



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

<b>Institution</b>	Point Loma Nazarene University School of Education
<b>Cohort</b>	none
<b>Date report is submitted</b>	11/14/14
<b>Program documented in this report</b>	Master in Teaching: Special Education, Moderate Severe
<b>Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)</b>	Traditional Intern
<b>Credential awarded</b>	Special Education Moderate Severe Preliminary Credential
<b>Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes</b>	
<b>If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered</b>	Bakersfield Inland Empire Mission Valley
<b>Program Contact</b>	Dr. Jill Hamilton-Bunch, Initial Teacher Preparation
<b>Title</b>	Associate Dean
<b>Phone #</b>	661.321.3487
<b>E-Mail</b>	JillHamilton-Bunch@pointloma.edu
<b>If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Dr. Shirlee Gibbs
<b>Title</b>	Director
<b>Phone #</b>	619.563.2852
<b>E-mail</b>	sgibbs @pointloma.edu

**SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION**  
**SPED MODERATE/SEVERE PRELIMINARY CREDENTIAL**  
**Traditional and Intern Pathways**

**PART I – Contextual Information:**

The Level I Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Program was approved by the CTC in 2003. By 2005, the CTC approved the Level I Education Specialist Moderate/Severe credential program, followed by the English Learner Authorization for both credentials in June 2007. The primary constituency for both programs is candidates who have completed their undergraduate degrees from other institutions and enroll in PLNU to complete the credential programs. An intern program and a traditional program in either Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe authorizations are available.

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 Preliminary 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 Teacher Education.

<b>Program Specific Candidate Information for Moderate Severe Credential</b>								
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	
	Trad	Intern	Trad	Intern	Trad	Intern	Trad	Intern
Arcadia Regional Center	4	1	3	1	0	0	0	0

Bakersfield Regional Center	29	6	13	6	22	0	10	3
Inland Empire/Corona Regional Center	3	0	3	1	5	0	5	0
Mission Valley Regional Center	22	0	3	0	12	0	8	1

**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 years.
- 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

### SPED Moderate/Severe Preliminary Credential Intern or Traditional Pathways

#### 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?

The School of Education collects a wide range of data on an annual basis from current students, graduates, master teachers and other teachers who host preliminary candidates, and from state-mandated assessments. Since the School of Education implemented the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in 2008 with the decision to include all Education Specialist candidates in the TPA process, TPA data has been collected on preliminary education specialist candidates even though CTC does not require it

As a result of that decision, the key assessments designated for the biennial report for preliminary educational specialist candidates are the four CalTPA assessments, and four “signature assignments” in courses that were designed by the SOE faculty.

Each of the courses within the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Credentials is designed to lead students to high levels of understanding and mastery centered around each of the common program standards as well as the program specific standards for education specialist teachers. The CalTPA tasks are uploaded to Task Stream and assessed by approved and calibrated assessors allowing for them to be assessed anonymously. The signature assignments are uploaded by the candidates on to the Task Stream website where they are assessed by the professor using a four point rubric. Both TPA and Signature Assignment scores and data are archived on Task Stream for data analysis and program improvement purposes.

The first task, TPA 1 *Subject-Specific Pedagogy*, was completed by candidates during their initial courses: *EDU 600 Foundations of Teaching and Learning Theory*, *EDU 601 /EDU 653 Language Acquisition and Diverse Populations / Acquisition of Language for Students with Disabilities*, and *EDU 602 Foundations of Special Education*. Students completed this first task (one case study at a time) with final submittal after completing all three courses.

Task 2, TPA 2 *Designing Instruction*, was completed after the candidate’s methods course, *EDU 612/EDU 654 Differentiated Math Instruction for All/ Teaching Methods for Students with Moderate/Severe Disabilities*.

Task 3, TPA 3 *Assessing Learning*, occurred for candidates’ while they attended Clinical Practice I (EDU 670 or 671) that was taken during the first eight weeks of clinical practice.

Candidates submitted the final task, TPA 4 *Culminating Teaching Experience*, upon completion of their second Clinical Practice experience (EDU 674 or 675), as a cumulative demonstration of their knowledge and skills at the end of their teaching credential program.

The additional signature assignments include the following:

- EDU 600 Signature Assignment *Demonstrating Knowledge of Learning Theory* wherein the candidate examines in-depth one of the research theories from the course.
- EDU 610 Signature Assignment *Literacy Case Study* that focuses on a student who is an English Learner from the vantage point of the Plan, Teach, Reflect, and Apply cycle.

- EDU 650 Signature Assignment *Positive Behavior Support Plan* wherein a candidate develops behavior intervention plan based on a case study scenario.
- EDU 652 Signature Assignment *Co-Teaching Lesson Plan* requires the candidate to develop a co-teaching lesson plan that delineates the roles of special education service providers in collaboration with general education staff to meet the diverse needs of students with mild/mod/severe needs and EL with special needs.

Evaluation Instrument (Direct)	Description	Data Collected: 2 years	Standards Assessed
TPA 1	Subject Specific Pedagogy	2012 and 2013	TPE Standards 1,3,4,6,7,9
TPA 2	Designing Instruction	2012 and 2013	TPE Standards 1,4,6,7,8,9,13
TPA 3	Assessing Learning	2012 and 2013	TPE Standards 3,6,7,8,9,13
TPA 4	Culminating Teaching Experience	2012 and 2013	TPE Standards 1-11, 13
EDU 600 Signature Assignment	Foundations of Education & Learning Theory	2012 and 2013	3,4,5,6,11
EDU 610 Signature Assignment	Teaching Reading Fall '09	2012 and 2013	5,6,7, 16
EDU 650 Signature Assignment	Assessment and Services for Students with Disabilities	2012 and 2013	1,4,5,6,7
EDU 652 Signature Assignment	Co-Teaching Lesson Plan	2012 and 2013	10, 12, 22, 23

**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 were introduced to the Dispositions in EDU 600 *Foundations of Education and Learning Theory*. At the end of the course, candidates self-assess their Dispositions and are verified by the professor of record. Candidates conduct self-assessments in EDU 612 *Differentiated Mathematics Instruction for All Learners* and in both phases of clinical practice. The professors-of-record, clinical practice university supervisors and cooperating teachers also assess candidates on dispositions.

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

**b) 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.

**CALIFORNIA TEACHER PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS**

**MODERATE/SEVERE CANDIDATES**

**Table 1**

**Signature Assignment Tasks 1-3 Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

Moderate/Severe Candidates 2012						
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Pass 1 <sup>st</sup> Rate	Pass 2 <sup>nd</sup> Rate	Pass 3 <sup>rd</sup> Rate
Task 1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Task 2	18	3.00	.47	66%	94%	100%
Task 3	13	3.07	.34	77%	92%	100%

Moderate/Severe Candidates 2013						
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Pass 1 <sup>st</sup> Rate	Pass 2 <sup>nd</sup> Rate	Pass 3 <sup>rd</sup> Rate
Task 1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Task 2	8	2.87	.54	63%	75%	100%
Task 3	5	3.00	.31	60%	100%	N/A

It is interesting to note that in 2012 Tasks 2 and 3 were passed with a mean score ranging from 3.00 – 3.07. Candidate performance was stronger on Task 3 in 2012 with a 1<sup>st</sup> time passage rate of 77% and a 2<sup>nd</sup> time passage rate of 92% . In 2013 the 1<sup>st</sup> time passage rate on Task 3 was only 31% with the 2<sup>nd</sup> time passage rate of 60%. This may be an area for consideration when the SPED Program team reviews the data for program improvement this summer.

In 2013, Task 2 was passed at a rate of 63% on the first attempt and 75% on the 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt. The overall mean score was at 2.87/4, an area of need for program improvement. Task 3, however, showed a strong increase from 60% on the 1<sup>st</sup> attempt to 100% on the 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt. It was on the 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt in each Task that a significant percentage of the candidates passed.

**Table 2**

**Signature Assignment Task 4 Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

<b>Task 4 – Culminating Teaching Experience Year: 2012</b>									
N	Criterion 1 - Establishing Goals and Standards	Criterion 2 - Learning About Students	Criterion 3 - Describing Classroom Environment	Criterion 4 - Planning for Instruction	Criterion 5 - Making Adaptations	Criterion 6- Using Subject- specific Pedagogical Skills	Criterion 7- Analyzing student evidence and assessment	Criterion 8 - Reflecting	Average Overall Score
104	Average Mean <b>3.11</b>	Average Mean <b>3.30</b>	Average Mean <b>3.39</b>	Average Mean <b>3.31</b>	Average Mean <b>2.99</b>	Average Mean <b>3.25</b>	Average Mean <b>3.19</b>	Average Mean <b>3.25</b>	<b>3.22</b>

<b>Task 4 – Culminating Teaching Experience Year: 2013</b>									
N	Criterion 1 - Establishing Goals and Standards	Criterion 2 - Learning About Students	Criterion 3 - Describing Classroom Environment	Criterion 4 - Planning for Instruction	Criterion 5 - Making Adaptations	Criterion 6- Using Subject- specific Pedagogical Skills	Criterion 7- Analyzing student evidence and assessment	Criterion 8 - Reflecting	Average Overall Score
95	Average Mean <b>3.06</b>	Average Mean <b>3.25</b>	Average Mean <b>3.38</b>	Average Mean <b>3.24</b>	Average Mean <b>3.03</b>	Average Mean <b>3.22</b>	Average Mean <b>3.25</b>	Average Mean <b>3.26</b>	<b>3.21</b>

The range of passing scores is high and provides useful information about key instructional components for Task 4. Comparison of scores for both 2012 and 2013 show strong performance with an overall average score of 3.22 for 2012 and 3.21 for 2013. Mean scores for each individual component area also remained close

between 2012 and 2013. *Learning About Students* (3.30; 3.25), *Planning for Instruction* (3.31; 3.24), and *Reflecting* ( 3.25; 3.26) were areas of relative strength among the various components.

### **EDU 600: FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING THEORY** **MODERATE/SEVERE CANDIDATES**

Table 3 ( 2012) and Table 5( 2013) report the performance of Education Specialist Moderate/Severe candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. Table 4 ( 2012) and Table 6 ( 2013) report the performance of Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist candidates.

The signature assignment for *EDU 600 Foundations of Education and Learning Theory* requires credentialing candidates to demonstrate their ability to do the following:

- Communicate their beliefs about education as related to students, learning, teaching, and schools
- Communicate their personal philosophy of education
- Communicate their reasons for choosing the field of education as a career choice
- Reflect on the development of their personal philosophies
- Demonstrate their ability to organize their thoughts in writing with correct grammar and spelling

**Table 3**  
**Signature Assignments Traditional Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE TRADITIONAL Key Assessment: EDU 600 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.
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



**Table 4****Signature Assignments Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE INTERN Key Assessment: EDU 600 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.
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 5****Signature Assignments Traditional Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE TRADITIONAL Key Assessment: EDU 600 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.
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	0
Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice	0	0	0	3	3.17	.29	0	0	0	1	4	0
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	4	0
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	0

**Table 6****Signature Assignments Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE INTERN Key Assessment: EDU 600 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.
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Due to the very low N ( N= 3) in 2013 and no data for 2012 it is difficult to make firm statements about this signature assignment. Candidates showed a performance ranging between 3.0 - 4.0. In *Knowledge of Research-Based Theories and Principles of Human Learning and Development*, candidates from Bakersfield and Mission Valley regional centers scored 4.00/4 in 2013. In *Presentation is Grammatically Correct, Spelling is Correct,*

*Layout is Organized* candidates in Bakersfield and Mission Valley also scored 4/4.0 in Bakersfield to 4/4.0. Comparison of scores between 2012 and 2013 are not possible due to an N=0 for 2012. No intern data was collected between 2012 and 2013 for this signature assessment.

**EDU 610: METHODS OF TEACHING READING AND WRITING**  
**MODERATE/SEVERE CANDIDATES**

Table 7 ( 2012) and Table 8( 2013) report the performance of Education Specialist Mild/Moderate candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. Table 9 ( 2012) and Table 10 ( 2013) report the performance of Intern Mild/Moderate Education Specialist candidates.

The signature assignment in *EDU 610 Methods of Teaching Reading and Writing* requires each candidate to choose an English Language Learner as a focus student during the field experience. The assignment requires candidates to perform the following tasks.

- Collect data through anecdotal observation and student conferences
- Collect data to determine the student's ELD abilities
- Collect data through the administration of literacy assessment instruments
- Reflect on the student's strengths and areas for growth
- Set learning goals or next steps for student growth

**Table 7****Signature Assignments Traditional Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE TRADITIONAL Key Assessment: EDU 610 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.
Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students	2	3.75	.35	5	3.8	.45	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data collection to determine language abilities or special needs	2	3.75	.35	5	3.8	.45	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data collection through the administration of literacy assessments	2	3	.71	5	3.8	.45	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	2	4	0	5	3.6	.55	0	0	0	0	0	0
Setting of learning goals or next steps for student growth	2	4	0	5	3.8	.45	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 8****Signature Assignments Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE INTERN Key Assessment: EDU 610 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.
Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data collection to determine language abilities or special needs	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data collection through the administration of literacy assessments	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Setting of learning goals or next steps for student growth	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 9****Signature Assignments Traditional Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE TRADITIONAL Key Assessment: EDU 610 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.
Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students	0	0	0	4	3.75	.5	0	0	0	4	4	0
Data collection to determine language abilities or special needs	0	0	0	4	3.5	1	0	0	0	4	4	0
Data collection through the administration of literacy assessments	0	0	0	4	3.25	1.5	0	0	0	4	4	0
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	0	0	0	4	3	1.41	0	0	0	4	3.88	.25
Setting of learning goals or next steps for student growth	0	0	0	4	3	1.41	0	0	0	4	3.75	.5

**Table 10****Signature Assignments Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE INTERN Key Assessment: EDU 610 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.
Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data collection to determine language abilities or special needs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data collection through the administration of literacy assessments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Setting of learning goals or next steps for student growth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Comparing the 2012 data for the EDU 610 Signature Assignment between Arcadia and Bakersfield regional centers, both groups of candidates scored well above 3.0 on all criteria. Specifically, on *Setting of learning*

*goals or next steps for student growth* Arcadia candidates scored 3.8 and Bakersfield scored 4/4 as an area of relative strength.

In 2013, a comparison between Bakersfield ( 3.75/4) and Mission Valley ( 4/4) regional centers on *Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students* showed this criteria as an area of strength. Overall, scores in Bakersfield ranged between 3.0 – 3.88 while in Mission Valley scores were somewhat higher ranging from 3.75 – 4/4 on all criteria.

Intern data showed a very small N ( N=1) from the Bakersfield regional center with scores of 4/4 on all criteria. No other intern data was available from the other three regional centers for this signature assignment.

### **EDU 650: ASSESSMENT AND SERVICES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES** **MODERATE/SEVERE CANDIDATES**

Table 11 (2012) and Table 12(2013) report the performance of Education Specialist Moderate/Severe candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. Table 13 ( 2012) and Table 14 ( 2013) report the performance of Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist candidates.

The signature assignment in *EDU 650 Assessment and Services for Students with Disabilities* requires each candidate to review a case in which a student requires a functional behavioral analysis and behavior support plan. The analysis will include the steps taken for the functional behavioral analysis, (slow and fast triggers, communicative intent, etc.), the assessment results, 3 goals/objectives for the IEP to include: behavior reduction, teaching of an alternative skill, and increasing the quality of life.

The plan will include materials, technology, supports, assessment system as well contacts with all stakeholders (student, parents, DIS, etc.) and when the team will reassemble to review progress or lack of progress. A personal reflection will also be conducted and identify new learnings and philosophy on supporting students with behavioral challenges.

**Table 11**

#### **Signature Assignments Traditional Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE TRADITIONAL Key Assessment: EDU 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.
Ecological Inventory	2	3.75	.35	9	3.22	.67	0	0		5	4	0
Target behavior interfering with learning	2	3.75	.35	9	3.67	.5	0	0	0	5	4	0
Data collection of presence and absence of behavior	2	3.75	.35	9	3.22	.83	0	0	0	5	4	0
Functional analysis of data with hypothesis and rationale	2	3.75	.35	9	3.22	.44	0	0	0	5	4	0
Goal development: reduce behavior interfering with learning	2	3.75	.35	9	2.78	1.09	0	0	0	5	4	0

Goal development: teach a replacement behavior that is socially acceptable and leads to self- regulation	2	3.75	.35	9	3.11	.33	0	0	0	5	4	0
Goal development: access to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life	2	3.75	.35	9	3.11	.33	0	0	0	5	4	0
Reflection	2	3.5	0	9	3.11	.93	0	0	0	5	4	0

**Table 12**

**Signature Assignments Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE INTERN Key Assessment: EDU 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.
Ecological Inventory	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Target behavior interfering with learning	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data collection of presence and absence of behavior	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Functional analysis of data with hypothesis and rationale	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goal development: reduce behavior interfering with learning	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goal development: teach a replacement behavior that is socially acceptable and leads to self-regulation	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goal development: access to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reflection	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 13****Signature Assignments Traditional Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE TRADITIONAL Key Assessment: EDU 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.
Ecological Inventory	0	0	0	12	3.54	.72	0	0	0	2	4	0
Target behavior interfering with learning	0	0	0	12	3.08	.51	0	0	0	2	4	0
Data collection of presence and absence of behavior	0	0	0	12	2.79	.58	0	0	0	2	4	0
Functional analysis of data with hypothesis and rationale	0	0	0	12	3.23	.63	0	0	0	2	4	0
Goal development: reduce behavior interfering with learning	0	0	0	12	2.9	.79	0	0	0	2	4	0
Goal development: teach a replacement behavior that is socially acceptable and leads to self-regulation	0	0	0	12	2.9	.79	0	0	0	2	4	0
Goal development: access to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life	0	0	0	12	2.98	.86	0	0	0	2	4	0
Reflection	0	0	0	12	3.4	.69	0	0	0	2	4	0

**Table 14****Signature Assignments Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE INTERN Key Assessment: EDU 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.
Ecological Inventory	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Target behavior interfering with learning	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data collection of presence and absence of behavior	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Functional analysis of data with hypothesis and rationale	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Goal development: reduce behavior interfering with learning	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goal development: teach a replacement behavior that is socially acceptable and leads to self- regulation	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goal development: access to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reflection	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Scores from 2012 with Bakersfield, Arcadia, and Mission Valley reporting data indicate candidates performed well on this assessment with all of the scores ranging 3.0 and higher. Bakersfield candidates tended to perform slightly lower than Arcadia and Mission Valley on most criteria in both 2012 and 2013. The criteria of *Target behavior interfering with learning* was a relative strength in 2012 across all three regional centers ( Bakersfield 3.67/4; Arcadia 3.75/4; Mission Valley 4/4). The criteria area of *Goal development: access to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life* showed the largest discrepancy with scores of 2.98 in 2012 in Bakersfield while scores in Mission Valley were 4/4 during the same time period.

Scores from 2013 were somewhat similar to 2012 with *Ecological Inventory* being an area of relative strength in both Bakersfield ( 3.54/4) and Mission Valley ( 4/4/). The criteria of *Functional analysis of data with hypothesis and rationale* was the next highest area of strength for candidates with scores of 4/4 in Mission Valley and 3.22/4 in Bakersfield.

Intern performance in Bakersfield is limited by a very small N ( N=1) in both 2012 and 2013. No other regional centers reported data for interns on this signature assignment. In 2012 the intern scores ranged between 3.0- 4.0 on the criteria. In 2013 intern performance was 4.0 across all criteria items.

### **EDU 652: COLLABORATION AND CONSULTATION FOR IEP IMPLEMENTATION, EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT MODERATE/SEVERE CANDIDATES**

Table 15 ( 2012) and Table 16 ( 2013) report the performance of Traditional Education Specialist Moderate/Severe candidates, including overall performance on a 4-point rubric, mean scores, and passage rates. Table 17 ( 2012) and Table 18 ( 2013) report the performance of Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist candidates.

The signature assignment in *EDU 652 Consultation and Collaboration for IEPs* requires each candidate to complete an Instructional Collaboration Project by using the California State Standards/Common Core Standards and co-teaching planning protocol as guides to:

- Prepare a lesson and delineate the role of a special education teacher, DIS, and paraeducators
- Lesson designed in collaboration with general education staff
- Lesson designed to meet the diverse needs of students with mild/moderate/severe disabilities and English Learners with special needs.



**Table 15****Signature Assignments Traditional Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE TRADITIONAL Key Assessment: EDU 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.
Common core standards and lesson plan objectives	4	3.75	.5	6	3	0	3	4	0	1	4	0
Additional considerations for students	4	4	0	6	3	0	3	3.67	.58	1	3	0
Considerations for enhancing materials (content) and assessment (student product) with co-teaching staff	4	3.25	.5	6	2.5	1.22	3	4	0	1	4	0
Considerations for enhancing instruction (process) with co-teaching staff	4	3.5	.58	6	3	0	3	4	0	1	4	0

**Table 16****Signature Assignments Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE INTERN Key Assessment: EDU 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.
Common core standards and lesson plan objectives	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Additional considerations for students	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Considerations for enhancing materials (content) and assessment (student product) with co-teaching staff	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Considerations for enhancing instruction (process) with co-teaching staff	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 17****Signature Assignments Traditional Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE TRADITIONAL Key Assessment: EDU 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.
Common core standards and lesson plan objectives	0	0	0	6	3	0	1	4	0	3	4	0
Additional considerations for students	0	0	0	6	3	.63	1	4	0	3	3.67	.58
Considerations for enhancing, materials (content) and assessment (student product) with co-teaching staff	0	0	0	6	3	0	1	4	0	3	4	0
Considerations for enhancing instruction (process) with co-teaching staff	0	0	0	6	3	0	1	4	0	3	3.67	.58

**Table 18****Signature Assignments Intern Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

MODERATE/SEVERE INTERN Key Assessment: EDU 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.
Common core standards and lesson plan objectives	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	0
Additional considerations for students	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	3.5	0
Considerations for enhancing, materials (content) and assessment (student product) with co-teaching staff	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	0
Considerations for enhancing instruction (process) with co-teaching staff	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	0

Traditional candidates performed strongly at all four regional centers ( Arcadia, Bakersfield, Inland Empire, and Mission Valley) in 2012 on this assessment with most scores between 3.5- 4.0 on all criteria. *Common Core Standards and Lesson Plan Objectives* was an area of relative strength with scores across all regional centers. In comparing regional centers, Bakersfield candidates seemed to score somewhat lower than candidates at other regional centers but still scores were at 3.0 or above for most criteria. *Considerations for Enhancing Materials*

(content) and Assessment (student product) With Co-Teaching Staff showed a relative spread of scores among candidates across Bakersfield ( 2.5/4), Arcadia ( 3.25/4), and Mission Valley (4/4).

In 2013, candidates continued to perform successfully on this assessment with all scores above 3.0 across all regional centers. The criteria areas of *Common core standards and lesson plan objectives* ( 4/4 in Mission Valley; 4/4 in Inland Empire; ¾ in Bakersfield) and *Enhancing instruction (process) with co-teaching staff* ( 3.67/4 in Mission Valley; 4.0/4 in Inland Empire; 3/4 in Bakersfield) again were areas of relative strength.

Intern candidates were limited ( N=1) in 2012 and (N=3) 2013 but nonetheless performed successfully ( 3.0 and above) on all criteria. In 2013, *Common core standards and lesson plan objectives* showed candidates in Bakersfield scoring at 3.0/4 and in Mission Valley 2.5/4 on this important criteria. *Considerations for Enhancing Materials (content) and Assessment (student product) With Co-Teaching Staff* was also shown to be an area for possible improvement with Mission Valley at 2.5/4 and Bakersfield with a score of 3.0/4.

### **Special TPA Section for Preliminary Credentials.:**

- 1) **Number of Assessors:** The total number of assessors the program uses is seven. These assessors actively scored in the years for which the biennial report data is being submitted.
- 2) **Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration:** All assessors must successfully complete the initial training. All assessors are recalibrated on an annual basis. They must also evaluate and score all (1-4) TPA's throughout the year.
- 3) **Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring (% of score agreement):**  
 15% of all first-try passing tasks are re-sent to different assessors for score agreement. 78% of these tasks gained score agreement on the first attempt of double scoring. The task continues to be sent until there is score agreement. If three attempts result in three different scores, the TPA coordinator becomes the final and fourth reader to obtain score agreement.  
 All non-passing tasks (scores of 1 or 2) are re-sent to different assessors for score agreement. 91% of these tasks gained score agreement on this first attempt of double scoring. The task continues to be sent until there is score agreement. If three attempts result in three different scores, the TPA coordinator becomes the final and fourth reader to obtain score agreement.
- 4) **Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration.**  
 No modifications have been made.

### **DISPOSITION ASSESSMENT** **MODERATE/SEVERE CANDIDATES**

**Table 19**

#### **Disposition Assessments: Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

<b>MODERATE/SEVERE Traditional and Intern Disposition Data 2012</b>						
<b>Rated Item</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Distribution %</b>				<b>Average</b>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	
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.	64	0	3.12	17.19	79.69	3.77
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	64	0	0	18.75	81.25	3.81
Indicator 3: Caring, Patience, and Respect. The candidate	64	0	0	29.69	70.31	3.7

demonstrates caring, patience, fairness and respect for the knowledge level, diversity, and abilities of others, ensuring that all students have the opportunity to achieve.						
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.	64	0	4.69	34.38	60.94	3.56
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.	64	0	1.56	34.38	64.06	3.63
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.	64	0	0	25	75	3.75
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.	64	0	3.12	25	71.88	3.69
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.	64	0	1.56	43.75	54.69	3.53

**Table 20**

**Disposition Assessments: Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

<b>MODERATE/SEVERE Traditional and Intern Disposition Data 2013</b>						
<b>Rated Item</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Distribution %</b>				<b>Average</b>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	
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.	19	0	0	26.32	73.68	3.74
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	19	0	5.26	15.79	78.95	3.74
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.	19	0	0	15.79	84.21	3.84
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.	19	0	5.26	36.84	57.89	3.53
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.	19	0	10.53	26.32	63.16	3.53
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.	19	0	0	21.05	78.95	3.79
Indicator 7: Perseverance with Challenge. The candidate perseveres, remains engaged, and persists as a life-long	19	0	0	26.32	73.68	3.74

learner, especially when academic and professional assignments are perceived as challenging.						
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.	19	0	0	52.63	47.37	3.47

**Table 21**

**Disposition Assessments: Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

Disposition Data (New Dispositions effective 08.27.13)						
Rated Item	Total	Distribution %				Average
		1	2	3	4	
Indicator 1: <b>Honor.</b> 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.	9	0	0	33.33	66.67	3.67
Indicator 2: <b>Spirit of Harmony and Collaboration.</b> 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.	9	0	0	66.67	33.33	3.33
Indicator 3: <b>Reflective Learner.</b> 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.	9	0	11.11	33.33	55.56	3.44
Indicator 4: <b>Professional and Positive Perseverance.</b> 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.	9	0	0	44.44	55.56	3.56

Candidates were assessed on their Dispositions of Noble Character beginning in the initial class within the MAT Level I/Preliminary Education Specialist program. Candidates are introduced to the Dispositions in EDU 600 *Foundations of Education and Learning Theory*. At the end of the course, candidates self-assess their Dispositions and are verified by the professor of record. Candidates conduct self-assessments in EDU 612 *Differentiated Mathematics Instruction for All Learners* and in both phases of Clinical Practice. The professors-of-record, clinical practice university supervisors and cooperating teachers also assess candidates on dispositions. Table 19 indicates the distribution percentage of how candidates evaluated themselves throughout the program on scoring rubric of 1 to 4. In the 2012 data, candidates scored at 3.5 or better in each of the

dispositional criteria. *Spirit of Collaboration, Flexibility, & Humility* ( 3.56/4) and *Diligence in Work Habits and Responsibility for Learning* ( 3.53/4) were somewhat lower than the other dispositional criteria. Table 20 shows how candidates evaluated themselves relative to the Dispositions in 2013. *Harmony in Learning Community* ( 3.53/4) and *Diligence in Work Habits and Responsibility for Learning* ( 3.47/4) were scored relatively lower than the other dispositional criteria. Table 21 reflects the new Disposition assessment after the changes made in the number of Dispositions and the description of the Dispositions. Table 21 reflects the change from 8 Dispositions to 4 Dispositions.

In Table 21 candidates showed that *Indicator 2 Spirit of Harmony & Collaboration* was scored at 3.33/4 and *Indicator 4 Reflective Learner* was scored at 3.44/4. *Indicator 1 Honor* received a mean score of 3.67, the highest score overall. *Indicator 3 Reflective Learner* showed a mean score of 3.44/4. Within Tables 19 and 20 candidates showed that Disposition 8 *Indicator 8: Diligence in Work Habits & Responsibility for Learning* was the lowest scored with 3.3/4 for 2012 and 3.41/4 for 2013 combining both traditional and intern candidates. All other Dispositions were scored between 3.5 – 4.0.

### **EXIT SURVEY** **MODERATE/SEVERE CANDIDATES**

**Table 21**

#### **Exit Survey Mild/Moderate Education Specialists**

The exit survey for 2012 is 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.

#### **Equip**

✳ [Formal Preparation for Teaching:](#) 🔍

**Form Element Type:** Rating Scale

**Total Author Response(s):** 23 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <a href="#">Display as</a>				Average
		<a href="#">Count</a>				
		1	2	3	4	
<a href="#">Construct effective lesson plans.</a>	23	73.91%	17.39%	0.00%	8.70%	1.43
<a href="#">Incorporate adaptations in lesson planning for English Language Learners and students with special needs.</a>	23	65.22%	26.09%	0.00%	8.70%	1.52
<a href="#">Plan a classroom management strategy for your classroom.</a>	23	60.87%	26.09%	8.70%	4.35%	1.57
<a href="#">Draw upon a variety of management strategies according to student/classroom needs.</a>	23	65.22%	21.74%	4.35%	8.70%	1.57
<a href="#">Use a variety of tools to keep parents informed of their child's progress in the classroom.</a>	23	60.87%	21.74%	13.04%	4.35%	1.61
<a href="#">Understand the importance of communicating regularly with parents.</a>	23	78.26%	13.04%	4.35%	4.35%	1.35
<a href="#">Conduct a parent/teacher conference.</a>	23	47.83%	26.09%	21.74%	4.35%	1.83

**Response Legend:** 1 = Well Prepared    2 = Adequately Prepared    3 = Somewhat Prepared    4 = Unprepared

#### **Transform**

✳ [Classroom Skills:](#) 🔍

**Form Element Type:** Rating Scale

**Total Author Response(s): 23 Author Response(s)**

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <a href="#">Display as</a>				Average
		<a href="#">Count</a>				
		1	2	3	4	
<a href="#">Effectively implement a variety of strategies to assess student learning.</a>	23	78.26%	13.04%	0.00%	8.70%	1.39
<a href="#">Use assessment data to inform instructional planning.</a>	23	73.91%	17.39%	0.00%	8.70%	1.43
<a href="#">Effectively implement a variety of EL strategies.</a>	23	60.87%	30.43%	4.35%	4.35%	1.52
<a href="#">Effectively implement a variety of strategies to meet the needs of students with special needs.</a>	23	86.96%	4.35%	0.00%	8.70%	1.30
<a href="#">Effectively implement a variety of differentiated instructional strategies to meet the learning needs of the full range of students in a typical classroom.</a>	23	73.91%	17.39%	0.00%	8.70%	1.43
<a href="#">Effectively implement a variety of classroom management strategies.</a>	23	78.26%	8.70%	8.70%	4.35%	1.39

