|  |
| --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report****2023-2024** |
| *College of Education and Behavior Sciences* | *School of Teacher Education* |
| *Master of Arts in Education: Learning and Behavior Disorders (0457)* |
| *Dr. Susan Keesey, Director* |
| ***Is this an online program***? ☒ Yes ☐ No | Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf . Indicate verification here ☐ Yes, they match! (If they don’t match, explain on this page under **Assessment Cycle)** |

**\*\*\* Please include Curriculum Map as part of this document (at the end), NOT as a separate file.**

|  |
| --- |
| ***Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages. Add more Outcomes as needed.*** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1:** Demonstrate knowledge of the etiology of dyslexia and related learning disabilities, demonstrate knowledge of how dyslexia and reading disabilities impact learning in the classroom, use appropriate scope and sequence to develop effective, explicit, and systematic instruction including phonological processing and the structure of language, determine appropriate accommodations and modifications in the classroom, and research effective interventions for students with dyslexia. (SLO 1-4, 7 combined) |
| **Instrument 1** | SPED 525 Lesson Plans (Fa 23) |
| **Instrument 2** | SPED 525 Discussion Board Posts (Fa 23) |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **X Met** | **☐ Not Met** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2:** Administer assessments, analyze results to determine strengths and areas of need, and use assessment data to write goals/objectives for an Individualized Education Program. (SLO 5 and 9 combined) |
| **Instrument 1** | SPED 530 Case Study (Fa 23) |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **X Met** | **☐ Not Met** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3:** Deliver instruction, collect and graph data, and use data analysis to refine instruction. (SLO 6) |
| **Instrument 1** | SPED 531 Case Study (Sp 24) |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **X Met** | **☐ Not Met** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 4:** Accumulate available resources to share with parents, teachers, and other partners. (SLO 8) |
| **Instrument 1** | SPED 612 Stakeholder Assignment and Discussion Boards (Fa 23) |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.** | **X Met** | **☐ Not Met** |
| **Assessment Cycle Plan:**  |
| We plan to align SLOs across both SPED MAE programs (as described in program 0438 23-24 ASL as well), maintaining the focus on students with learning and behavior disorders. As mentioned in 0438 23-24 ASL, there are overlapping courses and content in our program sequence and would like to streamline the assessment process. We will be combining/aligning the program assessment processes between ASL and CAEP. This past year we updated/created a new version of the capstone course for MAE students to gather information on student’s research application abilities and gather a more holistic view of their abilities at program end. We also updated/introduced an advanced professional disposition process (form/rubric) including both self- and faculty-level assessments. These will be included in the 2024-2025 cycle, and we will have multiple data collection timepoints [beginning, middle (formative), and final] to gather more information about our students and how they apply feedback to adjust over time. The current program SLOs do not include this information. Additionally, rubrics may be updated to either be included in the next assessment cycle or to better align with reporting.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | Demonstrate knowledge of the etiology of dyslexia and related learning disabilities, demonstrate knowledge of how dyslexia and reading disabilities impact learning in the classroom, use appropriate scope and sequence to develop effective, explicit, and systematic instruction including phonological processing and the structure of language, determine appropriate accommodations and modifications in the classroom, and research effective interventions for students with dyslexia. (SLO 1-4, 7 combined) |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have at least one direct measure of student learning. Indirect measures are not required.****SPED 525 Lesson Plans (Phonics and Comprehension)**Students will write two lesson plans during the semester. The first lesson plan will be on phonics and the second lesson plan will be on comprehension. Lesson plans will include hypothetical student demographic information, IEP goals, progress monitoring data, state standards, formative and summative assessment plans, modeling, guided practice, and independent practice. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students receive a passing grade (C or better; > 70%) on the aggregate of both lesson plans. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | We aim to have at least 80% of our students receive a passing grade (C or better; > 70%) on the aggregate of both lesson plans. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **Fall 2023**10 of 11 (90.91%) received a passing grade on both lesson plans.**11 of 11 (100%) received a passing grade across both lesson plans *with points taken in aggregate*.** |
| **Methods**  | We assessed 100% of the MAE-LBD student artifacts in SPED 525. This is reflected in our reporting of program success/percent of program achieving. There was 10 of 11 (90.91%) receiving a passing grade on the phonics lesson plan, and 11 of 11 (100%) receiving a passing grade on the comprehension lesson plan. |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | **NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have at least one direct measure of student learning. Indirect measures are not required.****SPED 525 Discussion Board Posts (IDA Resource Analysis, Reading Universe Resource Analysis, and FCRR Resource Analysis)**There will be two assigned readings from a choice of journal articles at two points in the semester. Please post substantial, well thought-out responses to the prompt about the reading. Additionally, students are required to interact with classmates in a quality discussion about the given topic or scenario at least two (2) times, for a total of at least 3 quality contributions to the discussion topic. All written work is to be completed in a professional manner. It should be typed and free of grammatical and spelling errors. The ideas developed in your written work should be clearly introduced, described, supported, and applied. The ABC Approach: After posting your initial response, read other postings and post a response to at least two classmates. Use the following ABC Approach when writing your reply posts. A = Acknowledge your classmates’ posts; B = Build upon these posts by providing additional details, statistics, ideas, perspectives, or links to interesting and relevant articles; C = Conclude with a question or new idea to further stimulate the discussion. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students receive a passing grade (C or better; > 70%) on the aggregate of three discussion board posts. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | We aim to have at least 80% of our students receive a passing grade (C or better; > 70%) on the aggregate of three discussion board posts. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **Fall 2023**7 of 11 (63.64%) received a passing grade on all three discussion board posts.**10 of 11 (90.91%) received a passing grade across all three discussion board posts *with points taken in aggregate*.** |
| **Methods** | We assessed 100% of the MAE-LBD student artifacts in SPED 525. This is reflected in our reporting of program success/percent of program achieving. There was 11 of 11 (100%) receiving a passing grade on the IDA resource analysis discussion board post, 11 of 11 (100%) receiving a passing grade on the reading universe resource analysis discussion board post, and 7 of 11 (63.64%) receiving a passing grade on the FCRR resource analysis. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **X Met** | **☐ Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results:** Based on the review of these data, we see that students are able to demonstrate appropriate lesson planning skills focusing on using appropriate scope and sequence of skills with explicit and systematic instruction and appropriate accommodations and modifications in the classroom. Additionally, overall, we see that students are able to apply their knowledge of effective interventions and instruction for students with dyslexia and related learning disabilities in analyses of current literacy resources. However, we do note that there was a decrease in passing grades specific to the FCRR resource analysis. It may be worthwhile to analyze how this analysis differs from the other two analyses to possibly explain the decrease in passing grades.**Conclusions**: This course was taught by an adjunct instructor this past Fall and after reviewing the data to pull for this specific ASL, it seems that there were no rubrics uploaded for the assignments used as measurement instruments in this ASL. This makes it difficult to determine patterns in the possibility of lower scores on assignments, and therefore challenging to determine what changes might need to be made for the next assessment cycle.**Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:** We would like to develop/ensure the use of a 4-point rubric for these respective assignments to then report our “program success target” for this measure as an average total score out of 4.0. Additionally, potentially collecting the lesson planning artifacts via Anthology (Chalk & Wire). The development/use of rubrics will not only likely improve communication of expectations to students, and provide consistency across instructors, but will also allow for further analysis in possible areas of difficulty if they appear. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | Administer assessments, analyze results to determine strengths and areas of need, and use assessment data to write goals/objectives for an Individualized Education Program. (SLO 5 and 9 combined) |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have at least one direct measure of student learning. Indirect measures are not required.****SPED 530 Case Study (Fa 23) (rubrics starting on pg. 7)**Throughout the semester, this assignment unfolded in three sequential parts, corresponding to the course modules and the student’s chosen target student. The initial phase required students to select a skill to assess (e.g., reading, math, written expression) and select a CBM skill and assessment. Students were required to directly assess their target student, graph, and summarize the results of the assessment. Following this, the focus shifted to assessing the student's behavior. Students applied some of the concepts of behavior assessment including: operationally defining a target behavior, selecting an appropriate assessment method, and collecting baseline data on the target behavior of their target student. Finally, the project culminated in completing an Individualized Education Program (IEP) about their target student. The IEP included the data collected during the record review, CBM, and behavior assessments. Students will specifically be showcasing their ability to communicate scores in parent/guardian-friendly terms, developing present levels of performance statements, and corresponding IEP goals and objectives. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students receive a passing grade (C or better; > 70%) on the aggregate of three parts of the Case Study. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | We aim to have at least 80% of our students receive a passing grade (C or better; > 70%) on the aggregate of three parts of the Case Study. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **Fall 2023**11 of 11 (100%) received a passing grade on all three parts of the Case Study.**11 of 11 (100%) received a passing grade across all three parts of the case study *with points taken in aggregate*.** |
| **Methods**  | We assessed 100% of the MAE-LBD student artifacts across both sections of SPED 530. This is reflected in our reporting of program success/percent of program achieving. There was 11 of 11 (100%) receiving a passing grade on part 1 of the case study (focusing on CBM), 11 of 11 (100%) receiving a passing grade on part 2 of the case study (focusing on behavior), and 11 of 11 (100%) receiving a passing grade on part 3 of the case study (focusing on IEP development). |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **X Met** | **☐ Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results:** Based on the review of these data, we see that students are able to demonstrate appropriate IEP development (goals and objectives) based on both academic and behavior assessment administration and results.