<div align="center">

CEC Assessment #8: Additional Assessment
Individualized Education Program (IEP)

</div>

a. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program
The Individualized Education Program (IEP) entry is completed during *SPED 662: Internship in the Elementary or Middle or Level*. The Individualized Education Program (IEP) artifact provides **graduate elementary/middle** teacher candidates' an authentic experience in creating an appropriate educational program for a student with exceptional learning needs. Special education teacher candidates must demonstrate competence in conducting educational assessments, writing present level academic and/or functional statements, annual goals, and short-term objectives. Evaluation procedures and other related components (e.g. Assistive Technology, accommodations, related services) with specific attention to the legal/ethical processes and regulations are necessary parts of this experience.

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.
Graduate elementary/middle teacher candidates work directly with students with exceptional learning needs during their internship in elementary or middle school programs. The IEP relates most directly to the following Council for Exceptional Children Standards #4, 7, 8, 9, 10.

CEC STANDARD 4: INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

How assessment aligns with CEC Standard #4: The IEP documents teacher candidates' ability to employ instructional strategy knowledge and skills in their design of appropriate educational programs for students with exceptional learning needs. **Graduate elementary/middle** teacher candidates must *select, adapt and use instructional strategies to promote positive learning results* for elementary or middle level students with disabilities. Candidates must employ evidence-based practices (**ICC4K1**) in their selection of *strategies and materials according to student characteristics* (**ICC4S3**). The aspect of the standard is assessed under rubric section: Introduction.

CEC STANDARD 7: INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING

How assessment aligns with CEC Standard #7: The IEP documents teacher candidates' knowledge and skills in instructional planning as they write Annual Goals and Short-Term Objectives based on state and local curricula guidelines (**ICC7K3**) for a student with exceptional learning needs. **Elementary/middle graduate** candidates develop individualized *annual goals and objectives based on the student's abilities/needs, the learning environment, and cultural/linguistic factors*. Clinical supervisors and cooperating teachers provide feedback about the IEP so that planning process is comprehensive and *collaborative* (**ICC7S2, IGC7S3**). IEPs are written with strong suggestion to incorporate *appropriate technologies* when possible. The aspect of the standard is assessed under rubric section: Annual Goals, Short-Term Objectives.

CEC STANDARD 8: ASSESSMENT

How assessment aligns with CEC Standard #8: In order to write IEPs for students with exceptional learning needs, **elementary/middle graduate** 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 (**ICC8K3, ICC8K5, ICC5S5**). Candidates are continually guided *by legal/ethical principles* and *best theory/practice* as they *make decisions* about *meaningful nonbiased assessments* for their students (**IGC8K2, ICC8S6, ICC8S9**). The aim is for candidates to collaboratively develop IEP goals/objectives for elementary or middle school students and report on results to families and relevant personnel (**ICC8S7**). Aspects of the standard are assessed under rubric sections: IEP, PLAAFP, Annual Goals, and Short-Term Objectives.

CEC STANDARD 9: Professional and Ethical Practice.

How assessment aligns with CEC Standard #9: In the IEP, **graduate elementary/middle** teacher candidates engage in important *professional activities that benefit individuals with exceptional learning needs, their families, colleagues and their own professional growth*. Candidates' development of constructive working relationships with families/colleagues and *participation in learning communities* that benefit students with exceptional learning needs is assessed in this entry (**ICC9S8**). Candidates must also demonstrate awareness of *legal/ethical considerations* and act with *sensitivity to the many aspects of diversity of individuals with exceptional learning needs and their families*

(**ICC9S1, ICC9S4**). Teacher candidates are offered opportunities to self-assess and encouraged to make plans for their own professional growth. Aspects of the standard are assessed in rubric sections: IEP, PLAAFP, Annual Goals, and Short-Term Objectives.

CEC STANDARD 10: Collaboration.

<u>How assessment aligns with CEC Standard #10</u>: In the IEP, **graduate elementary/middle** teacher candidates must effectively collaborate with *families, colleagues, and other related service providers/personnel in culturally responsive ways* (**ICC10K2, ICC10S2**). The IEP requires clinical supervisors and cooperating teachers to assess the candidate's ability to serve as a collaborative *resource to their colleagues* as they aim to better meet the needs of students with exceptional learning needs through individualized educational programs. This standard is assessed in rubric sections: Introduction, PLAAFP, Annual Goals, and Short-Term.

c. A brief analysis of the data findings;
Of the students in the **M.Ed. in Mild/Moderate Disabilities (Elementary/Middle)** since 2008, *all* teacher candidates (**n=17**) met standard (CEC standards 4, 7, 8, 9, & 10) by performing at the *Acceptable* or *Target* level on the overall analysis of the IEP. From Fall 2008 through Fall 2010, 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.

Since **Fall 2008**, all IEP data was collected on candidate performance at each component of the rubric to allow for greater analyses of **elementary/middle graduate** teacher candidate skills. It must be noted that there were no M.Ed. candidates eligible for internship in Fall 2009. Overall, no clear areas of weakness were identified in the analysis of data.

d. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards: Evaluation data on the IEP indicates that teacher candidates have met standards through a rubric that documents performance on CEC Standards 4, 7, 8, 9, & 10. Historically, the IEP (along with the entire Exit Portfolio), were completed by the teacher candidate during an 8-week internship. Candidates conducted formal/informal assessments, created present level statements, and developed IEP goals/objectives based on math, reading or writing, and/or functional issue. As of August 2009, all candidates must now complete a 16-week internship. As stated previously, all **elementary/middle graduate candidates** met standard by achieving "Acceptable" (or higher) at the rubric level on the following elements: Introduction; IEP, PLAAFP, Annual Goals, and Short-Term Objectives**.**

CEC Assessment #8: Additional Assessment
Department of Special Education Exit Portfolio
Individualized Education Program Entry

Purpose

The Individualized Education Program (IEP) artifact is designed to promote reflection, discussion, and decisions regarding the regulations, process and various components of an IEP. The project provides the opportunity for special education teacher candidates to demonstrate competence in educational assessment, writing present level statements, annual goals, evaluation procedures and other related components of the IEP for students with exceptional learning needs.

Standards Addressed

The following Rhode Island Professional Teacher Standards (RIPTS) and NCATE/Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) Standards are addressed through development of the IEP Entry.

R.I. Professional Teacher Standards	CEC Standards	Conceptual Framework
RIPTS Standard 4: Teachers create instructional opportunity that reflects a respect for the diversity of learners and an understanding of how students differ in their approach to learning.	**CEC Standard #4:** Instructional Strategies: Special educators possess a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs. **CEC Standard #7:** Instructional Planning: Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.	*Knowledge: Human Learning and Development, Diversity: Cultural Diversity; Pedagogy: Assessment*
RIPTS Standard 7: Teachers work collaboratively with school personnel, families and the broader community to create a professional learning community and environment that supports the improvement of teaching, learning and student achievement.	**CEC Standard #10:** Collaboration: Special educators routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways.	*Knowledge: Areas of Specialization; Pedagogy: Professional Practice*
RIPTS Standard 9: Teachers use appropriate formal and informal assessment strategies with individuals and groups of students to determine the impact of instruction on learning, to provide feedback and to plan for future instruction.	**CEC Standard #8:** Assessment: Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special education and special educators use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	*Knowledge: Area of Specialization, Knowledge: Reflective Problem Solving; Technology; Pedagogy: Assessment, Professional Practice*
RIPTS Standard 11: Teachers maintain professional standards guided by legal and ethical principles.	**CEC Standard #9:** Professional & Ethical Practice: Special educators are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	*Knowledge: Area of Specialization, Pedagogy: Professional Practice*

Process

Candidates collect and analyze assessment data on one student with exceptional learning needs as a basis for completing the IEP. Cultural and linguistic diversity and family issues must be considered with the analysis. Current regulations

Rev: Spring 2011

pertaining to IEP team membership, process and components are considered. Appropriate present level of academic and functional performance statements, goals, objectives, evaluation procedures and other IEP components are presented.

Product

Candidates develop a clearly organized Individualized Education Program Entry that includes all appropriate components consistent with the student's exceptional learning needs. The format of the IEP Entry is as follows:

Introductory Page
- A **ONE-PAGE** strength-based summary of the student's strengths and needs in separate paragraphs
- Describe the student inclusive of age, gender, disability label, dominant language, and language of the home.
- Summary includes brief statement of data sources (e.g. CBA, Woodcock-Johnson, etc) that contribute to strength and need statements
- A final sentence indicates the need for specific goals/objectives that are indicated in the IEP.

Individual Education Program (formal RIDE approved document)
The IEP must include the following information*:
- **Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance statements (PLAAFPs)** are indicated in the appropriate strengths and needs sections in strength-based terms. <u>Academic areas</u> can include English-Language Arts (reading recognition, reading comprehension, listening comprehension, written expression), mathematical calculation, mathematical applications, other academic areas (science and/or social studies). <u>Functional areas</u> can include organizational skills, behavioral skills, social skills, activities for daily living, communication access skills and vocational skills.
- Areas to be covered in IEP are clearly indicated.
- A **baseline statement (with chart/graph when appropriate)** is made that directly corresponds with the Annual Goal and Short-term Objectives. This statement is made in positive terms (e.g. what the student can do now?) rather than in what they cannot do yet. This statement also includes data sources as well.
- At least **THREE measureable Annual Goals (AGs)—TWO focused on Academic need; ONE based on functional challenges;** that directly relate to the present level statements.
- GLEs, GSEs, and AAGSEs are referenced underneath AGs.
- **Short-term Objectives (STOs—at least 4/goal)** that are observable and measurable
- Progress Monitoring and Evaluation Criteria and Procedures clearly stated that directly relates to baseline statement.
- Accommodations of coursework and modifications of programs are listed (when appropriate)
- State/District Testing Accommodation page is filled out as appropriate. This page corresponds with the Accommodations section information.
- Technology considerations are made
- Special Education Services (amount of time/degree of service) indicated
- Related Services (when appropriate)
- Headers are filled out with appropriate name, meeting date, and dates of IEP year
- If extended school year services are not warranted then dates must be written accordingly (e.g. 10/1/10-6/15/11; 8/30/11-9/30/11)

Submission Information

For Graduate Candidates Only: The IEP Entry is completed during the special education internship under the supervision of the Cooperating Teacher and the RIC Supervisor. The Exit Portfolio must include the IEP rubric completed by the RIC Supervisor.

*IEP Entry components may be changed based on state and federal changes in IEP requirements

Rev: Spring 2011

INDICATORS	EVIDENCE	UNACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	ACCEPTABLE	**Target**
INTRODUCTION Candidate provides a context for designing an appropriate IEP that provides the current cognitive, social, and personal needs of their student in strength-based language. **(RIPTS 4, CEC 4, 10; Knowledge: Reflective Problem Solving; Pedagogy: Professional Practice)**	A **one page** introduction to the IEP is provided that respects the confidentiality of the subject. Content summarizes relevant school history, cultural/ linguistic background, and current cognitive and personal/social needs of the subject. Student's strengths and needs are identified using strength-based language separately. Briefly states data sources. Professional language is used in terms of spelling, punctuation and grammar in this introduction, <u>and</u> throughout the IEP.	Candidate's introduction is missing or inadequate, and/or -violates confidentiality, and/or - fails significantly to meet the requirements of professional language.	Candidate's introduction lacks clarity, strength-based language, and/or -violates student confidentiality, and/or - contains more than two errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar.	Candidate's introduction is professionally written, informative and strength-based. Demonstrates respect for the confidentiality of student. There are no more than three errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar.	Candidate's introduction is highly informative, clearly written, and succinctly summarizes all key student information in strength-based terms. Introduction demonstrates respect for the student's confidentiality, and is free from stylistic errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar. **ICC4K1, ICC4S3, ICC10S2**
IEP Candidate uses a variety of formal/informal assessment strategies and instruments that are aligned with instructional content and methodology. **(RIPTS 9, 11; CEC 8, 9; Knowledge: Technology)**	An appropriate RIDE approved **ELEMENTARY IEP** form is used. All applicable components, including evaluation criteria, transition plans, special and related services are completed.	Candidate does not use an appropriate form, and /or major required components of the **ELEMENTARY IEP** are incomplete, and/or contain incorrect information or content elements.	Candidate uses an appropriate IEP form. Some minor components of the **ELEMENTARY IEP** are incomplete, and/or contain incorrect information or content elements.	Candidate uses the appropriate IEP form is used, and **all** required components of the **ELEMENTARY IEP** are completed and include correct information or content.	Candidate uses the appropriate IEP form is used, and **all** required components of the **ELEMENTARY IEP** are completed and include correct information or content. **ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K5, ICC8S7, ICC8S9; ICC9S1, ICC9S4**
IEP Present Level Statements **(RIPTS 4, 7, 9; CEC 7, 8, 9, 10; Knowledge: Reflective Problem Solving; Pedagogy: Assessment, Professional Practice)**	Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance Statements (PLAAFPs) are written in three separate areas: 2 academic and 1 functional concern . Each PLAAFP must include – -clearly stated specific behaviors, description of the measurement conditions, -levels of proficiency, are stated positively in parent friendly, strength-based language.	Candidate's PLAAFPs are described ambiguously without a clear reference to GLEs, GSEs, or AAGSEs -major components of the PLAAFPs format are missing or inaccurate, and/or one or both PLAAFPs are missing.	Candidate's PLAAFPs are included; but one or both are insufficiently provided in terms of the required components.	Candidate's PLAAFPs are included and all required components are included, and are accurately written.	Candidate's PLAAFPs are included and address important areas of academic/functional need. All required components are included and are written clearly in objective and measurable terms. **ICC7S2, IGC8K3, ICC8S5, ICC8S9; ICC9S4, ICC9S8, ICC10K2, ICC10S2**

Rev: Spring 2011

INDICATORS	EVIDENCE	UNACCEPTABLE	DEVELOPING	ACCEPTABLE	Target
Annual Goals **(RIPTS 4, 7, 9; CEC 7, 8, 9, 10; Knowledge: Reflective Problem Solving; Pedagogy: Assessment, Professional Practice)**	**TWO Annual Academic Goals and ONE Functional Goal (AGs) that** are written and are consistent with the PLAAFPs for the IEP subject. Grade Level Expectations (GLEs), Grade Span Expectations (GSEs) **or** Alternate Assessment Grade Span Expectations (AAGSEs) are referenced and embedded in goal statements. **Functional goal includes the functional target performance and measurability.**	Candidate has at least one AG missing which does not correspond in an appropriate way to the subject's PLAAFPs. AGs are unclear (not observable or measurable) and/or unreasonable. **Target performance in functional AG not appropriate to student needs.**	Candidate's AGs are present but may not correspond in all ways to the subject's PLAAFPs. AGs are *somewhat* unclear (not observable or measurable) and/or unreasonable. No reference made to GLEs, GSEs, **or** AAGSEs. **Target performance in functional AG is not clearly related to student needs.**	Candidate's AGs are present and correspond appropriately to the subject's PLAAFPs. AGs are observable, measurable, and reasonable. GLEs, GSEs, **or** AAGSEs are checked and somewhat embedded. **Target performance in functional AG is related to student needs.**	Candidate's AGs are present and correspond in all ways to the subject's PLAAFPs. AGs are exceptionally written. They are observable, measurable, with clear criteria and reasonably address the learning needs of the student. GLEs, GSEs, **or** AAGSEs are accurately checked and are fully embedded. **Target performance in functional AG is fully related to student needs and is clearly measurable.** **ICC7K3, ICC7S2, IGC7S3, ICC8S6, ICC9S4, ICC10K2, ICC10S2**
Short-Term Objectives (or Benchmarks) **(RIPTS 4, 7, 9; CEC 7, 8, 9, 10; Knowledge: Reflective Problem Solving; Pedagogy: Assessment, Professional Practice)**	**Short Term Objectives (STOs) or Benchmarks** are written in a manner that directly connects the PLAAFPs to the AGs. STOs are sequential and logical in content (measurable, observable with criterion). A minimum of 4/goal (quarterly) STOs must be provided.	Candidate's STOs are missing, and/ or -there is little, or no connection between the PLAAFPs and the AGs, and/or -fewer than 4 STOs are presented.	Candidate offers fewer than 4 STOs. Although there may be a connection between the PLAAFPs and AGs, the connection has weaknesses in content, criteria, sequence or logic.	Candidate's STOs are written in a manner that generally connects the PLAAFPs to the AGs. STOs are sequential, demonstrate some criteria for judgment, and are mostly logical in content. A minimum of 4/goal (quarterly) STOs are provided	Candidate's STOs are written in a manner that specifically connects the PLAAFPs to the AGs. STOs have an evident content sequence, criteria for judgment, and logic. A minimum of 4/goal (quarterly) STOs are provided **ICC7S2, IGC7S3, ICC8S6, ICC9S4, ICC10K2, ICC10S2**

Candidate's Name _____

Evaluation: Unacceptable ____   Developing ____   Acceptable _____   Target ____

SPED 662 Instructor's Signature: _____   Date: _____   (Elementary Page 2 of 2)

Rev: Spring 2011

DATA TABLE
Individualized Education Program

	Fall 2008 n=5			Spring 2009 n=2			Fall 2009 n=0			Spring 2010 n=2		
	U/D	A	T	U/D	A	T	U/D	A	T	U/D	A	T
Introduction		40% (2)	60% (3)		50% (1)	50% (1)					50% (1)	50% (1)
IEP Form		100% (5)	0% (0)		100% (2)	0% (0)					100% (2)	0% (0)
Present Level of Academic and Functional Performance (PLAAFP)		60% (3)	40% (2)		100% (2)	0% (0)					0% (0)	100% (2)
Annual Goals		80% (4)	20% (1)		100% (2)	0% (0)					0% (0)	100% (2)
Short-Term Objectives		80% (4)	20% (1)		50% (1)	50% (1)					0% (0)	100% (2)
Overall Evaluation		80% (4)	20% (1)		100% (2)	0% (0)		0% (0)	0% (0)		50% (1)	50% (1)

U=Unacceptable   D=Developing   A=Acceptable   T=Target

Rev: Spring 2011

DATA TABLE
Individualized Education Program

	Summer 2010 n=4			Fall 2010 n=4			Spring 2011 n=			Summer 2011 n=		
	U/D	A	T	U/D	A	T	U/D	A	T	U/D	A	T
Introduction		25% (1)	75% (3)		25% (1)	75% (3)						
IEP Form		100% (4)	0% (0)		100% (4)	0% (0)						
Present Level of Academic and Functional Performance (PLAAFP)		25% (1)	75% (3)		25% (1)	75% (3)						
Annual Goals		50% (2)	50% (2)		25% (1)	75% (3)						
Short-Term Objectives		50% (2)	50% (2)		25% (1)	75% (3)						
Overall Evaluation		50% (2)	50% (2)		25% (1)	75% (3)						

U=Unacceptable   D=Developing   A=Acceptable   T=Target

Rev: Spring 2011