**Response Legend:** 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared

**\*Functionality of Program:** 

**Form Element Type:** Rating Scale

**Total Author Response(s): 23 Author Response(s)**

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <u>Display as</u>				Average
		<u>Count</u>				
		1	2	3	4	
<a href="#">Exposing you to the diversity of settings in CA schools.</a>	23	69.57%	17.39%	8.70%	4.35%	1.48
<a href="#">Helping you gain a better understanding of the daily routines and responsibilities of a classroom teacher.</a>	23	69.57%	21.74%	4.35%	4.35%	1.43
<a href="#">Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via university supervision.</a>	23	78.26%	13.04%	4.35%	4.35%	1.35
<a href="#">Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via the clinical practice seminar.</a>	23	65.22%	21.74%	8.70%	4.35%	1.52
<a href="#">Assessing your teaching performance in the clinical practice placement.</a>	23	82.61%	8.70%	4.35%	4.35%	1.30
<a href="#">Supporting you in the completion of Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) tasks.</a>	23	60.87%	30.43%	4.35%	4.35%	1.52

**Response Legend:** 1 = Extremely Effective 2 = Effective 3 = Somewhat Effective 4 = Ineffective

**Empower**

**\*Professional Attributes:** 

**Form Element Type:** Rating Scale

**Total Author Response(s): 23 Author Response(s)**

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <a href="#">Display as</a>				Average
		<a href="#">Count</a>				
		1	2	3	4	



<a href="#">Collaborate with teachers in the school setting.</a>	23	73.91%	17.39%	4.35%	4.35%	1.39
<a href="#">Collaborate with school administrators in the school setting.</a>	23	60.87%	30.43%	4.35%	4.35%	1.52
<a href="#">Contribute to discussions of educational issues.</a>	23	60.87%	26.09%	4.35%	8.70%	1.61
<a href="#">Reflect upon your own teaching and make changes based upon that reflection.</a>	23	91.30%	0.00%	4.35%	4.35%	1.22

**Response Legend:** 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared

#### [Teaching as a Calling/Christian Worldview:](#)

**Form Element Type:** Rating Scale

**Total Author Response(s):** 23 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <a href="#">Display as</a>				Average
		<a href="#">Count</a>				
		1	2	3	4	
<a href="#">Encouraging you to explore teaching as a calling.</a>	23	86.96%	4.35%	4.35%	4.35%	1.26
<a href="#">Encouraging you to consider God's grace in your life.</a>	23	73.91%	21.74%	0.00%	4.35%	1.35
<a href="#">Raising your awareness of how dispositional characteristics impact a teacher's professional performance.</a>	23	86.96%	8.70%	0.00%	4.35%	1.22

**Response Legend:** 1 = Extremely Effective 2 = Effective 3 = Somewhat Effective 4 = Ineffective

### **EXIT SURVEY 2013** **MILD/MODERATE CANDIDATES**

**Table 21**

#### **Exit Survey Moderate/Severe Education Specialists**

The exit survey for 2013 is 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.

#### **Equip**

#### [Formal Preparation for Teaching:](#)

**Form Element Type:** Rating Scale

**Total Author Response(s):** 5 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <a href="#">Display as</a>				Average
		<a href="#">Count</a>				
		1	2	3	4	
<a href="#">Construct effective lesson plans.</a>	5	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00
<a href="#">Incorporate adaptations in lesson planning for English Language Learners and students with special needs.</a>	5	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.40
<a href="#">Plan a classroom management strategy for your classroom.</a>	5	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.20
<a href="#">Draw upon a variety of management strategies according to student/classroom needs.</a>	5	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00
<a href="#">Use a variety of tools to keep parents informed of their child's progress in the classroom.</a>	5	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.20
<a href="#">Understand the importance of communicating regularly with</a>	5	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00



[parents.](#)

[Conduct a parent/teacher conference.](#)

5 60.00% 40.00% 0.00% 0.00% 1.40

Response Legend: 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared

## Transform

✳️ [Classroom Skills:](#) 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 5 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <a href="#">Display as</a>				Average
		<a href="#">Count</a>				
		1	2	3	4	
<a href="#">Effectively implement a variety of strategies to assess student learning.</a>	5	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.20
<a href="#">Use assessment data to inform instructional planning.</a>	5	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	1.60
<a href="#">Effectively implement a variety of EL strategies.</a>	5	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.60
<a href="#">Effectively implement a variety of strategies to meet the needs of students with special needs.</a>	5	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00
<a href="#">Effectively implement a variety of differentiated instructional strategies to meet the learning needs of the full range of students in a typical classroom.</a>	5	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.60
<a href="#">Effectively implement a variety of classroom management strategies.</a>	5	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	1.60

Response Legend: 1 = Well Prepared 2 = Adequately Prepared 3 = Somewhat Prepared 4 = Unprepared

✳️ [Functionality of Program:](#) 🔍

Form Element Type: Rating Scale

Total Author Response(s): 5 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <u>Display as</u>				Average
		<u>Count</u>				
		1	2	3	4	
<a href="#">Exposing you to the diversity of settings in CA schools.</a>	5	80.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	1.40
<a href="#">Helping you gain a better understanding of the daily routines and responsibilities of a classroom teacher.</a>	5	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.20
<a href="#">Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via university supervision.</a>	5	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.20
<a href="#">Supporting you in the clinical practice experience via the clinical practice seminar.</a>	5	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.40
<a href="#">Assessing your teaching performance in the clinical practice placement.</a>	5	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.20
<a href="#">Supporting you in the completion of Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) tasks.</a>	5	60.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	1.80

Response Legend: 1 = Extremely Effective 2 = Effective 3 = Somewhat Effective 4 = Ineffective

## Empower

✳️ [Professional Attributes:](#) 🔍

**Form Element Type:** Rating Scale

**Total Author Response(s):** 5 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <u>Display as</u>				Average
		<u>Count</u>				
		1	2	3	4	
<a href="#">Collaborate with teachers in the school setting.</a>	5	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	1.60
<a href="#">Collaborate with school administrators in the school setting.</a>	5	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	1.60
<a href="#">Contribute to discussions of educational issues.</a>	5	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.20
<a href="#">Reflect upon your own teaching and make changes based upon that reflection.</a>	5	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00
<b>Response Legend:</b> 1 = Well Prepared    2 = Adequately Prepared    3 = Somewhat Prepared    4 = Unprepared						

**\* [Teaching as a Calling/Christian Worldview:](#)** 

**Form Element Type:** Rating Scale

**Total Author Response(s):** 5 Author Response(s)

Rated Item(s)	Total	Distribution % <u>Display as</u>				Average
		<u>Count</u>				
		1	2	3	4	
<a href="#">Encouraging you to explore teaching as a calling.</a>	5	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00
<a href="#">Encouraging you to consider God's grace in your life.</a>	5	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	2.00
<a href="#">Raising your awareness of how dispositional characteristics impact a teacher's professional performance.</a>	5	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.20
<b>Response Legend:</b> 1 = Extremely Effective   2 = Effective   3 = Somewhat Effective   4 = Ineffective						

An analysis of the 2012 data can be informative due to the robust N( N=23). An analysis of the responses from the 2012 Exit Survey indicate strong confidence in teaching skills acquired in the program in the areas of Transform by combining the scores for “well prepared” and “adequately prepared” to show greater than 90% agreement. Similarly, by combining the scores for Empower (“extremely effective” and “effective”) again a score of greater than 90% can be seen. However, when examining Equip and specifically looking at the issue of parent/teacher conferences, slightly more than 25% of candidates indicated that they felt either only “somewhat prepared” or “underprepared”. Clearly this is an area for program improvement by the special education program team.

Analysis of the 2013 data is more limited with a much smaller N ( N=5). This data shows continued satisfaction with key outcomes and elements grouped under our programmatic themes of Equip, Transform, and Empower. All criteria were viewed as well prepared/ prepared and/or extremely effective/effective. A high degree of satisfaction was seen among the 2013 candidates.

**SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION**  
**SPED MOD/SEVERE PRELIMINARY CREDENTIAL**  
**Traditional and Intern Pathways**

**PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data**

**Table 22**  
**Analyses of Candidate and Program Assessment data from Tables 1-21.**

**CalTPA for Moderate/ Severe Education Specialist Candidates**

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Task 1	No data reported. Moderate/Severe candidates had taken Task 1 while enrolled in a different credentialing program.	No data reported.
Task 2	The candidates gave considerable effort to learning about their students. The candidates are receiving solid exposure to and practice of how to design effective instruction. 75% of our candidates passed this task on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> attempt. The average mean score was only 2.87/4	Our program needs to continue encouraging the practice of making appropriate instructional and content adaptations to meet the needs of students.
Task #3	Candidates are gaining proficiency in planning developmentally appropriate activities and reflecting on evidence of student learning based on those assessments. 60% of our candidates passed this task on the 1st attempt; 100% on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> attempt.	Candidates continue to be challenged in making adaptations to their instruction, content, and assessment in the effort to meet the needs of their English Learners and children who pose different learning challenges.
Task #4	The criteria in Task 4 became one of the higher scoring criteria. Candidates passed this task on the first attempt, with an average mean score of 3.21/4	Candidates are in the final clinical practice experience and they continue to be challenged with developing appropriate adaptations to meet the learning needs of all students.

**EDU 600 Philosophy of Education Signature Assignment**

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	Candidates passed this criteria with a mean score of 4.0/4	No improvement needed

Knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.17/4 – 4.0/4.	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.0/4 – 4.0/4.	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized.	Candidates passed this criteria with a mean score of 4.0/4	No improvement needed.

#### **EDU 610 Methods of Teaching Reading and Writing signature assignment**

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Data collection through anecdotal observation and student conferences	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.75/4 – 4.0/4.	No improvement needed.
Data collection to determine student ELD abilities	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.50/4 – 4.0/4.	No improvement needed.
Data collection through administration of literacy assessment instruments	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.25/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.0/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Setting learning goals or next steps for student growth	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.0/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.

#### **EDU 650 Assessment and Services for Students with Disabilities signature assignment**

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Ecological Inventory	Candidates passed this criteria with means scores ranging from 3.22/4 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.

Target behavior interfering with learning	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.67/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Data collection of presence and absence of behavior	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.22/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended..
Functional analysis of data with hypothesis and rationale	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.22/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Goal development: reduce behavior interfering with learning	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.22/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Goal development: teach a replacement behavior that is socially acceptable and leads to self-regulation	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.11/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Goal development: access to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life.	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.11/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.
Reflection	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.11/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed with continued emphasis recommended.

#### **EDU 652 Consultation and Collaboration for IEPs signature assignment**

Criteria	Strengths	Areas for Improvement
Common core standards and lesson plan objectives	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 2.5/4 – 4.0/4	Program team needs to review Intern performance on this signature assignment.
Additional considerations for students	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.5/4 – 4.0/4	No improvement needed.

Considerations for enhancing, materials (content) and assessment (student product) with co-teaching staff	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 3.0/4 – 4.0/4.	No improvement needed but continued emphasis recommended.
Considerations for enhancing instruction (process) with co-teaching staff	Candidates passed this criteria with mean scores ranging from 2.5/4 – 4.0/4	Program team needs to review Intern performance on this signature assignment.

### **ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:**

**ALL PROGRAM COURSES:** All syllabi and accompanying assignments will be reviewed to ensure adequate instruction of the common core standards at the graduate level.

**ALL PROGRAM DATA** Candidates enrolled in the Masters in Teaching (MAT) degree program often enter with the goal of receiving one preliminary credential. Many candidates are now choosing to seek two credentials. This requires that candidates enter into a second Taskstream Direct Response Folio (DRF). This impacts the consistent number of participants in a program. Key Assessment data may be in one folio or the other.

**SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION**  
**SPED MOD/SEVERE PRELIMINARY CREDENTIAL**  
**Traditional and Intern Pathways**

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

<b>Data Source</b>	<b>Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made</b>	<b>Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)</b>
TPA 1,2 ,3,& 4	<p><b>No changes. Continue to Monitor.</b></p> <p>All tasks were passed at a relatively high rate, between 82% and 100% passage rate. Education Specialist candidates' overall mean scores are very consistent over the course of Tasks 1-4, indicating that candidate skill and knowledge remains strong as the rigor of the performance tasks increase. This is also a finding that can be considered a program strength.</p> <p>In 2013, Task 2 was passed at a rate of 63% on the first attempt and 75% on the 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt. The overall mean score was at 2.87/4, an area of need for program improvement. Task 3, however, showed a strong increase from 60% on the 1<sup>st</sup> attempt to 100% on the 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt. It was on the 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt in each Task that a significant percentage of the candidates passed. Education Specialist candidates' overall mean scores are very consistent across Tasks 2-3, indicating that candidate skill and knowledge remains strong as the rigor of the performance tasks increase.</p> <p>The range of passing scores is high and provides useful information about the quality of preparation provided by the SOE. No significant difference was apparent among the four regional centers. Continued intentional work on the TPAs embedded in coursework would assist candidates in their preparation for TPAs. The Special Education Program Director and TPA coordinator will continue regular monitoring of each candidate's progress throughout the program.</p>	<p><i>Common Standard 9</i></p> <p><i>M/S Program Standard 3</i></p>
Signature Assignments	<p>Candidates performed strongly on the signature assignments.</p> <p><b>No changes. Continue to Monitor.</b></p> <p>EDU 600 - Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that support candidate development of how learning theories affect and resonate with their beliefs.</p>	<p><i>Common Standard 9</i></p> <p><i>M/S Program Standard 3</i></p>

	<p>EDU 610 – Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that support candidate development of how reading, reading comprehension, and literacy skills develop to a competency level in students.</p> <p>EDU 652 - Since consultation and collaboration are critical aspects of the function of an education specialist in schools today the signature assignment in this course is an essential one. Recommend continuation of this signature assignment.</p> <p>EDU 650- <b>Recommendation:</b> The current signature assignment is limited in its capacity to measure only a few of the standards for the course. Recommend the use of a signature assignment that measures a wider array of standards for this course.</p> <p>EDU 655 - <b>Recommendation:</b> Add a signature assignment to (Organization for Success in the Mod/Severe Classroom) as a means to help address candidate knowledge and skills in instructional strategies.</p>	
Dispositions	<p>Since between 2012 and 2013 the Dispositions were revised and changed from 8 to 4, a review of the implementation process for the new 4 Dispositions needs to occur throughout the coming years. Upon initial analysis, however, the data showed <i>Indicator 3 Reflective Learner</i> as being the area of lowest concern with a mean score of 3.35/4. <i>Indicator 2 Spirit of Harmony and Collaboration</i> received a score of 3.50/4 with <i>Indicator 4 Professional and Positive Perseverance</i> received a mean score of 3.54/4. The highest mean score was shown in <i>Indicator 1 Harmony</i> received a mean score of 3.58/4.</p> <p><b><u>Recommend:</u></b> As a result, faculty need to discuss ways to assist candidates by increasing their confidence in collaboration and emphasizing the need to exhibit humility as well as learning how to manage conflicts and/or issues with others. The faculty need to develop a “plan of action” as to how to address these three areas for future candidates to include discussion and role play.</p>	<p><i>Common Standard 2 and 9</i></p> <p><i>M/S Program Standard 4</i></p>
Exit Survey	<p>As with the disposition data, this data requires time discussion and follow-up by faculty. An analysis of the responses indicate strong confidence in teaching skills acquired in the program in the areas of Transform by combining the scores for “well prepared” and “adequately</p>	<p><i>Common Standard 7</i></p>



	<p>prepared” to show greater than 90% agreement. Similarly, by combining the scores for Empower (“extremely effective” and “effective”) again a score of greater than 90% can be seen. However, when examining Equip and specifically looking at the issue of parent/teacher conferences, slightly more than 25% of candidates indicated that they felt either only “somewhat prepared” or “underprepared”. Clearly this is an area for program improvement by the special education program team.</p> <p><b><u>Recommend:</u></b> Implementing the co-teaching clinical practice model, candidates will have increased access to parent partnerships.</p>	
<p>Course Data</p> <p>Disposition Data</p> <p>Exit Survey Data</p>	<p><b><u>Recommend:</u></b> With candidates choosing to seek two credentials, they enter into a second DRF. This impacts the consistent number of participants (n) in the assessments of a program. Task force will work with Taskstream to ensure that there is a “crosswalk” so that consistent numbers are represented in each credential program.</p>	<i>Common Standard 2</i>
Signature Assignment Course Data	<p><b><u>Recommend:</u></b> All syllabi and accompanying assignments will be reviewed to ensure adequate instruction of the common core standards at the graduate level.</p>	<p><i>Common Standards 2, 7 and 9</i></p> <p><i>M/S Program Standards 1 and 3</i></p>
Lack of consistent collection of disposition data	<p><b><u>Recommend:</u></b> Simplify method of data collection for dispositions to specific courses aligned with other SOE programs. Course professors assess dispositions in the same courses that candidates complete their disposition self-assessment.</p>	<i>Common Standard 9</i>