**Conclusions:** This assignment seems to be an appropriate and successful assessment of these SLOs and will continue to be used in future assessment cycles. **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:** For the next assessment cycle, this assignment (in part or in its entirety) will be evaluated using the CAEP rubric on criteria 1.1a, and 1.1e. We will then report on student success in alignment with the CAEP Capstone rubric and potentially with assignment level rubrics as well. Potentially, artifacts to be collected via Anthology (Chalk & Wire) for both a formative checkpoint and in student’s final portfolio submission. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | Deliver instruction, collect and graph data, and use data analysis to refine instruction. (SLO 6) |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have at least one direct measure of student learning. Indirect measures are not required.****SPED 531 Case Study (Sp 24) (rubric starting on pg. 11)**This project is a cumulative, adaptive, semester-long project that focuses on explicit instruction within an academic subject and using data to make adjustments to instruction. Parts A-B will be submitted throughout the semester, for the opportunity for revisions and feedback. All revised parts will be turned in with Part C by the end of the semester. Part A: background information, initial assessments, and present skills. Part B: initial instruction (intervention 1). Part C: data analysis and guidelines for next steps within instruction. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students receive a passing grade (C or better; > 70%) on the final submission of the Case Study. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | We aim to have at least 80% of our students receive a passing grade (C or better; > 70%) on the final submission of the Case Study. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **Spring 2024**10 of 11 (90.91%) received a passing grade on final submission of the Case Study. |
| **Methods**  | We assessed 100% of the MAE-LBD student artifacts in SPED 531. This is reflected in our reporting of program success/percent of program achieving. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **X Met** | **☐ Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results:** Based on the review of these data, we see that students are able to demonstrate appropriate instructional planning, and use of data analysis skills to refine future instruction/intervention.**Conclusions:** This assignment seems to be an appropriate and successful assessment of this SLO and will continue to be used in future assessment cycles. With respect to the student that did not reach the program level success target, the student did not turn in the final submission of the case study.**Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:** For the next assessment cycle, this assignment will use a 4-point rubric to then report our “program success target” for this measure as an average total score out of 4.0.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 4** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | Accumulate available resources to share with parents, teachers, and other partners. (SLO 8) |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have at least one direct measure of student learning. Indirect measures are not required.****SPED 612 Stakeholder Assignment and Discussion Boards (Fa 23) (rubrics starting on pg. 13)**The purpose of the stakeholder assignment is to explore more closely the various stakeholders in the IEP processes beyond the three most commonly addressed: special educators, general educators, and parents. For this assignment, students will choose three additional stakeholders to explore. Then, students will create a handout for each to summarize the dynamics and issues of each of the chosen stakeholders.For this activity [discussion board], students gather resources for stakeholders to understand the IEP process (meetings, procedural rights, eligibility information, behavior, collaboration) related to course objective number 8. Students will search for 2 quality resources for parents or general education teachers that provide training and information on the IEP process. Complete (if it is a module) or review the resource to be able to answer the reflection questions below. Suggested places to start: Parent Training Institutes, ed.gov, IRIS modules, Vkclearning.org, KDE DoSE website, KDE or KY Spin materials.For this assignment [discussion board], students will locate 4 resources or agencies available to support individuals with disabilities and their families in the transition from school to post-school outcomes. These can be websites, individual agencies, national, state-wide, or local. Students will assess each of the four resources regarding (a) the extent to which their supports are parent-friendly, (b) the types of services available, and (c) whether the resource is available to students in KY. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students receive a passing grade (C or better; > 70%) on the aggregate of the stakeholder assignment and the two specified discussion board posts. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | We aim to have at least 80% of our students receive a passing grade (C or better; > 70%) on the aggregate of the stakeholder assignment and the two specified discussion board posts. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **Fall 2023**7 of 7 (100%) received a passing grade on associated activities/assignments.**7 of 7 (100%) received a passing grade on associated activities/assignments *with points taken in aggregate.*** |
| **Methods**  | We assessed 100% of the MAE-LBD student artifacts in SPED 612. This is reflected in our reporting of program success/percent of program achieving. There was 7 of 7 (100%) receiving a passing grade on the stakeholder assignment, 7 of 7 (100%) receiving a passing grade on the first discussion board post described above in the description of measure instrument 1, and 7 of 7 (100%) receiving a passing grade on the second discussion board post described above in the description of measure instrument 1. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 4.** | **X Met** | **☐ Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results:** Based on the review of these data, we see that students demonstrated successful accumulation of appropriate and available resources to parents, teachers, and other stakeholders.**Conclusions:** This collection of assignments taken together seems to be an appropriate and successful assessment of this SLO and will continue to be used in future assessment cycles. **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:** For the next assessment cycle, these assignments are not a part of current CAEP data collection and will need to indicated necessary for ASL reporting in future syllabi to maintain consistency across instructors. |

