p> <p>EDAA 1,2</p>
Dispositions	<p>Candidates scored higher than 3.5/4 on all dispositional criteria. Candidates scored relatively higher on Indicator 2 <i>Honesty and Integrity</i> (3.78/4) than they did on Indicator 8 <i>Diligence for Work Habits and Responsibility for Learning</i> (3.52/4). Candidates scored higher with 6 of the 8 criteria at 3.85/4 or higher. <i>Diligence in Work Habits and Responsibility for Learning</i> (3.69/4) and <i>Harmony in the Learning Community</i> (3.69/4) were scored relatively lower when compared to the other dispositional criteria. As the dispositions changed from 8 to 4, candidates demonstrated that <i>Disposition 1 Honor</i> (3.64/4) was the highest score and relatively lower was <i>Disposition 3 Reflective Learner</i> (3.43/4). With the recent change from 8 Dispositions to 4 Dispositions, it would be useful for the program team to review the Table 19 findings and identify ways in which support for Dispositions can be increased in coursework across the program. Recommendations include continuation of specific points of assessment of Dispositions within the program along with intentional activities and/or assignments within courses to support the development of the Dispositions throughout the candidate's experience of the program.</p>	

Exit Survey	<p>Candidates indicated confidence and satisfaction with the overall program. They scored the area of <i>Teaching faculty helped me become more knowledgeable and sensitive in my preparation to work with diverse students</i> with an average mean score of 4.86/5. However, although 90.5% were in agreement and strong agreement, 7.14% indicated they were “<i>unsure</i>” about their <i>capacity to actively and effectively participate in instructional teams and professional decisions</i>. Similarly, 14.29% were “<i>unsure</i>” about their <i>competency to share their knowledge about pedagogical content through leadership roles in school and community</i>.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly, areas where candidates indicated they were “unsure” are program improvement areas and will guide the special education program team to discuss and develop an action plan to better support candidates in their acquisition of skills, knowledge, and dispositions to be effective leaders in their school communities.</p>	Common Standard 9
--------------------	---	-------------------

GED 622 Advanced Assessment and Behavioral Analysis (Rev. 11.15.11)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Personal Beliefs/Philosophy About Assessment & Behavior Supports	Little or no evidence of statements of personal beliefs and a philosophy about assessment and behavior supports	A partial statement of personal beliefs and a philosophy about assessment and behavior supports	Clearly states personal beliefs and a philosophy about assessment and behavior supports	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly states personal beliefs and a philosophy about assessment and behavior supports	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Clear Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 5: Pedagogy Standard: Program Standard 6a: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching English Learners Standard: Program Standard 6b: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching Special Populations				
Identification of a Viable Set of Rules/Expectations Along with Reinforcements & Consequences	Little or no evidence relating to the identification of a viable set of rules & expectations with no clear rationale as to the specific reinforcements and consequences selected	Partial evidence relating to the identification of a viable set of rules & expectations with no clear rationale as to the specific reinforcements and consequences selected	Clearly relates the identification of a viable set of rules & expectations and a clear rationale as to the specific reinforcements and consequences selected	Clearly, consistently, convincingly relates the identification of a viable set of rules & expectations and a clear rationale as to the specific reinforcements and consequences selected	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Clear Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 5: Pedagogy Standard: Program Standard 6a: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching English Learners Standard: Program Standard 6b: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching Special Populations				
How Rules/Expectations are Taught and Used to Establish a Positive Classroom Environment	Little or no evidence of analysis of how rules/expectations are taught with no clear rationale for how they are used to establish a positive classroom environment	Partial evidence of analysis of how rules/expectations are taught with no clear rationale for how they are used to establish a positive classroom environment	Clear evidence of analysis of rules/expectations are taught with rationale for how they are used to establish a positive classroom environment	Clear and consistent, evidence of analysis of how rules/expectations are taught with clear rationale for how they are used to establish a positive classroom environment	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Clear Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 5: Pedagogy Standard:				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Program Standard 6a: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching English Learners Standard: Program Standard 6b: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching Special Populations				
Established Guidelines for Individual Behavioral Needs, Room Arrangement, Procedures & Positive Supports	Little or no evidence is given to identify and address the individual student's behavioral needs in the following areas: • Room arrangement. • Procedures and Positive Supports for the student's behavior as well as consequences as appropriate.	Partial evidence is given to identify and address the individual student's behavioral needs in the following areas: • Room arrangement • Procedures and Positive Supports for the student's behavior as well as consequences as appropriate .	Clear evidence is given to identify and address the individual student's behavioral needs in the following areas: •Room arrangement. • Procedures and Positive Supports for the student's behavior as well as consequences as appropriate.	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence is given to identify and address the individual student's behavioral needs in the following areas: • Room arrangement • Procedures and Positive Supports for the student's behavior as well as consequences as appropriate.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Clear Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 5: Pedagogy Standard: Program Standard 6a: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching English Learners Standard: Program Standard 6b: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching Special Populations				

GED 650 Universal Design Lesson Plan (Rev. 11.26.12)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
California State Standards	Little or no evidence citing use of California State Standards.	Partial evidence cited to include California State Standards.	Clearly states: California State Standards, grade level, and specific focus area.	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly states: 1) California State Standards, grade level, and specific focus area and 2) Interdisciplinary themes/standards.	
Gathering facts about the learners	Little or no evidence identifying the learners in the classroom.	Partial evidence identifying in the learners in the classroom to include: 1) ELL, Special Education, Gifted, and At-Risk populations.	Clear evidence identifying the learners in the classroom to include: 1) ELL, Special Education, Gifted, and At Risk populations, 2) Learning modalities of strength and multiple intelligences.	Clear and consistent evidence identifying the learners in the classroom to include: 1) ELL, Special Education, Gifted, and At Risk populations, 2) learning modalities of strength and multiple intelligence, 3) Pause and reflection to ensure that "all" students are considered.	
Considerations for differentiating CONTENT (What will they learn?)	Little or no evidence is given of adjusting content and curricular resources for instruction.	Partial evidence of adjusting level of content and differentiated curricular resources for instruction to include one of the following: 1) Variations in curricular resources for ELL, Special Education, Gifted, and At Risk populations.	Clear evidence of adjusting level of content and differentiated curricular resources for instruction to include both of the following: 1) Variations in curricular resources for ELL, Special Education, Gifted, and At Risk populations, 2) Adjustment in content to accommodate learning modalities of strength , multiple intelligence, and different learning abilities.	Clear and consistent evidence of adjusting level of content and differentiated curricular resources for instruction to include the following: 1) Variations in curricular resources for ELL, Special Education, Gifted, and At Risk populations, 2) Adjustment in content to accommodate learning modalities of strength , multiple intelligence, and different learning abilities, 3) Pause and reflection to ensure that "all" students are considered.	
Considerations for differentiating	Little or no evidence is given to address the use of multiple assessment products along with	Partial evidence is given to address the use of multiple assessment products along with	Clear evidence is given to address the use of multiple assessment products along with evidence and	Clear and consistent evidence is given to address to address the use of multiple assessment	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
PRODUCT (How will they convey their learning?)	evidence and criteria for assessing student progress.	evidence and criteria for assessing student progress: 1) Variations in the assessment products for ELL, Special Education, Gifted, and At Risk populations.	criteria for assessing student progress: 1) Variations in the assessment products for ELL, Special Education, Gifted, and At Risk populations, 2) Variations in the assessment products to include learning modalities of strength, multiple intelligence, and different learning abilities, 3) Pause and reflection to ensure that "all" students are considered.	products along with evidence and criteria for assessing student progress: 1) Variations in the assessment products for ELL, Special Education, Gifted, and At Risk populations, 2) Variations in the assessment products to include learning modalities of strength, multiple intelligence, and different learning abilities, 3) Pause and reflection to ensure that "all" students are considered.	
Considerations for a differentiated instructional PROCESS (How will they engage in learning?)	Little or no evidence for considerations for a differentiated instructional process.	Partial evidence for considerations for a differentiated instructional process to include MORE THAN two of the following: 1) Format (adapted lecture, activity-based, web-based, etc), 2) Arrangement (cooperative group structure, small group, tutorial,etc.), 3) Strategies (research-based, Blooms Taxonomy, ELL/SPED, etc), 4) Social/Physical (learning stations, individual seats, outside class, community learning, etc.), 5) Co-teaching (supportive, parallel, complementary, team).	Clear evidence for considerations for a differentiated instructional process to include MORE THAN two of the following: 1) Format (adapted lecture, activity-based, web-based, etc), 2) Arrangement (cooperative group structure, small group, tutorial,etc.), 3) Strategies (research-based, Blooms Taxonomy, ELL/SPED, etc), 4) Social/Physical (learning stations, individual seats, outside class, community learning, etc.), 5) Co-teaching (supportive, parallel, complementary, team).	Clear evidence for considerations for a differentiated instructional process to include MORE THAN two of the following: 1) Format (adapted lecture, activity-based, web-based, etc), 2) Arrangement (cooperative group structure, small group, tutorial,etc.), 3) Strategies (research-based, Blooms Taxonomy, ELL/SPED, etc), 4) Social/Physical (learning stations, individual seats, outside class, community learning, etc.), 5) Co-teaching (supportive, parallel, complementary, team), 6) Pause and reflection to ensure that "all" students are included.	
Identification of implementation stage	Little or no evidence of responsibilities of the involved staff during the instructional process.	Partial evidence of the responsibilities of the involved staff, highlighting responsibilities during the instructional process.	Clear evidence of the responsibilities of the involved staff, highlighting responsibilities before and during the instructional process.	Clear and consistent evidence of the responsibilities of the involved staff, highlighting responsibilities before, during, and after the instructional process.	
Reflection	Little or no statement of staff reflection.	Partial statement of staff reflection.	Clear statement of staff reflection to include: 1) how staff and students engaged and performed, 2) recommendation for design of the next lesson.	Clear and consistent statement of staff reflection to include: 1) how staff and students engaged and performed, 2) recommendation for design of the next lesson, 3) where, when, and how often collaborative reflection takes place.	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level

