Instructional Program Priorities

Program: Mild/Moderate Educational Specialist Credential (M/Mod) - Educational Specialist Credential/M.A. in Education (Special Education)

Department EDS

Number of students enrolled in the program in Fall, 2011

- Early Childhood Special Education Credential (ECSE): 29
- Mild/Moderate Educational Specialist Credential (M/Mod): 92
- Moderate/Severe Educational Specialist Credential (Mod/S): 23
- M.A. in Education (Special Education)*: 52

Total: 196

*Note: All M.A. candidates are also in one of the above credential programs, but the given counts are not duplicative

Faculty member completing template: Ostertag (Date January 23, 2012)

Period of reference in the template: 2006-07 to present

1. Please describe your program’s learning-outcomes trajectory since 2006-07: Has there been a transformation of organizational culture regarding the establishment of learning outcomes and the capacity to assess progress toward their achievement? If so, during which academic year would you say the transformation became noticeable? What lies ahead; what is the next likely step in developing a learning-outcomes organizational culture within the program?

[Please limit your response to 200 words or less]

In response to changes in the standards for all special education credentials by the California Commission on Teacher Credentials (CCTC), the Mild/Moderate Educational Specialist Credential (M/Mod) program was completely revised over the past three years to meet these required changes. Hence, as of this Fall 2011, a new series of revised credential programs were instituted for ECSE, M/Mod, and Mod/S. In a similar manner, all M.A. candidates are also in one of the three graduate credential programs, this program experienced a revision per the 18-units of specialized coursework (30-units total).

The preliminary Mild/Moderate Educational Specialist Credential (M/Mod) credential program encompasses 44-48 Units (reduced 25% from pre-fall 2011). Many of the courses overlap with ECSE and Moderate/Severe credential offerings. The total preliminary core units include 10-12 units of student teaching experiences; a candidate may meet some of these state requirements in their own place of M/Mod special education employment. Total units may be less based upon equivalencies granted by a departmental advisor per previous experiences, university courses, and credentials held by a candidate.
Candidates may attend the program full-time or part-time. The M/Mod Educational Specialist Credential Program can be completed in as little as three full-time semesters. Internships are available.

All CCTC programs are learning-outcomes/standards based.

2. Please list in prioritized order (or indicate no prioritization regarding) up to four desired learning outcomes ("takeaways" concerning such elements of curriculum as perspectives, specific content knowledge, skill sets, confidence levels) for students completing the program. For each stated outcome, please provide the reason that it was designated as desired by the faculty associated with the program.

[Please limit your response per outcome to 300 words or less]

This report will focus on five key assessments that are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence for the Mild/Moderate program prior to being recommended for a credential. The same also apply, as appropriate, for the M.A.:

{No priority order}

a) Initial Reading/Spelling Analysis [M/Mod]
b) Competence in Reading Instruction: RICA (Statewide Reading Instruction Competence Assessment) [M/Mod]
c) Cumulative Mild/Moderate Instruction Knowledge: Candidate Portfolio [M/Mod]
d) Culminating Mild/Moderate Student Teaching Skills: Student Teaching Evaluation [M/Mod]
e) Synthesis of Mild/Moderate Issues: M.A. Thesis/Project or Comprehensive Exam [M/Mod, M.A.]

The reasons these (program outcomes were designated are the same: through a three-year series of meetings with the community, students, campus and area group faculty, program outcomes were devised per the input of the participants based upon academic rigor, research findings, best practices, and standards set forth by CCTC.

3. For undergraduate programs only, in what ways are the set of desired learning outcomes described above aligned with the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals? Please be as specific as possible.

[Please limit your response to 400 words or less]

The M/Mod credential and M.A. programs are all at the graduate level. The University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals do not apply. Instead, the programs address the standards set forth by CCTC and meet all Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) parameters.

4. For each desired outcome indicated in item 2 above, please:
a) Describe the method(s) by which its ongoing pursuit is monitored and measured.
The approach of the Mild/Moderate credential/ M.A. in Education (Special Education) programs toward assessment is multi-faceted, with the intentional inclusion of both formative and summative assessment procedures as well as longitudinal and cross-sectional measures of student progress toward articulated learning objectives.

This multiple strategy approach incorporates (a) faculty in-course assessments using objective, written, and performance-based measures; (b) objective, non-course based assessment of student general understanding of the discipline of special education; (c) objective, non-course based assessments of methodology. This multi-faceted approach is aligned with the conceptual orientation to assessment presented at the beginning of this document.

The faculty in special education adheres to the position that the overarching purpose of assessment is to benefit students’ educational experience. The assessment plan provides for analysis of artifacts of student performance, faculty input, programmatic examination and reported student perceptions.

Please see Table 1 below for response. This table provides details about the nature of each key assessment per monitoring and measurement.

Table 1: Overview of Key Assessments & Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Type of Assessment (formative/ summative)</th>
<th>When administered</th>
<th>Details about Administration</th>
<th>Standards, Performance Outcomes, etc. Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment a: Spelling Analysis</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>At the end of the EDS 221 course</td>
<td>Individual course instructors assess candidate work based on a standard rubric designed by the course instructor</td>
<td>CCTC Standards addressed: TPEs 1-13 M/Mod and Mod/S Specialist Standards: 14 b, 14c, 14d, 14e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment b: RICA Exam</td>
<td>Summative *Students do have the option of retaking the exam if they fail the exam</td>
<td>Taken after the completion of the EDS 221 course</td>
<td>The RICA is administered by an outside agency. <a href="http://www.rica.nesinc.com/">http://www.rica.nesinc.com/</a></td>
<td>All domains of effective literacy instruction as defined by CCTC and State Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment c: Candidate Portfolio</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>At the end of the finalizing seminar course in ECSE</td>
<td>Individual seminar instructors assess candidates’ portfolio based on a rubric designed by the faculty group</td>
<td>CCTC Standards addressed: All finalizing Mild/Moderate Educational Specialist Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment d: Culminating Student Teaching Evaluations</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>In final semester: at the midterm and at the end of the semester</td>
<td>Implemented by the supervisor and mentor teacher at midterm and at the end of the semester of the final student teaching experience</td>
<td>CCTC Standards Addressed: CCTC Standards Addressed: All competencies per Mild/Moderate standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment e: M.A. Thesis/Project or Written Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Culminating requirement in M.A. program</td>
<td>Thesis/Project Chair and second reader (as appropriate) or Special education faculty readers (at last 3) for the written comprehensive exam</td>
<td>Culminating written comprehensive or Thesis/Project guidelines as established by OGS and approved by campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Include a description of the sample of students (e.g., random sample of transfer students declaring the major; graduating seniors) from whom data were/will be collected and the frequency and schedule with which the data in question were/will be collected.

Every candidate in the post-baccalaureate M/Mod credential program and M.A. participate in the assessments indicated above as well as providing feedback for all of their course experiences through the campus Course Evaluation process.
c) Describe and append a sample (or samples) of the “instrument” (e.g., survey or test), “artifact” (e.g., writing sample and evaluative protocol, performance review sheet), or other device used to assess the status of the learning outcomes desired by the program.

The process and rubric per the M.A. written comprehensive exam evaluation and Spelling Analysis: Signature Assignment Rubric are in Appendix A-D following item 8 response.

d) Explain how the program faculty analyzed and evaluated (will analyze and evaluate) the data to reach conclusions about each desired student learning outcome. [Please limit your response to 200 words or less per learning outcome]

Based upon the success rate of students per the above, the faculty in special education meets to review the M.A. written comprehensive exam questions, scoring rubrics, and program processes each year. Candidates in the EDS 298 class provide oral and/or written feedback (as well as course evaluations) to the course instructor per these elements who then shares these responses with the faculty for their consideration.

5. Regarding each outcome and method discussed in items 2 and 4 above, please provide examples of how findings from the learning outcomes process have been utilized to address decisions to revise or maintain elements of the curriculum (including decisions to alter the program’s desired outcomes). If such decision-making has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur. [Please limit your response to 200 words or less per item]

{No priority order}

a) Initial Reading/Spelling Analysis
b) Competence in Reading Instruction: RICA
   (Statewide Reading Instruction Competence Assessment)
   [M/Mod]
c) Cumulative Mild/Moderate Instruction Knowledge:
   Candidate Portfolio
   [M/Mod]
d) Culminating Mild/Moderate Student Teaching Skills:
   Student Teaching Evaluation
   [M/Mod]
e) Synthesis of Mild/Moderate Issues: M.A. Thesis/Project or
   Comprehensive Exam
   [M/Mod, M.A.]

The assessment methodology tools outlined previously indicate that the students enrolled in the Mild/Moderate credential program and/or M.A. are, in general, learning at a high level of achievement in informal and structured settings. All of our key assessments provide in-depth analysis of direct application of knowledge, skills, and clinical practice with focus children/youth and their school/family teams. Candidates demonstrated highly proficient-to-proficient results on the assessments in each key area by the end of the program. The faculty in special education are confident that the completers have proficient skills in literacy, IEP development, systematic and data-based instruction, valid and reliable assessment procedures, functional assessment, and positive behavioral support. Our completers also
show strengths in collaborative teaming with families and professionals, advocacy, and systems change skills. Completers also demonstrated high level of skill in supporting all students with mild/moderate disabilities in integrated and natural settings utilizing principles of Universal Design for Learning, partial participation, and modified outcomes referenced to the general education curriculum standards.

Overall, the program has strong ties between cooperating/mentor teachers and University faculty and supervisors. This has had a direct effect of high program quality. Student teachers/interns are carefully mentored, their progress is very carefully tracked and there are numerous opportunities for critical feedback. Student teachers/interns demonstrated high success in the final evaluation and portfolio development. The program has demonstrated success in the key areas nationally recognized in the field as core to mild/moderate disabilities, person/family centered planning, collaborative IEP development, positive behavioral supports, supporting students to access the core curriculum, and research-based practice and systems change.

As of the time of this report, CCTC has approved the paradigm, courses, and experiences being employed in the Mild/Moderate Education Specialist credential program. They have attested that all accreditation standards are being met. Additionally, all graduating educational specialist teaching candidates are finding employment in their respective fields.

6. Has the program systematically sought data from alumni to measure the longer-term effects of accomplishment of the program’s learning outcomes? If so, please describe the approach to this information-gathering and the ways in which the information will be applied to the program’s curriculum. If such activity has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur. [Please limit your response to 300 words or less]

Per our recent CCTC accreditation approved submission, the faculty in special education actively utilized current students and alumni (as well as community and other Sac State faculty) in the development of the revised programs. This three-year effort involved meetings in-class, group presentations off-campus (i.e., Region 3 SELPA presentations), phone discussion, emails, beta-class student evaluations to frame the curriculum and service delivery of said programs. As recently as November 1, 2011 a host of these folks were invited to campus to share their interactions with the Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and Early Childhood Special Education credential programs (and by inference, the 18-units of specialized studies in the M.A.). The feedback from these activities was very positive and was critical in the development and accreditation of our programs.

7. Does the program pursue learning outcomes identified by an accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization as important? Does the set of outcomes pursued by your program exceed those identified as important by your accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization? [Please limit your response to 300 words or less]
Our Mild/Moderate Education Specialist credential program (plus the M.A. in Education [Special Education]) meets the accreditation standards of the California Commission on Teacher Credentials (CCTC). However, to some degree, our program also exceeds these stated standards/learning outcomes as reflected in our program Mission Statement: Our mission is to prepare highly qualified individuals from diverse backgrounds to provide appropriate educational services to individuals with disabilities, birth to adulthood, and their families. <http://edweb.csus.edu/eds/special_education/mission.html>

A couple of examples per those extended learning outcomes include:

- Demonstrate respect and support for the diversity and dignity of all persons, regardless of age, race, ethnicity, language, socioeconomic status, religion, gender, national origin, abilities, family composition, and sexual orientation.
- Demonstrate awareness of being effective agents of systems change and promoters of social justice in schools, programs, communities, and professional disciplines.

Course syllabi, delivered content, and assignments address these areas as appropriate.

8. Finally, what additional information would you like to share with the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities regarding the program’s desired learning outcomes and assessment of their accomplishment? [Please limit your response to 200 words or less]

Our Mild/Moderate Education Specialist credential program (M/Mod) has been re-verified by CCTC as meeting all statewide accreditation standards/learning outcomes as of Fall 2011.

The College of Education has been engaged in an extensive program of restructuring over the last 2.5 years. At the center of this is the streamlining of many of our administrative functions including our approach to assessment. In 2008, we began exploring opportunities to centralize our college efforts and collecting data for assessment of learning goals around a central vision of TEACHing for change, which includes Transformation, Equity and Social Justice, Advocacy, Collaboration, Civic and Community Engagement and Human Capital and Diversity. This overarching vision of students and credential candidates in the College of Education is adopted by all programs. As many of our programs also must adhere to strict regulations of accrediting bodies, these standards are also aimed to integrate within the central assessment system. The college a College of Education has begun work toward hiring a director of assessment within the college to oversee the collection, analysis, and synthesis of assessment data for all programs, integrating with CMS and CTQ data.
Appendix A

Review of the Literature: A Set of Rubrics
EDS 250 — Spring, 2012

This set of rubrics is fairly identical to those utilized in EDTE 290 and are intended to support special education graduate students in writing an effective review of the literature to serve as Chapter 2 in a thesis or project or alternative culminating experience in the College of Education at California State University, Sacramento. The set is not exhaustive and does not address all of the issues a faculty adviser or faculty second reader may consider, especially regarding content, reasoning, and analysis. Further, if there is a conflict between any aspect of this rubric and aspects pointed out by the faculty adviser and/or department chair, students are expected to privilege the advice of the adviser and/or chair.

The rubrics are built around five guiding questions, each of which is discussed generally below:

- How well does the review discuss the literature?
  - The emphasis in this question is placed on the word “discuss.” Academic discussions usually develop themes, elaborate on connections, raise concerns and questions, point out similarities and differences, evaluate the logic and force of theoretical arguments, and the like. Reviews that simply list or summarize studies need revision.

- How well does the review express ideas and reduce bias in language?
  - This question focuses on elements of writing including diction, cohesion and coherence, syntactic conventions and style, and sensitivity to fairness in references to people in groups of various kinds.

- How well is the information organized?
  - This question asks writers to consider the overall structure of the text with particular attention to cues that guide readers to the varying levels of importance of ideas.

- How well and fully documented is the review?
  - This question gets at the heart of a review of the literature in that it asks writers to do a thorough yet carefully focused search of the literature as a foundation for the discussion. It also requires writers to understand the nature of plagiarism and to avoid it in the paper. Finally it requires writers to construct and present full citations in a Reference List according to APA guidelines.

- How well does the review follow APA Editorial Style?
  - This question points to the need to pay close attention to the surface elements of text to ensure that conventions valued by the academic community are not violated (e.g., punctuation, hyphenation, spelling, abbreviations, headings, etc.)
Guiding Question 1: How well does the review discuss the literature?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Revision</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discusses literature tangentially relevant to the research question or problem or includes literature for purely historical reasons</td>
<td>Discusses the literature pertinent to the research question or problem while avoiding an exhaustive historical review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cites irrelevant work or leaves the task of discovering relevance to the reader</td>
<td>Cites works directly relevant to the issues under study and explains or highlights their relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizes irrelevant findings and conclusions or includes nonessential details</td>
<td>Emphasizes relevant findings and conclusions from previous research while avoiding nonessential details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists summaries or reports of referenced works as isolated pieces of information</td>
<td>Develops logical connections among referenced works past and present as they relate to the research question or problem (i.e., uses the literature to build a theoretical argument or framework)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides too much or insufficient elaboration (writes for a non-professional or narrow audience)</td>
<td>Elaborates on ideas sufficiently for the widest possible professional audience while avoiding “a complete digest” (APA, p. 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats controversies or other information in the research with bias or engages in ad hominem attacks</td>
<td>Treats controversies in the research fairly and avoids ad hominem attacks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding Question 2: How well does the review express ideas and reduce bias in language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Revision</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presents ideas more or less randomly with some discontinuity in words, concepts, and thematic development</td>
<td>Presents ideas in an order and “…aim[s] for continuity in words, concepts, and thematic development from the opening statement to the conclusion” (APA, p. 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates information with abrupt shifts between topics or subtopics</td>
<td>Communicates information smoothly through transitions from one topic or subtopic to the next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates one or more of the following: “redundancy, wordiness, jargon, evasiveness, overuse of the passive voice, circumlocution, and clumsy prose” (APA, pp. 67-68)</td>
<td>Presents ideas economically and avoids “redundancy, wordiness, jargon, evasiveness, overuse of the passive voice, circumlocution, and clumsy prose” (APA, p. 67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present ideas unconventionally either occasionally or consistently</td>
<td>Presents ideas conventionally (use of verbs, subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, use of modifiers, use of relative pronouns and subordinate conjunctions, parallel construction) (APA, pp. 77-86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses words that are not fair to individuals/groups (describes at appropriate level of specificity, is sensitive to labels, acknowledges participation, avoids ambiguity in sex identity/role, uses preferred terms to refer to sexual orientation, demonstrates specificity and sensitivity in references to racial/ethnic identity, uses “nonhandicapping” language refers appropriately to age (APA, pp. 71-77)</td>
<td>Uses words that are fair to individuals/groups (describes at appropriate level of specificity, is sensitive to labels, acknowledges participation, avoids ambiguity in sex identity/role, uses preferred terms to refer to sexual orientation, demonstrates specificity and sensitivity in references to racial/ethnic identity, uses “nonhandicapping” language, refers appropriately to age (APA, pp. 71-77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Guiding Question 3: How well is the information organized?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Revision</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develops ideas in one continuous chunk or in overlapping chunks or in sections not clearly marked</td>
<td>• Develops ideas in clearly marked sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If sections are present, may have one or more sections with only one subheading</td>
<td>• Develops each section with either no subsections or at least two subsections (APA, p. 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outline of the hierarchy of ideas is not clear nor marked by headings and subheadings</td>
<td>• Outlines the hierarchy of ideas in the review by using headings to convey the sequence and levels of importance (APA, p. 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May present topics or ideas of equal importance at unequal heading levels or may not mark topics or ideas of equal importance at all</td>
<td>• Presents topics of equal importance at the same heading level throughout the review (APA, pp. 62-63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May not use tables or figures when appropriate or may use them but not tell the reader what to look for</td>
<td>• Uses tables and/or figures to summarize ideas when appropriate and “always tell[s] the reader what to look for... and provides sufficient explanation to make them readily intelligible” (APA, p. 125)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guiding Question 4: How well and fully documented is the review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Revision</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cites and discusses few or no reports of empirical studies relevant to the research question or problem</td>
<td>• Cites and discusses reports of empirical studies relevant to the research question or problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refers to and discusses few relevant review articles when these articles are available</td>
<td>• Refers to and discusses relevant review articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cites and uses few or no relevant theoretical articles, methodological articles, and case studies when these articles are available</td>
<td>• Cites and uses relevant theoretical articles, methodological articles, and case studies as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses quotations when paraphrase is appropriate or quotes inaccurately and/or unconventionally or distorts meaning through ellipsis</td>
<td>• Uses quotations appropriately, accurately, and conventionally (APA, pp. 117 – 120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does not credit all sources (plagiarism)</td>
<td>• Credits all sources whether paraphrasing or quoting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses reference citations in text inappropriately</td>
<td>• Uses reference citations appropriately in text (APA, pp. 207 – 214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presents an incomplete reference list or presents a bibliography or presents citations unconventionally</td>
<td>• Presents a reference list (not a bibliography) including “works that specifically support” the review (APA, p. 215)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guiding Question 5: How well does the review follow APA Editorial Style?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Revision</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates occasional or consistent noncompliance with the APA Editorial Guidelines “to ensure clear, consistent presentation of the printed word” in matters of punctuation, hyphenation, spelling, abbreviations, tables, headings, grammar, citations, and references (APA, p. 77)</td>
<td>• Demonstrates compliance with the APA Editorial Guidelines “to ensure clear, consistent presentation of the printed word” in matters of punctuation, hyphenation, spelling, abbreviations, tables, headings, grammar, citations, and references (APA, p. 77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presents statistics in text in a manner that conflicts with APA conventions (pp. 138 – 147)</td>
<td>• Presents statistics in text in accordance with APA conventions (pp. 138 – 147)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Special Education –

Special Education Master’s Comprehensive Exam

Guidelines for Faculty Readers
Spring, 2012

The MA exam is fast approaching so once again we need to agree to a schedule for faculty readers and review the questions for this comprehensive exam - Monday, May **th**. The exam questions are presented for review and timelines for reading by all full-time faculty are proposed. Students are given two questions in the morning (9:15 am to 11:30 am) and two more questions in the afternoon (1:00 pm to 3:15 pm). This allows for a lunch break and provides a little more time for students to organize/edit their answers.

Currently there are a total of ** students preparing for the exam and thus each of us will need to block out enough time (3-4 hours) for reading, making written comments and recording scores. As in the past, the faculty has been divided into four teams of two readers each. Two faculty persons have been designated as third readers for cases where there are major concerns or significant discrepancies in faculty scoring.

The following assignments for faculty readers are proposed and if you are not able to read during the time allotted, you may need to change reading time slots with your team partner or let all faculty know ASAP if significant changes need to be made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORNING SESSION FOR STUDENTS - 9:15a.m. - 11:30a.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #1          READER #1        Gonsier-Gerdin READER #2 Gee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #2          READER #1        Gonzales        READER #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFTERNOON SESSION FOR STUDENTS - 1:00 P.M. - 3:15P.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #3          READER #1        Durán           READER #2 Cho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first reader may pick up the student packet of bluebooks by 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May **th** in the Special Education Office (EUR 316). The first faculty reader should discuss timing with the second faculty reader for handing in materials and leaving the up the student blue books so that the second reader can pick them up at a time/place that is convenient for both parties (e.g. Fri May **th** 3pm – EUR 316).

The second team reader has until Wed May **th** (noon). This will allow time for a third reader to rate questions that have discrepant scores across readers. Hopefully, the final ratings will be completed by Saturday noon May **th**. The instructor or record has responsibility for directly contacting students to inform them of their scores and submitting materials to the special ed office so that formal letters indicating the ratings for each question can be mailed to the students.

**THE READING PROCESS**

The comprehensive exam is scheduled to be administered on at the Educational Testing Center. This year one student will be using extended time as an accommodation. The instructor of record is responsible for making sure that the morning and afternoon student test packets are delivered to the testing center (Diane Stenhouse) by Friday April **th** and that all students are aware of the guidelines.

Additionally, the instructor of record must assure that all designated faculty readers receive the necessary rating materials prior to the exam. The Department Chair is responsible for serving as a backup person to the instructor of record in case of unforeseen events.

Note: Students must turn in the exam question sheets, all blue books (used and unused) and their unannotated reference lists. Students have been informed that reference lists may be color-coded and must be typed or copied but may not include any written notes.

These lists must be submitted before leaving the exam center.
On the following day, the instructor of record will gather the student packets and organize the student bluebooks into reader packets so that the person reading first from each faculty team may pick up the student packet of bluebooks for the assigned questions by 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May **th. The scoring sheets and other rating materials will be available in the Special Education Office (EUR 316) and designated by the reader number.

It is the responsibility of the first reader from each faculty team to complete the rating of student responses using the scaled scoring (0-10) guidelines and to deliver the packet of bluebooks to the second team reader in a timely fashion. It is requested that the first faculty reader make prior arrangements with the second faculty reader for handing over of materials at a pre-designated time and place that is convenient for both parties. It is requested that no discussion of individual exam ratings be conducted until after the second readers have had time to conduct their independent ratings. The students will be using a four digit code to label their packets and thus maintain anonymity. The faculty readers are requested to rate independently so that the evaluation process can be blind and unbiased. Scoring materials must be returned in the reader packets to the Special Education Office so that the second reader is not privy to the scorings of the first reader.

All necessary materials for rating student responses will be included in your packets:

1) the exam;
2) Guidelines for Students;
3) Guidelines for Rating Individual Student Responses;
4) rating sheets for each student response (half sheets); and
5) the overall Faculty Rating Sheet.

All materials and scores must be submitted to the Department Office by Wed May 1**th (noon). This will allow time for the instructor of record to organize materials for a third reader to rate questions that have discrepant scores across readers. The final ratings will be completed by Sat noon May **th so that students can be notified and prepare for graduation. The ceremony is scheduled to be held at the Hornet Stadium on-campus for Sat May *** at 6:00 pm.
THE RATING PROCESS

Passing for a question is considered to be a rating of 8.0 or better from 2 raters. In the event that one grade is below passing for a third rater will be used. Students must pass all four questions or pass three questions with an overall exam average of 8.0 or better. Thus, students may receive a rating below 8.0 on a given question and still pass the overall exam.

NOTE: In the rare case where wide discrepancies exist across raters, university policy states that the final decision be dictated by a simple majority (CSUS Catalog, p.83).

The bluebooks will be arranged in numerical order according to ID number. You may want to vary from that pattern to reduce the probability of sequence effects, fatigue, or time constraints as a rating variable for a given student.

For each student response, these elements should be considered:

- the comprehensiveness (breadth) - all elements of a question addressed
- the content (depth) - key points addressed, accurate
- citation of sources - current, relevant
- position statement (if appropriate) - convincing, supported,
  in the conclusion of the essay

Additionally, these elements may be considered:

- form (general) - intro, paragraph construction, transitions, conclusion
- form (specific) - grammar, punctuation, spelling

Most importantly, students have been encouraged to recognize a range of views on controversial topics (e.g., reform, full inclusion). In all cases, students have been assured that faculty members will not rate on giving the "right answer," but readers will rate on how well a personal position is supported.

Please be sure to adjust your calendars to allow time for reading of the masters exams so that you can submit your scores to the graduate coordinator as soon as possible. Thanks again for your support in this process.
Appendix C

SPECIAL EDUCATION MASTER'S COMPREHENSIVE EXAM

Guidelines for Rating Individual Student Responses

Student does not attempt to answer the question or only restates the question; content is deficient. Student response is significantly below passing.

Ratings: 0 - 3.0

Student attempts to answer the question but misses the point of the question, fails to address significant components of the question, includes misinformation on important points or fails to respond in a coherent manner. Citations are missing or inaccurate. Student response is significantly below passing.

Ratings: 3.1 - 6.0

Student answers the question partially. Minor points may be incorrect, but most points are accurately described and cited. On the whole, the answer is coherent, but it does not demonstrate an ability to analyze or synthesize information. It may be simply a list of definitions or citations. It may be characterized by poor organization, many grammatical errors, diction problems or confused word choice. Student response is below passing/marginal.

Ratings: 6.1 - 7.9

Student answers the question adequately. Minor points may be incorrect or missing, but important points are accurately explained and cited. The answer is not sophisticated but demonstrates basic knowledge of the topic and ability to analyze and synthesize. There may be some grammatical errors, but they do not interfere with the discussion. Student response is marginal/passing.

Ratings: 8.0 - 8.4

Student answers the question, addressing all major points. The answer is organized, coherent, accurately cited, and generally well-written. The discussion demonstrates an understanding of the issues and an ability to analyze and synthesize information. A personal position is provided but may not be clearly supported by the discussion. Student response is passing.

Ratings: 8.5 - 8.9
Student answers the question fully and demonstrates an ability to synthesize information from a variety of sources. The response is well-written and generally error-free. It includes accurate citations and clear and convincing support as rationale for a personal position. Student response is a high pass.

Student answers in a sophisticated style using citations, data and/or other sources to effectively support arguments. Essentially, the response is error-free and may be highly creative. The answer demonstrates an exceptional ability to integrate theory and practice in support of a personal position which may/may not be controversial. Student response is worthy of acknowledgement as a merit pass.
Appendix D

EDS 221 Language and Literacy in Inclusive Classrooms, II

Spelling Analysis: Signature Assignment Rubric

In order to receive 100 points or the total amount of points for this assignment follow your syllabus outline carefully, which directs you on how to prepare this assignment. The below summarizes what the syllabus indicates under: Assignments & Class Requirements.

I have read these below points in order to understand how to obtain points on the spelling analysis assignment.

Signature____________________________________________________ Date:________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSIGNMENT ACTIVITY</th>
<th>SCORE [100 PTS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(See syllabus for details of what you need to do in different part of the assignment).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction for your student.</td>
<td>[5 pts]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Background or Student Profile.</td>
<td>[5 pts]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher and Parent Interviews</td>
<td>[5 pts]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indicate the Spelling Stage where you believe the student is at this point after you have tested your student.</td>
<td>[5 pts]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Complete Analyses From the Assessments you have given your student.</td>
<td>[20 pts]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Complete Analyses From Writing Samples you have collected from your student.</td>
<td>[20 pts]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Complete Recommendations for Student Based on All of Your Assessments, Interviews, Observations, and Other Supporting Data You Have Collected.</td>
<td>[20 pts]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Read any additional commentary written in the syllabus concerning this assignment and follow each recommendation regarding this assignment carefully as the instructor will look to see if you have included these points within your spelling analysis.</td>
<td>[20 pts]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS: ____________________

COMMENTS:
Special Education, Rehabilitation, School Psychology & Deaf Studies: EDS Mild/Moderate, Mild/Moderate with MS
Name of Program: Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, School Psychology, & Deaf Studies

Credentials Awarded: Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Disabilities with Multiple Subject Credential

Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes

If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered:
1. California State University, Sacramento
2. California State University Bay Area Program, San Pablo, California

Program Contact:
Name: Dr. Kathy Norman, Associate Dean
Phone #: (916) 278-4187
E-mail: knorman@csus.edu

If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:
1. Dr. Paula Gardner 916-278-5540 paula_gardner@csus.edu
2. Dr. Bruce Ostertag 916-278-5541 ostertag@csus.edu
SECTION A – PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

I. CONTEXT

The table below reflects data on candidates enrolled during the Fall ’08 through Spring ’10 semesters of our 4 semester Mild Moderate Specialist Credential only program and our 5 semester Mild Moderate and Multiple Subject Credential program. Candidates may apply to our credential programs during both the fall and spring application cycles. Credential candidates can progress through the program according to one of three pathways (see below). Currently, our Mild/ Moderate and Mild/Moderate-Multiple Subject credential candidates are not assigned to a cohort.

Table 24: Total Number of Candidates Enrolled and Completers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mild/Moderate: Level I On-campus</th>
<th>Mild/Moderate/Severe: Level I Bay Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credential Candidates</td>
<td>Fall 2008 Spring 2009 Fall 2009 Spring 2010</td>
<td>Fall 2008 Spring 2009 Fall 2009 Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of candidates enrolled</td>
<td>54 57 53 51</td>
<td>19 17 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of completers</td>
<td>26 33 18 28</td>
<td>2 5 5 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Subject- Mild/Moderate Specialist Credential Programs:

The Level I Multiple Subject-Mild/Moderate Specialist credential program is a unique, collaborative dual-credential special and general education program designed to provide candidates with the knowledge and competencies necessary for earning both credentials. The Level I Mild/Moderate Specialist credential program at CSUS focuses on 14 state standards developed by the California Teacher Credentialing Commission. Candidates entering with no previous credential follow a 2-2.5 year sequence, and candidates entering with a multiple subject or secondary credential follow a 1+ year sequence. University coursework is tied closely to a series of district supervised and university supervised field experiences in schools working with a diverse student population. Many of the program’s field experiences are completed in conjunction with several Professional Development Schools.

CSUS Provides Multiple Pathways to Pursue a Both a Multiple Subject and Preliminary Mild/Moderate Specialist Credential

- **Traditional Mild Moderate Credential Program:** A post BA credential program for candidates in non-teaching or teaching positions interested in flexible scheduling.

- **Intern Mild/Moderate Credential Program:** A post BA 4-semester program designed for teachers who are eligible for an internship credential and are hired by a school district.
• **Multiple Subject/Mild Moderate Credential Program:** A post BA 5-semester program designed for candidates interested in pursuing two credentials

**Courses of Study for Special Education Programs**

The credential courses and field experiences are sequenced to reflect a progression from theoretical foundations, to instruction in consultation skills, to instruction in methods (including guided practice in early field experiences), to independent practice. LEVEL I courses and field experiences have been designed to include experiences that emphasize creating, developing, and implementing, individualized adaptations and accommodations to facilitate access to learning in a wide variety of environments.

- **The Mild/Moderate LEVEL I coursework and field experience (already hold multiple subject credential):** Candidates who already hold a multiple credential follow a sequence of 24 units of coursework, 10 units of supervised student teaching, and 1 unit of student teaching seminar (a total of 35 units).
- **The Mild/Moderate LEVEL I coursework and field experience:** Candidates entering in to the Mild/Moderate specialist credential program who do not hold any other teaching credential, follow a sequence of 36 units of coursework, 15 units of supervised fieldwork/student teaching, and 3 units of student teaching seminar (a total of 54 units). This includes all pre-requisite requirements.

- **The Mild/Moderate LEVEL I & Multiple Subject coursework and field experience:** Candidates pursuing both a Mild/Moderate and Multiple Subject credential follow a sequence of 51 units of coursework, 21-26 units of supervised fieldwork/student teaching, and 3 units of student teaching seminar (a total of 75/80 units). This includes all pre-requisite requirements.

**Significant changes, deletions or innovation in the program since the last program document was approved:**

Changes to our program document as of 2008 included the adding of a course on emotional disturbance, eliminating one course on physical disabilities and specialized health care, allowing the health and technology courses to be completed during Level II (clear), and reconfiguring the initial seminar and instructional strategies course (see summary below).

**Additional required course:**

- **EDS 276A/B Education of Students with Emotional Disturbance/Behavior Disorders**
  Meets Standard 15 (Managing Learning Environments), Standard 22 (Assessment and Evaluation of Students), and Standard 24 (Positive Behavioral Support).

**Courses modified or no longer required for the Mild/Moderate Credential:**

- No Longer required: EDS 216 A/B -Movement, Mobility & Specialized Health Care
- Modified: **Social Science Methods** (EDS 122A/B) and **Science Methods** (124A/B) frameworks are now covered in the Initial Seminar (EDS 232) and Instructional Strategies course (EDS 273A/B)
• EDS 232 Initial Seminar: Mild/Moderate now addresses Core Educational Specialist Standards: 12, 16, 17, 20, 23 and Multiple Subjects Teaching Performance Expectations 1-13.

• Level I or II option: EDS291A/B Technology in Special Education and HLSC 136 School Health Education.

For an online program overview, please see <http://edweb.csus.edu/eds/special_education/programs_credential/L1_Mild_Mod_MultSubOverview.html>.

II. Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

a. Primary Candidate Assessments

There are several arenas for a both formative and summative evaluation of candidates in the LEVEL I Mild/Moderate & Multiple Subject credential programs, ensuring that each candidate has satisfied each professional competency prior to being recommended for the credential(s); university coursework, evaluation of key assessments, determination of competence by field supervisors (district and institutional); and evaluation of competency by special education faculty advisor, and, when warranted, by the Special Education Area Group and Department Chair.

Candidates participating in these student teaching field experiences are evaluated by master teachers designated by the student teaching program coordinator and local school districts. Special Education intern candidates approved for an intern teaching assignment may be evaluated by the employer and university supervisor. Written procedures for requesting a supervised intern teaching field experience are included in the student teaching placement application and follow CCTC policies governing the issuance of intern credentials.

Fieldwork supervisors maintain detailed accounts of candidate performance. Written accounts include faculty observations and master teacher reports. Faculty supervisors of fieldwork also maintain close relations with site personnel in order to gather as much information as possible on the professional performance of the candidate. Evaluations by master teachers and university supervisors are maintained in candidate files, located in the Teacher Preparation and Credentials Office (TPAC). Copies of fieldwork evaluation forms are made available to candidates in the various student teaching manuals.

This report will focus on 4 key assessments that are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for a credential, including:

1. Elementary Literacy Commentary Assessment:

As part of the literacy commentary assessment project the candidates will do the following: Select one test in the area of phonological awareness, phonics, sight words, comprehension (such as the silent assessment that is given in informal reading inventories that is designed to assess a student’s knowledge of silent reading). The candidates will indicate in the commentary how appropriate these assessments are for
assessing English learners and students with special learning needs. As part of this assessment commentary the candidates will also create a summary of how applicable each assessment noted above would be for beginning, early intermediate, intermediate, and advanced students who are English learners. Also, as part of the assessment commentary the candidate will take each assessment and describe the prior knowledge of the content and student individual strengths and challenges (for example, academic development, language proficiency, and special needs) that students may have if these assessments were given to the students. Further, the candidates will specifically describe what would be done for each assessment or describe what would be written in the assessment results if the candidate were administering each assessment to a child who is special needs and is an English learner. The assessment commentary will also include information on the SOLOM (Student Observation Language Matrix) is appropriate for candidates who are English learners and who are also students with special needs. Additionally, the report will include a review of the El Paso Phonics Survey and whether it is appropriate or not appropriate for English learners and special needs students who are low readers and or struggling readers. Additionally, the candidate will have a section in the commentary for what parents would be told if their son or daughter has taken these assessments. Finally, candidates will review articles (as part of this commentary) related to assessing English learners and students with special needs who are low and/or are struggling readers and explain information that is relevant to assisting students who are assessed with these type of assessments.

2. **Mild/Moderate Teaching Portfolio:**

Evidence of attainment of all Level I Preliminary Program Standards is a requirement in the culminating Mild/Moderate EDS 233 seminar. Each candidate is required to develop a Professional Teaching Portfolio. This portfolio provides faculty members with an important opportunity to assess the candidate’s potential for developing reflective thinking and inquiry into professional practice. The candidate’s ability to reflect on his/her growth and document what he/she has accomplished as he/she develops the portfolio is evaluated. The portfolio is organized around the CCTC Core Standards for all Specialists and Service Credentials, the Preliminary Level I: Specialist Teaching Standards, the Preliminary Level I: Mild/Moderate/Severe Common Standards, and the Preliminary Level I: Mild/Moderate Standards. The standards respond to the evolving nature of special education service delivery and integrate general and special education professional preparation. The “core” standards address the need for special educators to be prepared to work with a variety of disabilities, to gain greater knowledge and understanding of the diversity of individual differences and needs of students, and instructional techniques that are effective with many types of learners. For each standard, the candidate selects artifacts that they deem evidence for having met competency in the particular area(s). A minimum of two artifacts per standard is required and for each artifact, a written justification/explanation of how it demonstrates competency must be provided. An artifact is tangible evidence of knowledge that is gained, skills that are mastered, values that are clarified, or
dispositions and attitudes that are characteristic of the candidate. Examples of artifacts are course assignments, photographs, student work, journals, lesson plans, audio- or video-tapes. To evaluate the portfolio (based on Level I Matrix), a rubric is used. The portfolio is evaluated, using the rubric, for the quality of its overall organization, visual layout, reflection and justification of personal artifacts, and specific evidence of standards. The portfolio is evaluated for the quality of its overall organization, visual layout, reflection and justification of personal artifacts, and specific evidence of standards. Candidates must earn a minimum score of 2 in order to receive credit for the portfolio. The Portfolio Review Sheet must be completed and signed by the seminar instructor.

**Multiple Subjects Teaching Portfolio:** Evidence of meeting all Multiple Subject Teaching Performance Expectations is a requirement in the culminating EDTE 332 PACT Seminar (replacing EDTE 307 as an equivalent). Each candidate also pursuing a Multiple Subjects Credential is required to develop a section in their Professional Teaching Portfolio specific to the Multiple Subjects Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Candidates are required to organize their portfolio around each of the 13 Teaching Performance Expectations. The evaluation of the portfolio is based on a rubric for the quality of its overall organization, visual layout, reflection and justification of personal artifacts, and specific evidence of standards. Candidates must earn a minimum score of 2 in order to receive credit for the portfolio. The Portfolio Review Sheet must be completed and signed by the seminar instructor.

3. **RICA (The Reading Instruction Competence Assessment):**

The RICA requirement applies to candidates who complete our combined Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and Education Specialist Credential programs. It is a standardized exam that focuses on core knowledge and skills needed to provide effective literacy instruction. All program completers must pass the RICA to apply for their credential.

**Multiple Subject and Mild/Moderate Culminating Student Teaching Evaluation:**

The evaluation of student teaching is a continuous process that facilitates the development of competencies in teaching and assists the candidate in developing techniques of self- evaluation. All candidates are evaluated both at the mid point and at the completion of both the Multiple Subject and Mild/Moderate student teaching/fieldwork experience. The final evaluation is held near the end of the semester and serves as a summative assessment of the teaching competencies of the candidate. The cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and candidate/intern are required to respond to each of the competencies by using the performance evaluation criteria provided. Candidates completing their Multiple Subject field experience are expected to demonstrate a score of level 3 (developing proficiency) or level 4 on all categories (proficiency). There are 52 items divided into 9 categories on the
evaluation tool including: 1) Preparation; 2) Instruction-Building Background; 3) Instruction-Comprehensive Input; 4) Instruction-Strategies; 5) Instruction-Interaction; 6) Instruction-Practice/Application; 7) Instruction-Lesson Delivery; 8) Assessment; and 9) Professionalism.

Student teachers completing their Mild/Moderate field experience are expected to demonstrate Level 2 “At Entry Level” proficiency or Level 3 “Above Entry Level” proficiency on all categories of a separate evaluation tool, distinct from that used for candidates seeking dual certification in multiple subjects. There are 6 categories on this evaluation tool including: 1) Professional and Interpersonal Skills; 2) Communication and Collaborative Partnerships; 3) Planning and Managing the Teaching and Learning Environment; 4) Managing Student Behavior and Social Interaction Skills; 5) Instructional Content and Practice; and 6) Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation. Each area has a list of descriptors (varying in number) with a descriptive rubric across 3 levels for each one; above entry, at entry, or below entry level. Each rating reflects the candidate’s “common and typical” performance in the classroom. Additionally, the University supervisor should indicate for each competency whether the rating is based on: O = Observation, I = Interview, and/or P = Portfolio. The cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and candidate/intern are required to respond to each of the competencies by using the performance evaluation criteria provided and completing the comments portion following each section.
Table 25: Overview of Key Assessments
The table below provides additional details about the nature of each key assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Type of Assessment (formative/summative)</th>
<th>When administered</th>
<th>Details about Administration</th>
<th>CCTC Standards, Performance Outcomes, etc. Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #1: Elementary Literacy Commentary Project</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>At the end of the EDS 221 course</td>
<td>Individual course instructors assess candidate work based on a standard rubric designed by the course instructor</td>
<td>TPEs 1-13 MM Specialist Standards: 14 b, 14c, 14d, 14e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #2: Candidate Portfolio</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>At the end of the EDTE 307 and EDS 233 seminar courses</td>
<td>Individual seminar instructors assess candidates’ portfolio based on a rubric designed by the faculty group</td>
<td>TPEs 1-13 MM Specialist Standards: 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #3: RICA Exam</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  *Students do have the option of retaking the exam if they fail the exam | After the completion of the EDS 221 course | The RICA is administered by an outside agency. | All domains of effective literacy instruction as defined by the CCT and State Department of Education |
| Assessment #4: Multiple Subject and Mild Moderate Student Teaching/Field Experience Evaluation | Summative | In final semester at the midterm and at the end of the semester | Implemented by the supervisor and mentor teacher at midterm and at the end of the semester of the final student teaching experience | All TPEs and Mild/Moderate Competencies and the Structured Instructional Observation Protocol (SIOP) |
As summarized in Table 24, our program had 45 Program Completers in Fall 2007 and 36 Program Completers in Spring 2008. In Table 26 below, we summarize the data related to completer performance as measured by the 4 key assessments detailed in Table 25.

### Table 26: Aggregate Data on Completer Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tools</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Spring 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment #1:</strong> Elementary Literacy Project (100 pts)</td>
<td>N= 24</td>
<td>N=21</td>
<td>N=33</td>
<td>N=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scoring Range: 80-100</td>
<td>Scoring Range: 80-100</td>
<td>Scoring Range: 80-100</td>
<td>Scoring Range: 80-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean: 98.19%</td>
<td>Mean: 97.16%</td>
<td>Mean: 98.38%</td>
<td>Mean: 93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment #2:</strong> Candidate Portfolio</td>
<td>EDTE 332 N: 8</td>
<td>EDTE 332 N: 10</td>
<td>EDTE 332 N: 9</td>
<td>EDTE 332 N: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE 332 Multiple Subject Seminar (PACT)</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment #3:</strong> RICA Exam</td>
<td>N: 24</td>
<td>N: 21</td>
<td>N: 33</td>
<td>N: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passing: 24/24</td>
<td>Passing: 21/21</td>
<td>Passing: 32/33</td>
<td>Passing: 30/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment #4:</strong></td>
<td>EDTE 420B N=8</td>
<td>EDTE 420B N=10</td>
<td>EDTE 420B N=9</td>
<td>EDTE 420B N=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE 420B: Multiple Subject</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDS 472: Mild Moderate Specialist Credential Student Teaching</td>
<td>EDS 472 N=19</td>
<td>EDS 472 N=25</td>
<td>EDS 472 N=28</td>
<td>EDS 472 N=22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
<td>Passing: 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional information about candidate and program completer performance:**

In addition to the 4 key assessments used to evaluate completer performance already reported above, we use the following assessments to help inform decisions made about our courses and our program. These additional assessments include: (1) a Functional Behavioral Assessment/Analysis Report; (2) a positive behavioral intervention support plan (BIP); (3) an IEP Initial Assessment Flowchart and Timeline, Procedures, and Exceptions Process; (4) a Comprehensive Case Study Assessment Report; and (5) feedback from university supervisors, cooperating/mentor teachers in the field.

1) Functional Behavioral Assessment/Analysis Report:

   A Functional behavioral assessment is considered to be a problem-solving process for addressing student problem behavior. It relies on a variety of techniques and strategies to identify the purposes of specific behavior and to help IEP teams select interventions to directly address the problem behavior. Functional behavioral assessment should be integrated, as appropriate, throughout the process of developing, reviewing, and, if necessary, revising a student’s IEP. A functional behavioral assessment looks beyond the behavior itself. The focus when conducting a functional behavioral assessment is on identifying significant, pupil-specific social, affective, cognitive, and/or environmental...
factors associated with the occurrence (and non-occurrence) of specific behaviors. This broader perspective offers a better understanding of the function or purpose behind student behavior.

2) Positive Behavioral Intervention Support Plan (BIP):

A Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) takes the observations made in the Functional Behavioral Assessment and turns them into a concrete plan of action for managing a student's behavior. A BIP may include ways to change the environment to keep behavior from starting in the first place, provide positive reinforcement to promote good behavior, employ planned ignoring to avoid reinforcing bad behavior, and provide supports needed so that the student will not be driven to act out due to frustration or fatigue. When a behavior plan is agreed to, the school and staff are legally obligated to follow it, and consequences of not following it should not be inflicted on the student. Behavioral intervention plans based on an understanding of "why" a student misbehaves are extremely useful in addressing a wide range of problem behaviors.

3) IEP Initial Assessment Flowchart and Timeline, Procedures, and Exceptions Process:

Each candidate is required to create an IEP Assessment flowchart (or creative visual) of the IEP initial assessment process, from beginning to end, including timelines and all the essential participants and information related to the IEP process.

4) Comprehensive Assessment Report:

The Comprehensive Assessment Report requires candidates demonstrate the basic principles and strategies related to using and communicating the results of a variety of assessment and evaluation approaches appropriate for general education and for those students receiving special education services with mild/moderate challenging conditions. Candidates will make educational decisions on the basis of a variety of nonbiased standardized techniques, instruments, and processes that are functional, curriculum referenced, performance based, and appropriate to the diverse needs of individual students. Candidates will use these approaches to assess the developmental, academic, behavioral, social, communication, vocational, and/or community life skill needs of students and the outcomes of instruction.

5) Feedback from university supervisors, cooperating/mentor teachers in the field:

Feedback from our university supervisors and cooperating teachers/mentors is ongoing during formal evaluation meetings with candidates, but also informal conversations, and 1:1 with the student teaching field placement coordinator and coordinator of the mild/moderate credential program. These individuals provide ongoing suggestions and feedback in the preparation of our candidates. Additionally, at the end of each semester, the field placement coordinator holds a meeting with all university supervisors to discuss individual candidate concerns and the overall evaluation process. Suggestions for change and/or improvement are shared with the mild/moderate coordinator, mild/moderate faculty area group (MMAG), and Special Education Area Group (SEAG). Action for change and/or improvement is decided by majority vote among the Mild/Moderate are group and the SEAG.
III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

Strengths:

a. Candidate performance: All of our 4 key assessments provide in-depth analysis of direct application of knowledge, skills, and clinical practice with focus children/youth and their school/family teams. Candidates demonstrated highly proficient to proficient results on the assessments in each key area by the end of the program. The Mild/Moderate faculty are confident that the completers have proficient skills in Literacy, IEP development, systematic and data-based instruction, valid and reliable assessment procedures, functional assessment, and positive behavioral support. Our completers also show strengths in collaborative teaming with families and professionals, advocacy, and systems change skills. Completers also demonstrated high level of skill in supporting students with mild/moderate disabilities in integrated and natural settings utilizing principles of Universal Design for Learning, partial participation, and modified outcomes referenced to the general education curriculum standards.

b. Program effectiveness: Overall, the program has strong ties between cooperating/mentor teachers and University faculty and supervisors. This has had a direct effect of high program quality. Candidates/interns are carefully mentored, their progress is systematically tracked and there are numerous opportunities for critical feedback. Candidates/interns demonstrated high success in the final evaluation and portfolio development. The program has demonstrated success in the key areas nationally recognized in the field as core to mild/moderate disabilities, person/family centered planning, collaborative IEP development, positive behavioral supports, supporting students to access the core curriculum, and research-based practice and systems change.

Areas for improvement:

a. Candidate/Intern Competency Evaluation:
Review of the data indicates that our current EDS 472 Competency Evaluation tool needs to be revised to more clearly articulate and operationally define each of the mild/moderate competencies. For example, on the first page of the current evaluation tool a Performance Criteria is provided. The Performance Criteria breaks down the three levels of performance as follows; Level 3: “Above Entry Level,” Level 2 “At Entry Level”, and Level 1 “Below Entry.” However, on each of the pages of the evaluation tool, only the descriptive level is provided not the numeral level e.g. “Above Entry Level”. As a result, it is very time consuming to convert the performance criteria score to a numeral value in order to identify the mean-median score across candidates.

b. Program effectiveness for interns: Overall, the program’s effectiveness for interns has in some cases been somewhat compromised depending on whether the intern is able to get the adequate on-site support he or she needs, and whether the intern is provided with important opportunities to observe master teachers identified as effective and highly qualified.
c. Modified outcomes and instructional strategies within the general education curriculum and environment: The effectiveness of the program in establishing skills for modified outcomes and instructional strategies within the general education curriculum, using adaptations, and understanding how to reference goals to the general education curriculum for students with the mild/moderate cognitive and behavioral disabilities is an area that needs improvement for the intern teachers as well.

IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Based on the data in Section III above, the program will take the following steps.

- Modified outcomes and instructional strategies within the general education curriculum and environment: Faculty in the mild/moderate program will have two retreats; one at the beginning and one at the end of each semester in order to review the effectiveness of the program in establishing skills for modified outcomes and to review all coursework and assignments and problem solve new teaching strategies for various concepts. These retreats will focus on data-based and systematic instruction, modifying the curriculum and designing IEP goals referenced to general education standards, and systems change.

- The mild/moderate student teaching evaluation tool will be revised based on input from faculty and supervisors. The EDS 472 Competency Evaluation tool will be revised to more clearly articulate and operationally define each of the mild/moderate competencies. Each competency will identify the Performance Criteria based on 3 numerical values; Level 3: “Above Entry Level,” Level 2 “At Entry Level”, and Level 1 “Below Entry.” This will allow for faculty to convert the performance criteria score to a numerical value in order to identify the mean-median score across candidates. A written description of the process to be used will be added and better information and training for actual grading will be implemented.

The Student Teaching and Internship Handbook containing these revisions can be found online at [http://edweb.csus.edu/eds/forms/spec_ed.html](http://edweb.csus.edu/eds/forms/spec_ed.html).