**SPED 530 Case Study Part 1 Rubric (SLO 2)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Component (Points) | Points Possible | Earned |
| Submission | Assignment submitted using correct digital format in word Document (1)* Lastname\_530\_CBMcasestudy

All bracketed guidance text is removed for this section (1) | 2 |  |
| Background Information | * Pseudonym (1), grade (1)
* Current level of special education services named (1)
* Known student strengths (1)
 | 4 |  |
| Current Eligibility Review | * Narrative includes students’ area of eligibility (1)
* Known diagnoses or medical conditions or statement saying none reported at this time. (1)
* Clear connection of scores to eligibility in narrative (6)
* All Table columns completed with correct test and score types (6)
 | 14 |  |
| Current IEP Review | * IEP date range completed (1)
* IEP goal areas relative to CBM outlined (1)
* Annual goal entered and de-identified with Pseudonym (3)
* Data collection method (e.g., data sheet, permanent product, etc.) entered (1)
 | 6 |  |
| Targeted Skill | * The statement clearly identifies skill within the content area of reading, written expression, or math. (2)
* Logical rationale provided using relevant information from record review to support selection. (3)
 | 5 |  |
| Measure Selection & Rationale | * State CBM selected and its source (2)
* Identify the measure as GOM or MM (2)
* Grade level is indicated (1)
* Provides rationale for this selection to assess the target skill (3)
* Screenshot of empty probe included (2)
 | 10 |  |
| Scoring and Results | * Type of score explicitly stated (2)
* Table completed with scores (3)
* De-identified completed and scored student probes included as an attachment (6)
 | 11 |  |
| Data Graph & Goal-Setting  | * Rate of growth calculated correctly (2)
* Goal calculations including all work are shown and correct (2)
* Source of goal calculation or norms table included in APA format (1)
* Goal correctly calculated (2)
* Graph included (5)
	+ X- and y- axes are labeled (2)
	+ Data points correctly placed (6)
	+ Goal included on graph with a star (2)
	+ Line drawn from median score to star (2)
 | 24 |  |
| Error Analysis | * Answered each of the three questions completely and correctly based on student work (2 pts/each)
 | 6 |  |
| Summary  | 1st paragraph – Describe and summarize the data 1. What trends were you seeing in the data?

