### Rhode Island College
### Feinstein School of Education and Human Development
### Department of Special Education

**SPED 501** <u>**Advanced Assessment of Children and Youth with Mild/Moderate Learning and Behavior Problems**</u> **(3 credits)**

**Required Text:**
Taylor, R. L. (2009). Assessment of Exceptional Students: Educational and Psychological Procedures, 8th Ed., Pearson, Boston.
Additional readings will be assigned during the semester and will be available as class handouts, on the Blackboard system, or through the Internet or RIC library system.

**Prerequisite***: SPED 300 or equivalents. Offered Spring.*

**Catalog Description**: Experienced teachers develop skills in diagnostic assessment of the academic and behavioral abilities of children and adolescents with disabilities.
*3 credit hours.*

**Extended Description:** This course builds upon and extends special educators' knowledge and skills in the assessment of students with disabilities. Participants examine philosophical and theoretical premises of current assessment practices (including Response to Intervention), review legal and ethical considerations in assessment (including ways of making assessment culturally and linguistically appropriate), discuss required assessment accommodations, and explore varied assessment approaches (observation, interviews, formal and informal testing, dynamic, criterion-referenced, performance and portfolio assessment). The course focuses on all phases of educational decision-making for students with disabilities and the design of state-of-the-art, assessment-based individualized educational programs. Participants also explore ways of using technology, meaningfully including parents, and collaborating with other school- and community-based professionals in the assessment process.

### Relationship of this course to the Professional Education Program
This course is an advanced assessment course in the teacher preparation program. Building upon the foundational knowledge acquired in the undergraduate program, the course is designed to extend teachers' assessment knowledge and skills for children and youth with disabilities. An ecological approach to assessment is emphasized, as well as the relationship of accurate assessment to effective instruction, the importance of data-based educational decision-making, and ways of using technology to select appropriate assessment tools, communicate with other assessment specialists, administer and score assessments, store and report assessment results.

### Relationship to the Conceptual Framework of the FSEHD:
*As a required course in the professional preparation program, this course relates to the knowledge base in the following ways:*

1. When conducting assessments of learners with special needs, Reflective Practitioners plan, interpret, and improvise according to both the situation in which they find themselves and dynamic principles gleaned from formal study, their own experience, and collaboration with others. They draw upon knowledge and theory in conducting assessments that is both experience-based and research-based. **[KNOWLEDGE: Domain-Specific Knowledge, Contextual Perspective]**

2    Reflective Practitioners demonstrate a wide range of knowledge of assessment instruments and select appropriately for varying assessment purposes consistent with students' characteristics. **[KNOWLEDGE: Domain Specific Knowledge; PRACTICE: Professional Practice]**

3.   Reflective Practitioners collect and analyze data for assessing students' needs, report this data competently, and use it effectively and efficiently for maximum student benefits**. [PRACTICE: Evidence-based Decision Making]**

4.   Reflective Practitioners demonstrate competency in providing feedback to parents and other professionals to further enhance student growth. **[PRACTICE: Evidence-based Decision Making]**

5.   Reflective Practitioners demonstrate knowledge of instructional technology and appropriate methods used in instruction, assessment, and professional productivity.   **[PRACTICE: Technology Use]**

6.   Reflective Practitioners appreciate, accommodate, and advocate for students' and families' distinctive needs.  They create instructional opportunities that reflect a respect for the diversity of learners and an understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning.  In conducting assessments of students, they consider students' cultural, linguistic, experiential and ability backgrounds in the selection of assessment instruments and approaches and in the interpretation of data **[KNOWLEDGE: Contextual Perspective]**

7.   Reflective Practitioners abide by principles of conduct in planning, implementing and interpreting non-discriminatory evaluations of students, reflect on their actions and take responsibility for the consequences.  **[KNOWLEDGE:  Professional Awareness]**


## COURSE OUTCOMES:

By the end of this course students will be able to:

1)   Apply the Planning, Acting and Reflecting (PAR) approach to the assessment of students with disabilities (e.g. understand the relationship between accurate student assessment and effective instruction, etc.).   **(PRACTICE: Evidence-based Decision Making)** CEC: Assessment,  *RIPTS Standard 9: Assessment*

2)   Develop a critical perspective on assessment policies and practices.  Explore basic issues related to the equitable and fair assessment of diverse learners, including the legal provisions and regulations that apply, and discuss the positive and negative effects of assessment policies and practices on learners and their families. **(KNOWLEDGE: Contextual Perspective)**  CEC: Assessment *,  RIPTS Standard 9: Assessment*

3)   Understand the Response to Intervention (RTI) paradigm and how to use on-going progress monitoring (i.e. probes) to support learning and to identify students with special needs through a data-based, decision-making approach. **(KNOWLEDGE: Domain Specific Knowledge)**  CEC: Assessment, Instructional Planning*,  RIPTS Standard 9: Assessment; Standard 11: Professional Standards*

4)   Understand the purposes for and uses of formal and informal assessment approaches with children and youth with disabilities (pre-referral, entitlement decisions, instructional planning, and accountability). **(KNOWLEDGE: Domain Specific Knowledge)**  CEC: Assessment*,  RIPTS Standard 9: Assessment*

5)   Develop skill in the use of alternative assessment approaches (classroom and curriculum-based, authentic, performance, and portfolio assessment) for the assessment of reading, oral and written language, spelling, handwriting, mathematics, content-area subjects, study skills and transition

readiness. (**KNOWLEDGE: Domain Specific Knowledge)** CEC: Assessment, *RIPTS Standard 9: Assessment*

6) Administer, score, and interpret various informal and formal assessment instruments. Offer students test-taking strategies to enhance their test performance; maintain records, and use the data collected to develop a learning plan for a child or youth exhibiting learning and/or behavioral problems. **(KNOWLEDGE: Domain Specific Knowledge, PRACTICE: Evidence-based Decision Making)** CEC: Assessment, Instructional Strategies, *RIPTS Standard 9: Assessment*

7) Explore ways of employing technology in assessment. **(PRACTICE: Technology Use)** *RIPTS Standard 9: Assessment*

8) Develop strategies for meaningfully including students and parents of diverse backgrounds, of reporting results, and collaborating with other school- and community-based professionals in the assessment process. **(KNOWLEDGE: Contextual Perspective, Professional Awareness)** CEC: Collaboration, *RIPTS Standard 7: Collaboration, RIPTS Standard 4: Instructional Planning*

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS**: [Cross-referenced to course objectives as listed above]

A. The completion of all assigned readings from the required text and any additional readings distributed. [all objectives]

B. Attendance at and participation in all class sessions. Come prepared each week to discuss the assigned readings. Visit all assigned websites that correspond to the topics of the course. [all objectives]

C. Completion of the following assignments:

1. **Response to Intervention Investigation.** [1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7] CEC#8: Assessment; **KNOWLEDGE: Metacognitive Knowledge**. Locate three research articles on the topic and visit one website listed under Web resources. Write a paper summarizing your learning and discussing how you will apply the information reviewed to your classroom setting and learners. The paper must be thoughtful, well written, detailed, and specific.

2. **Formal Testing Report Written in Parent-Friendly Format**
Using test results for a given student, write a report for parents in parent-friendly language considering the literacy and educational level of the particular parents, their proficiency in English, and their major concerns about their child. Describe the parent's background on a separate sheet that precedes the report. CEC#10: Collaboration; **PRACTICE: Communication and Expression; KNOWLEDGE: Domain Specific Knowledge**

3. **In-class Presentation of an Informal Assessment Technique.** Investigate a classroom or curriculum-based assessment approach of interest. You may select a technique for the assessment of behavior/social skills, reading, writing, oral language, spelling, handwriting, mathematics, content-area subjects, or study skills, or concentrate on particular specialized assessment such as pre-school, career, or transition assessment. Make a 20-minute presentation in class in which the technique is introduced and modeled in terms of its application to progress monitoring. [4, 5, 6]; CEC #8: Assessment; **Practice: Communication and Expression;**

4.  **Educational Evaluation and IEP** for a particular student with a disability.  The student assessment to be conducted must involve two areas of functioning.  You will incorporate existing formal assessment results and the results of informal assessments you administer to construct *relevant pages of the student's IEP* (needs, goals, and objectives--linked to state standards, as well as specification of the testing accommodations needed) or to write a Learning (e.g. PLP) or Behavior Plan.  Compare the results of formal vs. informal assessment in *a performance report* that precedes your IEP, Learning or Behavior Plan.  Further details regarding this assignment to be provided in class.  [1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]; CEC #8: Assessment, **KNOWLEDGE: Domain Specific Knowledge**  CEC #7: Instructional Planning; **PRACTICE: Professional Practice;**

**PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**

| Performance | Course Outcomes | CEC Standards/RIPTS | Advanced Competencies |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Response to Intervention Investigation** | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 | CEC#8: Assessment *RIPTS 9: Assessment* | **KNOWLEDGE: Domain- Specific Knowledge** |
| **Formal Testing Report Written in Parent-Friendly Format** | 2,8 | CEC#10: Collaboration *RIPTS 9: Assessment* *RIPTS 7: Collaboration* | **PRACTICE: Evidence-based Decision Making** **KNOWLEDGE: Domain Specific Knowledge** |
| **Oral Presentation of an Informal Assessment Technique** | 4,5,6 | CEC#8: Assessment *RIPTS 9: Assessment* | **PRACTICE: Professional Identity Development, Technology Use** |
| **Educational Evaluation and IEP** | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 | CEC #7: Instructional Planning CEC #8: Assessment *RIPTS 9: Assessment* *RIPTS 4: Diversity* | **KNOWLEDGE: Domain Specific Knowledge,** **PRACTICE: Professional Identity Development** |

**COURSE EVALUATION**
Your course grade will be based on:

1.  Preparation for class; Class participation      10 points
2.  RTI Investigation                                20 points
3.  Parent Friendly Report                           15 points
4.  In-Class Presentation                            20 points
5.  Student Assessment/Performance Report            20 points
    Educational Plan (IEP/PLP)                       15 points

## COURSE GRADING

| A  = 94-100 | B+ = 87-89 | C+ = 77-79 | D+ = 67-69 |
| A- = 90-93 | B  = 84-86 | C  = 74-76 | D  = 64-66 |
| | B- = 80-83 | C- = 70-73 | D- = 60-63 |

**SPED 501 REFERENCES**

Allsopp, D. H., Kyger, M. M., Lovin, L., Gerretson, H., Carson, K. L., & Ray, S. (2008).  Mathematics dynamic assessment:  Informal assessment that responds to the needs of struggling learners in mathematics.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 40(3), 6-16.

Artiles, A.J. & Ortiz, A.A. (Eds.) (2002).  English Language Learners with special needs:  Identification, placement, and instruction.  Washington, DC:  ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics.

Barrett, H.C. (1994).  Technology-supported portfolio assessment.  The Computing Teacher, 1-3.

Batzke, J. (1992).  Portfolio assessment and evaluation:  Developing and using portfolios in the classroom.  Cypress, CA:  Creative Teaching Press.

Boehm, A. & Weinberg, R.A. (1997).  The classroom observer:  A guide for developing observation skills.  New York:  Teachers College Press.

Bradley, R., Danielson, L., & Doolittle, J. (2007).  Responsiveness to Intervention:  1997-2007.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 39(5), 8-12.

Brown-Chidsey, R. & Steege, M. (2005).  Response to Intervention:  Principles and strategies for effective practice (Practical Intervention in the Schools).  New York:  Guilford Press.

Brown, J. E. & Doolittle, J. (2008).  A cultural, linguistic, and ecological framework for Response to Intervention with English Language Learners.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 40(5), 66-72.

Capizzi, A. M. (2008).  Engaging a decision-making process in writing measurable IEPs.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 41(1), 18-25.

Cheng, L.L. (1987).  Assessing Asian Language Performance.  Oceanside, CA:  Academic Communication Associates.

Cummings, K. D., Atkins, T., Allison, R., & Cole, C. (2008).  Response to Intervention:  Investigating the new role of special educators.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 40(4), 24-31.

Danielson, C. & Abrutyn, L. (1997).  An introduction to using portfolios in the classroom.  Alexandria, VA:  Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994).  Performance-based assessment and educational equity.  Harvard Educational Review, 64 (1), 5-30.

Davis, G. N., Lindo, E. J., & Compton, D. L. (2007).  Children at risk for reading failure: Constructing and early screening measure.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 39(5), 32-37.

Dettmer, P., Dyck, N. & Thurston, L.P. (1999).  Consultation, collaboration and teamwork for students with special needs.  Third Edition.  Boston:  Allyn & Bacon.

Farr, B.P., & Trumbell, E. (1997).  Assessment alternatives for diverse classrooms.  Norwood, MA:  Christopher-Gordon.

Figueroa, R.A. & Garcia, E. (1994).  Issues in testing students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.  Multicultural Education, 2 (1), 10-23.

Fuchs, D. & Fuchs, L.S. (2005).  Responsiveness-to-Intervention:  A blueprint for practitioners, policymakers , and parents.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 38 (1) 57-61.

Fuchs, D. & Fuchs, L.S. (2007).  A model for implementing Responsiveness to Intervention.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 39(5), 14-20.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Compton, D. L., Bouton, B., Caffrey, E., & Hill, L.  (2007).  Dynamic assessment as Response to Intervention: A scripted protocol to identify young at-risk reader.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 39(5), 58-63.

Garcia, G.E. & Pearson, P.D. (1994).  Assessment and diversity.  In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.).  Review of Research in Education, 10 (pp. 337-391).  Washington, D.C.:  American Educational Research Association.

Gelfer, J. & Perkins, P. (1998).  Portfolios:  Focus on young children.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 31(2), 44-47.

Genesee, F. & Upshur, J.A. (1996).  Classroom-based evaluation in second language education.  New York:  Cambridge University Press.

Hamayan, E.V. & Damico, J.S. (Eds.)  (1991).  Limiting bias in the assessment of bilingual students.  Austin, TX:  Pro-Ed.

Herman, J.L., Aschbacher, P.R., & Winters, L. (1992).  A practical guide to alternative assessment.  Alexandria, VA:  Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Johnson, E. S. & Smith, L. (2008).  Implementation of Response to Intervention at middle school:  Challenges and potential benefits.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 40(3), 46-52.

Law, B. & Eckes, M. (1995).  Assessment and ESL.  Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada:  Peguis Publishers.

Macy, M. & Hoyt-Gonzales, K. (2007).  A linked system approach to early childhood special education eligibility assessment.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 39(3), 40-44.

Mariotti, A.S. & Homan, S.P. (2001).  Linking reading assessment to instruction.  Mahwah, NJ:  Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers, Inc.

Mazzotti, V. L., Rowe, D. A., Kelley, K. R., Test, D. W., Fowler, C. H., Kohler, P. D., & Kortering, L. J. (2009).  Linking transition assessment and postsecondary goals: Key elements in the secondary transition process.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 42(2), 44-51.

O'Malley, J.M, & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996).  Authentic assessment for English language learners:  Practical approaches for teachers.  Reading, MA:  Addison-Wesley.

Pierangelo, R. & Giuliani, G.A. (2000).  Special educator's complete guide to 109 diagnostic tests.  San Francisco:  Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rinaldi, C. & Samson, J. (2008).  English Language Learners and Response to Intervention:  Referral considerations.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 40(5), 6-14.

Rolheiser, C., Bower, B. & Stevahn, L. (2000).  The portfolio organizer:  Succeeding with portfolios in your classroom.  Alexandria, VA:  ASCD.

Roseberry-McKibbin, C. (2002).  Multicultural students with special language needs.  Practical strategies for assessment and intervention.  Second Edition.  Oceanside, CA:  Academic Communication Associates.

Salend, S. (1998).  Using portfolios to assess student performance.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 31 (2), 36-43.

Salend, S. (2009).  Technology-based classroom assessments: Alternatives to testing.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 41(6), 48-58.

Salend, S. (2009).  Using technology to create and administer accessible tests.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 41(3), 40-51.

Stiggins, R. (1997).  Student-centered classroom assessment (2nd. Ed.).  Upper Saddle River, NJ:  Prentice-Hall.

Thompson, J. R., Meadan, H., Fansler, K. W., Alber, S. B., & Balogh, P. A. (2007).  A new way to jumpstart family/school collaboration.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 39(6), 19-25.

Thurlow, M.L., Elliott, J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1998).  Testing students with disabilities:  Practical strategies for complying with district and state requirements.  Thousand Oaks, CA:  Corwin Press.

Turnbull, A., Zuna, N., Hong, J. Y., Hu, X., Kyzar, K., Obremski, S., Summers, J. A., Turnbull, R., & Stowe, M. (2010).  Knowledge-to-action guides: Preparing families to be partners in making educational decisions.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 42 (3), 42-53.

Valdes, G. & Figueroa, R.A. (1994).  Bilingualism and testing:  A special case of bias.  Norwood, NJ:  Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Wiggins, G. (1998).  Educative assessment:  Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance.  San Francisco:  Jossey-Bass.

Ysseldyke, J., Burns, M. K., Scholin, S. E., & Parker, D. C. (2010).  Instructionally valid assessment within Response to Intervention.  Teaching Exceptional Children, 42 (4), 54-61.

## WEBSITES

| | |
|---|---|
| National Center on Response to Intervention | www.rti4success.org |
| Council for Exceptional Children | www.cec.sped.org |
| Rhode Island Department of Education | www.ride.ri.gov |
| US Department of Education | www.ed.gov |
| Intervention Central | www.interventioncentral.org |
| Easy CBM | easyCBM.com |
| AIMSWeb (RTI Progress Monitoring System) | http://www.aimsweb.com |
| American Psychological Association | http://www.apa.org/ |
| ERIC Clearinghouse (on Assessment and Evaluation) | http://searchERIC.org |
| National Association of School Psychologists | http://www.nasponline.org |
| CRESST | http://www.cse.ucla.edu |
| (National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing) | |
| National Council on Measurement in Education | http://www.ncme.org |
| FAIR TEST | http://www.fairtest.org |
| Portfolio Assessment (Grady Profile) | http://aurbach.com |
| Alternative Assessment for Students with Disabilities | http://www.anu.edu.au/disabilities/altass.html |
| Rhode Island Technical Assistance Project | http://www.ritap.org/rti/ |
| WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards & ACCESS for ELLs Assessment | http://www.wida.us/ |

**Rhode Island College Handbook**
**2010-2011**
**Chapter 3- page 28**

## 3.9 ACADEMIC STANDARDS
### 3.9.1 Academic Dishonesty
*(As amended by the Council of Rhode Island College – 11/07/08)*
Academic integrity is the foundation of the academic community. Students who violate College rules on academic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary penalties, including the possibility of failure or removal from a course, disciplinary probation, and/or dismissal from the College. Individual schools may have additional standards and policies related to academic honesty.
**(a) Examples of Academic Dishonesty include (but are not limited to):**
• **Cheating**: intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information or study aids in any academic exercise.
• **Fabrication:** intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.
• **Plagiarism**: intentionally or knowingly representing the words or ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise. The following are examples of plagiarism:
**i. Word-for-word plagiarism:** This includes (a) the submission of another student's work as one's own; (b) the submission of work from any source whatever (print or electronic) without proper acknowledgement by footnote or reference within the text of the paper; (c) the submission of any part of another's work without proper use of quotation marks.
**ii. Patchwork plagiarism:** This consists of a piecing together of unacknowledged phrases and sentences quoted verbatim (or nearly verbatim) from a variety of sources. The mere reshuffling of other people's words does not constitute original work.
**iii. Unacknowledged paraphrase**: It is perfectly legitimate to set forth another author's facts or ideas in one's own words, but if one is genuinely indebted to the other author for these facts or ideas, the debt must be acknowledged by footnote or reference within the text of the paper (e.g., the above paragraphs are based largely on Sears, Harbrace *Guide to the Library and Research Paper*, p. 39).
Many facts, ideas, and expressions are considered to be in the public domain or general knowledge and need not be acknowledged (e.g., the fact that the Declaration of Independence was signed in 1776; the idea that universal public education is essential to the survival of democratic institutions; such proverbial expressions as "A rolling stone gathers no moss," or "New York is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there,") but as a general rule, when one is in doubt, it is best to acknowledge the source.
• **Collusion:** facilitating academic dishonesty intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to commit an act of academic dishonesty.
• **Deception:** Providing false information to an instructor concerning a formal academic exercise, e.g. giving a false excuse for missing a deadline or falsely claiming to have submitted work.
• Sabotage: Acting to prevent others from completing their work. This includes cutting pages out of library books or willfully disrupting the experiments of others.
• **Multiple Submissions**: Submitting for credit, when a student has not been given permission to do so, any work that is the same or substantially the same as work that has been submitted for credit in another course. Many professors allow re-working or building on prior work; however, multiple submissions are permitted only with the prior permission of the instructor(s), and only when the student acknowledges the multiple submission in the work itself.
**(b) Faculty Role**
The faculty member has two clearly defined roles: first, to establish preventive measures; and, second, to ensure that detected instances of academic dishonesty are dealt with appropriately and reported.
Preventive measures should include a statement to each class by the faculty member outlining expected standards of intellectual honesty and the necessity for such standards. The faculty member should also maintain reasonable security of all examination materials and procedures. Generally, the faculty member should employ any reasonable methods to discourage acts of academic dishonesty.

A faculty member may take action up to and including failing a student accused of academic dishonesty.

**Some often-used penalties include:**
*i.* A low or failing grade on the assignment in which the offense occurred.
*ii.* An additional assignment.
*iii.* Reduction of the final grade up to and including failure.
*iv.* Any combination of the above.
In all cases, a report describing the nature of the dishonesty and the subsequent action taken by the faculty member shall be filed with the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Additionally, the faculty member may recommend that the Board of College Discipline recommend further action.

**Dispositions/Performance Consistent with the Special Education Teaching Profession** will be evaluated. Student performance inconsistent with the teaching profession will be documented on the Special Education Department Retention Form. Unacceptable performance within the practicum experience (as observed by the college professor and the practicum teacher) may result in a teacher candidate's dismissal from preparation for teacher licensure.

**Feinstein School of Education and Human Development**
**Special Education: Undergraduate Admission and Retention Committee**
**Candidate Documentation Form**

** Forms are due to the Department by the last day of finals**

Candidate's Name _____   ID# _____

SPED Course # _____   Section # _____   Sem   Fall   Sp   Sum   Year   **201**
_____                                                                                                  **1** ____

Assess the candidate in the following areas; circle the appropriate box: S for satisfactory or U for unsatisfactory.       Use the space just below the area to include comments. Please use the back if additional space is needed.

**S**     **U**      Plans/Implements meaningful and significant learning

**S**     **U**      Uses effective management

**S**     **U**      Uses feedback constructively

**S**     **U**      Is timely

**S**     **U**      Attends class regularly

**S**     **U**      Collaborates effectively

**S**     **U**      Demonstrates knowledge of content

**S**     **U**      Communicates effectively orally and in writing

**S**     **U**      Other concerns

In the overall evaluation, (which takes into account any of the attributes/behaviors on this form, the candidate's grade, and/or the candidate's dispositions) this candidate is:

_____ Recommended to Continue with          _____ Not Recommended to Continue in      Grade
        Concerns                                                      Program                                                      _____

_____     _____
  Faculty signature                                 Date

_____ I agree with the area(s) identified above     _____ I **do not** agree with the area(s) identified
                                                                            above                 (Candidate may submit a response)


I _____ have read this on _____.
        Candidate's signature                                                      Date

**SPED 501**
## Educational Evaluation and IEP
[35 points]

**Description:** Conduct an educational evaluation of a student with a disability. The assessment must involve two areas of functioning and include both formal and informal assessments. A performance report must be constructed with the assessment results obtained. The candidate will also construct relevant pages of the student's IEP using the assessment results obtained.

**Standards Addressed by this project**:
KNOWLEDGE: Domain Specific Knowledge; CEC Standard 8: Assessment, CEC #3: Individual Learning Differences
PRACTICE: Professional Practice; CEC Standard #7: Instructional Planning; CEC #9: Professional/Ethical Practice

**Performance Report**: [15 points]

--Maintain confidentiality. Use a pseudonym or initials to identify the student.
--Describe the rationale for assessing the areas you chose to assess (your concerns).
    You must assess a minimum of TWO areas.
--Divide your report into sections according to the domains/skills assessed.
--List the formal and informal measures given.
--Describe the measures and explain how they complement one another to give a complete picture of the area in question.
--Report the major results.
--Make sure that your report is clear, complete, easy to interpret, and free of biased language.

Report should be approximately 2-3 pages in length.

**IEP Pages\* to Be Completed**: [20 points]
--Strengths/needs (Item #3), as determined by your assessment
--Present levels of performance (Item #13), *referenced to the measures given*
--Annual goals (Item #14), *linked to state standards*
--Short term objectives, performance criteria, evaluation procedure, transition, progress rating, provider/placement (Items #15-21), *linked to GLEs/GSEs and WIDA ELPs as appropriate*
    *Use Descriptors Provided on the IEP Form*
--Expectations for meeting goal (Items #22-23)
--Specification of instructional (Item #25-30) and testing accommodations to be provided (Item #40)

\*If you use a Massachusetts or Connecticut IEP format, please complete the relevant sections to correspond to the areas named above.

**Your Grade for this Project will be Based Upon:**

1) The quality of the assessments conducted
2) The completeness of each section of the project (Evaluation Report/IEP) according to the criteria named above
3) The alignment between the assessment conducted and the IEP produced
4) The quality of the presentation of both documents (as an indicator of your professionalism)

# Rubric for Assessment & IEP Artifacts:  SPED 501

## Performance Report (15 points)

| | CEC Standards | Approaches Standard | Meets Standard | Exceeds Standard | Pts. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Selection, Adaptation and Implementation of Instruments /Techniques** (Multifaceted Assessment) | **Standard 8** *Candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions; conduct formal and informal assessments to design appropriate learning experiences for learners* **Standard 9** *Candidates practice within the CEC Code of Ethics and other standards of the profession; Uphold high standards of competence and integrity and exercise sound judgment in the practice of the profession; Candidates conduct professional activities in compliance with applicable laws and policies* | There are fewer than two areas of student functioning selected, or both formal and informal assessment measures are not included, or the assessments conducted are insufficient to understand functioning in one or both areas assessed. | Includes two areas of student functioning.  The assessment instruments and techniques are well selected to understand the student's performance in the given areas of functioning, adapted as required, and correctly implemented (administered, scored, and interpreted) | Includes extensive formal and informal assessment measures that richly describe student functioning in the two areas selected The assessment instruments/techniques are extremely well selected, administered, scored, and interpreted. | (5) |
| **Performance Report** | **Standard 8** *Candidates interpret information from formal assessments and use the results of assessment to develop and implement individualized instruction programs* **Standard 9** *Candidates know how culture and language can interact with exceptionalities* | The  performance report does not 1) give sufficient information to understand the assessment results, 2) is inaccurate in terms of the scores reported or interpretations made, and/or 3) does not draw comparisons between the results of the formal and informal assessments conducted | The performance report contains all of the required information, measures given are correctly scored and interpreted, and the comparisons between the formal and informal assessments conducted are well made. | The performance report is extremely well done, giving highly detailed and accurate information related to all aspects named. | (5) |
| **Writing Quality** | **Standard 8** *Candidates report assessment results to all stakeholders using effective communication skills and are skilled in the use of basic assessment terminology.* **Standard 9** *Candidates use written language effectively* | One of the documents meets basic standards of professional practice, but the other does not in terms of the writing quality and appropriate use of terminology. | The performance report and IEP are well written. Specialized assessment and instructional terminology are effectively used. | Both the performance report and IEP are extremely well written and models of professionally written documents. | (5) |

**IEP  (20 points)**

| | CEC Standards | Approaches Standard | Meets Standard | Exceeds Standard | Pts. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **IEP Needs and Strengths** | Standard 3 *Candidates demonstrate understanding of learning differences and learner needs and strengths. The understanding of learning differences provides the foundation upon which they individualize instruction to provide meaningful and challenging learning* | The needs and strengths statements do not capture the results of the assessments conducted. In addition, they may be deficient in wording or organization. | The needs and strengths statements are directly linked to the assessments conducted, are well organized, well worded and complete. | The needs and strengths statements are highly detailed representations of the results of the assessments conducted | (3) |
| **IEP PLEP Statements** | Standard 7 *Candidates place individualized decision-making and instruction at the center of special education practice* Standard 9 *Candidates conduct professional activities in compliance with applicable laws and policies* | The PLEP statement: 1) is not related to needs identified; 2) fails to describe the student's performance in relation to the general education curriculum; 3) fails to describe what the student does and needs to be able to do; 4) is not written in objective, measurable terms or state how the present level was determined | The PLEP statement contains all of the required criteria | The PLEP statement provides highly detailed and carefully worded information related to all of the required criteria | (3) |
| **IEP Annual Goal Statements** (Linked to Standards) | Standard 7 *Candidates develop long-range individualized instructional plans anchored in both general and special educ.* Standard 9 *Candidates conduct professional activities in compliance with applicable laws and policies* | The statement is lacking one or more of the following: 1) appropriately selected curriculum standard/ benchmark, 2) includes target performance, 3) is measurable, and 4) relates to the PLEP | The annual goal statement contains all of the required criteria | The annual goal statement provides highly detailed and carefully worded information related to all of the required criteria | (4) |
| **IEP Short Term Objectives, Benchmarks** (Linked to GLEs/GSEs and WIDA ELPs as appropriate) | Standard 7 *Candidates systematically translate individualized plans into carefully selected shorter-range goals an objectives taking into consideration an individual's abilities and needs* Standard 9 *Candidates conduct professional activities in compliance with* | The short term objectives are lacking one or more of the following criteria: 1) related to the annual goal, 2) measurable intermediate steps to reach the goal, 3) at least two are provided, 4) each objective references effective pedagogy | The short term objectives contain all of the required criteria | The short term objectives are very well written and would provide clear direction to a teacher implementing the IEP in terms of instructional aim and teaching approach | (4) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *applicable laws and policies* | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria, Procedure, Schedule And Service Delivery Arrangement** | Standard 7 *Candidates modify instructional plans based on ongoing analysis of the individual's learning progress. Moreover, candidates facilitate this instructional planning in a collaborative context including the individuals with exceptionalities, families, professional colleagues, and personnel from other agencies as appropriate.* Standard 9 *Candidates conduct professional activities in compliance with applicable laws and policies* | All 3 elements are not provided or they are vague or incomplete in terms of the following standards: 1) objective and measurable criteria, 2) clear documentation of goal attainment in the procedure, 3) linkage to the objective, 4) provision of rubrics, if used. The IEP is extremely vague in terms of the provider responsible for each of the short term objectives or where the services are to be delivered | The 3 elements are provided for each short term objective and they meet all of the standards listed. All of the required information about service delivery is provided; Providers are well selected for the needs of the student | The required elements are extremely well written and give clear guidance to the teacher regarding assessing the short-term objectives. The IEP provides detailed information about the persons responsible for each objective and the locations in which services are to be provided | (3) |
| **IEP Cross-referencing in Accommodations & Modifications** | Standards 3 & 8 *Candidates use appropriate technologies to support instructional planning and assessment.* Standard 7 *Candidates adapt instruction for individual needs* | There is little connection between the student's documented needs and the aids and services to be provided; or there is little detail about what is to be provided (where and when) | All of the required information is provided and clearly connected to the student's documented needs | The IEP lists supplementary aids and services, accommodations and modifications known to be effective with the specific student needs documented | (3) |

*Place the performance report comparing the results of formal vs. informal assessments conducted in front of the IEP submitted.*

Exceeds Standard= 35 or more points; Meets Standard = 25-35 points; Approaches Standard= 0-24 points
If you receive an unacceptable score you must revise and resubmit your project.

*Note: Candidates using RI IFSPs or MA or CT IEP forms must designate which sections of their documents correspond to the aspects evaluated*

Name _____     Date: _____     Score_____

Resubmitted Project     Date: _____     Score_____