

## **Program Report – Annual Update Higher Learning Commission (HLC) – Spring 2015**

### **Quincy University – Special Education**

#### **Overview of Contents of this Report**

This report provides a synopsis of the major forms of assessment utilized within the special education program at QU. It includes basic program goals/objectives, basic program learning outcomes, program learning outcomes assessed during the 2014-2015 academic year, and the multiple assessments utilized in measuring these outcomes. It provides an overview of the major professional standards upon which the program is based and knowledge and performance competencies candidates are expected to attain. It provides a specific review of a variety of checkpoints that candidates pass through prior to their licensure as a teacher in the state of Illinois. In particular the report reviews basic performance data of candidates on state licensure exams and provides examples of program-specific competencies that candidates are expected to meet in addition to the overall competencies expected by candidates in all programs within the school of education.

#### **Quincy University Mission Statement**

Quincy University stands as a Catholic, independent, liberal arts institution of higher learning in the Franciscan tradition. Inspired by the spirit of Francis and Clare of Assisi, we respect each person as a sister or brother with dignity, value, and worth. We work for justice, peace, and the integrity of creation. We prepare men and women for leadership and for the transformation of the world by educating them to seek knowledge that leads to wisdom. We welcome and invite all to share our spirit and life.

#### **Special Education Program Mission Statement and Relation to QU's Mission Statement**

The special education program at Quincy University (QU) seeks to develop educators who will embrace values of servant leadership, reflective decision making, and the desire for academic and social success of all individuals entrusted to their care. The program seeks to develop educators who have the personal dispositions as well as the knowledge- and skill-based competencies to appropriately and effectively plan for, implement, evaluate, and modify instruction for a diverse range of students with special needs.

The above program mission statement relates to Quincy University's mission statement in that it seeks to develop educators who will embrace all students as beings worthy of educators' utmost personal and professional efforts. The special education program is cognizant of the fact that each student is deserving of a substantive and meaningful educational program, and that these tenets form the very foundation of special education.

#### **Program Goals/Objectives (Contextualized in Report Narrative)**

1. Upon culmination of program during student teaching, the candidate will meet target proficiency in each of the 9 broad areas of the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards.
2. Upon culmination of program, on the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching, the candidate will perform at minimum at the level of "average", which is designated by the 3rd from the highest

evaluation rating as follows: “has done a good job and will be an asset to the school system; showing much promise in the teacher field.”

3. The candidate will successfully meet the criteria for each of the 5 major evaluation checkpoints established by the Teacher Education Program. Checkpoints range from #1 - entrance to the Teacher Education Program (TEP) to #5 - successful program completion.
4. The candidate will achieve a grade of C or better in all courses required as prerequisite to successful entrance into the TEP and in all graded courses, field experiences, and practicum experiences prior to student teaching. Furthermore, successful completion of courses assures basic knowledge (and as applicable performance) in relevant Illinois Professional Standards relevant for a given course.
5. The candidate will demonstrate appropriate personal dispositions necessary for entrance into, continuance, and completion of the TEP program. Dispositions are measured by the School of Education’s Dispositions Rubric (See Appendix B).
6. The candidate will successfully pass all state tests as follows: Test of academic proficiency or minimum established score on ACT prior to TEP admittance; all relevant content area tests prior to student teaching, and the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) prior to full licensure for the Learning Behavior Specialist-I (LBS-I).

### **Program Learning Outcomes**

This section provides a basic list of program learning outcomes that *extend directly from and expand* basic program goals/objectives delineated in the previous section. As is the case with the program goals/objectives, these learning outcomes are contextualized and expanded upon within the program report.

1. In foundational coursework prerequisite to TEP and in all courses needed for LBS-I licensure, the candidate will show evidence of basic competency in established knowledge and skill targets aligned with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. The candidate will attain a grade of C or higher in courses prerequisite to TEP and all required for LBS-I licensure.
2. The candidate will attain required knowledge and skills competencies in clinical field experiences and practicum experiences prerequisite to student teaching.
3. The candidate will demonstrate competencies by achieving at minimum a rating of (a) developing [with higher ratings being (b) target, and (c) exceeds] in the following major areas of the Illinois Professional Teaching standards: Standard 1: Teaching Diverse Learners; 2: Content Area and Pedagogical Knowledge; 3. Planning and Differentiating Instruction; 4. Learning Environment; 5. Instructional Delivery; 6. Reading, Writing, and Oral Communication; 7. Assessment; 8. Collaborative Relations; 9. Professionalism, Leadership, and Advocacy. (Program report provides narrative showing how specific courses aligned with selected areas and how field experiences align with selected areas in which candidates are expected to range from (a) developing to (b) target (meets target criteria) to (c) exceeds (exemplary).

4. The candidate will successfully meet criteria for each of the 5 major checkpoints for special education candidates: Checkpoint 1: Admission to TEP; Checkpoint 2: Ongoing assessment each semester. Checkpoint 3: Admission to Student Teaching; Checkpoint 4: Completion of Student Teaching; Checkpoint 5: Program Completion.

5. The candidate will attain passing criteria or above on state exams associated with licensure. Exams include (a) academic proficiency prior to TEP entrance, (b) content area tests prior to student teaching, and (c) the Assessment of Professional Teaching (K-12) prior to program completion and LBS-I licensure.

## **I. Program Learning Outcomes Assessed This Year**

Program learning outcomes assessed during 2014-2015 are thoroughly outlined and documented in sections II and III of this report and include details on assessment that the special education program shares in common with other programs within the School of Education and program-specific assessment, which includes an outline of program-based performance assessments that occur for candidates within a variety of courses. Furthermore, complete information on a variety of standardized assessments required for state licensure testing is included in this report.

## **II. Description of Methods of Program Assessment Utilized in 2014-2015**

The special education program at Quincy University functions within the framework of the School of Education (henceforth referred to as the Unit or the School of Education [SOE]) and utilizes the basic assessment systems of the Unit for preparing teacher candidates. The candidate assessment processes assume that candidate performance is developmental involving multiple pieces of information over a long period of time. Although there are many course-specific standards that are assessed within the special education program itself, the global competencies candidates must attain are assessed by ascertaining that the candidate is able to meet the required criteria within a series of five major, program checkpoints (detailed specifically subsequently in this document).

### **Major Candidate Outcomes – Knowledge and Performance**

A significant undertaking for all educators is to identify major learning outcomes or goals for their learners. The following details major outcomes expected of special education candidates. Just as candidates in other SOE programs, candidates in special education must ultimately meet nine global standards in the outlined areas pertinent to professional educators, with particular emphasis on special educators, as follows:

### **Quincy University Professional Standards for Special Education Program Candidates**

**Note:** In all cases when the *School of Education – Professional Standards Rubric* is referenced, a score of 3 on this rubric denotes proficiency and is viewed as the criterion level of performance, which is the target goal. A program goal/objective is that most candidates may be performing at this level at the completion of their student teaching. Furthermore, this criterion may also be met in several areas during the candidates program, including in targeted areas of content knowledge and skills, which

*are part of the candidate's coursework and field experiences. The rubric has a 4-point scale with 1: Unsatisfactory; 2: Developing; 3: Meets (target for proficiency); and 4: Exceeds (Considered Exemplary). An additional general note pertinent to “the completion of student teaching” is that all candidates at the initial level of licensure complete a culminating electronic portfolio in LiveText® as part of their student teaching seminar (Spe 499/MSE 591) where candidates describe, analyze, and reflect upon their planning of, implementation of, and assessment of their day-to-day and long-term instruction. Candidates complete this using the edTPA framework. Beginning in the fall of 2015, meeting criterion on extensive edTPA scoring rubrics will be required prior to completing student teaching and prior to receiving licensure.*

