

CEC ASSESSMENT #6: ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT
ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATION (SPED 525)

a. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program

The Analysis of Communication is completed during SPED 525: Development of Communication and Movement. The assessment demonstrates that teacher candidates have an understanding of language differences and can use this knowledge of receptive and expressive communication in program planning, lesson development, collaboration, and assessment.

b. A description of how this assessment aligns with CEC Standards.

Teacher candidates observe a young child with disabilities who presents with a significant challenge in language and communication. Teacher candidates use observation and a complete review of educational records to 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 Analysis of Communication relates directly to the following CEC Standards.

CEC Standard #3: Individual Learning Differences.

Teacher candidates observe a child with disabilities and a significant challenge in language and communication. The student's strengths and areas of challenge are presented to provide an overview of the student's academic, social, and learning abilities (ICC3K1-K2, ICC3K5-K3). Teacher candidates provide a description of a student with diverse language and special needs. To document the effect of their disability on communication, teacher candidates complete a full language sample, mapping the student's communication in terms of function, form, antecedents, consequences, communicative partners, and referent. The student's language history is described and a current analysis of the student's level of spoken language (identifying student's mean length of utterance). The student's home environment, family members, other home-based communicative partners (transition coordinators, health professional support, behavioral support personnel, are described to provide a full view of the student's potential for communication growth and opportunity for practice (ICC3K4, ICC3K3).

CEC Standard #6: Language.

The student's strengths and areas of challenge are presented to provide an overview of the student's academic, social, and learning abilities. Teacher candidates provide a description of a student with diverse language and special needs (ICC6K1-K2). To document the effect of their disability on communication, teacher candidates complete a full language sample, mapping the student's communication in terms of function, form, antecedents, consequences, communicative partners, and referent. Teacher candidates identify assistive technology, specialized equipment, augmentative communication supports (ICC6K4, ICC6K2). Teaching strategies and a plan for instruction are identified to match student abilities and preferences, and consider family needs to extend learning to home environments (ICC6S1-S2, IIC6S1-S3).

c. Brief analysis of data findings.

Fall 2007-Fall 2008: SPED 525: Development of Communication and Movement is a course taken by teacher candidates in two programs: the M.Ed. in Special Education: Severe/Profound Disabilities and in the M.Ed. in Early Childhood Special Education. For the first two years of data collection, these two programs were combined in data results. In the Fall 2009, the data was separated for individual reporting by program. All teacher candidates met standard (CEC standards 3 and 6) by performing at the Acceptable or Target level on the overall analysis of the Communication Inventory. In the Fall 2008, further data was collected on candidate performance at each component of the rubric. Data indicates that all teacher candidates met standard (Acceptable) or higher (Target) on most aspects of the Analysis of Communication.

d. An interpretation of how data provide evidence for meeting standards.

The language/communication sample required of students in this course demonstrate their knowledge of language differences, delays, alternative communication strategies, and of the influence of environmental factors (e.g. curriculum design, peer language models, adult language models) on language acquisition. The product that students prepare coincides with CEC Standard 3 (Learning Differences) and 6 (Language).

CEC Assessment #6: Additional Assessment
GUIDANCE FOR ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATION (SPED 525)

Purpose

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

Standards

This communication project relates most directly to the following Council for Exceptional Children Standards:

CEC Standard #3: Individual Learning Differences.

Special educators understand the effects that an exceptional condition 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, and interests. 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.

Product

Observe a child who has a suspected or identified language/communication impairment.

Provide an overview of the student including:

- a. primary language, culture, and familial backgrounds interact with the individual's exceptional condition
- b. how the student's exceptional condition affects the student's learning

Document the language experience by fully completing the communication matrix form provided in class. (40 communication acts)

- c. Translate the information from the communication matrix onto the dot matrix communication form
- d. In paragraph form, define, describe, graph, and summarize the child's communication in regards to:
 - variety and dominance of different pragmatic intents (include the dot matrix)
 - variety and dominance of semantic function
 - mean length of utterance (include the formula used)
 - nonverbal, verbal, and vocal behaviors (include a graph)
 - summary of antecedents/consequences which facilitate communication attempts

Estimate the child's general communication age using the stages provided in class, compare/contrast this information with the child's MLU and support by examples from your observation.

Provide short-term objectives: What you might expect the child to achieve over the next year?

Describe possible age-appropriate instructional strategies, communication systems (in detail), and intervention techniques with related resources on best-practices that could facilitate this child's language/communication growth in both receptive and expressive communication. Identify 3 research articles related to best practice as it applies to this student

CEC Assessment #6: Analysis of Communication

PROFESSIONALISM OF PAPER

	BELOW STANDARD			ACCEPTABLE	TARGET
	1 Unacceptable	2 Developing		3 Acceptable	4 Target
Candidate's Professionalism in Written Report	<input type="checkbox"/> Information is extremely difficult to read based on errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing skills convey information but has errors noted below detract from clarity of expression		<input type="checkbox"/> Good writing skills <input type="checkbox"/> Some errors are noted below	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent writing skills <input type="checkbox"/> Paper is organized and looks professional
	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor sentence structure used <input type="checkbox"/> Acronyms are not defined	<input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 errors of spelling <input type="checkbox"/> Run-on sentences <input type="checkbox"/> Sentence Fragments	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent use of past/present/future tenses within a paragraph	<input type="checkbox"/> "chatty" phrases used/use of non-professional language	<input type="checkbox"/> Not concisely worded <input type="checkbox"/> Ideas are difficult to follow in some areas
	<input type="checkbox"/> Margins are irregular <input type="checkbox"/> Line spacing is irregular	<input type="checkbox"/> Font size is too small or too large for professional look	<input type="checkbox"/> Areas of paper are not clearly defined using headers <input type="checkbox"/> Paper not clasped	<input type="checkbox"/> Pages not numbered <input type="checkbox"/> Page breaks occur in odd places	<input type="checkbox"/> Print is difficult in areas/smudges found

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENT'S COMMUNICATION: OVERVIEW OF STUDENT

Areas of Analysis	Unacceptable	Developing	Acceptable	Target
<p>Overview of student's strengths and areas of challenge; additional information affecting communication and learning</p> <p><i>Confidentiality MUST be maintained in describing the student (CEC 3, 6)</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Information was not found in this area	<input type="checkbox"/> The matrix provides very brief overview of the child's communication. <input type="checkbox"/> Information provide a cursory level of analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> The overview provides a general overview of the student. Information is supported with some examples. <input type="checkbox"/> Tone of this section is primarily strength-based <input type="checkbox"/> Information is provided in communication with some information on effect on learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> The overview provides a complete overview of the student. Information is supported with examples. <input type="checkbox"/> Tone of this section is extremely strength-based in both areas of strength and areas of need. <input type="checkbox"/> Information is provided in both communication and additional learning challenges

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENT'S COMMUNICATION: COMMUNICATION MATRIX

Areas of Analysis	Unacceptable	Developing	Acceptable	Target
<p>Communication Matrix has analysis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Referent <input type="checkbox"/> Antecedents <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Communication Act</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Consequences <input type="checkbox"/> Pragmatic Function <input type="checkbox"/> Semantic Meaning <p><i>Confidentiality MUST be maintained in describing the student</i> (CEC 3, 6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Information was not found in these areas <input type="checkbox"/> Information was incorrect or did not conform with project guidelines <p style="text-align: center;">0 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The matrix provides an overview of the child's diversity of communication. <input type="checkbox"/> Entries provide a cursory level of analysis: Entries were often incorrect or missing <p style="text-align: center;">2 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The matrix provides a detailed "snapshot" of the child's diversity of communication <input type="checkbox"/> All sections are completed <input type="checkbox"/> Entries indicate an adequate understanding of each area, <i>although some errors are noted</i> <input type="checkbox"/> A few entries are unclear and would benefit from further information <p style="text-align: center;">4 5 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The matrix provides a detailed "snapshot" of the child's diversity of communication <input type="checkbox"/> All sections are complete. <input type="checkbox"/> Entries indicate an excellent understanding of all areas of analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Additional information has been included for Communication Acts that are unclear. <p style="text-align: center;">7</p>

WRITTEN SUMMARY OF THE CHILD'S COMMUNICATION				
Areas of Analysis	Unacceptable	Developing	Acceptable	Target
Analysis of Verbal/Non-verbal Communication (CEC 3, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Written summary is extremely limited in scope or not found. <input type="checkbox"/> No examples are included 0 1	Written summary: <input type="checkbox"/> Examples used to support the areas of verbal and non-verbal communication are defined but not taken from the communication inventory <input type="checkbox"/> No discussion of the balance of verbal and non-verbal communication is found. 2 3	Written summary: <input type="checkbox"/> includes a short definition of verbal communication and non-verbal communication <input type="checkbox"/> describes the percentage of verbal and non-verbal communication used by the child with limited or no description of whether this breakdown is typical <input type="checkbox"/> Some examples are provided directly from the matrix but both verbal and non-verbal may not be included 4 5 6	Written summary <input type="checkbox"/> includes a full definition of verbal, vocal, and non-verbal communication <input type="checkbox"/> describes the percentage of verbal, vocal, and non-verbal communication used by the child with a statement describing whether this breakdown is typical. <input type="checkbox"/> Examples are provided (with the context for the communication), taken directly from the matrix on how the child uses the three types of communication 7
Analysis of Pragmatic Function (CEC 3, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Written summary is extremely limited in scope or not found. <input type="checkbox"/> No examples are included 0 1	Written summary: <input type="checkbox"/> Examples used to support the areas pragmatic functions are not correct <input type="checkbox"/> No discussion of the breadth of pragmatic functions used 2 3	Written summary: <input type="checkbox"/> includes a short definition of pragmatic function <input type="checkbox"/> describes the 5 most frequent pragmatic functions used by the child with limited information describing the breadth or limitations associated with the child's pragmatic use this breakdown is typical <input type="checkbox"/> Some examples are provided directly from the matrix in some pragmatic functions 4 5 6	Written summary <input type="checkbox"/> includes a full definition of pragmatic function <input type="checkbox"/> describes the 5 most frequent pragmatic functions used by the child with a detailed statement describing the breadth or limitations associated with the child's pragmatic use <input type="checkbox"/> Examples are provided directly from the matrix (with the context for the communication) on how the child demonstrates each of the top 5 pragmatic functions. 7
Analysis of Semantic Function (CEC 3, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Written summary is extremely limited in scope or not found. <input type="checkbox"/> No examples are included 0 1	Written summary: <input type="checkbox"/> Examples used to support the areas semantic meaning are not correct <input type="checkbox"/> No discussion of the breadth of semantic meaning used 2 3	Written summary: <input type="checkbox"/> includes a short definition of semantic meaning <input type="checkbox"/> describes the 5 most frequent semantic meaning used by the child with limited information describing the breadth or limitations associated with the child's pragmatic use this breakdown is typical <input type="checkbox"/> Some examples are provided directly from the matrix in some semantic meaning 4 5 6	Written summary <input type="checkbox"/> includes a full definition of semantic meaning <input type="checkbox"/> describes the 5 most frequent semantic meaning used by the child with a detailed statement describing the breadth or limitations associated with the child's semantic use <input type="checkbox"/> Examples are provided directly from the matrix (with the context for the communication) on how the child demonstrates each of the top 5 semantic meaning 7

WRITTEN SUMMARY OF THE CHILD'S COMMUNICATION - Continued				
Areas of Analysis	Unacceptable	Developing	Acceptable	Target
Mean Length of Utterance (CEC 3, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/> No information on MLU is included 0 1	<input type="checkbox"/> The MLU has been calculated but the formula is not present <input type="checkbox"/> For students without verbal communication, this information has been briefly mentioned 2 3	<input type="checkbox"/> Mean length of utterance is defined, is calculated, with the formula included <input type="checkbox"/> For students without verbal communication) a description of why the MLU is not calculated has been included 4 5 6	<input type="checkbox"/> Mean length of utterance is defined, has been calculated, with the formula included <input type="checkbox"/> A description of how this MLU compares to the expected age range for this child is included <input type="checkbox"/> (For students without verbal communication) a description of why the MLU is not calculated has been included 7
Summary of Antecedents and Consequences (CEC 3, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information on antecedents and consequences was found but it is extremely limited in scope. 0 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Antecedents and consequences are listed, with little information on how this child uses them for communication. 2 3	<input type="checkbox"/> Antecedents and consequences are described although limited information is provided regarding how they relate to student communication 4 5 6	<input type="checkbox"/> A description of antecedents, consequences included a definition and examples from the communication matrix. <input type="checkbox"/> A summary of the types of antecedents and consequences that result in communication have been described with examples. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on how these relate to communication are described fully (cue dependent, initiation) 7
ESTIMATION OF CHILD'S COMMUNICATION AGE:				
Areas of Analysis	Unacceptable	Developing	Acceptable	Target
(1) Communication Age <input type="checkbox"/> Compare MLU & Communication Matrix & Stages of Communications (select stage & explain rationale) <input type="checkbox"/> Compare all three findings (CEC 3, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information on the child's stage of communication is extremely limited in scope. 0 1	<input type="checkbox"/> The stage of communication is described. Few examples support this conclusion 2 3	<input type="checkbox"/> The stage of communication is described with some examples present to support this conclusion. 4 5 6	<input type="checkbox"/> A full definition of the general stage of this child's communication is included comparing the three areas of analysis. <input type="checkbox"/> An extensive description of the "cues" this child demonstrates from a communication stage is addressed with examples taken from the matrix <input type="checkbox"/> Discrepancies between the three areas of analysis are discussed. 7

SHORT TERM EXPECTATION				
Areas of Analysis	Unacceptable	Developing	Acceptable	Target
Short Term Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> 2 short term objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Rationale why objectives were chosen <input type="checkbox"/> How they would assist communication/ and/or QOL (CEC 3, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Little information has been included to support a direction for changes in this child's communication.	<input type="checkbox"/> Short term expectation are described but in very general terms. <input type="checkbox"/> A cursory rational is included.	<input type="checkbox"/> Short term expectations are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> A rationale for these suggestions has been included but how the changes will affect the student is not evident.	<input type="checkbox"/> Short term expectations are described in detail. <input type="checkbox"/> A rationale has been included as to why these suggestions could assist the student increase meaningful communication.
	0 1	2 3	4 5 6	7

EDUCATIONAL SUPPORTS/ COMMUNICATION PROGRAM - Worth Double Points				
Areas of Analysis	Unacceptable	Developing	Acceptable	Target
Next Steps: <input type="checkbox"/> Special equipment/ materials <input type="checkbox"/> Assistive Technology <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the proposed communication instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching strategies and detail of communication instr. (2 settings) (CEC 3, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Little information has been included to support changes in this child's educational program.	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional strategies, communication systems, or intervention techniques are described but detail is lacking. <input type="checkbox"/> A cursory rational is included.	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional strategies, communication systems, or intervention techniques are described with adequate detail and encompass areas of both receptive and expressive communication. <input type="checkbox"/> A rationale for these suggestions has been included but how the changes will affect the student may not be evident.	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional strategies, communication systems, or intervention techniques are described in detail and encompass areas of both receptive and expressive communication. <input type="checkbox"/> A rationale has been included as to how these suggestions could assist the student increase communication.
	0 2	4 6	8 10 12	14

Name _____

Grade: _____

Evaluation of Analysis of Communication

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unacceptable/Developing	Acceptable	Target

Data Table
M.Ed. in Early Childhood Special Education
Assessment #6: Additional Assessment: Analysis of Communication

	Fall 2007 n=30			Fall 2008 n=24			Fall 2009 n=6			Fall 2010 n=		
	U/D	A	T	U/D	A	T	U/D	A	T	U/D	A	T
Professionalism				0%	4% (1)	96% (23)		33% (2)	67% (4)			
Overview of student (CEC 3,6)								50% (3)	50% (3)			
Communication Matrix (CEC 3,6)				0%	46% (11)	54% (13)		33% (2)	67% (4)			
Type of Communication (CEC 3,6)				0%	46% (11)	54% (13)			100% (6)			
Pragmatic Functions (CEC 3,6)				4% (1)	21% (5)	75% (18)			100% (6)			
Semantic Meaning (CEC 3,6)				4% (1)	46% (11)	50% (12)		33% (2)	67% (4)			
Mean Length of Utterance (CEC 3,6)				8% (2)	33% (8)	59% (14)	20% (1)	80% (5)				
Antecedents/Consequences (CEC 3,6)				8% (2)	25% (6)	67% (16)		67% (4)	33% (2)			
Communication Age (CEC 3,6)				8% (2)	50% (12)	42% (10)		100% (6)				
Short Term Expectations (CEC 3,6)				0%	42% (10)	59% (14)		33% (2)	67% (4)			
Teaching Communication (CEC 3,6)				4% (1)	42% (10)	54% (13)		33% (2)	67% (4)			
Overall Evaluation	0%	43% (13)	57% (17)	0%	25% (6)	75% (18)		20% (1)	80% (5)			