Data are accurately described in terms of current data path or trends relative to the aim line (3)2nd paragraph – Impact on instruction1. If you were providing instruction on these skills, what would these data tell you needs to happen. (2)
2. From the error analysis, where would you focus on teaching next? (3)
3. Based on what you collected, would the IEP goal be reached by the end of the year? If not, what changes would need to be made to the goal? (2)

3rd Paragraph 1. Was the project helpful? (2)
2. What did you learn that will inform how you plan your teaching? (2)
3. In what ways can you plan ahead to make data collection and graphing easier? (2)
4. What were the road blocks you encountered, if any? (2)
 | 18 |  |
| Writing | Writing errors will be deducted at -.5/occurrence off total score Lack of APA reference list (-5) | \* |  |
|  |  | Total |  |

**SPED 530 Case Study Part 2 Rubric (SLO 2)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section | Components (Points) | Points Possible | Points Awarded |
| Target Student | Presenting student behavior concerns are described | 2 |  |
| Target Behavior Defined | * Defined in observable terms (5)
* Action-based (i.e., did not use terms like *refrain from*) (3)
* Examples provided (2)
* Nonexamples provided (2)
 | 12 |  |
| Direct Observation | * ABC data collection form inserted (1)
* At least consecutive 5 minutes were observed (1)
* ABC data form completed correctly (7)
 | 9 |  |
| Data Collection Method & Justification | * Method selection matches target behavior (5)
* Definition/description (2)
* Rationale (3)
 | 10 |  |
| Data collection Example | * Tool contains date, observation time, observation length, and matches method and justification (10 points – 2 points each)
* Tool included (2 points)
 | 12 |  |
| Target behavior data | * Table contains at least 3 to 5 target behavior data points (3)
 | 3 |  |
| Target behavior graph | * Graph is included (3 points)
* Data match the table above (5 point)
* Y- and x-axes are labeled (2 point)
 | 10 |  |
| Data Summary and Hypothesis | * Data are correctly summarized and questions answered (5)
* Hypothesis is definitively provided (5)
* Justification matches conclusion (5)
 | 15 |  |
| Define Replacement Behavior | * Replacement behavior matches function (3)
* Operationally defined (5 pt)
* Examples and non examples provided (2)
 | 10 |  |
| Intervention Selection | * Appropriate intervention (5)
* Description included (5)
* Intervention citation included (3)
 | 13 |  |
| Formatting and References | * Paper submitted on template with correct formatting (2)
* All prompted language removed (2)
* All references are in APA format
* Writing errors -.5/each
 | 4\* |  |
| Total | 100 |  |