<p><b>Standard 1 - Teaching Diverse Students</b> The special education candidate understands the diverse characteristics and abilities of each student and how individuals develop and learn within the context of their social, economic, cultural, linguistic, and academic experiences. The candidate uses these experiences to create instructional opportunities that maximize student learning.</p> <p><b>(Where Most Directly [although globally] assessed):</b> <i>Responding to Learners with Diverse needs is assessed through the assessment of competencies required for clinical experiences and student teaching (see Standard 3 – School of Education – Professional Standards Rubric) within Clinical Field Experiences (i.e., 390/MSE 590 and Student Teaching (i.e., EDU 497/498/MSE 592 &amp; 593). Also refer to Standard 3 of School of Education Dispositions Rubric.</i></p>	<p><b>Standard 2 - Content Area and Pedagogical Knowledge</b> –The special education candidate has in-depth understanding of content area knowledge that includes central concepts, methods of inquiry, structures of the disciplines, and content area literacy. The candidate creates meaningful learning experiences for each student based upon interactions among content area and pedagogical knowledge, and evidence-based practice.</p> <p><b>(Where Most Directly [although globally] assessed):</b> <i>Grades within major courses must be C or above; includes passing of State Required Content Area Tests #155-LBS-I for Special Education and #163 – Special Education – General Curriculum. Also, all undergraduate dual licensure (elementary ed. and special ed., must pass the Elementary and Middle School Content Area Test (#110) prior to student teaching. Refer to Checkpoints One-Three in this document.</i></p>
<p><b>Standard 3 - Planning for Differentiated Instruction</b> – The special education candidate plans and designs instruction based on content area knowledge, diverse student characteristics, student performance data, curriculum goals, and the community context. The candidate plans for ongoing student growth and achievement.</p> <p><b>(Where Most Directly assessed):</b> <i>In major methods course such as first- (316/317/MSE 507/508) and second-level of reading: (318 or 359/360 or 459/460 or MSE – several options but most typically 514 or 544) and math methods:</i></p>	<p><b>Standard 4 - Learning Environment</b> – The special education candidate creates a safe and healthy learning environment for his/her students that facilitates cultural and linguistic responsiveness, emotional well-being, self-efficacy, positive social interaction, mutual respect, active engagement, academic risk-taking, self-motivation, and personal goal-setting.</p> <p><b>(Where Most Directly assessed):</b> <i>Within Clinical Experiences 390/391 or MSE 590 &amp; Student Teaching EDU 497/498/MSE 592 &amp; 593: See Standard 4 – School of Education - Professional Standards Rubric; Completion of Checkpoint # 4 –</i></p>

<p>(323/522); <i>Portfolio Documentation and Grade of C or better in Spe 453/553 – Sem./Pract. – Mild/Mod/Severe; Clinical Experiences: especially 291 &amp; 390 &amp; 391 or MSE 590; Student Teaching: EDU 497/498/MSE 592 &amp; 593; See School of Education – Professional Standards Rubric – Standard 3.</i></p>	<p><i>Completion of Student Teaching</i></p>
<p><b>Standard 5 - Instructional Delivery</b> – The special education candidate differentiates instruction by using a variety of strategies that support critical and creative thinking, problem-solving, and continuous growth and learning. This candidate understands that the classroom is a dynamic environment requiring ongoing modification of instruction to enhance learning for each student.</p> <p><b>(Where Most Directly assessed):</b> <i>Portfolio Documentation that includes the edTPA framework and Grade of C or better in Spe 453/553 – Sem./Pract. – Mild/Mod/Severe; Within Clinical Experiences 390/391 or MSE 590 &amp; Student Teaching EDU 497/498/MSE 592 &amp; 593: See Standard 5 – School of Education - Professional Standards Rubric; Completion of Checkpoint # 4 – Completion of Student Teaching</i></p>	<p><b>Standard 6 - Reading, Writing, and Oral Communication</b> – The competent teacher has foundational knowledge of reading, writing, and oral communication within the content area and recognizes and addresses student reading, writing, and oral communication needs to facilitate the acquisition of content knowledge.</p> <p><b>(Where Most Directly assessed):</b>  <i>Ele 316/317 &amp; 318; 359/360 &amp; 459/460; MSE 514 or 544; Within Clinical Experiences Edu 291/390/391; MSE 590; &amp; Student Teaching EDU 497/498/MSE 592 &amp; 593: See Standard 6 – School of Education - Professional Standards Rubric</i></p>
<p><b>Standard 7 - Assessment</b> – The competent special education candidate understands and uses appropriate formative and summative assessments for determining student needs, monitoring student progress, measuring student growth, and evaluating student outcomes. The teacher makes decisions driven by data about curricular and instructional effectiveness and adjusts practices to meet the needs of each student. <b>(Where Most Directly assessed):</b> <i>Successful completion of Diagnosis &amp; Evaluation of Students with Special Needs – Spe 235/MSE 528 – Diagnosis Eval./Psychoed. Testing with grade of C or better; Portfolio Documentation that includes the edTPA framework and Grade of C or better in Spe 453/553 – Sem./Pract. – Mild/Mod/Severe; Within</i></p>	<p><b>Standard 8 - Collaborative Relationships</b> – The special education candidate understands the value and necessity of building and maintaining collaborative relationships to foster cognitive, linguistic, physical, and social and emotional development. This candidate understands the importance of working as a team member with professional colleagues, students, parents or guardians, and community members.</p> <p><b>(Where Most Directly assessed):</b> <i>Course: Spe/MSE 465/565; Portfolio Documentation that includes the edTPA framework and Grade of C or better in Spe 453/553 – Sem./Pract. – Mild/Mod/Severe; Within Clinical Experiences 390/391 or MSE 590 &amp; Student Teaching EDU</i></p>

<p><i>Clinical Experiences 390/391 or MSE 590 &amp; Student Teaching EDU 497/498/MSE 592 &amp; 593: See Standard 7 – School of Education - Professional Standards Rubric; Completion of Checkpoint # 4 – Completion of Student Teaching</i></p>	<p><i>497/498/MSE 592 &amp; 593: See Standard 8 – School of Education - Professional Standards Rubric; Completion of Checkpoint # 4 – Completion of Student Teaching</i></p>
<p><b>Standard 9 - Professionalism, Leadership, and Advocacy</b> – The competent special education candidate understands the need to be an ethical and reflective practitioner who will exhibit professionalism; provide leadership in the learning community; and advocate for students, parents or guardians, and the profession.</p> <p><b>(Where Most Directly assessed):</b> <i>Courses: EDU 421; Spe/MSE 465/565; Portfolio Documentation and Grade of C or better in Spe 453/553 – Sem./Pract. – Mild/Mod/Severe; Within Clinical Experiences 390/391 or MSE 590 &amp; Student Teaching EDU 497/498; Spe 499/MSE 591; 592 &amp; 593: See Standard 9 – School of Education - Professional Standards Rubric; Completion of Checkpoint # 4 – Completion of Student Teaching</i></p>	

**Basic Summary of Assessment and Data Collection for All Initial Teaching Licensure Candidates (including special education)**

- ✓ **Adequate or above professional dispositions:** Disposition assessments at critical points: (a) preprofessional courses, (b) admittance to teacher education, (c) advancement toward student teaching, (d) admittance to student teaching, (e) during student teaching leading to program completion.
- ✓ **Satisfactory performance on five major program checkpoints.** Checkpoints range from Admission to Teacher Education Program (#1) to Program Completion (#5). Included in these checkpoints leading to teaching licensure is passage of all required state licensure tests (5 total for special education candidates at the undergraduate level who desire dual licensure in special and elementary education).
- ✓ **Criterion or Target Level Performance on Major Evaluation Rubrics Leading Towards Program Completion.** On the School of Education’s Professional Standards Rubric, 3 = Proficient and is the target level of performance across 11 major areas reflected in the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (**See Appendix A**). Criterion or target level performance on the School of Education’s Dispositions Rubric is 2 to 3: 2 = meets expectations and 3 = exceeds expectations. (**See Appendix B**) These evaluation rubrics are applied for clinical field experiences and during student teaching.
- ✓ **Criterion or Target Level Performance for Final, Summative Evaluation Scale for**

**Student Teaching: (See appendix C)** The Final Evaluation for Student Teaching rubric contains 5 holistic rating categories. In addition to the summative, holistic rating the rubric contains broad categories with sub-indicators in the areas of (a) personal qualities, (b) control of learning environment, (c) teaching abilities, (d) attendance pattern, and (e) professional development. Each of the sub-indicators for these categories can be rated on a 1 (unacceptable); 2 (weak); 3 (average); 4 (high); 5 (very high) scale. Target Criteria for sub-indicators are a preponderance of 3's – 5's. In a summative fashion, the rubric enables the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor to also rate one of 5 descriptors that holistically sums up perceived candidate performance. The criterion target is the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest or higher category. The 3<sup>rd</sup> highest category description is: “has done a good job and will be an asset to the school system; showing much promise in the teacher field.” The highest category description is: “has done such an excellent job that he/she is ready to move immediately into a school and be considered an excellent teacher”.

### **Candidate Outcomes: Demonstrating Appropriate Professional Dispositions**

Integral to meeting the aforementioned knowledge and performance competencies necessary to become a special educator are dispositions reflective of the individual as a whole. Some of the key dispositions, among other more easily observable candidate traits, are grounded in the SOE's Conceptual Framework. While candidate dispositions are even more challenging to quantify than are global professional standards that we expect of each special education candidate, they are, nonetheless, unifying indicators of traits and qualities needed to be a successful educator. The five major tenets of the SOE's Conceptual Framework include: (a) servant leadership, (b) the desire for success for all (K-12) students within one's charge, and (c) reflective decision making that should undergird the practice of all educators, (d) commitment to ethical norms and accepted values of professional educators, and (e) commitment to ongoing professional behaviors. From these five major tenets, agreed upon candidate dispositions have been derived and are incorporated in a disposition performance rubric agreed upon by the SOE faculty and outside stakeholders (e.g., cooperating teachers and other school personnel). Other more easily quantifiable dispositions relate to the candidate's overall willingness to commit oneself to the expected requirements (e.g., quality completion of assignments and projects) during program coursework and field experiences (e.g., punctuality, excellent attendance, and demonstration of professional behaviors) that are needed throughout one's program and that can be observed across a variety of settings and from the perspectives of a variety of SOE faculty and cooperating teachers in a candidate's field experiences.

Because candidate dispositions are viewed as vital to the development of the teacher candidate, faculty are encouraged to complete disposition alert forms at any point they may have concerns about a given candidate. Due to the fact that all education majors (with the exception of transfer students who have already had one or more of the courses) are involved in each of the four pre-professional courses of (a) Foundations of Education, (b) Educational Psychology, (c) Survey of Exceptional Students, and (d) Media and Technology in Education, candidate dispositions are assessed earlier in one's program and may, again, be evaluated by any faculty member at any point in a candidate's program through the dispositions alert form. The advisor of the candidate and the Dean of Education are made aware of concerns. Furthermore, a candidate's advisor may also submit a dispositions alert form. Remediation attempts to resolve dispositional concerns are made typically in collaboration with the Dean of Education, the candidate, and other involved stakeholders.

**Note: Refer to Appendix B Quincy University's – SOE Dispositions Rubric and Appendix E - Dispositions Alert Form**

**Five Major Checkpoints for Special Education Candidates**

The heart of the overall assessment system tracking a candidate's progress through their initial experiences within teacher education (prior to formal admittance) until they meet all of the requirements for licensure involve five major checkpoints. While there is a sixth checkpoint involving graduates of the program, the success of a given candidate in meeting the global requirements within his/her special education program can be monitored through five of the benchmark checkpoints summarized as follows.

<b>Checkpoint One – Admission to Teacher Education Program</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application to teacher education             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Course completions with grade of C or better in tool skills within general education courses as follows:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ENG 111 Composition &amp; Text I</li> <li>▪ ENG 112 Composition &amp; Text II</li> <li>▪ COM 101 Fundamentals of Public Speaking</li> <li>▪ MAT 110 &amp; 111</li> <li>▪ HIS 111 or 112 (US History)</li> <li>▪ POL 200 US Government</li> <li>▪ 1 or more of pre-professional courses: EDU 213 – Foundations of Ed.; EDU 214 – Ed. Psych.; Spe 229 – Survey of Exceptional Students; EDU 240 Media &amp; Tech. or 354 – Computer Uses in Ed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cumulative GPA requirement of 2.6</li> <li>• Background check - fingerprinting</li> <li>• Disposition evaluations from first pre-professional course(s) (on as needed basis)</li> <li>• Pass the Illinois Test of Academic Proficiency or ACT Composite Score of 22 or above with 19 or above on English/Writing Subtest Score</li> <li>• Recommendation Forms (2) Completed on Student's Behalf             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Advisor and professor outside the School of Education or, if need be, 2 professors within the School of Education or professional who is otherwise familiar with student</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Checkpoint Two – Ongoing Assessment Each Semester</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitored by <i>one or more</i> of the following: Faculty within the SOE, candidate's advisor, Director of Field Experience, the Licensure Officer for the School of Education, the Admissions and Retention Committee through transcript analysis and review of checklist of requirements</li> <li>• Cumulative GPA of 2.6 or higher</li> <li>• Successful completion of field experiences</li> <li>• Satisfactory disposition assessments; monitoring of candidates through the completion of disposition alerts as needed.</li> </ul>
<b>Checkpoint Three – Admission to Student Teaching</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admitted to teacher education program</li> <li>• Application to student teach</li> </ul>



- Cumulative GPA of 2.6 or higher
- Prior completion of the following courses with grade of C or better:
  - EDU 213 Foundations of Education/MSE 504 – Comparative Educational Philosophy
  - Educational Psychology (EDU 214 or MSE 513)
  - Survey of Exceptional Students (SPE 229 or MSE 567)
  - MATH 110 and 111 (or comparable)
  - Clinical Experiences totaling 120 hours (EDU 290, 291, 390); (or MSE 590)
  - Clinical Experience seminar (EDU 391); (or MSE 590)
- Pass the Illinois Content Test – Special Education – LBS-I (#155)
- Pass the Special Education General Curriculum Test (#163) (Content Test);
- Undergraduates or MSE Seeking Dual Cert. in Sped/El. Ed – Elem./Middle School (#110); Dual Cert. (part of undergraduate special education program)
- Courses in content area and methods courses have been completed with a letter grade of C or better while maintaining an overall GPA of 2.6. Courses in content and methods areas with a grade lower than a C must be repeated.
- Updated recommendation form from advisor
- Recommendation form from another professor other than the one who recommended the teacher candidate on the application for teacher education
- Second background check – fingerprinting
- Satisfactory completion of all required field experiences
  - Satisfactory assessments of lessons taught in the field experiences by both the cooperating teacher and university personnel
  - Self-assessment of teaching experiences by teacher candidate
- Satisfactory disposition assessments

#### **Checkpoint Four – Completion of Student Teaching**

- Teacher candidates are placed in either one (16-week) or two (8-week) settings. In each 8-week segment, candidates are formally observed at least three times and conference with the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. Additional meetings occur for mid-term (at the end of 8 weeks) and final evaluations (at end of 16 weeks). Teacher candidates in one 16-week placement are also observed a minimum of six times.
- Daily informal meetings with the cooperating teacher are required, as is at least one longer meeting each week to discuss the candidate's progress as documented by the weekly conference forms that are submitted to the university supervisor and signed by both the teacher candidate and the cooperating teacher. Teacher candidates are also encouraged to use a journal as a means of communicating with their university supervisor and to assist candidate in completing weekly reflections. Reflection statements following the formal meeting each week are submitted in hard copy or electronically to the university supervisor. A hard copy, signed by both the teacher candidate and the cooperating teacher, is collected by the university supervisor.
- During observations, the university supervisor completes a student teaching

evaluation form and meets with the cooperating teacher and teacher candidate to discuss the lesson that was observed. Strengths are noted and suggestions for improvement are given to the candidate.

- At the end of each 8-week placement or at midterm and end of 16-week placement, the teacher candidate, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor independently complete both the disposition rubric and the professional standards rubric. Final ratings are generated by consensus and recorded on the final evaluation rubrics.
- Cooperating teacher at the end of 8 weeks completes a final, summative evaluation and shares with candidate. At the end of the student teaching experience, the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher complete a final, summative evaluation of the teacher candidate's performance in student teaching.

### **Checkpoint Five– Program Completion**

- Pass the Illinois Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) – Special K-12 (#104) prior to 9-14 and APT (#188) subsequent to 9-14
- Successful completion of Student Teaching/ Internship
  - Satisfactory results on disposition rubric
  - Satisfactory results on professional teaching standards rubric
  - Satisfactory presentation of electronic portfolio to seminar instructor(s) (Spe 499/MSE 591); Done within edTPA framework
  - Demonstrate competence with technology (i.e., completion of LiveText® electronic portfolio) (Spe 499/MSE 591)
  - Successful illustration of professional and applicable state standards alignment in lessons
  - Educational philosophy (revised) which reflects conceptual framework
  - Unit plan
- Apply for state licensure and submit to the Licensure Officer
- Bachelor's degree awarded to undergraduate candidates; Successful completion of licensure requirements for Master's candidates; Nearly all Master's candidates in the area of special education, first complete requirements for licensure and subsequently complete their required research component (MSE 600 - Research Methodology) with an option to do further specific research (MSE 601 - Master's Project) or an additional course (MSE 503) in area of Educational Measurement & Evaluation for the completion of the Master's degree, which remains a separate requirement for degree and not directly required for the Learning Behavior Specialist - I (LBS-I) licensure. Program completers are those who meet requirements for state licensure (LBS-I).

### **Program and Course-Specific Standards Within Special Education**

During the past several years, the special education program has documented in great length adherence to major standards needed for candidates receiving initial licensure in special education (in our case, Learning Behavior Specialist – I licensure). Basic assessment standards have been extensively documented for multiple standards and associated indicators according to three major standards areas: (1) Common Core for All Special Educators, (2) Learning Behavior Specialist-I (LBS-I), and (3) Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS). Each of those multi-page documents is readily available in

electronic format; however, their scope is likely well beyond the scope required for Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and related annual documentation for the program report for the Illinois State Board of Education. Within those matrices are outlined how the component standards and indicators are met throughout coursework and fieldwork experiences in the area of special education, and as previously mentioned, how those standards and indicators are assessed. Specific numerical assessment has not been required by the state in terms of how programs meet required standards when utilizing assessment at the “within-course” level. Some major candidate assignments and major projects are, however, summarized in narrative form in an appendix attachment of this report.

### ***Program Utilizes Performance-Based, Rubric Assessment in Several Areas***

As one example of how candidates meet knowledge and performance standards within coursework associated within the program, multiple performance-based projects are provided in several key areas within one’s program (e.g., developing a framework for making modifications and adaptations for students with disabilities, constructing literacy units that differentiate instruction for students at various skill levels, developing a case study that shows knowledge and skills in terms of functional behavioral analysis and programming for students with behavioral disorders, developing plans exhibiting knowledge and skills in the area of collaborative teaching [general and special educators], developing plans for content area modification, developing functional instructional planning for individuals with cognitive disabilities). In fact there are 9-10 major areas in the special education sequence where these projects are completed and assessed as part of foundational coursework and in one instance pre-student teaching practicum experiences involving students with cognitive disabilities.

A basic outline of the nature of these knowledge and skill-based projects are provided in **Appendix D** of this document. The reviewer will be able to attain a general understanding of the nature and the scope of these program-based projects by reviewing this basic outline. Again, these projects utilize rubric-based evaluative criteria to assess candidate performance on competencies required in these projects. Due to the scope and involvement of such projects some projects are completed in either pairs or small groups to simulate the various thinking and planning processes needed by educators in real-life educational settings (e.g., (a) planning for differentiated instruction in co-teaching efforts, (b) planning for content area accommodations and modifications to enable K-12 students with disabilities to better access general education curricula, and (c) collaborative planning for literacy units.)

In brief, major candidate assignments or projects align with a minimum of 2 to as many as 8 of the 9 Learning Behavior Specialist –I (LBS-I) standards and several specific indicators. The LBS-I is the level of initial licensure received by special education candidates upon program completion.

### **III. Results of This Year’s Assessment**

The unit as a whole collects basic data at each major checkpoint discussed in Section I relating to various aspects of candidate progress through the special education program (i.e., meeting of program entrance requirements to be admitted into teacher education, disposition checks and adequate progress checks as one proceeds through the program, meeting of criteria for admittance to student teaching, and extensive documentation during student teaching, which is the culminating event of a candidate’s program). All checkpoints must be successfully met prior to the completion of one’s program. Following the successful completion of requirements a candidate is considered a program completer and is eligible for licensure.

### **Program Completers and Candidates in Progress -- QU Campus 2014-2015**

In 2014-2015, five Quincy area candidates at the undergraduate level and three candidates at the graduate level met program completion criteria for the Learning Behavior Specialist – I (LBS-I) licensure. All persons who are declared special education majors at the undergraduate level are eligible to receive dual licensure in special ed. and elementary ed. MSE program completers receive licensure in special education only unless they complete additional coursework or unless they had previously completed an initial licensure in elementary education. During the 2014-2015 academic year, there were 8 undergraduate program completers and 1 Graduate completer who received an additional LBS-I licensure having had an initial teaching licensure in another area.

Currently we have four on-campus (Quincy area) MSE candidates and one out-of-area (Springfield area) candidate working towards full licensure in special education (LBS-I). We have ten undergraduate students who have either met entrance criteria for the teacher education program (TEP) or who are near meeting eligibility requirements for TEP. Several other students are seeking the LBS-I endorsement who have declared majors other than special education (e.g., elementary ed., physical ed.).

A significant gatekeeper for students working towards full admittance into teacher education is the Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP), which is administered as a state-required pre-teacher education test. The same obstacle is typically true for students who are likely to seek an educational studies degree (non-licensure degree sometimes granted to those who either fail to meet entrance and/or completion requirements for the teacher education program). The state does currently, however, allow a minimum composite ACT score of 22 or higher with the writing portion included as part of the ACT test to be used in place of the TAP, and most students find this to be easier criteria to meet than passing all portions of the TAP. Furthermore, there are always potentially a small number of candidates who have passed the TAP and have been admitted to the teacher education program who might eventually be denied continuance toward completion for reasons related to either dispositional or performance issues.

If a candidate chooses a minor in special education, but does not seek full LBS-I licensure, the endorsement core courses are included in the minor and these candidates are required take a minimum of two courses beyond the basic endorsement courses to earn a minor in special education. The endorsement option is also a popular avenue for already licensed teachers who want to simply add a basic special education endorsement rather than seeking full LBS-I licensure.

### **Basic Data on Licensure Exams**

Candidates in special education must pass a minimum of four exams administered through the Illinois Licensure Testing System (ILTS) prior to meeting licensure requirements as follows: (a) Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP). All must pass the TAP – state test #400 or the ACT with a 22 composite or above as previously stated prior to admittance in teacher education; (b) Special Education Content Area Test – LBS-I (state test #155) and the Special Education – General Curriculum Test (state test #163) prior to student teaching; (c). If a person is seeking dual licensure in special and elementary education [all undergraduates], they must also pass the Elementary Education Content Area Test (state test #110) prior to student teaching; and (d) Assessment of Professional Teaching Standards (state test #188) prior to full licensure as Learning Behavior Specialist-I (LBS-I). Basic data for state licensure exams is reported in the following table.

A separate row is included for endorsement only candidates who have declared majors other than special education. These candidates typically take only the #155 and the required content area test for the area in which they are seeking full licensure (e.g., elementary education or physical education). The endorsement courses required beyond the Survey of Exceptional Students course added to their initial licensure area are Spe/MSE 239/509 – Characteristics of Students with Special Needs; Spe/MSE 235/528 – Diagnosis & Evaluation of Students with Disabilities/Psychoeducational Testing; and Spe/MSE 310/510: Instructional Methods – Sped.

### Data Corresponding to Current Program Report Year: July 2014-June 2015

Candidate Seeking (either at undergraduate or MSE level)	LBS-I: Test #155 (a Sped Content Area Test)	Sped Ed. Gen Curr. Test: Test # 163 (a Sped Content Area Test)	ELE/Middle Grades: Test #110 (required for undergraduate with dual cert. in sped & el. ed.)	Assess. of Prof. Teaching APT K-12: Test #104 pre- 9/14; APT #188 post- 9-14
<b>Undergraduate - Full Licensure in LBS-I</b>	4/4 = 100%	4/4 = 100%	5/5 = 100%	4/4 = 100%
<b>Graduate-Full Licensure in LBS-I</b>	1/1 = 100%	1/2 = 50%	Test Not officially required unless seeking dual licensure. 1/1 = 100%	1/1 = 100%
<b>Undergraduate Endorsement in Sped only (not full licensure) added to another initial teaching license</b>	1/1 = 100%	Not officially required for endorsement candidates	Not Applicable for the Purpose of This Data	5/5 = 100%
<b>Graduate Endorsement in Sped only (not full licensure) added to another initial teaching license</b>	4/4 = 100%	Test Not officially required.	Test Not officially required.	1/1 = 100%

Comparable for Chicago candidates is not shown in the above table, but is briefly summarized as follows: Test #155: 5/5 = 100%; Test #163: 7/8 = 88%; Test # 188: 17/21 = 80%. The Chicago program officially ended in December of 2014; however, a few selected offerings have been available to selected students who were not able to finish their programs by that date due to extenuating circumstances.

In summary, data from 2014-2015 and from previous years show that our candidates are quite successful in completing required state licensure tests that assess professional knowledge attained within their major field. Historical data is not shown in this report to reduce length of document a bit.

## Basic Data on Major Rubric Evaluations Utilized During Checkpoint Four – 2014-2015

Checkpoint 4 (See Section I) involves the completion of student teaching. In addition to the minimum of six direct observations of a candidate's actual teaching performance, the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher along with the candidate carefully collaborate in the formative and summative assessment of a candidate's performance. An initial meeting occurs at the beginning of the semester or at the end of the semester preceding a candidate's student teaching among university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates to provide an overview of and basic expectations of the student teaching semester. Each stakeholder is given a binder containing pertinent information regarding student teaching, the required evaluation procedures including the basic forms that will be utilized to evaluate a candidate's student teaching experiences formatively and summatively.

The School of Education has a basic database of student teachers where each of the subarea indicators for the School of Education – Professional Standards Rubric and the School of Education – Dispositions Rubric may be accessed to quickly determine if any given student teacher is meeting the targeted criteria specified previously in this report at the point of the completion of student teaching.

### School of Education's Professional Standards Rubric

As outlined in Section I, target performance criteria are established for the School of Education's Professional Standards Rubric containing 4 points (1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = developing, 3 = meets basic proficiency, and 4 = exceeds); Most candidates on final evaluations attain a preponderance of 3's with some 4's. **Appendix A** shows the average data for all program completers on this rubric.

### School of Education's Candidate Dispositions Rubric

The School of Education's Dispositions Rubric containing 4 points (0 = "unacceptable", 1 = "needs improvement", 2 = "meets expectations", and 3 = "exceeds expectations"); nearly all candidates receive a preponderance of 2's and 3's. See **Appendix B** for the average data for all 2014-2015 LBS-I program completers on this rubric.

### Final Summative Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance

The final, summative evaluation of student teaching where target levels for our candidates is quite routinely met with a preponderance of "3's through 5's" (average to very high) on sub-indicators for major categories; furthermore, most candidates in the special education program attain the **target of 3 or higher** on the final, holistic indicator for student teaching performance (3 = "has done a good job and will be an asset to the school system; showing much promise in the teacher field"; 4 = "has done an unusually good job and has gone beyond expectations; almost certain to become an excellent teacher"; 5 = "has done such an excellent job that he/she is ready to move immediately into a school and be considered an excellent teacher.) All student teachers met target criteria. **See Appendix C for the rubric used to provide summative evaluation of student teaching performance).**

Student teachers involved in QU's on-campus program during the fall and spring semesters of the 2014-2015 academic year were largely successful in meeting criterion-level or higher performance in analysis of data from the three separate aforementioned evaluation rubrics. (Again, please refer to

Appendix A, B, and C for these respective rubrics). Average performance for program completers is delineated on rubrics within Appendices A and B.

#### **IV. Analysis of Assessment Results**

A review of Unit Data where data on Checkpoints is monitored by the field experiences coordinator, candidates' advisors, and the Dean of the School of Education largely reveals that most special education candidates are able to successfully pass through the respective checkpoints. As a matter of policy, in cases where a candidate might be deficit in one or more critical areas, a remediation plan may be initiated wherein the candidate is given time to correct deficits. Numerical data is entered on the SOE Professional Standards Rubric and the SOE Dispositions Rubric during pre-student teaching clinical field experiences. During pre-student teaching field experiences, the Clinical Field Experiences Coordinator reviews these rubrics completed by cooperating (K-12) teachers with teacher candidates during exit interviews. Typically these rubrics are not shared with advisors during pre-student teaching field experiences unless problems arise. However, the records of pre-student teaching clinical field experiences are kept in a clinical experience file. Advisors do, of course, see the final grades of these clinical field experiences along with all other semester grades of the advisee.

A major checkpoint is Checkpoint Three (review checkpoint descriptions in Section I) as this checkpoint is very critical since meeting the various criteria enables the candidate to be recommended for student teaching. In brief, analysis of a given candidate's information at this checkpoint will document whether or not the candidate's (a) academic preparation has been successful, (b) recommendations are favorable, (c) disposition assessments have been favorable, and (d) a background check is acceptable.

The need to assess dispositions of candidates frequently and early in one's program is viewed as essential. The Dispositions Alert Form (See Appendix E) is utilized if concerns about a candidate arise. The Dispositions Alert Form is completed on an as-needed basis within the four preprofessional courses (i.e., Foundations of Education, Educational Psychology, Survey of Exceptional Students, and Media and Technology). Furthermore, the Dispositions Alert Form is utilized -- if needed -- in subsequent coursework or field experiences after the candidate is accepted into the teacher education program and proceeds towards program completion. The form includes sections to report previous actions taken and recommendations for appropriate interventions as needed to address areas of legitimate concern.

#### **Overall Program Success Dependent Upon Successful Completion of Checkpoints Four and Five**

Checkpoints 4 and 5 (See Section I) denote the completion of student teaching and the completion of program leading to licensure, respectively, and are final stages in a candidate's quest to become a certified educator who is ready for employment in a K-12 setting. Successful completion of these checkpoints is documented by major evaluation forms utilized during student teaching and documentation that the candidate has completed the necessary steps to receive his/her licensure to teach. As previously outlined in sections I (Description of Program Assessment Methods) and II (Results of Assessment), it appears that special education candidates during the past several years and with current focus in particular on the 2014-2015 academic year have successfully met their basic, initial career goals

to complete QU's program in special education, to secure initial licensure, or in the case of some MSE candidates additional licensure in the area of Special Education (Learning Behavior Specialist – I).

## **V. Planned Program Changes Based on Assessment Results and Changes Needed to Meet State Requirements**

Due to the fact that many of the core courses, specific to special education only and those not routinely taken by candidates who are not pursuing either full licensure, a minor, or an endorsement in special education are taught by a limited number of faculty, communication among the special education coordinator and core adjunct faculty occurs on an as-needed basis to make adjustments in programming (e.g., in outside practicum experiences). Furthermore, the licensure structure for the special education program allows for special education majors to seek dual licensure with elementary education; therefore, certain core courses are common across program areas (i.e., the same course for special, elementary, or secondary education majors [e.g., pre-professional courses]).

In some instances certain other courses may be cross-listed with both elementary education and special education designation, whereas in other cases only one designation (for efficiency's sake) is utilized for a common course taken concurrently by different program areas. Such programming allows for needed program changes on a wider scale unit basis, especially through collaboration with elementary education. At this point, it appears that the major checkpoints utilized for special education candidates are serving as relatively effective indicators of candidates' readiness to assume greater and greater responsibilities throughout their programs with the ultimate goal of becoming a program completer and a licensed special educator. Results have shown that most of our candidates have been quite successful in completing their programs and in securing employment. Furthermore, unless a program completer is very geographically limited, nearly all attain employment in a reasonable time following program completion.

While no major program changes are perceived as necessary at the current time due to the assessment results reported within this document, there are areas that continually receive attention (e.g., the need for possible revisions and adjustments based on feedback from candidates and cooperating teachers in preprofessional courses, pre-student teaching clinical experiences, practicum experiences, and student teaching). We also attempt to make needed program changes based on needs of current candidates and future candidates on a course-by-course basis if deemed necessary. However, major revisions within the School of Education as well as within special education will occur within the next academic year due to how student teachers will be evaluated in accordance with an initiative termed as edTPA -- adopted by the State of Illinois and various other states relating to the manner in which student teachers are evaluated and standards individual candidates and their programs will be accountable for. Efforts have been ongoing to prepare for edTPA during the last two to three years within the School of Education.

## **Selected Program Changes that Have Occurred Due to Qualitative and Quantitative Considerations and Aspects of Program Revision Occurring as a Result of State Requirements**

The aforementioned candidate dispositions have received continuing attention in 2014-2015 (i.e., completion of disposition forms -- if needed -- in all pre-professional courses – 213: Foundations of Education; 214 Educational Psychology; 229 – Survey of Exceptional Students; 240 – Media and



Technology in Education) as well as the use of disposition alert forms as faculty deem necessary throughout a candidate's program. This enhances faculty awareness of basic strengths of weaknesses of potential teacher education candidates as well as candidates who advance toward program completion. When candidate concerns are significant in terms of (a) academic or (b) other dispositional issues, it is important that careful consideration be given to individual cases. Depending on the individual situation, candidates may be given opportunities to remediate deficit performance or may be encouraged to seek alternative options to program continuance, which may include a degree in Educational Studies instead of pursuing teacher licensure. In these proceedings, candidates are allowed basic due process rights in terms of their ability to appeal decisions made by the admission and retention committee and subsequently an appeals committee may render a final decision after which the candidate may still appeal to either to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and, if necessary, to the President of QU. A very small percentage of candidates for varying reasons have chosen non-licensure degree options or have been encouraged to pursue such alternatives to traditional teacher licensure.

## **VI. Program Aspirations**

Our hope is to continue to meet our goals/objectives and program learning outcomes criteria established within the three major phases as follows: (a) students entering candidacy to the Teacher Education Program (TEP); (b) candidates within the TEP advancing successfully to student teaching; and (c) candidates becoming successful program completers upon the culmination of student teaching. The nature of the criteria and the assessments employed to measure candidate's progress have been reviewed throughout this program report. Our overall aspiration is that candidates will be as successful as they have been in the past. Meeting these goals and outcomes on a continuing basis requires an investment in terms of finances, staff, and technology at least at the levels we have utilized in the past.

## **VII. Possible Changes (Additions/Modifications) in Assessment Methods for the Future**

During the last three to four years, the School of Education began a process of curriculum review and revisions -- not due to assessment reported within this document -- but in response to necessary changes required by the Illinois State Board of Education's mandates for programs seeking continuing approval to offer teacher licensure. Most recently efforts have been ongoing in the area of elementary education to make required state changes for candidates who will graduate in 2017 and after. These changes are pertinent also to special education since all undergraduate special education majors seek dual licensure in special and elementary education. Significant changes will continue to occur at the state level in terms of specific licensure requirements in the area of special education also in the not too distant future.

For the upcoming academic year the aforementioned edTPA requirements are scheduled to receive formal implementation in the fall semester of 2015. These ongoing changes require continued collaboration and planning by individual faculty and core groups of the School of Education faculty. Adapting to the edTPA requirements will certainly require some basic additions and modifications in future assessment methods. This will be a challenging endeavor. Our School of Education is fortunate in that within the last two to three years, preparations in pre-student teaching clinical experiences and student teaching requirements have been modified to attempt to better prepare candidates to respond to edTPA requirements. Furthermore, as the whole School of Education moves toward these significant

changes for our candidates, our assessment methods will likely need to be modified to better reflect edTPA demands.

### **Summary**

In summary, it is quite evident that multiple assessment measures are needed and have been utilized through the major checkpoint framework that has been established for special education candidates as well as all other education candidates by the School of Education. The checkpoints allow for an ongoing evaluation of a student's knowledge and performance as he/she begins initial experiences, proceeds to the point of candidacy, and subsequently advances toward program completion. By utilizing course grades one is enabled to ascertain a candidate's knowledge as well as skills in performance aspects of courses. In addition, through careful evaluation of field experiences and ongoing indications of a student's dispositions, the program is better able to determine if the candidate is able to eventually assume the responsibilities of student teaching and hopefully the demands of future employment.

Determining the "fit" of individual candidates for his/her intended career objectives in education is by no means an exact science, and different faculty may differ considerably in how they might assess specific academic and behavioral dispositions. Nevertheless, the better one's data collection from multiple sources, the easier it becomes for program faculty to make reasonable decisions on individual candidates. Better communication among faculty regarding different candidates is something that we continually strive for. Continued efforts to create better communication and the recent establishment of a more centralized and accessible database available only to "key stakeholders" due to confidentiality reasons assists faculty in being able to create a better "snapshot" of a candidate's performance at crucial points in a student's program. To this end, faculty efforts to improve upon and refine several of the means of current data collection and utilization is a more reasonable goal than attempting to completely overhaul current methods of data collection and analysis.

As reviewed at the end of this report, some major changes will be necessary within special education, elementary education, and secondary education offerings to comply with state mandates. Most especially this is pertinent to the aforementioned edTPA requirements as all student teachers must meet criteria in their specific areas of licensure beginning in the fall of 2015. These changes will subsequently become a part of internalized practices, and will likely necessitate basic changes in our assessment and documentation practices.

## **Appendix A**

**Note: Shows Average for All Program Completers with Full Licensure for LBS-I for the 2014-2015 Academic Year**

**Quincy University – School of Education – Professional Standards Rubric**



## TEACHER EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

### FINAL COLLABORATIVE ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

**Name: Average for All Completers 2014-2015 (The results are generated from 7 Chicago and 5 Quincy area students)**

Grade / Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluators \_\_\_\_\_

**KEY:    Unsatisfactory (1)    Developing (2)                      Meets (3)    Exceeds (4)**

STATE STANDARD	ELEMENT	FINAL	COMMENTS
#1 Teaching Diverse Students	<b>A</b> Selects resources and strategies to meet a range of individual needs	3.4	
	<b>B</b> Teaches to individual learning abilities	3.6	
	<b>C</b> Holds high expectations for learning and achievement	3.6	
#2 Content / Pedagogical Knowledge	<b>A</b> Possesses content knowledge	3.3	
	<b>B</b> Integrates knowledge into instructional objectives	3.4	
	<b>C</b> Engages students in meaningful learning	3.6	
	<b>D</b> Identifies resources that support student learning	3.5	
#3 Planning for Differentiated Instruction	<b>A</b> Plans for long and short term instruction	3.5	
	<b>B</b> Prepares learning activities based on essential skills, state standards, and district curriculum	3.4	
	<b>C</b> Differentiates instruction	3.4	
#4 Learning Environment	<b>A</b> Establishes intrinsic motivation and positive climate	3.8	
	<b>B</b> Establishes expectations for behavior	3.5	
	<b>C</b> Monitors and responds to student behavior	3.5	
	<b>D</b> Manages materials and technology, time, pace, and transitions	3.5	
#5 Instructional Delivery	<b>A</b> Demonstrates multiple teaching strategies	3.3	
	<b>B</b> Adjusts for individual needs	3.5	
	<b>C</b> Uses appropriate role of the teacher for each instructional activity	3.6	
#6 Reading / Writing / Oral Communication	<b>A</b> Assesses and implements strategies to meets students' literacy needs	3.4	
	<b>B</b> Uses a variety of materials / strategies to teach vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency	3.3	
	<b>C</b> Teaches appropriate content area writing	3.3	
	<b>D</b> Plans for effective oral communication	3.5	
#7 Assessment	<b>A</b> Uses a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies	3.3	
	<b>B</b> Uses assessment in lesson planning	3.4	
	<b>C</b> Evaluates criteria and provides feedback	3.2	
	<b>D</b> Records and monitors assessment data	3.6	
#8 Collaborative Relationships	<b>A</b> Promotes a positive school climate	3.8	
	<b>B</b> Collaborates with school personnel to benefit student learning and behavior	3.7	
	<b>C</b> Communicates with families	3.6	
	<b>D</b> Knows and accesses community resources	3.4	
#9 Professionalism / Leadership / Advocacy	<b>A</b> Models professional behavior	3.7	
	<b>B</b> Reflects on teaching to identify paths for professional growth	3.7	
	<b>C</b> Communicates effectively	3.6	
	<b>D</b> Participates in professional development opportunities	3.5	

## Benchmark Conference

Student Teaching Semester:      Fall / Spring      Year: \_\_\_\_\_

**Final Benchmark Conference**      Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: Teacher Candidate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: Cooperating Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: Cooperating Teacher (if applicable)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: University Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Comments/Suggestions/Goals:**

## **Appendix B**

**Note: Shows Average for All Program Completers with Full Licensure for LBS-I for the 2014-2015 Academic Year.**

**Quincy University – School of Education – Dispositions  
Rubric – (Field Experiences)**



## School of Education - Student Teaching Final Disposition Performance Evaluation

Teacher Candidate's Name: (Average for all Program Completers for 2014-2015.)

Evaluators: \_\_\_\_\_

Check one area for each disposition element. Please comment on any area marked *unacceptable* or *Needs Improvement* on the reverse side of this form.

**(The below results are based on 7 Chicago and 5 Quincy area candidates.)**

Dispositions	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Not Observed	Average 2014-2015
	0	1	2	3	X	
<b>Servant Leadership</b>						
Practices active listening						2.7
Accepts individual differences						2.6
Distinguishes between the behavior and the person						2.6
Uses methods other than coercion to lead						2.6
Maintains positive outlook						2.8
<b>Reflective Decision-making</b>						
Seeks constructive feedback from others						2.8
Makes changes based on feedback						2.7
Recognizes personal limitations						2.7
Seeks to enhance personal strengths						2.8
Seeks to compensate for or overcome personal limitations						2.8
<b>Commitment to Ethical Standards</b>						
Displays honesty in interactions with others						2.8
Models ethical behavior of a professional						2.7
Maintains confidentiality						2.8
Respects others						2.8
Is trustworthy						2.8
<b>Success for All</b>						
Provides constructive feedback						2.7
Implements strategies to meet the needs of all						2.8
Helps all achieve						2.8
Uses diversity as a strength when working with others						2.8
<b>Professionalism</b>						
Dresses appropriately						2.8
Follows through on commitments						2.8
Communicates without an intent to deceive						2.8
Attends all expected meetings						2.9
Works collaboratively with others						2.7
Is punctual						2.8

## **Appendix C**

### **Quincy University – School of Education – Final Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance**





Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

**Placement 1:** School: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Placement 2:** School: \_\_\_\_\_

Cooperating Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Cooperating Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_

Grade / Subject: \_\_\_\_\_  
Subject \_\_\_\_\_

Grade / \_\_\_\_\_

University Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Please check the level of performance which, in your judgment, best describes this student teacher.

	Outstanding	Good	Acceptable	Poor	Unacceptable
	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Personal Qualities</b>					
Cooperation					
Dependability					
Enthusiasm					
Initiative					
Voice – quality / diction / projection					
Poise					
Appearance					
<b>Control of Learning Environment</b>					
Materials organized before lesson					
Routine procedures handled responsibly					
Classroom control – large / small groups					
<b>Teaching Abilities</b>					
Knowledge of subject matter					
Variety of techniques / strategies used in instruction					
Resourceful / creative in adapting materials					
Communication skills – grammar / discussion					
Transitions planned and implemented effectively					
Provisions for individual differences					
Fair / effective praise or disciplinary techniques					
<b>Attendance Pattern</b>					
Punctuality					
Attendance					

## Professional Development

Relationship with students / effective rapport					
Rapport with colleagues – outside classroom					
Self-evaluation – strengths / weaknesses					
Commitment to profession / extra participation					

**Summary Statement:** Please describe the student teacher's performance.

Check the statement below that best describes the student teacher at this time:

Student teacher:

has done such an excellent job that he/she is ready to move immediately into a school and be considered an excellent teacher

has done an unusually good job and has gone beyond expectations; almost certain to become an excellent teacher

has done a good job and will be an asset to the school system; shows much promise in the teaching field

has done an average job. He / She met the requirements adequately, but has not gone beyond expectations

falls short of being ready to take on a regular teaching position. Needs further improvement before predictions of success in the teaching profession

---

Date  
Signature

---

Student Teacher Signature

University Supervisor

## **Appendix D**

### **Outline of Major Performance-Based Projects Required in Varied Coursework within Quincy University's Special Education Program**

**Skeletal Outline of Contents of Ten Multistandards Performance-Based Projects –  
(Reviewer May also refer to electronic file for complete project activities – if one requests  
from Dr. Landsom – Special Education Program Coordinator)**

Assignment/Project & Activities	Applicable LBS – I Standards	LBS – I Indicators
<p><b>1. Content Area Modification Assignment - 465 &amp; 565 – Effective Inclusion</b>            Purpose: This assignment allows the teacher candidate direct practice in developing basic competencies necessary for modifying and adapting content area instruction for students with learning difficulties. This assignment enables the candidate to attain realistic practice in modifying content instruction to make it more appropriate for low-achieving students. Within this assignment, candidates perform a critical content analysis of a published curriculum unit or section of instruction that may be routinely provided in a school setting. The candidate typically works collaboratively with one or more other teacher candidates in determining essential aspects of the curriculum necessary for all learners and ways in which the content may be most appropriately delivered and assessed. It enables the candidate to determine necessary links between assessment, planning, instructional delivery, and the collaborative skills necessary to reach consensus on a myriad of issues when collaboratively planning and providing instruction with other educators.</p>	3, 4, 6, & 7	3G, 4B, 4I, 4M, 4N, 4O, 4P, 6A, 6F, 6G, 6S, 7B
<p><b>2. Co-Teaching Assignments – 465 &amp; 565 – Effective Inclusion</b>            Purpose: Purpose of Collaborative Teaching Assignments: These assignments allow the teacher candidate direct practice in developing knowledge and performance competencies in the critical area of collaborative teaching. The first major assignment enables the candidate to learn principles of leveling and differentiated instruction for varied learners. The candidate decides how to level instruction by collaborating with one or more other teacher candidates who assume roles of both the special and the general educator. It focuses goals of (a) acquainting other educators with the critical characteristics of learners with disabilities, (b) assessing and managing quality of student access to general education, and (c) planning for and delivering appropriate instruction in a multi-ability classroom. Collaborative conduct is emphasized throughout as well as assuming a leadership role in better assuring quality co-teaching efforts. The second major assignment enables the candidate to extend skills by submitting a hypothetical proposal to a “school principal” in which the candidate submits a plan for the development of enhanced collaborative instruction. Through this effort, the candidate must synthesize what he/she would propose as constituting promising practices for co-teaching within the context of today’s school environments.</p>	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9	2D, 3G, 3H, 3I, 4A, 4B, 4M, 4O, 4P, 6A, 6F, 6G, 6S, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 9A

Assignment/Project & Activities	Applicable LBS – I Standards	LBS – I Indicators
<p><b>3. Curriculum Analysis - Direct Instruction Reading 310 &amp; 510 – Instructional Methods - Sped</b></p> <p>Purpose: In addition to all other reading courses and supervised experiences within the reading center that candidates are involved in, special education majors receive additional coverage and focus in the area of reading within the Spe 310/MSE 510 course. This enables candidates to become increasingly familiar with a model (Direct Instruction) of reading diagnosis and implementation that encompasses research-based practices in such areas as the development of phonemic awareness, word recognition, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Candidates learn basic principles of diagnosis (<b>LBS Standard 3 – Assessment</b>) and specific intervention strategies enabling candidates to better plan (<b>LBS Standard 4 – Planning</b>), deliver (<b>LBS Standard 6 – Instructional Delivery</b>), and adjust instruction for students with various needs. Furthermore, candidates learn to provide prompted instruction that results in low error rates and greater mastery in learning.</p>	3, 4	3D, 3N, 3O, 4C, 4D, 4E, 4R, 6E, 6R
<p><b>4. IEP Assignment 465 &amp; 565</b></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> In Effective Inclusion candidates learn a significant amount about the IEP process and learn to construct an IEP based on the needs of either a real or a hypothetical student. Candidates utilize Bateman and Linden’s <b><u>Better IEPs: How to Develop Legally Correct and Educationally Useful Programs</u></b> as a primary resource. The IEP is a fundamental document that is foundational to nearly all tenets upon which appropriate special education programs are established. The emphasis is not to conform specifically to any given district’s IEP format but to learn the importance of including the most essential components of the IEP in a manner that centers upon student needs.</p>	1-8	3F, 3G, 4N, 5D, 6F, 6M, 7A, 8C

Assignment/Project & Activities	Applicable LBS – I Standards	LBS – I Indicators
<p><b>5. Instructional Adaptations Assignment 229</b>            Purpose: The purpose of this assignment is to provide the candidate with a basic framework for making appropriate modifications and adaptations in the curriculum that will allow the candidate to make informed decisions regarding the implementation and evaluation of appropriate adaptations and/or modifications for low achieving students and those with disabilities, thereby allowing students with learning difficulties higher quality access to the general education curriculum. The candidate will learn how to plan for, how practitioners apply, and how to evaluate several modifications and adaptations that have received long-standing empirical support that enable learners to function more effectively in the general education curriculum. The assignment is evaluated through a specific rubric that fits assignment parameters.</p>	3, 4	3G, 4B, 4P
<p><b>6. Language Disorders &amp; Intervention Activities (covered across several courses and in practicum activities)</b>            Purpose: Candidates complete various activities associated with their acquisition of knowledge and performance competencies in the area of language disorders and appropriate interventions. The following shows applicable standards with which these activities align themselves as well as some of the basic activities through which candidates acquire knowledge and competencies in these areas. Naturally, due to the nature of and the complexity of the language area, evaluative activities for candidates' knowledge are composed primarily of (a) accurate completion of and ability to discuss study supports, (b) evidence of satisfactory performance on related exams, and (c) documentation of understanding and application of principles related to language and communication within their practicum activities that accompany low-incidence students. Practicum activities required for the lower incidence areas of intellectual disabilities and associated moderate and severe disabilities are presented in a separate area. Furthermore, the case study project that candidates complete for Spe 469/MSE 569 – Autism/TBI/POHI (retitled Autism and Pervasive Developmental Disorders at the beginning of the 2007-2008 academic year) requires candidates to assess and document interventions for communication disorders.</p>	2, 3, 4, 6	2A, 2D, 3A, 4H, 6C, 6Q

Assignment/Project & Activities	Applicable LBS – I Standards	LBS – I Indicators
<p><b>7. Literacy Skills Unit Project 310 &amp; 510</b>            Purpose: The literacy project is assigned to give candidates practice in developing a unit of instruction similar to one they may be responsible for developing during their student teaching and future teaching experiences. Planning should occur for 5<sup>th</sup>- to 6<sup>th</sup>- grade students or older (may be junior high or high-school age). Teacher candidates (TCs) will work in small groups to complete this project and to divide necessary labor for project. Candidates decide on overall objectives for activities that extend over a 10-14 day period and the specific order in which activities will be presented. Candidates base their literacy unit on a collaboratively selected novel and prepare a fairly comprehensive activity packet outlining their activities and demonstrating how these activities will support learning. In addition, candidates are responsible for documenting how their presentation of specific literacy and comprehension strategies will support student learning. Candidates are expected to present to the class how their instruction will be provided to students.</p>	4, 7	4B, 4C, 4D, 40, 4R
<p><b>8. Mod./Sev. Practicums (lower incidence disabilities) – 453/553</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> When the special education program was restructured for the LBS-I licensure standards, it was seen as essential that candidates be provided with field experiences well beyond traditional, pre-LBS-I clinical field experiences and their culminating student teaching experiences. Due to the heavy emphasis within LBS-I standards on providing an appropriate education for students with a vast range of moderate and severe disabilities, specific practicum experiences that complemented and were in addition to coursework were seen as essential. Candidates spend a good deal of time within these practicum experiences that align with critical aspects of nearly all common core and LBS-I standards. The specific knowledge and performance requirements candidates are expected to meet and ways in which they align with critical LBS-I standards are outlined in the accompanying practicum requirements booklet. In brief, the major parameters of standards that receive emphasis focus on the following major categorizations: 1. Characteristics/Impacts of Disabilities 2. Assessment: Informal and Alternative 3. Individual Education Plans; Life-Goal Planning; Developing Independence; Planning for and Delivery of Instruction 4. Assistive/Augmentative Communication Devices &amp; Adaptations/Accommodations for Physical &amp; Other Health Impairments 5. Collaboration with Related Service Providers and Collaboration with Community Agencies 6. Behavior Management 7. Prevocational, Transitional, and Vocational Planning 8. Communication and Collaboration with Other Professional Service Providers 9. Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Academic and Nonacademic Settings.</p>	Refer to electronic file – nearly all standards applicable to lower incidence disabilities are applicable	Refer to electronic file – nearly all indicators of standards relevant to lower incidence disabilities are applicable



Assignment/Project & Activities	Applicable LBS – I Standards	LBS – I Indicators
<p><b>9. Emotional &amp; Behavioral Disorders Final Project – 450/550</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> This final project is designed to engage the candidate in a synthesis of material learned throughout the semester. It will involve individual and group work. The candidate will utilize a case study approach based on an actual individual. The candidate will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assess, evaluate, and plan an IEP for the case study student. The IEP must account for the least restrictive environment for the student;</li> <li>• complete a functional behavior analysis and a behavior intervention plan including attempts to create a sustaining management program, ways to increase the individual’s self-regulation, and a plan for ongoing monitoring of the individual;</li> <li>• determine how the case study fits or does not fit with the federal definition of Emotional Disturbance and will utilize conceptual models to be able to explain the case study from various perspectives</li> <li>• identify and evaluate the success or nonsuccess of prereferral interventions, review and discuss the eligibility process and defend whether or not eligibility is appropriate</li> <li>• specifically define the disorder(s) of the individual in the case study and discuss how causal factors may contribute to the case</li> </ul>	1, 3, 4, 5, 6,	3B, 3C, 3F, 3G, 3I, 4A, 4N, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A, 6G, 6I
<p><b>10. Case Study of Student with Communication and Behavioral Needs – 469/569 – Autism/TBI/POHI (retitled Autism and Pervasive Developmental Disorders at the beginning of the 2007-2008 academic year)</b></p> <p>In this course teacher candidates develop a case study in which they include the following basic elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A summary of student’s learning environment;</li> <li>2. Identification of student strengths and deficits;</li> <li>3. Completion of communication profile of student;</li> <li>4. Completion of sensory profile of student;</li> <li>5. Target and description of one specific priority behavioral issue;</li> <li>6. Functional behavior analysis instrument based on target behavior;</li> <li>7. Behavior goal and objective addressing the target behavior;</li> <li>8. Formulation of intervention dealing with appropriate replacement behavior and accounting for communication profile as well as identification of teaching strategy to teach replacement behavior;</li> <li>9. Create a visual strategy/environmental support or social story that can be used with student observed;</li> <li>10. Cite class texts, notes, and at least two other sources;</li> <li>11. Provide a culminating personal analysis/insights regarding course.</li> </ol>	2, 3, 5, 6	2A, 2B, 3A, 3C, 3J, 5A, 5E, 5F, 6D, 6K, 6Q, 6T

**Appendix E**  
**Dispositions Alert Form**

**Please submit to the Dean of the School of Education**

### Academic and Disposition Notice

Please complete this form on a School of Education candidate's performance. If it is not satisfactory, please discuss your concerns with him/her.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher Candidate Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

#### A. Areas of Noted Strengths

<b>Academic</b>		<b>Disposition</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Performance on tests/quizzes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Attitude/commitment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Performance on assignments	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reflective self-assessment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Please specify:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Show respect/concerns for others
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Please specify:

#### B. Areas of Concerns

<b>Academic</b>		<b>Disposition</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Performance on tests/quizzes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Attitude/lack of commitment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Performance on assignments	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adjustment Issues
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Please specify:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excessive Absences
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Please specify:

#### 1. Interventions already attempted

1:1 discussion    email communication    phone communication    Other:

#### 2. What reasons has the candidate indicated to you for his/her poor performance problem?

#### 3. What are your recommendations for support?

- Meet with Academic Advisor (if he/she is not the instructor) to address concerns
- Learning Resource Center Writing Lab Assistance
- Learning Resource Center Math Lab Assistance
- Learning Resource Center for subject area tutoring
- Meet with the Dean of School of Education & instructor to develop IEC
- Other:

Report by the Dean of the School of Education	
Action Taken	
Result	

#### Additional Information: