

## Special Education Mild/Moderate for Elementary Education Grades 1-5 [SPEO]

Cycles included in this report:

Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

This PDF document includes any files attached to fields in this report.

To view the attachments you should view this file in Adobe Acrobat XI or higher, or another PDF viewer that supports viewing file attachments.

The default PDF viewer for your device or web browser may not support viewing file attachments embedded in a PDF.

If the attachments are in formats other than PDF you will need any necessary file viewers installed.

# Program Name: Special Education Mild/Moderate for Elementary Education Grades 1-5 [SPEO]

## Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Traditional or less than 50% Distance/Traditional

## 2 Is this program offered at an off-site location?

No

## 2.1 If yes to previous, provide addresses for each location where 50% or more of program credits may be earned.

## **3 Example of Program Improvement**

2015-2016:

By reviewing the data throughout the assessments, it shows evidence that the candidates' performance has improved in applying the instructional strategies, observation's techniques, data's collection, behavior management, and evaluating students' academic and behavior performance.

The major assessment for SPED 403 the "Essay on Collaboration" will be replaced with the "Directory of Service." Each student will develop a directory of services which will include at least five agencies, for each of the 10 types of disabilities that provides intervention service service for children with disabilities and their families in the student's local communities. They will also need to select one of the director/person-in-charge and conduct an interview.

## 2016-2017:

Through the review of data from 2015-2016, evidence of candidates' improvement exists in the following areas: implementation of instructional strategies; observation techniques; data collection; behavior management; evaluating students' academic and behavior performance. The above statement is not supported by current data. These courses were taught under a different instructor. As a new professor, the entire special education program is being restructured and courses are being re-written to produce solid evidence of candidate improvement.

## 2017-2018:

There were no examples of program improvement reported.

## 2018-2019:

At the end of the 18-19 AY, the two SPED instructors left the University. Some data was retrieved, however, what was found did not provide reliable data upon which decisions could be made. A new professor was hired for the 19-20 AY and will be revising the coursework and assessments in order that reliable and useable data can be reported moving forward.

## 2019-2020:

## 2020-2021:

Review of existing data does indicate that candidates are showing improvement overall. Due to COVID related course modifications and multiple state and federally recognized natural disasters, the normal flow of instruction was impeded multiple times; progress on program redesign was slowed this academic year due to the same. A second special education faculty member was hired for fall 2020 and will work to further improve overall program redesign continues. Alignment to InTASC, CAEP, LCET, CEC, and state standards have been maintained.

## 4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

## 2016-2017:

New assessment coordinating activities have brought a renewed emphasis on data collection and assignment development.

#### 2017-2018:

There were no program highlights reported.

#### 2018-2019:

At the end of the 18-19 AY, the two SPED instructors left the University. Some data was retrieved, however, what was found did not provide reliable data upon which decisions could be made. A new professor was hired for the 19-20 AY and will be revising the coursework and assessments in order that reliable and useable data can be reported moving forward.

2019-2020:

#### 2020-2021:

An additional special education faculty member was hired for the fall 2020 semester. The special education faculty members have been and will continue to work collaboratively in creating the most effective program possible for educators seeking their special education credentials.

#### **5 Program Mission**

The SPED ED M/MOD for Secondary Ed GR 6-12 (P.B.C.) is designed to prepare teacher education candidates for entry into teaching Mild/Moderate students. Additionally, the purpose is to prepare professional educators and life-long learners who will contribute to the cultural and intellectual advancement of the citizens of Louisiana and instill professionalism, collaboration, reflection, and a respect for diversity.

#### **6** Institutional Mission Reference

While McNeese State University is primarily a teaching institution of the undergraduate students, the special education mild/moderate certificate program does serve the regional K-12 educational employers and educational communities in its region. The SPED certificate is an add-on certification for certified teachers in Louisiana.

#### 7 Assessment and Benchmark Enrollment, Completion, Retention, and Recruitment

#### Assessment: Enrollment and Completer Numbers.

Track levels of student enrollment, retention, and completion, and monitor trends to determine actions needed to increase or maintain viable levels of enrollments and completers. Active recruitment efforts within the community specific to your program.

Benchmark: The EPP has set a goal to increase enrollment by 7% across programs each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment.

#### 7.1 Data

Program - SPED EI:

| Academic Year | # of students |            |  |
|---------------|---------------|------------|--|
| Academic real | Enrolled      | Completers |  |
| 2014-2015     | 4             | 0          |  |
| 2015-2016     | 1             | 1          |  |
| 2016-2017     | 0             | 0          |  |

#### Program - SPED M/M Grades 1-5:

| Academic Year | Officially enrolled<br>within program | # of completers<br>fall semester | # of completers<br>spring semester | Total # of<br>completers |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2014-2015     | 2                                     |                                  |                                    | 1                        |
| 2015-2016     | 6                                     |                                  |                                    | 1                        |
| 2016-2017     | 15                                    |                                  |                                    | 13                       |
| 2017-2018     | 10                                    | 0                                | 2                                  | 2                        |
| 2018-2019     | 9                                     | 0                                | 0                                  | 0                        |

| 2019-2020 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|
| 2020-2021 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## 7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2016-2017:

Track enrollments for another year before deciding specific benchmark. Determine appropriate methods of recruitment.

Faculty will advise students of the requirements to complete the program.

#### 2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The goal of 2018-2019 is to collaborate with Elementary faculty to contact graduating seniors about the PBC opportunities as well as to collaborate with McNeese State University Office of Admissions to contact 100% of applicants indicating interest in the PBC program.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The Recruitment Committee will document two in-services and job fairs attended with the intent to recruit for the Elementary PBC program.
- A minimum of 10 potential PBC students' information will be collected on sign-in sheets at these events.

#### 2018-2019:

With the redesign of the elementary education curriculum, candidates will have all of the coursework needed to complete the add-on certification in mild-moderate. We are also looking to add the SPED M/M as a minor for candidates who are in secondary education. We are hoping that this will increase interest in the program from within.

2019-2020:

#### 2020-2021:

The program benchmark of 7% increase in enrollment was not met in the 2020-2021 academic year. COVID related policies and multiple state and federally recognized natural disasters that directly impacted the campus, surrounding communities, and enrolled students should be considered here as the enrollment of 7 candidates for the academic year was maintained, with 5 of the 7 candidates completing in the 2019-2020 academic year and 5 new candidates enrolling for the 2020-2021 academic year.

The Special Education faculty, in conjunction with other faculty, will increase collaboration efforts, stifled by COVID and natural disasters in 2020-2021, to offer teacher candidates opportunities for hands on interaction with Augmented and Assistive Technology that can be utilized to support Special Education populations across the continuum of placements available in the public school setting as part of professional development/in-service. This will be used as a tool to reach out to candidates and encourage their consideration of SpEd certification going forward. An additional consideration for continuous improvement would be opening the floor for co-teaching opportunities related to differentiation in instruction of methods between general (regular) education and special education faculty in the P-12 setting. A minor in Special Education has also been added for students currently enrolled in undergraduate education programs leading to initial certification in secondary or K-12 education, allowing for completion of a substantial amount of coursework required for Special Education.

Meetings among faculty that teach Elementary Special Education and general (regular) education coursework will be held to discuss augmented and assistive technology with the intention of jumpstarting the process of planning in-service activities. Additionally, this will open the door for consideration and discussion of the implementation of co-teaching opportunities for special education and general (regular) education faculty related to differentiation in methods coursework. These meetings will be scheduled to occur at least once per month during the 2021-2022 academic year.

#### 8 Assessment and Benchmark Curriculum Development

Assessment: Curriculum Development.

Provide a comprehensive curriculum that reflects disciplinary foundations and remains responsive to contemporary developments, student and workforce demand, and university needs and aspirations.

Benchmark: Program faculty will meet at least two times during the year to discuss curriculum changes/implementation, assessment data, and progress monitoring of action plans.

Prior to 2015-2016, the benchmark was that faculty meet three times per year.

#### 8.1 Data

2015-2016:

- January 12, 2016 QEP Campus-Wide discussion of advising strategies.
- January 13, 2016 DEP faculty meeting, Lesson Planning, and rubric revisions.
- May 16, 2016 DEP Workshop, Assessment for Specific Curricula.

#### 2016-2017:

• Dec. 2016 LA SPED competency alignment across program.

Curriculum alignment includes:

- InTASC standards
- Program standards
- Year-long residency
- Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching
- Louisiana Teacher Preparation Competencies
- Louisiana Student Standards

2017-2018:

See attached data table.

#### 2018-2019:

At the end of the 18-19 AY, the two SPED instructors left the University. Some data was retrieved, however, what was found did not provide reliable data upon which decisions could be made. A new professor was hired for the 19-20 AY and will be revising the coursework and assessments in order that reliable and useable data can be reported moving forward.

