## CEC Assessment #7: Additional Assessment
## Oral Language Project

**a. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program**
The Communication Inventory is completed during SPED 505: Oral & Written Language—Classroom Interventions. The assessment demonstrates that **graduate elementary/middle teacher candidates** have an understanding of language differences and disability to use in program planning, lesson development, collaboration, and assessment.

**b. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.**
Teacher candidates observe a student with diverse language and special needs and describe the student in terms of current language and language history, culture, learning, and supports received.  The classroom environment is observed to identify the techniques used to support student language, culture, and learning. The Communication Inventory relates most directly to the following Council for Exceptional Children Standard:

---

**CEC STANDARD  3:  INDIVIDUAL LEARNING DIFFERENCES.**

---

<u>How assessment aligns with CEC Standard #3</u>:  **Elementary/middle graduate** teacher candidates must analyze the individual learning differences of students from varied culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (**ICC3K3**). Teacher candidate's review elementary or middle-aged students academic, social, and learning strengths and preferences in the context of their familial traditions and experiences (**ICC3K1**).  This assessment is designed to provide assist candidate's understanding of the impact of dual language development on the student's school life.  This is assessed under rubric section: Description of the Student, Oral Language Sample.

---

**CEC Standard 6: Language**

---

<u>How assessment aligns with CEC Standard #6</u>:  **Elementary/middle graduate** teacher candidates describe the diverse language strengths/needs of a student whose primary language is not English (**ICC6K2**).   The student's language history is reviewed and analyzed with respect to the level of spoken and written language using WIDA standards of language proficiency (**IGC6K1**).  Teacher candidates compare levels of proficiency between English and the language of origin for the elementary or middle schooler.  Teacher candidates *understand typical and atypical language development* and describe the practices *of cultural and linguistic sensitivity* that promote language learning (**IGC6S2**). These practices (see additional information in Additional Guidance for further information) are identified within transitional bilingual and/or dual language classrooms in urban school environments.  Teacher candidates identify language supports (*instructional methods, materials, augmentative communication, symbolic support for basic language learners, language intervention techniques*) to promote language learning.  Teacher candidates develop a plan to remedy the learning needs of students with diverse language backgrounds.  This is assessed under rubric sections: Description of the student, Transcription; Sentence Scoring; MLU; Eyeballing Technique; Oral Language; Remedial Plan, Reflection.

---

**CEC STANDARD 8: Assessment.**

---

<u>How assessment aligns with CEC Standard #8</u>: **Graduate elementary/middle** teacher candidates must gather and conduct *multiple forms of formal and informal assessment* data (both formative and summative) to help *identify exceptional learning need*, *develop/implement individualized instruction*, *regularly monitor student's progress, and adjust instruction* accordingly to address student's exceptional learning needs with respect to oral language strengths/needs ((**ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6**). **Elementary/middle** graduate candidates are continually guided *by legal/ethical principles* and *best theory/practice* as they *make decisions* about *meaningful nonbiased assessments* for their students (**IGC8K2**). All aspects of the standard are assessed under the Oral Language Project rubric sections: Transcription; Sentence Scoring; MLU; Eyeballing Technique; Oral Language; Reflections; Writing Conventions.

---

**CEC STANDARD 9: Professional and Ethical Practice.**

---

<u>How assessment aligns with CEC Standard #9</u>: In the Oral Language Project, **graduate elementary/middle** teacher candidates engage in important *professional activities that benefit individuals with exceptional learning needs, their families, and their own professional growth*.  The written interpretation and analyses inherent in this Project requires the candidate to *regularly reflect upon/adjust their practice* to effect student's progress (**ICC9S1, ICC9S4, ICC9S6, ICC9S11**)**.** The information is then

respectfully shared as appropriate with students, families, colleagues and other relevant personnel mindful of *legal/ethical* matters.  This aspect of the standard is assessed in rubric sections: Reflections; Writing Conventions.

**c. A brief analysis of the data findings;**
**Fall 2007-Fall 2009**: Of the students in the **M.Ed. in Mild/Moderate Disabilities (Elementary/Middle)** since 2008, almost *all* teacher candidates (**n = 45/47**) met standard (CEC standards 3, 6, 8, 9) by performing at the Acceptable or Target level on the overall analysis of the Oral Language Project from two classes as this course is offered once/year.  Two students did not meet standard (achieving developing or unacceptable).  From one class, in Spring 2008, this analysis was on the overall performance of teacher candidates and did not provide information on strengths or areas in need of further instruction on skills and knowledge assessed within individual rubric components.

**d. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards:**  Evaluation data on the Oral Language Project indicates that teacher candidates have met standards through an assessment that documents performance on CEC Standards #3: Individual learning Differences,  #6: Language; #8: Assessment; and #9: Professional & Ethical Practice.  For this project, the teacher candidate observed a student with who had both a communication challenge, and a language difference.

Since **Spring 2009 (n=40)**, data have been collected on candidate performance at each component of the rubric, which indicated that all candidates, except one, achieved at least an acceptable rating overall.  One student failed to complete all course requirements in Fall 2010 for personal/familial reasons.  An average or mean of the two semesters are presented here as a summary of the different levels assessed.  It appears that **elementary/middle graduate candidates** are strongest in student description, oral language sample, sentence scoring, as well as conventions.  Areas to further review for additional teacher candidate support seems to be MLU, eyeballing technique, oral deficit descriptions, and remedial plan.  This data set at the rubric level, however, is relatively young, and may/may not indicate this as a consistent pattern of strengths/needs of candidate performance.  Further analysis of the data in terms of candidates' understanding of  CEC Standards #3, #6, #8, and #9 will be ongoing.

| Rubric Indicator/CEC Standards | Performance at Acceptable or Target Levels |
|---|---|
| Student Description | 97% |
| Oral Language Sample | 97% |
| Developmental Sentence Scoring | 97% |
| Mean Length of Utterance (MLU) | 95% |
| Eyeballing Technique | 95% |
| Articulation Analyses | 95% |
| Oral Language Deficits | 93% |
| Remedial Plan | 93% |
| Reflection | 93% |
| Writing Conventions | 97% |
| Overall Evaluation | 97% |

# CEC Assessment #7
## Oral Language Project
## Guidance for Teacher Candidates

**Purpose**

To promote the understanding of diversity of oral language and the effect on communication and learning, an analysis of the communication and learning environment of a student is produced.

**Standards**

This communication project relates most directly to the following Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and Rhode Island Professional Teacher (RIPTS) Standards and Indicators:

## CEC Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences.

Special educators understand the effects that an exceptional condition2/ can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life. Special educators understand that the beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures can affect relationships among and between students, their families, and the school community. Moreover, special educators are active and resourceful in seeking to understand how primary language, culture, and familial backgrounds interact with the individual's exceptional condition to impact the individual's academic and social abilities, attitudes, values, interests, and career options. The understanding of these learning differences and their possible interactions provides the foundation upon which special educators individualize instruction to provide meaningful and challenging learning for individuals with ELN.

## CEC Standard 6: Language.

Special educators understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language. Special educators use individualized strategies to enhance language development and teach communication skills to individuals with ELN. Special educators are familiar with augmentative, alternative, and assistive technologies to support and enhance communication of individuals with exceptional needs. Special educators match their communication methods to an individual's language proficiency and cultural and linguistic differences. Special educators provide effective language models and they use communication strategies and resources to facilitate understanding of subject matter for individuals with ELN whose primary language is not English.

## CEC Standard 8: Assessment

Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and special educators use **multiple types of assessment information** for a variety of educational decisions. Special educators use the results of assessments to help identify exceptional learning needs and to develop and implement individualized instructional programs, as well as to adjust instruction in response to ongoing learning progress. Special educators understand the **legal policies and ethical principles of measurement and assessment** related to referral, eligibility, program planning, instruction, and placement for individuals with ELN, including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Special educators understand **measurement theory and practices** for addressing issues of validity, reliability, norms, bias, and interpretation of assessment results. In addition, special educators understand the appropriate **use and limitations** of various types of assessments. Special educators collaborate with families and other colleagues to assure **non-biased, meaningful assessments and decision-making**. Special educators conduct **formal and informal assessments** of behavior, learning, achievement, and environments to design learning experiences that support the growth and development of individuals with ELN. Special educators use assessment information to **identify supports and adaptations** required for individuals with ELN to access the general curriculum and to participate in school, system, and statewide assessment programs. Special educators **regularly monitor the progress** of individuals with ELN in general and special curricula. Special educators **use appropriate technologies** to support their assessments.

## CEC Standard 9: Professional and Ethical Practice.

Special educators are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards. Special educators practice in multiple roles and complex situations across wide age and developmental ranges. Their practice requires ongoing attention to **legal matters** along with serious professional and **ethical considerations**. Special educators engage in **professional activities** and participate in learning communities that benefit individuals with ELN, their families, colleagues, and their own professional growth. Special educators view themselves as **lifelong learners** and regularly reflect on and adjust their practice. Special educators are aware of how their own and others attitudes, behaviors, and ways of communicating can influence their practice. Special educators understand that culture and language can interact with exceptionalities, and are **sensitive to the many aspects of diversity** of individuals with ELN and their families. Special educators actively plan and engage in activities that foster their professional growth and keep them **current with evidence-based best practices.** Special educators know their own limits of practice and practice within them.

**RIPTS Standard 3:** Teachers create instructional opportunities that reflect an understanding of how children learn and develop.

- Teachers understand how students learn – how students construct knowledge, acquire skills, develop habits of mind, and acquire positive dispositions toward learning (3.1).
- Teachers design instruction that meets the current cognitive, social, and personal needs of their students (3.2).

**RIPTS Standard 4:** Teachers create instructional opportunities that reflect a respect for the diversity of learners and an understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning.

- Teachers design instruction that accommodates individual differences (e.g., stage of development, learning style, English language acquisition, learning disability) in approaches to learning. (4.1).
- Teachers use their understanding of students (e.g., individual interests, prior learning, cultural experiences) to create connections between the subject matter and student experiences. (4.2).
- Teachers seek information about the impact of students' specific challenges to learning or disabilities on classroom performance, and work with specialists to develop alternative instructional strategies to meet the needs of these students. (4.3)
- Teachers make appropriate accommodations (e.g., in terms of time and circumstances for work, tasks assigned) for individual students who have identified learning differences or needs in an Individual Educational Plan (IEP). (4.4)

**RIPTS Standard 8:** Teachers use effective communication as the vehicle through which students explore, conjecture, discuss, and investigate new ideas.
- Teachers use a variety of communication strategies (e.g., restating ideas, questioning, offering counter examples) to engage students in learning. (8.1).
- Teachers use a variety of modes of communication (e.g., verbal, visual, kinesthetic) to promote learning. (8.2).
- Teachers use technological advances in communication, including electronic means of collecting and sharing information, to enrich discourse in the classroom. (8.3)
- Teachers emphasize oral and written communication through the instructional use of discussion, listening and responding to the ideas of others, and group interaction. (8.4).

**RIPTS STANDARD 9:** Teachers use a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies to support the continuous development of the learner.
- Teachers use a variety of assessment strategies and instruments, (e.g., observation, portfolio, teacher made tests, self-assessments) that are aligned with instructional content and methodology (9.2).
- Teachers maintain records of student learning and communicate student progress to students, parents/guardians, and other colleagues (9.4).
- Teachers use information from their assessment of students to reflect on their own teaching and to modify their instruction (9.5).

**Product**

Provide the following information on the oral language of a child.
1. identify child with language problems, L.E.P., or child below age 6.
2. take and transcribe language sample of at least 30 utterances.
3. perform DSA, MLU, and "eye-balling" assessment techniques
4. summarize findings and evaluate the effectiveness of each technique for your subject
5. identify, with rationale, 3 priority areas
6. develop and describe plan to remediate top priority
7. provide a Xerox copy of language sample & DSA

The Oral Language Project Rubric (graded and signed by the professor) is included in the Preparing for Internship Portfolio.

# CEC Assessment #7: Additional Assessment

## Oral Language Artifact Rubric

### CEC Standards 3, 6, 8, 9

| Evidence/CEC Standard | Unacceptable | Developing | Acceptable | Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Description of Student** Candidate offers a clear description of the student in terms of: <br>• age and gender <br>• cultural/linguistic background <br>• primary language <br>• why chosen in terms of oral language concern, LEP, or developmental level <br>• Current school placement if applicable <br><br>**ICC3K1, ICC3K3** . | Candidate detailed description of the student and relevant oral language history is not provided or is lacking two or more of the required elements. | Candidate detailed description of the student and relevant oral language history is provided for all, except one of the required elements. | Candidate detailed description of the student and relevant oral language history are described for all required elements. | Candidate detailed description of the student and relevant oral language history are clearly and comprehensively described. |
| **2. Transcription of Oral Language Sample** Candidate's complete oral language sample transcribed from tapes is presented. It includes proper labeling of each party speaking during session. **ICC3K1, ICC3K3 ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2** | Candidate's transcription is not provided or does not follow the required format, or is incomplete. | Candidate's transcription is provided but has numerous format issues or omissions. | Candidate's transcription is provided but has minor format issues or omissions. | Candidate's transcription is provided using proper format and is complete. |

| Evidence/CEC Standard | Unacceptable | Developing | Acceptable | Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3. Developmental Sentence Scoring (DSA).** The candidate's DSA is provided, is correctly scored and graphed. It is evaluated in terms of its effectiveness as a tool for identifying the language needs of the subject. <br><br> **ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6** | Candidate's DSA or evaluation is not provided, or there are numerous scoring errors, or the evaluation does not demonstrate a reflective understanding of the process. | While provided, the candidate's DSA contains a few significant and minor errors in scoring.. The reflection on the results and the DSA process is weak or unclear. | Candidate's DSA contains few minor errors in scoring and the evaluation is clear and demonstrates understanding and reflection on the results and process. | Candidate's DSA scoring is virtually error free and the evaluation is very clear and demonstrates a significant understanding of the results and a solid reflection on the value of the process. |
| **4. Mean Length of Utterance (MLU)** The candidate's MLU is provided and is correctly scored. It is evaluated in terms of its effectiveness as a tool for identifying the language needs of the subject. <br><br> **ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6** | Candidate's MLU or evaluation is not provided, or there are numerous scoring errors, or the evaluation does not demonstrate a reflective understanding of the process. | While provided, the candidate's MLU contains a few significant and minor errors in scoring.. The reflection on the results and the MLU process is weak or unclear. | The candidate's MLU contains few minor errors in scoring and the evaluation is clear and demonstrates understanding and reflection on the results and process. | The candidate's MLU scoring is virtually error free and the evaluation is very clear and demonstrates a significant understanding of the results and a solid reflection on the value of the process. |
| **5. "Eyeballing" Technique** Candidate's results of using "eyeballing" to identify the subject's oral language strengths and weaknesses are presented | Candidate's results of the "eyeballing" technique or its evaluation is not provided, or the evaluation does not demonstrate a reflective understanding of | Candidate's results of the "eyeballing" technique and its evaluation are provided. The evaluation is weak or does not clearly demonstrate a reflective | Candidate's results of the "eyeballing" technique and its evaluation are provided. The evaluation is appropriate and demonstrate a reflective | Candidate's results of the "eyeballing" technique and its evaluation are provided. Both demonstrate excellent insight and reflection into the results and the process |

| Evidence/CEC Standard | Unacceptable | Developing | Acceptable | Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| and reflected upon.<br><br>**ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6** | the results or the process. | understanding of the results or the process. | understanding of the results and the process. | |
| **7.Remedial Plan**<br>Candidate's remedial plan is developed and described in detail for one of the top three oral language priority needs of the student.<br><br>**ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6** | Candidate does not present, or the plan described is lacking in sufficient detail, or does not address the identified problem in a manner likely to be successful. | Candidate's plan presented is generally appropriate to remediating the identified problem but lacks sufficient detail or clarity. | Candidate's plan presented is appropriate to the remediation of the identified problem with sufficient detail and clarity. | Candidate's plan presented is appropriate to the remediation of the identified problem with a high likelihood of success based on very clear understanding of the student's needs and strengths. |
| **8. Reflection**<br>The candidate presents a reflection on the benefits of the assignment to both the candidate and the student assessed.<br><br>**ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC9S1, ICC9S4, ICC9S6, ICC9S11** | Candidate's reflection is not provided or is limited in its discussion of the benefit to both the candidate and student. | Candidate's reflection is provided but lacks clarity or reflection in its discussion of the benefit to both the candidate and student.. | Candidate's reflection is provided and is clear and shows appropriate level of reflection in discussing the benefit to both the candidate and student. | Candidate's reflection is provided and is very clear and shows a highly appropriate level of reflection in on the benefit of the assignment to both the candidate and student. |

| Evidence/CEC Standard | Unacceptable | Developing | Acceptable | Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **9.Writing Convention and Format**<br>The entire report is evaluated in terms of organization, focus, relevance, spelling, grammar, appropriate use of professional language and vocabulary, and consistence adherence to the student's confidentiality.<br><br>**ICC9S1, ICC9S4, ICC9S6** | Candidate's report shows multiple errors in three or more of the categories: organization, focus, relevance, spelling, grammar, appropriate use of professional language and vocabulary, and confidentiality. | Candidate's report shows occasional errors in one or two of the categories: organization, focus, relevance, spelling, grammar, appropriate use of professional language and vocabulary, and confidentiality. | Candidate's report shows primarily correct usage in all of the categories: organization, focus, relevance, spelling, grammar, appropriate use of professional language and vocabulary, and confidentiality. | Candidate's report is consistently well organized, focused, relevant, error free in terms of spelling, grammar and use of professional language, and strictly adheres to the requirements for subject's confidentiality rights. |

**Student Name** _____ **Evaluation: Unacceptable** ___     **Developing** ___     **Acceptable** ___     **Target** ___

**Faculty Signature:** _____ **Date:** _____**ARTIFACT COURSE GRADE:**_____

**M.Ed. Program. in Mild/Moderate Disabilities (Elementary/Middle)**     **Assessment 7:**
**Data Table**

**Additional**

**Assessment**

### DATA TABLE
### Oral Language Project

| RUBRIC ELEMENTS | Spring 2008 n=23 | | | Spring 2009 n=24 | | | Fall 2010 n=16 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U/D | A | T | U/D | A | T | U/D | A | T |
| **Description of Student** ICC3K1, ICC3K3 | | | | 0% | 4% (1) | 96% (23) | 6% (1) | 31% (5) | 63% (10) |
| **Oral Language Sample** ICC3K1, ICC3K3 ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2 | | | | 0% | 46% (11) | 54% (13) | 6% (1) | 69% (11) | 25% (4) |
| **MLU Calculation** ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6 | | | | 0% | 46% (11) | 54% (13) | 6% (1) | 69% (11) | 25% (4) |
| **Eyeballing Technique** ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6 | | | | 4% (1) | 21% (5) | 75% (18) | 6% (1) | 38% (6) | 56% (9) |
| **Articulation Analysis** ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6 | | | | 4% (1) | 46% (11) | 50% (12) | 6% (1) | 69% (11) | 25% (4) |
| **Oral Language Deficits** ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6 | | | | 8% (2) | 33% (8) | 59% (14) | 6% (1) | 44% (7) | 50% (8) |
| **Remedial Plan** ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6 | | | | 8% (2) | 25% (6) | 67% (16) | 6% (1) | 31% (5) | 63% (10) |
| **Reflection** ICC6K2, IGC6K1, IGC6S2, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC9S1, ICC9S4, ICC9S6, ICC9S11 | | | | 8% (2) | 50% (12) | 42% (10) | 6% (1) | 19% (3) | 75% (12) |
| **Conventions** | | | | 0% | 41% | 59% | 6% | 31% | 63% |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ICC9S1, ICC9S4, ICC9S6, ICC9S11 | | | | | | (10) | (14) | | (1) | (5) | (10) | |
| **Overall Evaluation** | 8% (2) | 8% (2) | 84% (19) | | 0% | 25% (6) | 75% (18) | | 6% (1) | 31% (5) | 63% (10) | |