GED 651 Understanding Emotional/Behavioral Disorders: Interventions and Supports (Rev. 11.19.11)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Discussion of relevant demographic data on student	Little or no discussion of relevant demographic data on the student.	A partial statement/discussion of relevant demographic data on the student.	Clearly gives statements/discussion of relevant demographic data on the student.	Clearly and thoroughly discusses the relevant demographic data on the student.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Emotional Disturbance (ED) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Causes, Characteristics, and Definitions of Students with Emotional Disturbance				
Description of the school and community.	Little or no description of the school and community for the student.	A partial description of the school and community for the student.	Clearly gives a description of the school and community for the student.	Clearly and coherently gives a description of the school and community for the student.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Emotional Disturbance (ED) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Causes, Characteristics, and Definitions of Students with Emotional Disturbance				
Educational history including schools attended, reason for initial referral, disability category, placement, decisions, IEP goals and objectives,	Little or no evidence of descriptions of the educational history including schools attended, reason for initial referral, disability category, placement, decisions, IEP goals and objectives, behavior support plan.	Partial evidence of description of the educational history including schools attended, reason for initial referral, disability category, placement, decisions, IEP goals and objectives, behavior support plan	Clearly relates a description of educational history including schools attended, reason for initial referral, disability category, placement, decisions, IEP goals and objectives, behavior support plan	Clear and coherent description of educational history including schools attended, reason for initial referral, disability category, placement, decisions, IEP goals and objectives, behavior support plan	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
behavior support plan.	Standards CA- PLNU/Emotional Disturbance (ED) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Causes, Characteristics, and Definitions of Students with Emotional Disturbance Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Curriculum Design, and Interventions in Academic and Social Domains for Students with ED				
Statements about family system elements important to understand the student's behavior.	Little or no evidence of statements about family system elements important to understand the student's behavior.	Partial evidence is given regarding specifications about the data collection system used.	Clear evidence is given regarding specifications about the data collection system used.	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence is given regarding specifications about the data collection system used.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Emotional Disturbance (ED) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 3: Consultation and Coordination with Families and Other Service Providers				
Description of classroom accommodations needed to support the student.	Vaguely written, so there is little or no description of classroom accommodations needed to support the student.	Partially written to include some description of classroom accommodations needed to support the student.	Clearly written discussion and description of classroom accommodations needed to support the student.	Clearly and coherently written discussion and description of classroom accommodations needed to support the student.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Emotional Disturbance (ED) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Curriculum Design, and Interventions in Academic and Social Domains for Students with ED				
Observational information related to goals and objectives in IEP.	Little or no observational information given that is related to goals and objectives in IEP.	Some observational information given that is related to goals and objectives in IEP.	Clearly written statements about observational information that is related to goals and objectives in IEP.	Clearly and coherently written statements about observational information that is related to goals and objectives in IEP.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Emotional Disturbance (ED) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Causes, Characteristics, and Definitions of Students with Emotional Disturbance Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Curriculum Design, and Interventions in Academic and Social Domains for Students with ED				
Description of outcomes from teacher/paraeducator interviews regarding the student.	Little or no description of outcomes from teacher/paraeducator interviews regarding the student.	Partially stated, not necessarily clear, description of outcomes from teacher/paraeducator interviews regarding the student.	Clearly stated description of outcomes from teacher/paraeducator interviews regarding the student.	Clear and coherent description of outcomes from teacher/paraeducator interviews regarding the student.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Emotional Disturbance (ED) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Curriculum Design, and Interventions in Academic and Social Domains for Students with ED				
Summary and synthesis statements	Little or no summary/synthesis statements given to indicate the	Partially stated, not necessarily clear, summary/synthesis	Clear summary/synthesis statements given to indicate the	Clear and coherent summary/synthesis statements	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
indicating the comparison of student's characteristics with those described in textbooks or research.	comparison of the student's characteristics with those described in textbooks or research.	statements given to indicate the comparison of the student's characteristics with those described in textbooks or research.	comparison of the student's characteristics with those described in textbooks or research.	given to indicate the comparison of the student's characteristics with those described in textbooks or research.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Emotional Disturbance (ED) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Causes, Characteristics, and Definitions of Students with Emotional Disturbance Standard: Program Standard 3: Consultation and Coordination with Families and Other Service Providers				

GED 652 Methods for Teaching Students with ASD (Rev. 11.15.11)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Daily Class Schedule, Task Completion, & Long-Short Term Assignments Planning	Little or no evidence of statements of the development of the following: Daily class schedule, Task completion process, Long-Short term assignments planning	Partial statements of the development of the following: Daily class schedule, Task completion process, Long-Short term assignments planning	Clearly statements of the development of the following: Daily class schedule, Task completion process, Long-Short term assignments planning	Clear, consistent, and convincing statements of the development of the following: Daily class schedule, Task completion process, Long-Short term assignments planning	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Characteristics of ASD Standard: Program Standard 2: Teaching, Learning, and Behavior Strategies for Students with ASD				
Identification of DIS Services and a Sensory Diet	Little or no evidence relating to the identification of DIS services with no clear rationale as to the sensory diet selected	Partial evidence relating to the identification of DIS services with no clear rationale as to the sensory diet selected	Clearly relates the identification of DIS services and a clear rationale as to the sensory diet selected	Clearly, consistently, convincingly relates the identification of DIS services and a clear rationale as to the sensory diet selected	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Standards CA- PLNU/Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Characteristics of ASD Standard: Program Standard 2: Teaching, Learning, and Behavior Strategies for Students with ASD Standard: Program Standard 3: Collaborating with Other Service Providers and Families				
How the Anticipation of Change and a Relaxation System Are Addressed	Little or no evidence of analysis of how the Anticipation of Change is taught with no clear rationale for how a Relaxation System is used with the individual student	Partial evidence of analysis of how the Anticipation of Change is taught with no clear rationale for how a Relaxation System is used with the individual student	Clear evidence of analysis of the Anticipation of Change is taught with rationale for how a Relaxation System is used with the individual student	Clear and consistent, evidence of analysis of how the Anticipation of Change is taught with clear rationale for how a Relaxation System is used with the individual student	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Characteristics of ASD Standard: Program Standard 2: Teaching, Learning, and Behavior Strategies for Students with ASD				
How a Communication System of Needs/Questions is Taught and Utilized	Little or no evidence is given to identify how a Communication System of Needs/Questions is taught to and utilized by the student with Autism Spectrum Disorder	Partial evidence is given to identify how a Communication System of Needs/Questions is taught to and utilized by the student with Autism Spectrum Disorder	Clear evidence is given to identify how a Communication System of Needs/Questions is taught to and utilized by the student with Autism Spectrum Disorder	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence is given to identify how a Communication System of Needs/Questions is taught to and utilized by the student with Autism Spectrum Disorder	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Characteristics of ASD Standard: Program Standard 2: Teaching, Learning, and Behavior Strategies for Students with ASD				