#### 2019-2020:

#### 2020-2021:

The benchmark was met through program faculty meeting regularly through video conference or through phone conversations. Collaborations with districts occurred via video conferencing on March 25, 2021. Additionally special education faculty and district leaders participated in US PREP Consortium convenings in June 2020, October 2020, and March 2021.

During the 2020-2021 academic year modifications to courses were required to align with COVID policy as well as to continue instruction through the occurrence of multiple natural disasters. Headway on course redesign was impacted due to teacher candidates being unable to perform field experiences in the P-12 setting. Continued collaboration between program faculty took place in an attempt to reduce negative impacts to quality curriculum. In spring 2021 high leverage practices were added to existing evidence-based practice instruction in program coursework. Courses are aligned with CEC, InTASC, Louisiana Teacher Preparation Standards: Special Education, and CAEP.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

PBC\_SPED\_Curriculum Development\_17-18

#### 8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2015-2016:

- During the QEP meeting, faculty discussed advising strategies adn procedures to enhance retention and graduation rates.
- Faculty discussed the lesson plan template and decided to use a more universal format in professional education courses.
- Rubrics for specific assessments were evaluated and changed to align with CEC standards
- Assignments were evaluated to identify strengths and weaknesses and changed to reflect the rigor of the course.

#### 2016-2017:

Assessment alignment of standards/competencies.

#### 2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met.

The faculty collaborated with local districts six times during spring 2018. The faculty attended six professional development meetings throughout spring 2018. Faculty attended eight retention and recruitment sessions throughout spring 2018. No noticeable trends due to lack of comparative data.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

- Program faculty will continue to meet at regular intervals throughout the year to discuss curriculum redesign and other programming issues/concerns.
- Program faculty will continue to collaborate with local districts to strengthen our program to prepare our teacher candidates to fully meet district needs.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Faculty will gather district input for consideration as curriculum changes are approved and adopted in regard to field experiences and student teaching.

#### 2018-2019:

At the end of the 18-19 AY, the two SPED instructors left the University. Some data was retrieved, however, what was found did not provide reliable data upon which decisions could be made. A new professor was hired for the 19-20 AY and will be revising the coursework and assessments in order that reliable and useable data can be reported moving forward.

2019-2020:

#### 2020-2021:

The benchmark was met. Collaboration among 2 of the 5 Special Education District Supervisors from our region, both special education faculty members, and regular education faculty members occurred via video conferencing 3.25.2021. Work has also taken place directly with the senior consultant for Calcasieu Parish School District during the US Prep Curriculum Design Consortium convenings 6.2020, 10.2020, 3.2021, and 6.2021, where an action plan was created to support equity for P-12 students through the collaboration with aforementioned districts leading to the provision of professional development activities that include both district special education and general education teachers and teacher candidates.

In fall 2021 and spring 2022, EPP special education faculty will work withe the surrounding districts to create and provide professional development activities that support special and regular education veteran and mentor teachers working alongside teacher candidates instructed in the use of co-teaching strategies and High Leverage Practices (HLP) to create the most equitable education for all P-12 students. These PD activities will help to ensure transferability of teacher candidates' instructional experiences related to co-teaching and HLP to their residency semesters, as well as to campuses in the 5 district region where they may secure teaching positions after graduation through developing and/or strengthening these same skill areas for current classroom teachers.

Faculty will continue to compile district input related to needed supports for the first quarter of the upcoming academic year. The EPP special education faculty will send out two surveys to the 5-district SPED personnel, as well as district administrators to solicit feedback by September 15, 2021. Data collected from the survey will be used to determine professional development topics and at least one professional development session will be delivered to partner district mentors and program faculty by the close of the fall 2021 semester.

#### 9 Assessment and Benchmark IEP and Informal Assessment and RTI (Previously RTI and DIR)

Assessment: Data Interpretation Report.

The Data Interpretation Report replaced the RTI in EDUC 336 in spring 2018. Students should evaluate an initial Individualized Education Plan as well as an Individualized Family Service Plan for a child with special needs by analyzing and interpreting data from formal and informal assessment procedures in Response to Teaching Intervention (RTI) report with a minimum of 80% accuracy on the first attempt.

EDUC 336: Assessment in Special and Inclusive Education

Council for Exceptional Children:

4.1 Beginning special education professionals select and use technically sound formal and informal assessments that minimize bias.

4.3 Beginning special education professionals, in collaboration with colleagues and families, use multiple types of assessment information in making decisions about individuals with exceptionalities.

5.10 Identify and teach basic structures and relationships within and across curricula.

5.12 Use responses and errors to guide instructional decisions and provide feedback to learners.

## LCET:

1A4 Identified materials/equipment/resources/adaptations, other than standard classroom materials, as needed for lesson/activity.

1A5 State method(s) of evaluation to measure learner outcomes.

2A1 Organizes available space, materials, and/or equipment to facilitate learning.

2C2 Uses monitoring techniques to facilitate learning.

3D1 Consistently monitors ongoing performance of students.

3D2 Uses assessment techniques effectively.

Benchmark: 80% of the candidates will score a minimum of 3.00 on each rubric element of the assessment.

#### **Outcome Links**

#### Assessment [Program]

Graduates understand assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators, and special educators use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions. Graduates use the results of assessments to help identify exceptional learning needs and to develop and implement individualized instructional programs, as well as to adjust instruction in response to ongoing learning programs.

#### 2007 ACEI Elementary Education Standards and Supporting Explanation [External]

#### 4.0 Assessment for instruction

Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

#### 5.1 Professional growth

Candidates are aware of and reflect on their practice in light of research on teaching, professional ethics, and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, families and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

#### 2013 InTASC Standards [External]

#### 2. Learning Differences

The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

#### 6. Assessment

The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teachers' and learners' decision making.

#### Special Education Teacher Competencies [External]

#### 1

The teacher candidate uses knowledge of measurement principles and practices to interpret assessment results and guide educational decisions for students with exceptionalities.

1

The teacher candidate uses data derived from functional assessments to develop intervention plans aligned to the specific needs of individual students.

2

The teacher candidate identifies reliable methods of response from students who lack typical communication and performance abilities, using supports as needed to accommodate individual student needs.

## 9.1 Data

| Torm        | Students e | earning 70% | Moon cooro | Benchmark |
|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| Term        | #          | %           | Mean score | met?      |
| Spring 2015 | 9/9        | 100%        | N/A        | Yes       |
| Fall 2015   | 16/21      | 85%         | 80         | Yes       |
| Spring 2016 | 15/17      | 92%         | 87         | Yes       |

#### EDUC 336 Assessment in Special and Inclusive Education:

| Rubric Element               | InTASC<br>Standard |                           | Fall<br>2017 |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
|                              |                    | Number                    | 0            |
| Learner                      |                    | Mean                      |              |
| Differences                  | 2j                 | Range                     |              |
| Narrative                    |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher |              |
|                              |                    | Number                    |              |
|                              |                    | Mean                      |              |
| IEP Review                   | 2h                 | Range                     |              |
|                              |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher |              |
|                              | 61                 | Number                    |              |
| Test Data                    |                    | Mean                      |              |
| Past/Present                 |                    | Range                     |              |
|                              |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher |              |
|                              |                    | Number                    |              |
| Data to<br>Determine Student |                    | Mean                      |              |
| Performance                  | 6g                 | Range                     |              |
| Abilities                    |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher |              |
|                              |                    | Number                    |              |
| Case Study                   |                    | Mean                      |              |
| Focus                        | 2a                 | Range                     |              |
|                              |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher |              |

\*The Response to Teaching Intervention used in fall 2017 was replaced with Data Interpretation Report. Results for spring 2018 are reported below.

| Rubric Element  | InTASC<br>Standard |                           | Spring<br>2018 | Fall<br>2019 | Spring<br>2020 |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
|                 |                    | Number                    | 2              | 0            | 0              |
|                 |                    | Mean                      | 30             |              |                |
| Data Analysis   | 6g                 | Range                     | 30             |              |                |
|                 |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%           |              |                |
|                 |                    | Number                    | 2              |              |                |
| Strategies      | 8a                 | Mean                      | 30             |              |                |
| Research        |                    | Range                     | 30             |              |                |
|                 |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%           |              |                |
|                 |                    | Number                    | 2              |              |                |
| Test Data       |                    | Mean                      | 5              |              |                |
| Past/Present    | 6k                 | Range                     | 5              |              |                |
|                 |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%           |              |                |
|                 |                    | Number                    | 2              |              |                |
|                 |                    | Mean                      | 10             |              |                |
| Recommendations | 2f                 | Range                     | 10             |              |                |
|                 |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%           |              |                |

\*No data reported for 2018-2019.

| IEP Rubric Element                            | InTASC<br>Standard |                           | Fall<br>2020<br>N=3 | Spring<br>2021<br>N=3 | Fall<br>2021<br>N= | Spring<br>2022<br>N= |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
|   |                    | Mean                      | 4.00                | 3.67                  |                    |                      |
| Includes State Standards<br>and All Necessary |                    | Range                     | 4.00                | 3.00-<br>4.00         |                    |                      |
| Components                                    |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%                | 100%                  |                    |                      |
|   |                    | Mean                      | 4.00                | 4.00                  |                    |                      |
| Effective Collaboration                       |                    | Range                     | 4.00                | 4.00                  |                    |                      |
|   |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%                | 100%                  |                    |                      |

| Informal Assessment RTI<br>Rubric Elements                        | Standard |                           | Fall<br>2020<br>N=3 | Spring<br>2021<br>N=3 | Fall<br>2021<br>N= | Spring<br>2022<br>N= |
|---|----------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Shows a high degree of attention to logic and reasoning of points |          | Mean                      | 3.67                | 4.00                  |                    |                      |
|   |          | Range                     | 3.00-<br>4.00       | 4.00                  |                    |                      |
|   |          | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%                | 100%                  |                    |                      |
|   |          |                           |                     |                       |                    |                      |

| Indicates synthesis of ideas,   | Mean                      | 3.67          | 3.67          |  |
|---|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| in-depth analysis and<br>evidences original thought and<br>support for the topic.             | Range                     | 3.00-<br>4.00 | 3.00-<br>4.00 |  |
| support for the topic.  | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%          | 100%          |  |
|   | Mean                      | 3.00          | 4.00          |  |
| Well developed with high<br>quality and quantity support                                      | Range                     | 2.00-<br>4.00 | 4.00          |  |
|   | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 67%           | 100%          |  |
|   | Mean                      | 3.67          | 2.33          |  |
| Free of distracting spelling,<br>punctuation, and grammatical<br>errors; absent of fragments, | Range                     | 3.00-<br>4.00 | 2.00-<br>3.00 |  |
| comma splices, and run-ons  | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%          | 37%           |  |
|   | Mean                      | 3.00          | 3.67          |  |
| Outstanding style going<br>beyond usual college level   | Range                     | 3.00-<br>4.00 | 2.00-<br>3.00 |  |
|   | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%          | 37%           |  |
|   | Mean                      | 2.67          | 3.67          |  |
| Meets all formal and assignment requirements and  | Range                     | 1.00-<br>4.00 | 3.00-<br>4.00 |  |
| evidences attention to detail   | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 67%           | 100%          |  |

#### 9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2015-2016:

Students should evaluate an initial Individualized Education Plan as well as an Individualized Family Service Plan for a child with special needs by analyzing and interpreting data from formal and informal assessment procedures in Response to Teaching Intervention (RTI) report with a minimum of 80% accuracy on the first attempt.

#### 2016-2017:

No data was available for this academic year because the two professors responsible for it left the University. New assessments begin in 2017-2018.

#### 2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. Due to the small student population, aggregation of data is on-going and will be reported once statistically viable sample sizes are gathered (two students enrolled for spring 2018).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

- Program faculty will continue to meet at regular intervals throughout the year to discuss curriculum redesign and other programming issues/concerns.
- Program faculty will continue to collaborate with local districts to strengthen our program to prepare our teacher candidates to fully meet district needs.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Faculty will gather district input for consideration as curriculum changes are approved and adopted in regard to field experiences and student teaching

2018-2019:

At the end of the 18-19 AY, the two SPED instructors left the University. Some data was retrieved, however, what was found did not provide reliable data upon which decisions could be made. A new professor was hired for the 19-20 AY and will be revising the coursework and assessments in order that reliable and useable data can be reported moving forward.

2019-2020:

#### 2020-2021:

Benchmark was met as 100% of the candidates scored at the proficient level or higher on both elements of the IEP assignment in the fall 2020 and spring 2021 semesters.

Benchmark was not met for the Informal Assessment and RTI assessment. Less than 80% of the candidates scored at the proficient level or higher on the following elements: Fall 2020: *Well developed with high quality and quantity support, Outstanding style going beyond usual college level,* and *Meets all formal and assignment requirements and evidences attention to detail;* Spring 2021: *Indicates synthesis of ideas, Free of distracting spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors, Outstanding style going beyond college level,* and *Meets all formal and assignment requirements and Meets all formal and assignment requirements and Meets all formal and assignment requirements and Meets all formal and assignment requirements and evidences attention to detail.* 

Candidates in the spring 2021 semester scored higher on *Well developed high quality and quantity support,* but scored lower than the fall 2020 candidates in *Free from distracting spelling, punctuation, etc.* Spring 2021 candidates also scored higher on *Outstanding style* and *Meeds all formal and assignment requirements...*than fall 2020 candidates.

A mini writing lab, utilizing standard aligned content will be created and implemented in the first 2 weeks of the course to effectively support assessment completion later in the course. The focus on improvement of academic and professional writing is imperative here and is aligned to *CEC Standard 6 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice* and *Standard 7 Collaboration* as much of a Special Educator's work is focused on formal written documentation.

Time has been scheduled for preparing the writing lab during summer 2021 so that implementation can begin in the fall 2021 semester. Additional faculty will be asked to review the writing lab for inclusion of best practices in writing instruction.

#### 10 Assessment and Benchmark SPED 403 Essay on Collaboration

#### Assessment: Essay on Collaboration.

Students should select and write about a topic within the field of effective collaboration for M/MOD for Secondary Ed. The paper will be a research-based best practices, resources, and strategies.

Benchmark: 100% of candidates will score a minimum of 80% on the Essay on Collaboration.

#### **Outcome Links**

#### **Collaboration** [Program]

Graduates collaborate effectively to include and teach individuals with exceptional learning needs (ELN). Also, providing resource to their colleagues in understanding the laws and policies relevant to Individuals with ELN

#### 10.1 Data

| Term          | Students e | earning 80% | Mean score  | Benchmark |  |
|---------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|--|
| Tenni         | #          | %           | Wearr Score | met?      |  |
| Spring 2015   | 27/29      | 95%         | _           | Yes       |  |
| Fall 2015     | 34/34      | 100%        | 100         | Yes       |  |
| Spring 2016   | 37/37      | 100%        | 100         | Yes       |  |
| Fall 2019*    | _          |             | _           | —         |  |
| Spring 2020** | 11/16      | 68.75%      | 73.75       | No        |  |
| Fall 2020     | _          | _           |             |           |  |
|               |            |             |             |           |  |

## Spring 2021 — — — — — —

\*Course was not offered in the fall 2019 semester.

\*\*Data for spring 2020 was impacted by COVID-19; 2 candidates did not submit assignments.

#### 10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2015-2016:

This is the second semester to administer this assessment. The level of achievement was met, and the assignment was not rigorous enough. Therefore, the major assessment in this course will be replaced with the "Directory of Service" beginning in Fall 2016.

Directory of Service (DOS): Each student will develop a "Directory of Services" which will include at least five agencies for each of the 10 types of disabilities that provides intervention service for children with disabilities and their families in teh stduent's local communities. They will also need to select a director/person-in-charge and conduct an interview.

#### 2016-2017

No data was available for this academic year because the two professors responsible for it left the University. New assessments begin in 2017-2018.

#### 2017-2018:

No data was reported for 2017-2018.

#### 2018-2019:

At the end of the 18-19 AY, the two SPED instructors left the University. Some data was retrieved, however, what was found did not provide reliable data upon which decisions could be made. A new professor was hired for the 19-20 AY and will be revising the coursework and assessments in order that reliable and useable data can be reported moving forward.

2019-2020:

#### 2020-2021:

There was no data reported for SPED 403 from the fall 2020 semester due to LMS issues and crashes during the hurricane impacted semester. Candidates were instead required to write a comprehensive and substantive discussion post on the importance of collaborating and partnering with parents and paras. They additionally completed a midterm research proposal. In spring 2021, there were no PBC SPED Elementary candidates enrolled in the course to report data on.

Faculty will continue to implement the Essay on Collaboration and will evaluate the rubric elements and adjust instruction as needed.

#### 11 Assessment and Benchmark SPED 424 Functional Behavioral Assessment

Assessment: Functional Behavioral Assessment.

Students complete a Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA) of a child, and to construct a behavior Intervention Plan to address a particular behavior problem of that child to assists meeting his/her needs.

SPED 424 Approaches to Managing Exceptional Children

Council for Exceptional Children:

Assessment:

4.1: Beginning special education professionals select and use technically sound formal and informal assessments that minimize bias.