## EDU600 Foundations of Education & Learning Theory (rev 8.9.11)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Knowledge of research-based theories and principles of human learning and development	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing evidence.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected evidence.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected evidence.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected evidence.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 3: Foundational Educational Ideas and Research <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 4: Relationships Between Theory and Practice <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 11: Using Technology in the Classroom				
knowledge about how these theories affect classroom practice	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing evidence .	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected data to determine ELD abilities.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected data to determine ELD abilities.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected data to determine ELD abilities.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 4: Relationships Between Theory and Practice <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession				
Reflection on how these theories affect and resonate with candidates' beliefs	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate and missing connection between theory and beliefs.	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected student work samples.	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected student work samples.	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected abilities to student work sample.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 3: Foundational Educational Ideas and Research <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 4: Relationships Between Theory and Practice <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Presentation is grammatically correct, spelling is correct, layout is organized	Multiple grammar and/or spelling errors and/or lack of organization, and few or no references.	A few grammar and/or spelling errors and/or lack of organization, and few references.	Accurate spelling, clearly organized layout, and list of references.	Accurate grammar and spelling, clear and creative layout, and comprehensive list of references.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 3: Foundational Educational Ideas and Research <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 4: Relationships Between Theory and Practice <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 11: Using Technology in the Classroom				

## EDU610 Teaching Reading Fall '09 (Revised 8.9.2011)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Data collection through anecdotal observation and conferences with students	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing anecdotal evidence	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected anecdotal evidence	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected anecdotal evidence	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected anecdotal evidence	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- CTC Standards of Quality &amp; Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs</b> <b>Program Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts <b>Sub-standard:</b> Standard 7-A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English The professional preparation program provides substantive, research-based instruction that effectively prepares each candidate for a Multiple Subject (MS) Teaching Credential to deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction in reading, writing and related language arts aligned with the state adopted English Language Arts Academic Content Standards for Students and the Reading/Language Arts Framework. The program provides candidates with systematic and explicit instruction in teaching basic reading skills, including comprehension strategies, for all students, including students with varied reading levels and language backgrounds. The Multiple Subject preparation program includes a significant practical experience component in reading, writing, and language arts that is connected to the content of coursework and that takes place throughout the program during each candidate's field experience(s), internship(s), and/or student teaching assignment(s). The preparation program provides each candidate for a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential with experience in a classroom where beginning reading is taught. The program places all candidates in field experience sites and student teaching assignments with teachers whose instructional approaches and methods in reading are consistent with a comprehensive, systematic program, and who collaborate with institutional supervisors and instructors. <b>Program Element:</b> 7A(h) As a specific application of Common Standard 7, field experiences, student teaching assignments, and internships are designed to establish cohesive connections among the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) content specifications, reading methods coursework, and the practical experience components of the program, and include ongoing opportunities to participate in effective reading instruction that complies with current provisions of the California Education Code.				
Data collection to determine language abilities or special needs	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing data to determine language abilities or special needs	Minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected data to determine language abilities or special needs	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected data to determine language abilities or special needs	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate, clear, and purposefully connected data to determine language abilities or special needs	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- CTC Standards of Quality &amp; Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs</b> <b>Program Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts <b>Sub-standard:</b> Standard 7-A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English The professional preparation program provides substantive, research-based instruction that effectively prepares each candidate for a Multiple Subject (MS)				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	<p>Teaching Credential to deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction in reading, writing and related language arts aligned with the state adopted English Language Arts Academic Content Standards for Students and the Reading/Language Arts Framework. The program provides candidates with systematic and explicit instruction in teaching basic reading skills, including comprehension strategies, for all students, including students with varied reading levels and language backgrounds. The Multiple Subject preparation program includes a significant practical experience component in reading, writing, and language arts that is connected to the content of coursework and that takes place throughout the program during each candidate's field experience(s), internship(s), and/or student teaching assignment(s). The preparation program provides each candidate for a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential with experience in a classroom where beginning reading is taught. The program places all candidates in field experience sites and student teaching assignments with teachers whose instructional approaches and methods in reading are consistent with a comprehensive, systematic program, and who collaborate with institutional supervisors and instructors.</p> <p><b>Program Element:</b> 7A(f) For each candidate, the study of reading and language arts includes the phonological/morphological structure of the English language, and methodologically sound research on how children learn to read, including English language learners, students with reading difficulties, and students who are proficient readers.</p>				
Data collection through the administration of literacy assessments	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate or missing student work samples	Mimimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected student work samples	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected student work samples	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clearly connected student work samples	
	<p><b>Standards</b> <b>CA- CTC Standards of Quality &amp; Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs</b> <b>Program Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts <b>Sub-standard:</b> Standard 7-A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English The professional preparation program provides substantive, research-based instruction that effectively prepares each candidate for a Multiple Subject (MS) Teaching Credential to deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction in reading, writing and related language arts aligned with the state adopted English Language Arts Academic Content Standards for Students and the Reading/Language Arts Framework. The program provides candidates with systematic and explicit instruction in teaching basic reading skills, including comprehension strategies, for all students, including students with varied reading levels and language backgrounds. The Multiple Subject preparation program includes a significant practical experience component in reading, writing, and language arts that is connected to the content of coursework and that takes place throughout the program during each candidate's field experience(s), internship(s), and/or student teaching assignment(s). The preparation program provides each candidate for a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential with experience in a classroom where beginning reading is taught. The program places all candidates in field experience sites and student teaching assignments with teachers whose instructional approaches and methods in reading are consistent with a comprehensive, systematic program, and who collaborate with institutional supervisors and instructors.</p> <p><b>Program Element:</b> 7A(e) For each candidate, the study of reading and language arts includes knowledge of the roles of home and community literacy practices, instructional uses of ongoing diagnostic strategies that guide teaching and assessment, early intervention techniques in a classroom setting, and guided practice of these techniques.</p>				
Reflection on student strengths and areas for growth	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate and missing data to connect to student strengths and areas for growth	Mimimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected data to student strengths and areas for growth	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected data to student strengths and areas for growth	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clearly connected data to student strengths and areas for growth	
	<p><b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession <b>Standard:</b></p>				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice				
Setting of learning goals or next steps for student growth	Inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate and missing learning goals or next steps for student growth	Mimimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, ambiguous or weakly connected learning goals or next steps for student growth	Appropriate, relevant, accurate and connected learning goals or next steps for student growth	Detailed, appropriate, relevant, accurate and clearly connected learning goals or next steps for student growth	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 6: Pedagogy and Reflective Practice <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 16: Learning, Applying, and Reflecting on the Teaching Performance Expectations				

created with  taskstream

## EDU 650 Assessment and Services for Students with Disabilities (Rev. 11.15.11)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Ecological Inventory	Little or no evidence of background information to suggest possible triggers for and communicative intent of behavior.	A partial statement of background information to suggest possible triggers and communicative intent of behavior.	Clearly states background information and possible triggers and communicative intent of behavior.	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly states possible triggers and communicative intent of behavior.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 2: Communication Skills <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	<b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 6: Positive Behavioral Support <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 4: Positive Behavior Support <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities				
Target Behavior Interfering with Learning	Little or no evidence of the target behavior, and how it interferes with the student's ability to progress.	A partial statement of the target behavior, how it interferes with the student's ability to academically and socially progress.	Clearly states the targeted behavior, how it interferes with the student's ability to socially and academically progress.	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly states how the behavior interferes with the student's ability to be involved in and make social and academic progress as well as to meet other identified DIS/IEP needs.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 2: Communication Skills <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 6: Positive Behavioral Support <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b>				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 1: Characteristics of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 4: Positive Behavior Support <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 6: Case Management				
Data Collection of Presence and Absence of Behavior	Little or no evidence of data collection identifying presences and absence of behavior over 2-4 week period by the case manager.	Partial evidence of data collection identifying presence and absence of behavior, through means of informal observations citing dates and frequencies collected by the involved staff.	Clear evidence of data collection, through means of informal observations and a data graphing chart citing dates and frequencies collected by involved staff.	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly cites data collection through the means of informal observations citing dates and frequencies, a data graphing chart, and an A-B-C data system by involved staff.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 2: Communication Skills <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 6: Positive Behavioral Support <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b>				



	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 4: Positive Behavior Support <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities				
Functional Analysis of Data with Hypothesis and Rationale	Little or no evidence relating to the functional analysis with no clear hypothesis and rationale.	Partial evidence of a functional analysis through means of informal notes gathered by the case manager.	Clearly states: - participation in the functional analysis with involved staff -clear hypothesis -clear rationale.	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly states: - participation in the "whole child" functional analysis with involved staff, student, and parents/legal guardians -slow and quick triggers -clear hypothesis -clear rationale.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 2: Communication Skills <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 6: Positive Behavioral Support <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	<b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 4: Positive Behavior Support <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities				
Goal Development: Reduce Behavior Interfering with Learning	<p>Little or no evidence relating the goal to reducing the behavior interfering with learning.</p>	<p>Partial evidence relating the goal to reducing the behavior interfering with learning. It is inclusive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a plan identifying how the goal will be measured and progress documented</li> <li>-accommodations needed for the goal implementation.</li> </ul>	<p>Clear evidence relating the goal to reducing the behavior interfering with learning inclusive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-a plan identifying how the goal will be measured and progress documented</li> <li>-accommodations needed for the goal implementation</li> <li>-communication system for key stakeholders.</li> </ul>	<p>Clearly, consistently, and convincingly states evidence relating the goal to reducing the behavior interfering with learning inclusive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-a plan identifying how the goal will be measured and progress documented</li> <li>-accommodations needed for the goal implementation</li> <li>-communication system for all stakeholders, inclusive of the student.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 2: Communication Skills <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 6: Positive Behavioral Support <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b>				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Mild/Moderate Standard 1: Characteristics of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 4: Positive Behavior Support <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities				
Goal Development: Teach a Replacement Behavior That is Socially Acceptable & Leads to Self-Regulation	Little or no evidence of relating the goal to teaching a replacement behavior that is socially acceptable and leads to self regulation.	Partial evidence relating the goal to teaching a replacement behavior that is socially acceptable and leads to self regulation. It is inclusive of: - a plan identifying how the goal will be measured and progress documented -accommodations needed for the goal implementation.	Clear evidence relating the goal to teaching a replacement behavior that is socially acceptable and leads to self regulation. It is inclusive of: -a plan identifying how the goal will be measured and progress documented -accommodations needed for the goal implementation -communication system for key stakeholders.	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly states evidence relating the goal to teaching a replacement behavior that is socially acceptable and leads to self regulation. It is inclusive of: -a plan identifying how the goal will be measured and progress documented -accommodations needed for the goal implementation -communication system for all stakeholders, inclusive of the student.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 2: Communication Skills <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 6: Positive Behavioral Support <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b>				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 4: Positive Behavior Support <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities				
Goal Development: Access to an Activity That Enhances the Quality of One's Life	Little or no evidence of relating the goal to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life.	Partial evidence relating the goal to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life. It is inclusive of: - a plan identifying how the goal will be measured and progress documented -accommodations needed for the goal implementation.	Clear evidence relating the goal to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life. It is inclusive of: -a plan identifying how the goal will be measured and progress documented -accommodations needed for the goal implementation.	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly states evidence relating the goal to an activity that enhances the quality of one's life. It is inclusive of: -a plan identifying how the goal will be measured and progress documented.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 2: Communication Skills <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 6: Positive Behavioral Support <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	<b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 4: Positive Behavior Support <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities				
Reflection	Little or no statement of new learning.	Partial statement on: - behavior as a method of communication - importance of data collection - importance of analyzing the behavior prior to goal development.	Clear information on : - behavior as a method of communication - importance of data collection - importance of analyzing the behavior prior to goal development - importance of key stakeholder involvement.	Clear, consistent and convincing reflection inclusive of: - behavior as a method of communication - importance of data collection - importance of analyzing the behavior prior to goal development - consideration of slow and fast triggers - importance of all stakeholders' involvement, inclusive of the student.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 2: Communication Skills <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 6: Positive Behavioral Support <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	<div><div>Standard:</div><div>Mild/Moderate Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities</div><div>Standard:</div><div>Mild/Moderate Standard 4: Positive Behavior Support</div><div>Standard:</div><div>Mild/Moderate Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities</div></div>				

# EDU 652 Co-Teaching Lesson Plan (Rev. 10.2013)

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
Common Core standards and lesson plan objectives	Little or no evidence citing use of:  •Common Core standards, grade level and specific focus area •Lesson plan objectives	Partial evidence cited to include:  •Common Core standards, grade level and specific focus area •Lesson plan objectives	Clearly states:  •Common Core standards, grade level and specific focus area •Lesson plan objectives	Clearly, consistently, and convincingly states:  •Common Core standards, grade level and specific focus area •Lesson plan objectives	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 3: Educating Diverse Learners <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 13: Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 3: Educating Diverse Learners <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 13: Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 3: Planning and Implementing Mild/Moderate Curriculum and Instruction				
Additional Considerations for Students (Facts About Learners)	Little or no evidence of co-teaching staff supporting learners in the classroom. Enhancing instruction through  • Clarification • Adaptations to content, product and process • Small group work • 1:1 Support	Partial evidence of co-teaching staff supporting learners in the classroom. Enhancing instruction through  • Clarification • Adaptations to content, product and process • Small group work • 1:1 Support	Clear evidence of co-teaching staff supporting learners in the classroom. Enhancing instruction through  • Clarification • Adaptations to content, product and process • Small group work • 1:1 Support	Clear and consistent evidence of co-teaching supporting staff learners in the classroom. Enhancing instruction through  • Clarification • Adaptations to content, product and process • Small group work • 1:1 Support	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 6: Using Educational and Assistive Technology <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Program Standard 6: Using Educational and Assistive Technology				

	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	<b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities				
Considerations for enhancing, materials (content) and assessment (student product) with co-teaching staff	Little or no evidence of adjusting instruction to include materials and assessment.	Partial evidence of adjusting instruction to include materials and assessment.	Clear evidence of adjusting instruction to include materials and assessment.	Clear and consistent evidence of adjusting instruction to include materials and assessment.  • Variations in materials & assessment product throughout the 5-steps of the lesson plan.	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 2: Communication Skills <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 6: Positive Behavioral Support <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 3: Planning and Implementing Mild/Moderate Curriculum and Instruction <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities				
Considerations for enhancing Instruction (Process) with co-teaching staff (Antic Set, Input, Guided Practice, Independent Practice, Closure, transfer and reflection.)	Little or no evidence is given addressing lesson sequence: planning tasks, sequence of instruction, staff responsibilities, and supporting reflection	Partial evidence is given to addressing lesson sequence  • Planning and preparatory steps • Co-teaching approaches identified • Instructional Sequence (5 step lesson plan) • Closure	Clear evidence is given to addressing lesson sequence  • Planning and preparatory steps • Co-teaching approaches identified • Instructional Sequence (5 step lesson plan) • Closure	Clear and consistent evidence is given to address multiple assessment products:  • Planning and preparatory steps • Co-teaching approaches identified • Instructional Sequence (5 step lesson plan) • Closure	
	<b>Standards</b> <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Moderate/Severe (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 2: Communication Skills <b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction				



	Far Below Standards	Below Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	Score/Level
	<b>Standard:</b> Moderate/Severe Standard 6: Positive Behavioral Support <b>CA- PLNU/Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Mild/Moderate (2011)</b> <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 3: Planning and Implementing Mild/Moderate Curriculum and Instruction <b>Standard:</b> Mild/Moderate Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities				