CCSU Special Education Department
Interim Assessment Report from AY 2016-17
Submitted September 27, 2017

Department: Special Education

Report Preparer: Joan Nicoll-Senft, PhD

Program Name and Level: MS Special Education (initial special education licensure, Post Baccalaureate in Special Education (initial special education licensure)

Program Assessment Question	Response
1) **URL**: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.	http://www.ccsu.edu/sped/
2) **LO Changes**: Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., LO more discrete, LO aligned with findings)	Program's learning outcomes were revised to align with the current practice and MAT program's learning outcomes.
3) **Strengths**: What about your assessment process is working well?	Clearly articulated and carefully sequenced clinical experiences; strong partnerships with CSDE and surrounding school districts; adoption of locally scored edTPA for all candidates (initial and cross endorsement) seeking special education licensure; and consistent use of Taskstream by faculty for key assignments across programs.
4) **Improvements**: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan should be reported here)	Improved edTPA scores for candidates; increased use of edTPA and Taskstream data for ongoing program improvement

LO #1) Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical).	
1.1) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, , etc.)	The assessment aligned with this outcome is the Praxis II for Special Education licensure in Connecticut is test code 0543 or 5543: Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications. This 90 multiple-choice questions assess the knowledge and understanding of principles and practices related to special education and mild to moderate applications. The three constructed-response questions are integrated ones that assess an examinee's knowledge of students with mild to moderate disabilities as related to instruction and assessment, learning environment and classroom management, and collaboration. This test consisted of three categories (Understanding Exceptionalities, Legal and Societal Issues, and Delivery of services to students with disabilities). Candidates are required to take the Praxis II after they have completed all coursework except student teaching. Candidates take the Praxis II during the semester immediately prior to student teaching. Teacher Candidates must pass Praxis II in order to receive teacher certification from the Connecticut State Department of Education.
1.2) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	This assessment is scored externally by its publisher, ETS. The cut score of 164 was recently lowered to 158 by CT's State Department of Education.
1.3) Since the most recent full report, list: a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	Conclusion: Pass rate for TCs is 90.9%; statewide pass rate is 98.5%. Changes: No change; our pass rate has increased slightly over the past three years (2014 – 2015 89.1%; 2015-2016 85.7%).

LO #2) Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.	
2.1) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The Evidence-Based Case Study is an assignment focusing on the academic, emotional, and behavioral characteristics of students with exceptional learning needs in K-12 settings and the identification of appropriate, evidence-based interventions to meet their needs. This assignment is used in SPED 503.
2.2) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	This assignment is graded using a rubric to determine the candidate's level of performance on the assignment.
2.3) Since the most recent full report, list:	Conclusion: 100% of students continue to pass at the Target or Acceptable categories (average score = 3.00/3.00).
a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	Changes: Effective 2016-17, SPED 511, 512, 513 were replaced by one 3-credit level course (SPED 503). This course was designed to better align to current practices in the field and edTPA and will include a field-based assignment focused on analyzing a focus learner's context of learning and justifying evidence-based programmatic recommendations.

LO #3) Use data, content knowledge, and evidence-based pedagogical content knowledge to critically examine practice for the purpose of improving student learning.	
3.1) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The Assessment Report requires candidates to select, administer, and interpret a battery of formal (standard) and informal (curriculum) assessments.
3.2) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	This assignment is graded using a rubric to determine the candidate's level of performance on the assignment.
3.3) Since the most recent full report, list: a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	Conclusion: 100% of teacher candidates achieved a score of Target or Acceptable on this assessment (average score = 2.95/3.00).
	Changes: The rubric for this assignment has been revised for the 2016-17 AY to reflect best practice and better align with edTPA.

LO #4) Design and deliver instrumental and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for struggling learners and those with disabilities	
4.1) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The Student Learning Profile requires candidates to develop a detailed learning profile of an elementary or secondary student with an identified disability, including a comprehensive summary of the student's strengths and needs, learning preferences, and an analysis of the student's IEP.
4.2) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	This assignment is graded using a rubric to determine the candidate's level of performance on the assignment.
4.3) Since the most recent full report, list: a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	Conclusion: 100% of teacher candidates achieved a score of Target or Acceptable on this assessment (average score = 2.98/3.00).
	Changes: The focus of this key assessment has been revised to better align with Task 2 (Planning) of the edTPA for the 2017-18 AY.

LO #5) Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning	
5.1) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The Learning Segment assignment requires teacher candidates to plan and implement a series of five consecutive lessons focused on the use of evidence-based reading instruction with a student with an identified disability in an elementary educational setting..
5.2) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	This assignment is graded using a rubric to determine the candidate's level of performance on the assignment.
5.3) Since the most recent full report, list: a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	Conclusion: 100% of teacher candidates achieved a score of Target or Acceptable on this assessment (average score = 2.73/3.00).

Changes: n/a |

LO #6) Act collaboratively, ethically, and responsibly to ensure student growth and advance the profession.	
6.1) **Assessment Instruments**: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The Student Teaching Assessment is a unit-wide assessment used by all of CCSU's teacher preparation programs.
6.2) **Interpretation**: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	The Student Teaching Assessment is administered by the CCSU Supervisor, Cooperating Teacher, and the teacher candidate and is rubric scored. This assessment is administered at the mid-point and end of each student teaching placement.
6.3) **Results**: 3.3) Since the most recent full report, list: a. The conclusion(s) drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s)	Conclusion: 100% of teacher candidates scored at the target or acceptable on our Student Teaching Evaluation.
	Changes: Our unit-wide Student Teaching Assessment was revised for the 2017-28 AY using Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED)'s evaluation rubric. This rubric has been aligned to CEC standards for use with special education teacher candidates.

CCSU Special Education Department
Interim Assessment Report
Data Tables AY 2016-17

LO #1 Possess strong knowledge of content, content pedagogy, and learner development (typical and atypical)

.

Test 5543 Special Education Content Knowledge	Number of Students*	Cut Score/ Or Possible # of Points	CCSU Mean	Median	Range	% of Candidates Passing or % Correct**	State Mean	State % Pass or % Correct
2016 – 2017 Overall Test Data (As of 4/17)	N=11	158	169.36	169	150-189	90.91%	177.15	98.53%
Category I: Development & Characteristics of Learners	N=11	15-15				77.58%		80.54%
Category II: Planning & the Learning Environment	N=11	16-19				75.08%		80.45%
Category III: Instruction	N=11	16-18				78.35%		84.33%
Category IV: Assessment	N=11	14-15				72.73%		73.65%
Category V: foundations & Professional Responsibilities	N=11	14-16				75.19%		81.01%
Category VI: Integrated Constructed Response	N=11	18-18				60.10%		72.51%

*This number includes ALL Candidates during the time frame who selected CCSU as their "attending" university.

**Questions in a category may vary in difficulty from one test to another. Therefore, the category scores of individuals who have taken different form of the test are not necessarily comparable. As such, category scores should just be used to identify areas of "weakness."

^ No data are displayed because the N is fewer than 5.

LO #2 Create an inclusive and culturally responsive learning environment.

Year	Criteria	Number of Students	Mean Score
2016-2017	Identification of focus learner's strengths, needs, and interests	N=12	3/3
	Identification of learning goa.	N=12	3/3
	Selection and justification of appropriate evidence-based practices.	N=12	3/3
	Presentation preparation.	N=12	3/3

LO #3 Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze multiple forms of standardized and curriculum-based assessments and use that information for a variety of educational decisions.

Year	Criteria	Number of Students	Mean Score
2016-2017	Assessment selection rationale.	N=31	2.77/3
	Appropriate assessment administration.	N=31	2.81/3
	Assessment scoring.	N=31	2.9/3
	Assessment reporting	N=31	2.97.3
	Assessment interpretation.	N=31	2.97.3
	Identifying educationally relevant background information.	N=31	2.97.3
	Developing summary of student performance.	N=31	2.97/3
	Developing summary of relevant test behavior.	N=31	2.94/3

	Analyzing student strengths and weaknesses.	N=31	2.94/3
	Consideration of individual diversity in data/analysis/conclusions and recommendations	N=31	3/3
	Considerations of instructional implications in data analysis/conclusions and recommendations.	N=31	2.9/3
	Developing student rapport.	N=31	3/3
	Analysis of testing environment.	N=31	3/3
	Part II Reading curriculum-based measures: Rationale	N=31	2.94/3
	Math curriculum-based measures: Rationale	N=31	3/3
	Writing curriculum-based measures: Rationale	N=31	3/3
	Spelling curriculum-based measures: Rationale	N=31	2.94/3
	Curriculum-based measures: Bias	N=31	3/3

	Direct observation form rationale	N=31	2.9/3
	Direct observation form development/use	N=31	2.97/3
	Parent/guardian interview questions: Development rationale	N=31	3/3
	Teacher interview questions: Development rationale	N=31	3/3

LO #4 Design and deliver instrumental and assessment strategies that facilitate significant learning for struggling learners and those with disabilities.

Year	Criteria	Number of Students	Mean Score
2016-2017	Unit Planning (big idea, essential questions, key knowledge & skills)	N=14	3/3
	Instructional Planning	N=14	3/3
	Planned Supports (learning environment, instructional strategies, learning tasks, materials, accommodations/modifications, assistive technology).	N=14	2.93/3
	Expressive/Receptive Communication Skills Targeted	N=14	2.93/3
	Assessment/Progress Monitoring	N=14	3/3
	Justification of Instruction and Supports	N=14	3/3
	Presentation	N=14	3/3

LO # 5 Design, deliver, and assess literacy/language strategies to deepen literacy and content learning.

Year	Criteria	Number of Students	Mean Score
2016-2017	Assessment Plan.	N=21	2.81/3
	Instructional Plan.	N=21	2.67/3
	Instruction: Learning Environment & Student Engagement	N=21	2.86/3
	Instruction: Lesson Sequencing, Instructional strategies, supports, and materials	N=21	2.71/3
	Instruction: Data-based Decision Making and Progress Monitoring	N=21	2.62/3
	Analysis of Teaching	N=21	2.76/3
	IEP Goal and Objective	N=21	2.67/3

LO #6 Act collaboratively, ethically, and responsibly to ensure student growth and advance the profession

Year	I. Classroom Environment	Number of Students	Average
2016-2017	**1. Management of Classroom Learning Environments 2.4, 2.5, (II C,) (3.4, 1.0)**	N=10	96.7%
	2. Management of Routines 2.5, (II C), (3.4)	N=10	100%
	3. Fostering a Learning Community 2.1, (II B & C), (3.4, 1.0)	N=10	100%
	4 Expectations of Standards of Behavior NON NEGOTIABLE 2.3, 2.4, (II B), (3.4)	N=10	100%
	5. Monitoring of and Response to Student Behavior NON NEGOTIABLE 2.3, 2.4, (II A), (3.4, 1.0)	N=10	100%
	6. Promoting Engagement and Shared Responsibility for Learning 2.2 III B)	N=10	96.7%
	II. Planning		
	7. Lesson Objective 3.2, (I C), (3.1)	N=10	100%

	8. Sequence of the Lesson 3.1, 3.2, (I C), (3.1)	N=10	100%
	9. Lesson Planning NON NEGOTIABLE 3.2, 3.6, 3.7, (I A & C), (3.1))	N=10	100%
	10. Selecting Appropriate Resources and Assessment Strategies when Planning the Lesson 3.4, 3.5, (II D), (3.1)	N=10	100%
	11. Meeting the Needs of All Learners by Differentiating Instruction 3.7, (II D)	N=10	96.7%
	III. Instructions		
	12 . Material Usage During Instruction 4.2, 4.3, (II D), (3.3)	N=10	100%
	13. Methods 4.1, 4.3, (II A & D), (3.3, 1.0)	N=10	100%
	14. Communication During Initiation NON NEGOTIABLE 4.1, 4.3, 4.7, (I B) ,(3.3, 1.0)	N=10	100%
	15. Communication During Closure NON NEGOTIABLE 4.7, (I B), (3.3, 1.0)	N=10	96.7%
	16. Knowledge of Content Areas NON NEGOTIABLE 1.1, 1.2, (I A), (3.1)	N=10	100%

	17. Promotes Independent Thinking through Questioning 3.8, 4.3, 4.4, 4.7, (II A & D), (3.3, 1.0)	N=10	100%
	18. Monitors Student Learning 4.6, (II D), (4.0)	N=10	93%
	IV. Assessing for Learning		
	19. Student Learning, Instruction, and Data Collection 5.2, 5.3, (II D), (4.0)	N=10	98%
	20. Monitoring Students' Understanding 4.6, (II D), (4.0)	N=10	100%
	21. Providing Feedback that Focuses on Content and Assists Students in Improving their Performance 5.5, 5.6, (II D), (4.0)	N=10	100%
	V. Communication		
	22. Oral and Written Language 1.3, (I B,) (3.5)	N=10	100%
	VI. Professionalism		
	23. Professional Attitude Toward Teaching and Dependability 6.11, (III A & B), (5.2)	N=10	100%
	24. Professional Attire 6.4, (III A)	N=10	100%

	25. Maintaining Confidentiality NON NEGOTIABLE 6.7, 6.11, (III A), (5.2)	N=10	100%
	26. Professional Collaboration/Communication with Others 6.3, 6.4, (III D), (5.2)	N=10	100%
	27. Professional Collaboration in Data Team Setting 6.3, 6.4 ,(III D), (5.2)	N=10	97.5%
	28. Use of Communication Technology NON NEGOTIABLE 6.9	N=10	100%
	VII. Student Diversity		**Target**
	29. Developing a Positive Self-concept 2.1, 2.3, 5.7, 6.6, (II B & III B), (3.2)	N=10	100%
	30. Understanding Individual Students 6.8, 6.2, (II A, B & C), (3.2)	N=10	100%
	VIII. Self-Evaluation and Reflection		**Target**
	31. Continuous Self-evaluation 6.1, (III B), (5.1)	N=10	100%
	32. Integration of Feedback 6.1, (II B), (5.1)	N=10	100%

	33. Professional Growth 6.2, (III C & D), (5.1)	N=10	100%