### Instructional Program Priorities

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

**Department:** EDS

**Number of students enrolled in the program in Fall, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Special Education Credential (ECSE)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild/Moderate Educational Specialist Credential (M/Mod)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate/Severe Educational Specialist Credential (Mod/S)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. in Education (Special Education)*</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>196</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 Moderate/Severe Educational Specialist Credential (Mod/S) 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, as 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 Moderate/Severe Educational Specialist Credential (Mod/S) credential program encompasses 53 Units (reduced 20% from pre-fall 2011). Many of the courses overlap with ECSE and Mild/Moderate credential offerings. The total preliminary core units include 8 units of student teaching experiences; a candidate may meet some of these state requirements in their own place of Mod/S 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 Mod/S Educational Specialist Credential Program can be completed in as little as four 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 Moderate/Severe 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  

b) Competence in Reading Instruction: RICA  
   (Statewide Reading Instruction Competence Assessment)  

c) Cumulative Moderate/Severe Instruction Knowledge:  
   Candidate Portfolio  

d) Culminating Moderate/Severe Student Teaching Skills:  
   Student Teaching Evaluation  

e) Synthesis of Moderate/Severe Issues: M.A. Thesis/Project or Comprehensive Exam  

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 Mod/S 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 Moderate/Severe 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>
<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 Moderate/Severe Educational Specialist standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment d: Culminating Student Teaching Evaluations EDS 472: Student Teaching II</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: All competencies per Moderate/Severe 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 Mod/S 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)
c) Cumulative Moderate/Severe Instruction Knowledge: Candidate Portfolio
d) Culminating Moderate/Severe Student Teaching Skills: Student Teaching Evaluation
e) Synthesis of Moderate/Severe Issues: M.A. Thesis/Project or Comprehensive Exam

[Mod/Severe]
[Mod/Severe]
[Mod/Severe]
[[Mod/Severe]
[Mod/Severe, M.A.]

The assessment methodology tools outlined previously indicate that the students enrolled in the Moderate/Severe credential programs 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 teeming with families and professionals, advocacy, and systems change skills. Completers also demonstrated high level of skill in supporting all students with moderate/severe 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 Moderate/Severe 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 Moderate/Severe 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 Moderate/Severe Education Specialist credential program (Mod/S) 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</td>
<td>• Presents topics of equal importance at the same heading level throughout the review (APA, pp. 62-63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideas of equal importance at all</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>
<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></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</td>
<td>• Cites and uses relevant theoretical articles, methodological articles, and case studies as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when these articles are available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses quotations when paraphrase is appropriate or quotes inaccurately and/or unconventionally or</td>
<td>• Uses quotations appropriately, accurately, and conventionally (APA, pp. 117 – 120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distorts meaning through ellipsis</td>
<td></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</td>
<td>• Presents a reference list (not a bibliography) including “works that specifically support” the review (APA, p. 215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unconventionally</td>
<td></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</td>
<td>• Demonstrates compliance with the APA Editorial Guidelines “to ensure clear, consistent presentation of the printed word” in matters of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear, consistent presentation of the printed word” in matters of punctuation, hyphenation,</td>
<td>punctuation, hyphenation, spelling, abbreviations, tables, headings, grammar, citations, and references (APA, p. 77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelling, abbreviations, tables, headings, grammar, citations, and references (APA, p. 77)</td>
<td>• Presents statistics in text in accordance with APA conventions (pp. 138 – 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presents statistics in text in a manner that conflicts with APA conventions (pp. 138 – 147)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 21**. 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 **22** 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><strong>Question #1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question #2</strong></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><strong>Question #3</strong></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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the comprehensiveness (breadth) - all elements of a question addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the content (depth) - key points addressed, accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citation of sources - current, relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position statement (if appropriate) - convincing, supported, in the conclusion of the essay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, these elements may be considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>form (general) - intro, paragraph construction, transitions, conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form (specific) - grammar, punctuation, spelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Moderate Severe
Program documented in this report: Education Specialist - Moderate/Severe

Name of Program: Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, School Psychology, & Deaf Studies

Credential awarded: Moderate/Severe Educational Specialist Credential

Is this program offered at more than one site? No

If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered: NA

Program Contact:
Name: Dr. Kathy Norman, Associate Dean

Phone #: (916) 278-4187

E-mail: knorman@csus.edu

If the preparer(s) of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:

1. Dr. Kathy Gee kgee@csus.edu (916) 278-4077
2. Dr. Bruce Ostertag ostertag@csus.edu (916) 278-5541
SECTION A – PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

I. Context

Table 27. Total Number of Candidates Enrolled and Completers

The table below shows data on candidates in the requested two semesters, Fall ’07 and Spring ’08. Please note, however, that this is a two year preparation program and candidates may enter either in Fall or Spring semester. The majority of candidates starts in the Fall and end in the Spring of their second year in the program. Thus, the numbers of those enrolled will not equal those completing in any given semester as some are in their first year and some are in their second year.

Table 27. Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 27. Enrollment</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Spring 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate/Severe: Level I On-campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential Candidates</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of candidates enrolled</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 27. Enrollment</strong></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Spring 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate/Severe: Level II On-Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential Candidates</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of candidates enrolled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief description of program characteristics. The Level I moderate/severe specialist credential program at CSUS focuses on 16 state standards developed by the California Teacher Credentialing Commission. This credential covers an age range of K-21 and a very wide range of disability types and issues. Candidates entering with no previous credential follow a 2-year sequence, and candidates entering with a multiple subjects or single subject credential follow a 1+ year sequence. Candidates are grouped in either a one-year cohort or a two-year cohort but these cohorts combine in the core moderate/severe courses. Candidates who already hold a multiple subjects or single subject credential follow a sequence of 30 units of coursework, 15 units of supervised student teaching, and 2 units of student teaching seminar (a total of 47 units). Candidates entering with no other teaching credential, follow a sequence of 45 units of coursework, 18 units of supervised fieldwork/student teaching, and 2 units of student teaching seminar (a total of 65 units).

The core methods courses are directly connected to demonstration competencies in the supervised fieldwork and student teaching experiences. The 3 semesters of supervised student teaching are competency based. Candidates must demonstrate mastery before moving on to the next experience. This means that candidates in the first supervised fieldwork experience must have a level of at least 3 out of 4 on the rubric in all competency areas in order to move on to the Student Teaching I semester; and, candidates in the Student Teaching I semester must demonstrate a level 3 out of 4 in all areas to move on to the final student teaching semester. Approximately half of the candidates are interns, and half of the candidates are traditional
student teachers. There is a close relationship between the school sites in which we place our student teachers and the core faculty in the moderate/severe program.

The moderate/severe credential program works with a large number of school districts and county programs since we have student teachers, intern teachers and traditional teachers in our program. Candidates who are not interns get 3 semester-long supervised experiences across both secondary and elementary grades, and experience with a wide range of disabilities. In addition the program has a strong commitment to ensuring that student teachers have experience in urban and non-urban districts and schools with English Language Learners. Intern teachers are also supervised over 3 semesters in their own programs. Through agreements with districts and counties, candidates who are employed as interns are supported to take days of leave to spend time in other programs for two purposes: 1) to give them an opportunity to observe best practice models; and, 2) to give them needed experiences in other age-groups and with other types of children with significant disabilities.

**Background about any significant changes, deletions or innovations in the program since the last program document was approved (2005).** We have not made any significant changes or deletions to the program; however we have undertaken some fruitful innovations since 2005. These include: establishment of the “end of first year review” for candidates in the 2-year sequence (they hold no prior teaching credential); a new rubric for the first supervised fieldwork semester; a new rubric for Student Teaching 1 and II; and, the establishment of a mentoring program called “community of practice.”

The “end of first year review” was established to provide an opportunity for the program coordinator and the candidates to examine the candidate’s progress over the first year, both in classes and supervised fieldwork. By reviewing and discussing the candidate’s evaluations in the field and performance in classes, we are able to carefully plan for the two student teaching semesters in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} year, give guidance, and provide overall advising for success. For intern candidates this process also provides an opportunity to discuss ways to facilitate spending time in mentor teachers’ classrooms and accessing experiences outside of their internship setting.

The rubrics for the 3 semesters of fieldwork and student teaching were re-structured as written rubric statements and replace a numeric scale, used previously. This has made it easier for supervisors and candidates alike to be very clear on exactly where candidates are in their progress toward becoming a proficient first-year teacher.

We received a new federally funded personnel preparation grant in August, 2008. Part of that project involves the establishment of a mentoring community online. A number of our highly successful program completers have agreed to participate in an online community which will support new teachers and interns through offering ideas and resources to each other. We call this a community of practice. These program completers were selected based on several factors: feedback from their administrators; evidence of effective practices in place in their classroom, as observed by the coordinator and one other advisor; their effectiveness as a mentor teacher; information provided in structured interviews with the university program coordinator; and/or, other professional practice demonstrations.
For an online program overview, please see:
http://edweb.csus.edu/eds/special_education/programs_credential/L1_Mod_Sev_Overview.html.

II. Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

  a. Primary Candidate Assessments (NOT including any assessments or data that are used to make an admissions decisions)

This report will focus on 6 key assessments that are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for a credential, including: 1) assessments and intervention plans for two students in augmentative and alternative communication; 2) design and implementation of a positive behavioral support plan following assessment and analysis; 3) a comprehensive (triennial) IEP assessment, report, and final IEP; 4) a “Moving Forward” project (schedule analysis, school site analysis, program plans); 5) the final student teaching evaluation; and, 6) the Student Portfolio.

1. Augmentative and alternative communication assessments and intervention plans. Communication skills (both non-symbolic and symbolic) are the most common IEP goals for students with significant disabilities. It is nationally recognized that having skills in the ability to assess and intervene with students with moderate/severe disabilities in the area of communication is one of the top critically important skills for teachers in this field. This key signature assignment is carried out in the student teaching setting while taking the EDS 209 course in augmentative and alternative communication. Credential candidates work closely with two students and their school teams (family members, teachers, speech therapists, other related service providers) to assess current communication skills and communication needs, design interventions, develop low-tech materials and recommend high tech devices (if needed), develop goals and instructional programs, design intervention strategies, and carry them out. At least one of the two focus children/youth must be someone who is nonverbal. The professor evaluates the work of the credential candidate at 3 points during the first two months of the semester. By the third month, the credential candidate and the professor have agreed on intervention plans and the candidate will carry them out. The candidate collects data, makes changes as necessary and summarizes the progress at the end of the semester. The professor provides a grade, but the communication system is in place and the team at the school site will carry it on.

2. Positive behavioral support plan: assessment, analysis, and team implementation.

For the Positive Behavioral Support Project, each candidate selects an individual with disabilities who engages in a challenging behavior(s) that need(s) to be decreased. Four components of this project are conducted over the course of the semester. For the first part, the Target Behavior Operational Definition, the candidate briefly describes the strengths and needs of the individual whose behavior he/she is identifying to change; describes the target behavior to be changed (i.e. the behavioral difficulty, deficit or excess), including examples; estimates how often the behavior occurs; describes how intense/severe the behavior is; determines what skills may be lacking that could potentially replace the behavior; operationally defines the target behavior in observable, measurable, and countable terms (i.e., topography, event, duration, seriousness, and/or intensity), and briefly describes data that needs to be generated to get adequate baseline. For the next component, the Functional Assessment of Challenging
Behavior, Analysis of Assessment Data, and Initial Hypothesis Statements, the candidate conducts assessments (i.e., baseline data, ABC analysis over three to four school settings), interviews with relevant stakeholders (e.g., parents, other teachers, instructional assistants, related services personnel); student interview, records review, communication interviews, motivational assessment scale, quality of live questionnaire, positive environment checklists, learning style preference scale) in order to assist in obtaining a greater understanding of the target behavior. After the above data is collected, the candidate writes a summary of the measures used and the findings/outcomes of the functional assessment conducted, the hypotheses generated regarding the challenging behavior and a description of the hypothesis testing which has been or will be conducted. Next, the candidate develops and implements a Multi-Component Positive Behavioral Support Plan, and writes a summary of the process and results.

3. Comprehensive (triennial) IEP assessment, report, and final IEP. In their Advanced Methods course, which is taken along with the final semester of student teaching, candidates are required to pull together their knowledge and skills from previous coursework to complete a comprehensive, integrated assessment. Candidates are required to utilize the collaborative teaming methods learned previously, taking them to a new level of professional practice. They collaborate with other school team members to write an integrated assessment report across all core areas (academic, cognitive, motor, social, sensory, domestic, self-care, self-management, vocational, recreational, community access, etc.). Candidates all develop the IEP goals and methods of tracking progress, carryout the meetings for the IEP (under supervision of their mentor teacher and/or supervisor), and follow up as necessary.

4. Moving forward project (schedule analysis, school site analysis, program plans). The Moving Forward with Integration/Inclusive School Practices Project is completed during a candidate’s final student teaching phase. The project has three components and its purpose is twofold: 1) to gain knowledge in program quality indicators and the planning and intervention processes which can take place to move programs forward toward more inclusive educational practices; and 2) to practice conducting activities which forward meaningful integration/inclusion and quality service delivery. First, each candidate conducts a school inventory; has interviews and reflective discussions with key individuals; utilizes quality indicator checklists; observes and participates in the school program, examines current system of service delivery components; analyzes his/her program’s schedule including the quality of the instructional day and how staff is assigned to maximize instruction, functional and meaningful activities, and inclusion in general education or the community. The candidate then writes a summary of his/her analyses indicating strengths and areas to target for program improvement and develops an action plan to include: a revised schedule that he/she could implement within the remainder of the semester; top prioritized long-term goals (approx. 3-year goals) set for the services for students with severe disabilities and activities he/she would recommend to meet those goals; a more detailed description of objectives and activities for the first year. The candidate then shares the plan with his/her university supervisor and mentor teacher to obtain feedback. Revisions are made as necessary. For the second component of this project, the candidate conducts one activity to forward comprehensive integration/inclusion at the school site or at a community vocational site through information provision. Finally, the last component involves the candidate participating in a systems change group/activity that may in some way further inclusive practices at the school or district.
5. Final student teaching evaluation. The Student Teaching Evaluation tool for Student Teaching I and II is the same rubric. By the end of Student Teaching I students are expected to be at a 3 (developing proficiency) on all categories. By the end of Student Teaching II, students are expected to be at a level 4 (proficiency) on all categories. There are 11 categories on the evaluation tool including: 1) collaboration, communication, and professional commitment; 2) teaching collaboratively in the general education curriculum; 3) IEP development; 4) supporting students with severe disabilities to access the core curriculum; 5) data-based, systematic instruction; 6) community-based and supported life instruction; 7) facilitation of social relationships and friendships; 8) augmentative and alternative communication; 9) positive behavioral support; 10) supporting students with physical, sensory, health, and multiple disabilities; 11) program management, evaluation, and systems change. Each area has a list of descriptors (varying in number) with a written rubric across 4 levels for each one.

6. Candidate Portfolio. Each candidate is required to develop a Professional Teaching Portfolio. Its major purpose is the development of reflective thinking and inquiry in teacher candidates. 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: Moderate/Severe Standards. For each standard, the candidate selects artifacts to include demonstrating 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. The portfolio is evaluated by the program faculty, using a rubric, for the quality of its overall organization, visual layout, reflection and justification of personal artifacts, and specific evidence of standards.

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: Signature assignment: 2 assessments and intervention plans for students who need augmentative and/or alternative communication systems</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Throughout a specific course required during Student Teaching I.</td>
<td>Individual faculty teaching the class assess candidate work based on a standard rubric designed by the faculty group</td>
<td>Standards addressed: 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #2: Signature assignment: Positive behavioral support plan following assessment and analysis</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Throughout a course required during Student Teaching I.</td>
<td>Individual faculty teaching the class assess candidate work based on a standard rubric designed by the faculty group</td>
<td>Standards addressed: 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #3: Signature assignment: Comprehensive (triennial) IEP assessment, report, and final IEP</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>In course required during final student teaching experience (II)</td>
<td>Individual faculty teaching the class assess candidate work based on a standard rubric designed by the faculty group</td>
<td>Standards addressed: 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #4: Signature Assignment: Moving forward project</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>In seminar taken during the final student teaching experience (II)</td>
<td>Individual faculty teaching the class assess candidate work based on a standard rubric designed by the faculty group</td>
<td>Standards addressed: 1, 2, 4, 6, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #5: Final student teaching evaluation</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>Standards addressed: all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #6: Student portfolio</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>In final semester at the midterm and at the end of the semester</td>
<td>Individual faculty teaching the student teaching seminar assess candidates’ portfolio based on a rubric designed by the faculty group</td>
<td>Standards addressed: all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Table below reflects data on candidates enrolled during the Fall ’08 through Spring ’10 semesters of our 4 semester. In Table 29 below, we summarize the data related to completer performance as measured by the 6 key assessments detailed in Table 28.

**Table 29. Aggregate Data on Completer Performance**

| Assessment Tools | Fall 2008  
| N= 5 | Spring 2009  
| N= 15 | Fall 2009  
| N= 2 | Spring 2010  
| N= 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| #1: Two augmentative and alternative communication assessments and interventions | Mean % out of 100 = 93%  
Mean % out of 100 - 92%  
Range: 92% - 95% | Mean % out of 100 = 93%  
Mean % out of 100 - 92%  
Range: 92% - 94% | Mean % out of 100 = 93%  
Mean % out of 100 - 92%  
Range: 85% - 98% |
| #2: Positive behavioral support plan and implementation | Mean score out of 40 = 36.65  
Range: 36.5 - 36.8 | Mean score out of 40 = 36.75  
Range: 33.2 - 38.4 | Mean score out of 40 = 37.05  
Range: 36.7 - 38.8 | Mean score out of 40 = 36.25  
Range: 33.2 - 39.6 |
| #3: Comprehensive (triennial) IEP assessment, report, and final IEP | Mean score out of 100 = 92.5  
Range: 91 - 94 | Mean score out of 100 = 93  
Range: 85-100 | Mean score out of 100 = 92  
Range: 90 - 94 | Mean score out of 100 = 93  
Range: 87-100 |
| #4: Moving forward project | Mean score out of 44 = 41.75  
Range: 41 – 42.5 | Mean score out of 44 = 41.57  
Range: 39.5 = 44 | Mean score out of 44 = 41.75  
Range: 41 – 42.5 | Mean score out of 44 = 42.6  
Range: 39.5 = 44 |
| #5: Final student teaching evaluation | Range and Mean score out of 4 on 11 content areas:  
Areas 1-5: 4-4; 4  
Area 6: N.O. – 4; 4  
Area 7: 3-5; 4  
Area 8: N.O. – 4; 4  
Area 9: 4-4; 4  
Area 10: 4-4; 3.6  
Area 11: 4-4; 3.83 | Range and Mean score out of 4 on 11 content areas:  
Area 1: 3-4; 3.94  
Area 2: N.O. – 4; 4.37  
Area 3: N.O. – 4; 3.83  
Area 4: 3-4; 3.68  
Area 5: 3-4; 3.81  
Area 6: 3-4; 3.68  
Area 7: 3-4; 3.69  
Area 8: 3-4; 3.39  
Area 9: 3-4; 3.81  
Area 10: 3-4; 3.78  
Area 11: 3-4; 3.7 | Range and Mean score out of 4 on 11 content areas:  
Area 1: 3-4; 3.94  
Area 2: N.O. – 4; 4.37  
Area 3: N.O. – 4; 3.83  
Area 4: 3-4; 3.68  
Area 5: 3-4; 3.81  
Area 6: 3-4; 3.68  
Area 7: 3-4; 3.69  
Area 8: 3-4; 3.39  
Area 9: 3-4; 3.81  
Area 10: 3-4; 3.78  
Area 11: 3-4; 3.7 | Range and Mean score out of 4 on 11 content areas:  
Area 1: 3-4; 3.94  
Area 2: N.O. – 4; 4.37  
Area 3: N.O. – 4; 3.83  
Area 4: 3-4; 3.68  
Area 5: 3-4; 3.81  
Area 6: 3-4; 3.68  
Area 7: 3-4; 3.69  
Area 8: 3-4; 3.39  
Area 9: 3-4; 3.81  
Area 10: 3-4; 3.78  
Area 11: 3-4; 3.7 |
| #6: Student Portfolio | Mean score out of 40 = 35  
Range: 33 - 37 | Mean score out of 40 = 35.5  
Range: 31 - 40 | Mean score out of 40 = 36  
Range: 35 - 37 | Mean score out of 40 = 34.87  
Range: 30 - 40 |
b. **Additional information about candidate and program completer performance.** In addition to the 6 key assessments used to evaluate completer performance already reported above, we use the following (3) assessments to help inform decisions made about our courses and our program. These additional assessments include: (1) an “end of first year” review (for candidates in the program with no previous credential; (2) a focus group discussion with completers of the Level I program who are in their first year of teaching; (3) phone or in-person interviews separately with both program completers and their direct administrators at the end of the first year of teaching; and, (4) feedback from mentor teachers in the field. The data collection process and key findings are presented below.

   (1) “End of first year review.” This process involves the Program Coordinator meeting with the candidate to review the coursework completed so far and the evaluation results from the first supervised semester in fieldwork. Data is used to determine student teaching placements for the following year and/or experiences needed for interns; ways to support the candidate to improve in certain areas; and whether or not the candidate will pass on to Student Teaching I.

   (2) Focus group interviews. First year candidates are brought together in December and February of their first year of teaching (often centered at the TASH and CalTASH conferences) to have focused discussion related to their assessment of their first year of teaching, their preparation, and any suggestions they might have for the program.

   (3) Individual interviews with program completers and their immediate supervisors at the end of the first year of teaching. Completers are called at the end of their first year or met with personally, as are their immediate supervisors. They are asked open-ended questions about performance, preparation, suggestions for courses and fieldwork, etc.

   (4) Feedback from mentor teachers in the field. Feedback from our mentors is ongoing during formal evaluation meetings with candidates, but also through informal conversations 1:1 with the two core advisors and coordinator of the moderate/severe program. These individuals provide ongoing suggestions and feedback about the preparation of our candidates.

III. **Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data**

In this section, we discuss the data displayed in Table 29 and the additional data that was summarized in Section II.b. We focus our discussion on the strengths and areas for improvement revealed by the analysis of these data.

**Strengths:**

a. Candidate performance: All of our 6 key assessments provide in-depth analysis of candidates’ direct application of knowledge, skills, and clinical practice with focus children/youth and their school/family teams. Candidates demonstrated high levels of performance on the assessments in each key area by the end of the program. We can be assured that completers have proficient skills in IEP development, systematic and data-based instruction, augmentative communication, and positive behavioral support. Our completers also show strengths in collaborative teaming with both families and professionals, advocacy, and systems change skills. Completers also demonstrated
high level of skill in supporting students with severe 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 mentor teachers and University faculty and supervisors. This has had a direct and positive effect on program quality. Student teachers are carefully mentored, their progress is very carefully tracked and there are numerous opportunities for critical feedback. Student teachers demonstrated high rates of success in the final evaluation and portfolio. The program has demonstrated success in the key areas nationally recognized in the field as core to moderate/severe disabilities: augmentative communication, person/family-centered planning and 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 performance: In reviewing the data from the Student Teaching Final Evaluation, some candidates struggled in the areas of core curriculum and general education practice, and social relationships facilitation, primarily due to being interns in situations in which the system in which they worked prevented enough practice in this area. In addition, some candidates struggled in the area of systematic, data based instruction. Data on their student teaching evaluations and their systematic instructional programs (related to the augmentative communication assignment and the positive behavioral support project) reveal that for a small number of candidates this proved to be more difficult. Further investigation revealed that this appeared to be related to the lack of modeling in their internship position, or to difficulties in finding ways to monitor within the typical teaching day.

b. Program effectiveness: 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 can get opportunities for modeling and observation of master teachers (in other words, getting opportunities to leave their own program and spend time in master teachers’ programs). The effectiveness of the program in establishing skills for modified outcomes within the general education curriculum, using adaptations, and understanding how to reference goals to the general education curriculum even for students with the most significant cognitive 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.

a. Individual meetings will be scheduled with school site principals and school district special education administrators who have intern teachers in August prior to the start of the school year. The core faculty for the program will use these meetings to discuss in more detail the signature assignments and the evaluation tool for the intern teachers. In this way, we hope to provide more detail to engage more support from these individuals to help
interns both get the experiences they need to master the competencies and get proper mentoring. Mentorship within districts/county programs is quite varied – some is excellent and some is non-existent. We hope through these meetings to gain a better understanding of the issues and find creative and collaborative ways to support the interns.

b. The initial fieldwork evaluation and “end of first year” review process will be implemented at the end of the first semester as well. And, for candidates in the one-year program (already hold a multiple subject credential), we will implement the process after the first semester.

c. Faculty in the moderate/severe program have a retreat each summer to review all coursework and assignments and problem solve new teaching strategies for various concepts. This summer the focus will be on data-based and systematic instruction, modifying the curriculum and designing IEP goals referenced to general education standards, and systems change.

d. The student teaching evaluation tool will be revised again based on the input from faculty and supervisors. A written description of the process to be used will be added and better information and training for actual grading will be implemented at the retreat.

e. Our “community of practice” that has just begun will be engaged to address the issues in Section III above to get ideas from the field for program improvement. Mentorship from highly qualified program completers will be added to the district-provided mentorship so that candidates will have more support.

The *Student Teaching and Internship Handbook* per the above can be found online at [http://edweb.csus.edu/eds/forms/spec_ed.html](http://edweb.csus.edu/eds/forms/spec_ed.html).