GED 653 TBI Case Study Analysis and Program Plan (Rev. 11.15.11)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Review and analyze the neurological and academic assessment reports.	Little or no evidence of review and analysis of relevant neurological, and academic assessment reports.	Partial statements about relevant neurological and academic assessments without a thorough reveiw and analysis.	Clear statements to show review and analysis of relevant neurological and academic assessments.	Clearly and coherently shows evidence of review and analysis of relevant neurological and academic assessments.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Characteristics of Students with TBI Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching & Learning for Students with TBI				
Identify areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	Little or no description and identification of areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	Partial description and identification of areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	Clear description and identification of areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	Clear and coherent statements as evidence of identification of areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching & Learning for Students with TBI Standard: Program Standard 3: Specialized Health Care and Behavior and Emotional Issues and Strategies for Students with TBI Standard: Program Standard 4: Transition and Collaborating with Families and Other Service Providers for Students with TBI				
Generate classroom recommendations of services and supports for IEP.	Little or no evidence of recommendations of specialized academic instructional setting (home, natural environment, hospitals, treatment center, classroom, itinerant instructional delivery) services and supports for the IFSP, IEP, and ITP	Partial statements given as recommendations of specialized academic instructional setting (home, natural environment, hospitals, treatment center, classroom, itinerant instructional delivery) services and supports for the IFSP, IEP, and ITP.	Clear description given for recommendations of specialized academic instructional setting (home, natural environment, hospitals, treatment center, classroom, itinerant instructional delivery) services and supports for the IFSP, IEP, and ITP	Clear and coherent of recommendations of specialized academic instructional setting (home, natural environment, hospitals, treatment center, classroom, itinerant instructional delivery) services and supports for the IFSP, IEP, and ITP	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard:				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching & Learning for Students with TBI Standard: Program Standard 3: Specialized Health Care and Behavior and Emotional Issues and Strategies for Students with TBI Standard: Program Standard 4: Transition and Collaborating with Families and Other Service Providers for Students with TBI				
Goals /objectives for a Positive Behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues	Little or no evidence showing goals/objectives for a Positive behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues.	Partial evidence given showing goals/objectives for a Positive Behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues.	Clear description given of goals/objectives for a Positive Behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues.	Clear and coherent description given showing goals/objectives for a Positive Behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching & Learning for Students with TBI Standard: Program Standard 3: Specialized Health Care and Behavior and Emotional Issues and Strategies for Students with TBI Standard: Program Standard 4: Transition and Collaborating with Families and Other Service Providers for Students with TBI				
Assistive technology goals/objectives	Little or no discussion and description of Assistive technology goals/objectives	Partial discussion and description of Assistive technology goals/objectives	Clear discussion and description of Assistive technology goals/objective	Clear and coherent discussion and description of Assistive technology goals/objectives	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching & Learning for Students with TBI				
Academic goals/objective; Goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team	Little or no evidence of academic goals/objective;goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team.	Partial statements regarding of academic goals/objective;goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team.	Clear description of academic goals/objective;goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team.	Clear and concise of academic goals/objective;goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching & Learning for Students with TBI Standard: Program Standard 4: Transition and Collaborating with Families and Other Service Providers for Students with TBI				

GED 654 OHI Case Study Analysis and Program Plan (Rev. 11.18.11)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Review and analyze the neurological and academic assessment reports.	Little or no evidence of review and analysis of relevant neurological, and academic assessment reports.	Partial statements about relevant neurological and academic assessments without a thorough review and analysis.	Clear statements to show review and analysis of relevant neurological and academic assessments.	Clearly and coherently shows evidence of review and analysis of relevant neurological and academic assessments.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Other Health Impairments (OHI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 1: Characteristics of Students with OHI Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching and Learning for Students with OHI				
Identify areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	Little or no description and identification of areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	Partial description and identification of areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	Clear description and identification of areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	Clear and coherent statements as evidence of identification of areas of strength and areas of need for the student; instructional needs and issues.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Other Health Impairments (OHI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching and Learning for Students with OHI Standard: Program Standard 3: Specialized Health Care and Supports for Students with OHI				
Generate classroom recommendations of services and supports for IEP.	Little or no evidence of recommendations of specialized academic instructional setting (home, natural environment, hospitals, treatment center, classroom, itinerant instructional delivery) services and supports	Partial statements given as recommendations of specialized academic instructional setting (home, natural environment, hospitals, treatment center, classroom, itinerant instructional delivery) services and supports	Clear description given for recommendations of specialized academic instructional setting (home, natural environment, hospitals, treatment center, classroom, itinerant instructional delivery) services and supports	Clear and coherent of recommendations of specialized academic instructional setting (home, natural environment, hospitals, treatment center, classroom, itinerant instructional delivery) services and supports	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	for the IFSP, IEP, and ITP	for the IFSP, IEP, and ITP.	for the IFSP, IEP, and ITP	for the IFSP, IEP, and ITP	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Other Health Impairments (OHI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching and Learning for Students with OHI Standard: Program Standard 3: Specialized Health Care and Supports for Students with OHI Standard: Program Standard 4: Transition and Collaborating with Families and Other Service Providers				
Goals /objectives for a Positive Behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues	Little or no evidence showing goals/objectives for a Positive behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues.	Partial evidence given showing goals/objectives for a Positive Behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues.	Clear description given of goals/objectives for a Positive Behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues.	Clear and coherent description given showing goals/objectives for a Positive Behavior Support Plan addressing behavior challenges and self-esteem issues.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Other Health Impairments (OHI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching and Learning for Students with OHI Standard: Program Standard 3: Specialized Health Care and Supports for Students with OHI Standard: Program Standard 4: Transition and Collaborating with Families and Other Service Providers				
Assistive technology goals/objectives	Little or no discussion and description of Assistive technology goals/objectives	Partial discussion and description of Assistive technology goals/objectives	Clear discussion and description of Assistive technology goals/objective	Clear and coherent discussion and description of Assistive technology goals/objectives	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Other Health Impairments (OHI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching and Learning for Students with OHI				
Academic goals/objective; Goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team	Little or no evidence of academic goals/objective;goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team.	Partial statements regarding of academic goals/objective;goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team.	Clear description of academic goals/objective;goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team.	Clear and concise of academic goals/objective;goals/objectives shared by a collaborative support team.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Other Health Impairments (OHI) Added Authorization (2011) Standard: Program Standard 2: Assessment, Communication, Teaching and Learning for Students with OHI				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Standard: Program Standard 3: Specialized Health Care and Supports for Students with OHI Standard: Program Standard 4: Transition and Collaborating with Families and Other Service Providers				

GED 656 Rubric (Rev. 6.27.12)

	Far Below Standard	Below Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Score/Level
Description of Policy and Procedures Related to IDEA.	Little or no description of specific policies and procedures related to: - Identification, assessment, and eligibility of special education services -Inclusive practices and programming -Parent involvement, parental rights, and due process -Collaborative teams and shared leadership decision-making -Effective collaboration, consultation, and special education programming.	Partial description of specific policies and procedures related to: - Identification, assessment, and eligibility of special education services -Inclusive practices and programming -Parent involvement, parental rights, and due process -Collaborative teams and shared leadership decision-making -Effective collaboration, consultation, and special education programming.	Clear description of specific policies and procedures related to: - Identification, assessment, and eligibility of special education services -Inclusive practices and programming -Parent involvement, parental rights, and due process -Collaborative teams and shared leadership decision-making -Effective collaboration, consultation, and special education programming.	Clear and complete description of specific policies and procedures related to: - Identification, assessment, and eligibility of special education services -Inclusive practices and programming -Parent involvement, parental rights, and due process -Collaborative teams and shared leadership decision-making -Effective collaboration, consultation, and special education programming.	
Analysis of School Resources.	Little or no analysis of the following components: -Enhancing effective leadership skills in special education personnel -Effective lesson planning/design, classroom instruction, lesson delivery	Partial analysis of the following components: -Enhancing effective leadership skills in special education personnel -Effective lesson planning/design, classroom instruction, lesson delivery	Clear analysis of the following components: -Enhancing effective leadership skills in special education personnel -Effective lesson planning/design, classroom instruction, lesson delivery	Clear and complete analysis of the following components: -Enhancing effective leadership skills in special education personnel -Effective lesson planning/design, classroom instruction, lesson delivery	

	Far Below Standard	Below Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Score/Level
	-Progress monitoring, assessment, and program evaluation.	-Progress monitoring, assessment, and program evaluation.	-Progress monitoring, assessment, and program evaluation.	-Progress monitoring, assessment, and program evaluation.	
Personal Reflection	Little or no statements indicating personal reflection about the following: -The strengths of the school as they relate to policy and procedures as well as school resources -The perceived areas of need for improvements as they relate to policy and procedures as well as school resources.	Partial statements indicating personal reflection about the following: -The strengths of the school as they relate to policy and procedures as well as school resources -The perceived areas of need for improvements as they relate to policy and procedures as well as school resources.	Clear statements indicating personal reflection about the following: -The strengths of the school as they relate to policy and procedures as well as school resources -The perceived areas of need for improvements as they relate to policy and procedures as well as school resources.	Clear and convincing statements indicating personal reflection about the following: -The strengths of the school as they relate to policy and procedures as well as school resources -The perceived areas of need for improvements as they relate to policy and procedures as well as school resources.	

GED 658 Individual Induction Plan (Rev. 11.16.11)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Focus: Determining What the Candidate Needs to Know and Be Able To Do.	Little or no evidence cited to determine what the candidate needs to know and be able to do.	Partial evidence cited to determine what the candidate needs to know and be able to do.	Clear evidence given to determine what the candidate needs to know and be able to do.	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence given to determine what the candidate needs to know and be able to do.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Clear Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 4: Formative Assessment Standard: Program Standard 5: Pedagogy Standard: Program Standard 6a: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching English Learners Standard: Program Standard 6b: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching Special Populations				
Action Plan: Examining Research	Little or no evidence of an Action Plan that examines research and	Partial evidence of an Action Plan that examines research and	Clear evidence of an Action Plan that examines research and	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of an Action Plan that	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
and Applying New Learning in Their Assignment.	makes application of new learning in their assignment.	makes application of new learning in their assignment.	makes application of new learning in their assignment.	examines research and makes application of new learning in their assignment.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Clear Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 4: Formative Assessment Standard: Program Standard 5: Pedagogy Standard: Program Standard 6a: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching English Learners Standard: Program Standard 6b: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching Special Populations				
Implementation Steps: Applying New Learning in Their Assignment.	Little or no evidence of implementation steps that apply new learning in their assignment.	Partial evidence of implementation steps that apply new learning in their assignment.	Clear evidence of implementation steps that apply new learning in their assignment.	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of implementation steps that apply new learning in their assignment.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Clear Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 4: Formative Assessment Standard: Program Standard 5: Pedagogy Standard: Program Standard 6a: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching English Learners Standard: Program Standard 6b: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching Special Populations				
Reflection/Application Regarding Instructional Strategies and Student Attainment of Goals/Objectives.	Little or no evidence of reflection/application regarding instructional strategies and student attainment of goals/objectives.	Partial evidence of reflection/application regarding instructional strategies and student attainment of goals/objectives.	Clear evidence of reflection/application regarding instructional strategies and student attainment of goals/objectives.	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of reflection/application regarding instructional strategies and student attainment of goals/objectives.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Clear Credential (2011) Standard: Program Standard 4: Formative Assessment Standard: Program Standard 5: Pedagogy Standard: Program Standard 6a: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching English Learners Standard: Program Standard 6b: Universal Access: Equity for all Students – Teaching Special Populations				

GED 661 Early Childhood Special Education Curriculum, Services, and Supports (Rev. 11.18.11)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Description of the objectives and their relationships to the IEP goals.	Little or no evidence of description of the objectives and their relationships to the IEP goals.	A partial statement of the description of the objectives and their relationships to the IEP goals.	Clearly states the description of the objectives and their relationships to the IEP goals.	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly states the description of the objectives and their relationships to the IEP goals.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Added Authorization Standard: Program Standard 1: Characteristics of Infants, Toddlers, and Preschoolers with IFSP and IEPs Standard: Program Standard 4: Experience in Early Childhood Special Education Programs				
Statements about	Little or no evidence of	A partial statement about the	Clearly relates statements about	Clearly, consistently,	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
the adaptations and accommodations needed for the child including EL	statements about the adaptations and accommodations needed for the child including EL	adaptations and accommodations needed for the child including EL.	the adaptations and accommodations needed for the child including EL	convincingly, and coherently relates statements about the adaptations and accommodations needed for the child including EL.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Added Authorization Standard: Program Standard 1: Characteristics of Infants, Toddlers, and Preschoolers with IFSP and IEPs Standard: Program Standard 3: Assessment and Intervention/Instructional Strategies: Birth through Pre-Kindergarten				
Description of the environment/setting and the materials needed.	Little or no evidence of descriptions of the environment/setting and the materials needed.	Partial evidence of a description of the environment/setting and the materials needed.	Clearly relates a description of the environment/setting and the materials needed.	Clear and consistent, evidence of description of the environment/setting and the materials needed.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Added Authorization Standard: Program Standard 3: Assessment and Intervention/Instructional Strategies: Birth through Pre-Kindergarten				
Specifications about the data collection system used.	Little or no evidence is given regarding specifications about the data collection system used.	Partial evidence is given regarding specifications about the data collection system used.	Clear evidence is given regarding specifications about the data collection system used.	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence is given regarding specifications about the data collection system used.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Added Authorization Standard: Program Standard 3: Assessment and Intervention/Instructional Strategies: Birth through Pre-Kindergarten				
Discussion about the way in which family members are included in the activity.	Vaguely written, so there is little or no discussion about the way in which family members are included in the activity.	Partially written to include some discussion about the way in which family members are included in the activity.	Clearly written discussion about the way in which family members are included in the activity.	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly written discussion about the way in which family members are included in the activity.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Added Authorization Standard: Program Standard 2: Role of the Family in Early Childhood Special Education				
Strategies for inclusion to accomplish curriculum adaptation, scheduling, class	Little or no listing of strategies for inclusion to accomplish curriculum adaptation, scheduling, class composition, grouping, and transitioning.	Partial listing of strategies for inclusion to accomplish curriculum adaptation, scheduling, class composition, grouping, and transitioning.	Clearly written listing of strategies for inclusion to accomplish curriculum adaptation, scheduling, class composition, grouping, and transitioning.	Clearly and convincing listing of strategies for inclusion to accomplish curriculum adaptation, scheduling, class composition, grouping, and transitioning.	

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
composition, grouping, and transitioning.	Standards CA- PLNU/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Added Authorization Standard: Program Standard 3: Assessment and Intervention/Instructional Strategies: Birth through Pre-Kindergarten Standard: Program Standard 4: Experience in Early Childhood Special Education Programs				
Description of the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in instruction.	Little or no description of the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in instruction.	Partially stated, not necessarily clear, description of the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in instruction.	Clearly stated description of the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in instruction.	Clear and convincing statement of the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in instruction.	
	Standards CA- PLNU/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Added Authorization Standard: Program Standard 4: Experience in Early Childhood Special Education Programs				

1. Dignity & Honor: The candidate honors and respects the worthiness of all individuals in word and deed based on PLNU's Wesleyan heritage: We are individuals created in the image of God, committed to civility, respect, hospitality, grace, and service.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all.	Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed	
2. Honesty & Integrity: The candidate demonstrates honesty, integrity, and coherence in attitudes, and actions, and is accountable to the norms and expectations of the learning community.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all.	Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed	
3. Caring, Patience, and Respect: The candidate demonstrates caring, patience, fairness and respect for the knowledge level, diversity, and abilities of others, ensuring that all students have the opportunity to achieve.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all.	Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed	
4. Spirit of Collaboration, Flexibility and Humility: The candidate actively participates in and contributes to the achievement of the learning community, explaining own thought process with humility and considers those of others with a positive, open-minded attitude.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all.	Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for	

		teacher.		improvement are discussed	
5. Harmony in Learning Community: The candidate takes responsibility for resolving conflicts or issues with others, and teaches students those skills, in a way that sustains and enhances a healthy and safe learning community.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all.	Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed	
6. Self-Awareness/Calling: The candidate shows awareness of areas of strength, interests, learning style, and areas for continuing growth; generates and follows through on personalized growth plans. The candidate demonstrates that serving as a professional educator is a confirmed calling to equip, to transform and to empower every student to fulfill his or her full potential.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all.	Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed	
7. Perseverance with Challenge: The candidate perseveres, remains engaged, and persists as a life-long learner, especially when academic and professional assignments are perceived as challenging.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all.	Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed	
8. Diligence in Work Habits & Responsibility for Learning: The candidate attends to the roles and responsibilities of the learning community, and is well-prepared and on time. The candidate completes required assignments on time and is reflective and receptive to formative feedback.	Demonstrates indicator infrequently if at all.	Demonstrates indicator with direct prompting from peers or teacher. May have some difficulty in responding openly to feedback from peers or teacher.	Demonstrates indicator with minimal prompting. Demonstrates an openness to reflect on feedback from peers or teacher.	Consistently and spontaneously demonstrates indicator with relative ease. Demonstrates the ability to self-correct or demonstrates responsiveness to feedback from peers or teacher if areas for improvement are discussed	