Instructional planning and strategies

5.1 Beginning special education professionals consider individual abilities, interests, learning environments, and cultural and linguistic factors in the selection, development, and adaptation of learning experiences for individuals with exceptions.

LCET:

1A3 Identifies and plans for individual differences.

1A4 Identified materials/equipment/resources/adaptations, other than standard classroom materials, as needed for lesson/activity.

3C1 Accommodates individual differences.

3C2 Demonstrates ability to communicate effectively with students.

3D1 Consistently monitors ongoing performance of students.

3D2 Uses assessment techniques effectively.

Candidates will score a minimum of 3.00 on each rubric element of the assessment.

Benchmark: 100% of the candidates will score a minimum of 80% on the Functional Behavioral Assessment on the first attempt in SPED 424.

#### **Outcome Links**

#### Human Development [Program]

Graduates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings. Graduates understand the similarities and differences in human development and the characteristics between and among individuals with and without exceptional learning needs. Moreover, special educators understand how exceptional conditions can interact with the domains of human development and they use this knowledge to respond to the varying abilities and behaviors of individual's with exceptional learning needs (ELN).

#### 2007 ACEI Elementary Education Standards and Supporting Explanation [External]

#### 3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge

Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community.

#### 3.4 Active engagement in learning

Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments.

#### 4.0 Assessment for instruction

Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

#### 2013 InTASC Standards [External]

#### 2. Learning Differences

The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

#### 6. Assessment

The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teachers' and learners' decision making.

#### 7. Planning for Instruction

The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

#### 8. Instructional Strategies

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

#### **Special Education Teacher Competencies [External]**

1

The teacher candidate uses data derived from functional assessments to develop intervention plans aligned to the specific needs of individual students.

#### Learning Environments B

The teacher candidate sets expectations for personal and social behavior of students with exceptionalities in various settings (e.g., classroom, library, cafeteria, gym, job site) and incorporates these expectations into effective instructional routines, lesson plans, IEP goals and objectives.

#### 3

The teacher candidate selects and adapts instructional materials according to characteristics and needs of

students with exceptionalities.

### Learning Environments E

The teacher candidate modifies the learning environment (e.g., physical arrangement, student grouping, instructional intensity, pacing, embedded assistive technology supports) to proactively manage student behaviors and unique learning needs.

## 11.1 Data

| Term        | Students e | arning 80% | Moon cooro | Benchmark |
|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Tenni       | #          | %          | Mean score | met?      |
| Spring 2015 | 16/17      | 94%        |            | Yes       |
| Fall 2015   | 15/19      | 79%        | 80         | No        |
| Spring 2016 | 15/18      | 93%        | 85         | Yes       |

## Functional Behavioral Assessment (SPED 424):

| Rubric Element                  | InTASC<br>Standard | ,                         | Fall<br>2017 | Spring<br>2018 |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------|
|                                 |                    | Number                    | 2            | *              |
| Description                     |                    | Mean                      | 10           |                |
| & Definition                    | 3d                 | Range                     | 10           |                |
| of Behavior                     |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%         |                |
|                                 |                    | Number                    | 2            |                |
| Baseline                        |                    | Mean                      | 10           |                |
| Data Collection                 | 6c                 | Range                     | 10           |                |
|                                 |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%         |                |
|                                 |                    | Number                    | 2            |                |
|                                 |                    | Mean                      | 10           |                |
| Hypothesis                      | 1e                 | Range                     | 10           |                |
|                                 |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%         |                |
|                                 |                    | Number                    | 2            |                |
| Appropriato Cool                |                    | Mean                      | 10           |                |
| Appropriate Goal<br>Development | 3k                 | Range                     | 10           |                |
|                                 |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%         |                |

\*Dr. SeSalem, Emily Rutherford's data is available for spring 2018 in Moodle.

#### Functional Behavioral Assessment (SPED 424):

| Rubric Element                             | InTASC<br>Standard |                           | Fall<br>2019 | Spring<br>2020 |
|--|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Description<br>& Definition<br>of Behavior | 3d                 | Number                    | —            | 13             |
|  |                    | Mean                      |              | 3.60           |
|  |                    | Range                     |              | —              |
|  |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher |              | 90%            |
|  |                    | Number                    |              | 13             |
|  |                    | Mean                      |              | 3.50           |
|  |                    |                           |              |                |

| Baseline<br>Data Collection     | 6c | Range                     | —    |
|---------------------------------|----|---------------------------|------|
|                                 |    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 88%  |
| Hypothesis                      | 1e | Number                    | 13   |
|                                 |    | Mean                      | 3.50 |
|                                 |    | Range                     | —    |
|                                 |    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 88%  |
| Appropriate Goal<br>Development | Зk | Number                    | 13   |
|                                 |    | Mean                      | 3.10 |
|                                 |    | Range                     | —    |
|                                 |    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 78%  |

No data reported for the 18-19 AY

Functional Behavioral Assessment (SPED 424):

| Rubric Element                        | InTASC<br>Standard |                           | Fall 2020<br>N=1 | Spring<br>2021<br>N=1 |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| High attention to logic and reasoning |                    | Mean                      | 4.00             |                       |
|                                       |                    | Range                     | 4.00             |                       |
|                                       |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%             |                       |
|                                       |                    | Mean                      | 4.00             |                       |
| Synthesis of ideas and in depth       |                    | Range                     | 4.00             |                       |
| analysis                              |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%             |                       |
| Well developed ideas with support     |                    | Mean                      | 4.00             | 3.00                  |
|                                       |                    | Range                     | 4.00             | 3.00                  |
|                                       |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%             | 100%                  |
| Grammar and Mechanics                 |                    | Mean                      | 4.00             | 2.00                  |
|                                       |                    | Range                     | 4.00             | 2.00                  |
|                                       |                    | % Proficient<br>or Higher | 100%             | 0%                    |
|                                       |                    | Mean                      | 4.00             | 2.00                  |
| Style                                 |                    | Range                     | 4.00             | 2.00                  |
| Otyle                                 |                    | % Proficient or<br>Higher | 100%             | 0%                    |
| Format and APA                        |                    | Mean                      | 4.00             | 1.00                  |
|                                       |                    | Range                     | 4.00             | 1.00                  |
|                                       |                    | % Proficient or<br>Higher | 100%             | 0%                    |
|                                       |                    | Mean                      |                  | 3.00                  |
| Organization                          |                    | Range                     |                  | 3.00                  |
| organization                          |                    | % Proficient or<br>Higher |                  | 100%                  |

|                  | Mean                      | 4.00 |
|------------------|---------------------------|------|
| Level of Content | Range                     | 4.00 |
|                  | % Proficient or<br>Higher | 100% |

### 11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

#### 2015-2016:

Students are doing well on this assessment, but the department will continue to collect data for a few semesters before determining how to adjust the assignment or set new benchmarks.

#### 2016-2017:

No data was available for this academic year because the two professors responsible for it left the University. New assessments begin in 2017-2018.

#### 2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. The level of achievement was met. Students scored higher than the minimum of 80% accuracy. Faculty will continue to use the (FBA). The program coordinator will review the data and make a decision about the assessment and the benchmark

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

- Program faculty will continue to meet at regular intervals throughout the year to discuss curriculum redesign and other programming issues/concerns.
- Program faculty will continue to collaborate with local districts to strengthen our program to prepare our teacher candidates to fully meet district needs.

Recommendations to Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement: Faculty will gather district input for consideration as curriculum changes are approved and adopted in regard to field experiences and student teaching.

#### 2018-2019:

At the end of the 18-19 AY, the two SPED instructors left the University. Some data was retrieved, however, what was found did not provide reliable data upon which decisions could be made. A new professor was hired for the 19-20 AY and will be revising the coursework and assessments in order that reliable and useable data can be reported moving forward.

2019-2020:

#### 2020-2021:

Teacher candidates evidence proficiency in understanding and applying content related to this assessment. This is evidenced by 100% proficiency in 3 of the 6 categories. However, a major component of special education is the ability to write at a professional level. The 3 categories in the rubric that address this were 0% proficient in spring 2021. In fall 2020 the candidate did exhibit proficiency in the categories related to writing. It is important to note that the sample size was one candidate in each semester. Therefore, further data collection is needed before trends in data can be identified and this data must be viewed with this small sample size in mind.

A mini writing lab, utilizing standard aligned content will be created and implemented within the first two weeks of SPED 424 each semester to effectively support assessment completion within the course.

Time has been scheduled during summer 2021 to establish the writing lab so that implementation can begin fall 2021. Additional faculty will review the writing lab proposal to determine inclusion of best practices in writing instruction.

Xitracs Program Report

End of report