**SPED 530 Case Study Part 3 Rubric (SLO 2)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section | Components (Points) | Points Possible | Points Awarded |
| Plan and Student Information | Student and plan information is completed at the top, matches part 1, and is de-identified | 5 |  |
| Consideration of Special Factors for IEP Development | Each question is correctly answered based on information from the first two case study assignments. Recall that if it is an area of concern, it must be checked here and addressed in the IEP.  | 10 |  |
| PLAAFP Statements | 1. Written for each area: (if applicable from records review) (5)* Communication
* Academic Performance
* Health, vision, motor ability
* Social-Emotional status
* General Intelligence

2. Makes statement of overall functioning in sub-area; describes strengths and needs; has detailed and measurable information from multiple sources (20 = 4 pts per section):* Cites sources of information
* Provides scores
* Explains scores in parent-friendly language
* Makes clear statement of whether the child’s functioning in this area is consistent with same age peers.

3. Described how the disability influences involvement in the general curriculum (5) | 30 |  |
| Goals | 1. 3 annual goals and short-term objectives for all areas of concern present (9)2. Each annual goal and the 2 short-term objectives are SMART and follows ABCDEF format: (6/goal = 18 total)* Audience – student specified
* Behavior – observable, measurable student action or skill
* Circumstance/conditions are clearly stated and include level of assistance
* Degree/Criterion – mastery criteria is an appropriate step for the time allotted and appropriately reasonable, yet ambitious
* Evaluation/Method of measurement
* Time – end date of expected goal mastery is indicated

3. Unit of measurement aligns with type of behavior or data used for mastery criteria (3)4. Includes an end/target date for completion (3)5. Indicates data and method for progress monitoring (3)6. At least 2 short-term objectives to break down annual goals into reasonable, scaffolded steps, and match SMART and ABCDEF (6) | 42 |  |
| Supplementary Aids and Services | Student provides at least 2 appropriate supplementary aides or services in each area of deficit | 8 |  |
| Overall Writing | * All areas are addressed
* Correctly submitted in digital format

\*Fractional points may be deducted for grammatical errors\* | 5 |  |
| Total | 100 |  |

**SPED 531 Case Study (SLO 3)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. ***Part A***
 | \_\_\_\_\_\_ / 30 pts |
|  \_\_\_ Provides a description of the student targeted for the case study |
|  \_\_\_ Describes (and summarizes) the existing information about the  target student (*i.e., student’s current skills – both strengths and areas of need,*  *current context for learning including information about the student’s current* *instructional setting and curriculum/instruction, current baseline data from assessments*  *and progress monitoring data)* |
|  \_\_\_ Describes the baseline assessments/initial assessments **and** results that were  used to develop the instruction/intervention for the target student. (*this can/likely includes formal and informal assessment data*) |
| 1. ***Part B***
 | \_\_\_\_\_\_ / 30 pts |
|  \_\_\_ Describes the intervention/instruction provided to the target  student as “Intervention I” (*i.e., includes information on the frequency of*  *sessions, group size, overall focus of the instruction, includes relevant subskills,*  *and format of instruction/instructional activities*) |
|  \_\_\_ Identifies (or describes) the progress monitoring measure(s) that is  used to monitor the target student’s progress in the intervention as planned. |
|  \_\_\_ Identifies decision rules for determining when changes/adaptations  to the intervention are necessary **and** for determining student mastery  of a skill that can be added to review |
| 1. ***Part C***
 | \_\_\_\_\_\_ / 35 pts |
|  \_\_\_ Summarizes target student’s progress in the first intervention  as planned |
|  \_\_\_ Includes a table and graph of the student’s current  progress on the progress monitoring measures identified in Part B (and  from the original case study information) |
|  \_\_\_ According to the decision rules outlined in Part B, reports on  decisions on possible instructional changes, **and** possible skills in review |
|  \_\_\_ Describes next steps for intervention based on decision rules  and why recommendations are made (e*.g., instructional changes to*  *accelerate learning, skills in review, continue intervention*) |
| 1. ***Overall Quality***
 | \_\_\_\_\_\_ / 5 pts |
|  \_\_\_ Well written and edited; logical and stylistically consistent;  appropriate grammar, and spelling.  (*follows APA 7th edition guidelines in final submission*) |
|  | **Total:** \_\_\_\_\_\_ / 100 pts |

**SPED 612 Stakeholder Assignment Rubric (SLO 4)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Element | Description (Points) | Points Possible | Points Awarded |
| Template Elements | All bracketed information completed (1 pt) and brackets removed (1 pt). Handout is 1 page in length not including reference page (1 pt).3 pts x 3 handouts = 9 total  | 9 |  |
| Role Description | Provides description of professional role (1 pt) with citation of information (2 pts)3 pts x 3 handouts = 9 total  | 9 |  |
| Involvement in the Process | Answers the following in **bulleted** fashion:* When would this person be involved in special education processes (e.g., eligibility, IEP meetings, IEP implementation, manifestation determinations, behavior plans)?
* Give 2 examples

5 pts x 3 handouts = 15 total | 15 |  |
| Role in IEP Meeting | If in attendance in the IEP meeting, what role would they represent from the required membership?2 pts x 3 handouts = 6 total | 6 |  |
| Examples of Support | Provides at least 3 **bulleted** examples of support3 pts x 3 handouts = 9 total | 9 |  |
| Barriers | Names (1 pt each) and describes (1 pt each) at least three barriers for this professional in collaboration6 pts x 3 handouts = 18 total | 18 |  |
| Strategies | Names (1 pt each) and describes (1 pt each) three strategies/considerations to support this professional in collaboration with the special education process.6 pts x 3 handouts = 18 total | 18 |  |
| Resources | Lists 2 resources to support professional (with hyperlinks)2 pts x 3 handouts = 6 total | 6 |  |
| References | In-text citations used for any cited material. Reference list in APA format with hanging indentions, alphabetical order, and proper citation. | 10 |  |
| Writing | Fractional points taken for any grammar or spelling errors (0.5pt/error) | \* |  |
| Total | 100 |  |

**SPED 612 Discussion Board Rubric (SLO 4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Satisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Poor** | **Missing** |
| **Substantive Content** | Provided thorough response to prompts with no grammatical or spelling errors. Answered all components of the discussion questions.(8 pts) | Provided thorough response to prompts with some grammatical or spelling errors. Answered all components of the discussion questions.(6 pts) | Provided partial response to prompts and/or significant grammatical or spelling errors.(4 pts) | Provided response that was off topic for the given prompts. Excessive writing errors.(2 pts) | Response is missing.(0 pts) |
| **Interaction with Peers** | Timely response to at least two peers’ postings. Demonstrates professional feedback and collaborative skills.(2 pts) | Partially completed.(1 pt) | - | Off topic.(0 pts) | Responses are missing.(0 pts) |

**Curriculum Map (Overlap with 0438 Courses)**

| **Student Learning Outcomes for Special Education Master’s Programs** | 1. Understand how exceptionalities impact develop and learning, and deliver individualized evidence-based instruction to support learning. | 2. Create safe, inclusive, and culturally responsive learning environments to promote learning and positive social interactions for students with disabilities. | 3. Use multiple means of assessment and data to drive instructional decision making. | 4. Understand how behavior impacts learning and develop behavioral interventions to improve social interactions and student learning. | 5. Collaborate effectively with colleagues and parents. | 6. Display the attitudes and dispositions of a special educator. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EDU 502 |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
| SPED 517 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPED 630 |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| SPED 618 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPED 590 |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |
| SPED 501 |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| SPED 610 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPED 612 |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
| SPED 529 |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| SPED 535 |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |
| SPED 615 | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPED 515 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LTCY 519 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPED 530 |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| SPED 525 | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPED 531 |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |

