

**SPED MILD/MOD 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 relatively high rate, with an 82% passage rate on the first attempt. Task 3, however, seemed to present more of a challenge with only 58% passing on the 1<sup>st</sup> attempt. It was on the 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt that 83% 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/M Program Standard 5</i></p>
Signature Assignments	<p>Candidates performed strongly on the signature assignments.</p> <p><b>No changes. Continue to Monitor.</b></p> <p><u>EDU 600</u> - Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that support candidate development of how learning theories affect and resonate with their beliefs.</p> <p><u>EDU 610</u> – Continuation of activities and assignments in this course that support candidate</p>	<p><i>Common Standards 2, 7 and 9</i></p> <p><i>M/M Program Standards 3 and 5</i></p>

	<p>development of how reading, reading comprehension, and literacy skills develop to a competency level in students.</p> <p><u>EDU 652</u> - 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. Continuation of this signature assignment.</p> <p><u>EDU 650- Recommendation:</u> Continued emphasis on the value and usefulness of assessment in making instructional decisions. 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>	
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>Recommend:</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/M 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 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</p>	<p><i>Common Standard 9 and 7</i></p>

	<p>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>Not applicable.</i>
<p>Signature Assignment</p> <p>Course Data</p>	<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/M Program Standards 3 and 5</i></p>
<p>Lack of consistent collection of disposition data</p>	<p>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 Standards 2 and 9</i>