1. Description of the assessment and use in the program

NO CHANGES

2. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III

The assessment has been redesigned to focus on fewer standards as recommended by NCATE/CEC. The task of lesson planning is a culminating activity that requires students to integrate and incorporate background knowledge and skills from a range of CEC standards. The emphasis is on Standards 4 and 7. Standard 5 is addressed in this work sample but is not a targeted standard for this assessment. See original report for descriptions about how this assessment aligns with standards 4 and 7.

3. A brief analysis of data findings

Findings from Assessment 3, *Lesson Plan Work Sample* include 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 data and are organized by each component of the assessment including an overall assessment score for both years. Final averages are provided for each component. Candidates in the PB SPED Program complete three *Lesson Plan Work Samples* during the Internship I field experience. Aggregate data from the third and final *Lesson Plan Work Sample* are provided here which is in line with how data are reported on this assessment. The undergraduate and PB SPED program use and report on the same assessment.

Findings from Assessment 3 show that a high majority of candidates met or exceeded expectations on all components of this assessment. Only 1 candidate was rated as needing improvement on three components of the assessment. The lowest ratings appeared to be writing instructional objectives, rationale, procedures, and assessment although the range of scores limits the interpretation here. The mixed nature of this data makes it clear that further analysis of each component including some refinement may be necessary. Upon examination of the overall data, candidates are showing improvement in the overall rating. Only one candidate (12%) in 06-07 exceeded expectations for this work sample. In 07-08 four (50%) of the candidates exceeded expectations. See attached data tables for Assessment 3.

4. Interpretation of how data provide evidence for meeting standards

The data clearly shows that the strong majority of candidates have successfully met or exceeded expectations related to the standards assessed by the components of the assessment tool. In this case, Standards 4, 5,7 and 8 are targeted. The aggregate data provided here will help us to examine ways to improve how we teach to the appropriate standards in the context of this work sample, and we look forward to refining and implementing this tool in the redesigned PB SPED program which is currently being developed into an M.Ed. program. The data here as well as feedback from KSC instructors and students will help us to continually improve on aspects of our program addressed by this assessment tool.

The *Lesson Plan Work Sample* is a long-standing assessment in the program, and has evolved over years and has been enhanced to explicitly show the connection to CEC standards. This assessment was refined to be more clearly aligned to the standards and more descriptively reflect each component of the assessment. The updates on this assessment took place over the last two years as these were driven by examination of the data and feedback from the initial SPA review of program. Various teaching strategies have been implemented to address areas of instructional planning that prove difficult in the context of lesson planning. Areas targeted

include (but are not limited to) the writing of solid instructional objectives and documenting the procedures of the lesson plan. The importance of reflecting on lesson effectiveness has also been stressed in our revised assessment tool.

Assessment Documentation

ATTACHMENT A
Assessment 3 (required) – Assessment Tool or Description of the Assignment
Lesson Planning Work Sample

Instructions for Candidates

NO CHANGES

NEW RUBRIC-- SEE NEXT PAGES

LESSON PLAN SCORING GUIDE

INTERN'S NAME _____   SUBMISSION DATE_____   LESSON DATE _____

COMPLETED BY:

☐ KSC SUPERVISOR _____   ☐ COOPERATING PROFESSIONAL _____   ☐ OTHER _____
           NAME   NAME   NAME

DIRECTIONS: EXAMINE EACH ASPECT OF THE LESSON PLAN (1-8) AND THEN PROVIDE AN OVERALL RATING (1, 2, OR 3) FOR A TOTAL OF 24 POINTS. CHECK BOXES IN FIRST COLUMN IF YOU HAVE SPECIFIC CONCERNS.

LESSON PLAN COMPONENT	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS
STANDARD 4 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES **STANDARD 7 INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING** **1. Instructional Objective** ☐ State expected outcomes and identify what student will learn under what conditions and at what criterion ☐ Connect instructional objective to the NH Curriculum Frameworks or general education curriculum	1 Lesson plan does not have a clear outcome tor the student(s) with little or no connection to the General Education Curriculum; objective does not include conditions or a criterion for assessment	2 Lesson plan identifies outcome but does not systematically connect to General Curriculum; short range objective may be difficult to measure using informal assessment	3 Lesson plan clearly identifies the short-range outcome that connects with General Curriculum (NH Curriculum Frameworks): objective includes conditions for instruction and criteria that is observable using informal assessment
	COMMENTS		
STANDARD 4 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES **STANDARD 7 INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING** **2. Rationale** ☐ Exceptional learning needs of student(s) are evident in planning ☐ Level of expectations are appropriate and challenging ☐ Lesson connects to student's developmental needs, interests, and strengths ☐ Lesson has direct connection to student needs as identified on IEP	1 Lesson plan does not describe the student's exceptional learning needs and does not have a direct connection to student's IEP; lesson plan seems generic and not tailored to the student's individual interests and strengths	2 Lesson plan describes the student's exceptional learning needs or directly connects to student's IEP, but not both; lesson plan does not provide detail on the student's individual interests and strengths	3 Lesson plan has direct connection to student's exceptional learning needs and long-range goals of IEP; expectations are appropriate and challenging; understanding of student's individual interests and strengths are incorporated
	COMMENTS		

STANDARD 4 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES STANDARD 7 INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING **3. Resources, Curriculum Materials, Supplies, and Space** ☐ Review physical layout and learning environment concerns (e.g., seating, proximity to instruction, group vs. individual) ☐ Arranges physical layout and learning environment (e.g., seating, proximity to instruction, group vs. individual) relative to proposed activities sequence of lesson and student needs ☐ Selects materials, strategies, and methods to use, taking into account learner needs (entry-levels, cultural, linguistic, and gender ☐ Incorporate assistive technology (low-tech to high tech) and/or other communication aids into the plan ☐ Incorporate material, resources, and other supports that correspond to cultural, linguistic, and gender needs of student ☐ Incorporates modification of materials, directions, and assistive technology into the plan where appropriate ☐ Identify staff to collaborate with for the success of the lesson (e.g., paraprofessionals, school counselors, volunteers)	**1** Lesson plan does not explicitly describe resources, curriculum materials, supplies, or space; appropriate assistive technology not used; does not show evidence of anticipating the individualized cultural, linguistic, or gender needs of the student; little or no collaboration with resource people in classroom	**2** Lesson plan includes some description of resources, materials, supplies, and space; plan for appropriate assistive technology; some general comments on cultural, linguistic, or gender needs; unclear use of resource people	**3** Lesson plan clearly anticipates and plans instructional strategies that include the physical/learning environment and resource people; appropriate assistive technology is integrated into plan; evidence of understanding student's cultural, linguistic, and gender needs; very clear collaboration with resource people
	COMMENTS		

STANDARD 4 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES STANDARD 5 LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS STANDARD 7 INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING **4. Procedures** **NOTE TO EVALUATOR:** *This section has a significant number of subcategories. Each category needs to be considered individually to determine the overall rating for section 4: Procedures. The subcategories allow for more specific feedback to candidate about procedures in the lesson.*	**1** Non-systematic planning of lesson with little or no detail; introduction, body, and conclusion are not explicit; lack of clarity of establishing positive learning environment or fostering active engagement of students	**2** Basic outline for executing lesson with specifics on sequence of activities; some detail on phrasing, specific questions, and directions; expectations, body, and conclusion are included but needs more detail to demonstrate advanced planning	**3** Excellent annotated outline for executing the lesson with a specific sequence of activities (e.g., phrases, specific questions to be posed, directions for task/activity); rules and expectation, body, and conclusion demonstrate strong understanding of planning procedures
4a. Rules and Expectations ☐ Defined behaviors and performance expectations for students including positive behavior interventions as well as responses to rule infractions and student error correction procedures	Little or no clarity on rules or expectations for lesson; no evidence of anticipating the use of positive behavior supports or consequences	Plan has general expectations for behavior that tends to be reactive rather than pro-active; self-motivation of students needs to be clarified	Plan demonstrates strong understanding of how to create effective learning environments that foster active engagement and self-motivation; clear expectations of behavior and use of positive behavior supports and consequences
4b. Introduction/Anticipatory Set ☐ Identify cues for gaining students' attention and interest ☐ Share goal for the lesson with students in their language ☐ Review previous learning to activate prior knowledge	Weak or no introduction to provide an anticipatory set of understanding for the students; lack of clarity on purpose of lesson or connection to prior work	Introduction provides basic cues for student engagement; purpose written in general terms that students may not understand; some specifics on prior knowledge	Introduction has a hook for engagement of students; clear cues for attention; purpose of lesson in language the students can understand; plan to activate prior knowledge

4c. Body ☐ List a step-by-step approach to presenting information, techniques for active engagement, and the sequence of activity ☐ Identify how the skill/concept to be learned is demonstrated or modeled (*I do it*) ☐ Identify and guide student in practice (*We do it*) ☐ Identify independent practice activities (*You do it*) designing task to check for and document understanding (formative/summative) ☐ Script key definitions, explanations, questions, transitions between tasks and feedback to support student understanding and involvement, insuring language reflective of student needs ☐ Identify ways to prompt, provided positive feedback, and correct errors	Steps do not follow a logical sequence that build on modeling or generalization; little or no explicit expectation of students' use of language/ communication concepts and skills; plan does not demonstrate understanding of how to actively engage students; no plan to check for individual student understanding	Steps are in logical order; uses modeling, guided practice, and encouragement of independent work; fostering of communication skills is implicit, not explicit; the check for student understanding is general and not specific to all individual students	Steps of lesson demonstrate components with explicit modeling and guided practice for students; fosters independent work and generalization; students are strongly encouraged to use range of language/ communication skills throughout lesson; clear plan to check for individual student understanding
4d. Conclusion ☐ Identify ways to review ☐ Identify how to provide positive feedback ☐ Plan for overall closure of lesson ☐ Plan for previewing next lesson ☐ Plan for transitioning to next activity	Plan does not include detail on the conclusion and how to review, provide feedback, closure, or preview next lesson; no discussion of transition to next activity	Plan for conclusion has a review of lesson and feedback to students; closure and next steps are provided; transition to next lesson is generic and not specific to this lesson	Plan for lesson conclusion clearly wraps up lesson that includes review, feedback, closure, anticipation of next lesson, and effective transition to next lesson
	COMMENTS		

STANDARD 8 ASSESSMENT **5. Assessment** ☐ State ways to evaluate student understanding and progress of throughout lesson ☐ Develop assessment tools/tasks that directly address lessons objective(s)	1 Little or no planning to assess student behavior or learning; assessment is not connected to learning outcomes; no plan for use of rubrics, charts, or work samples	2 Basic use of informal assessment that needs refining to be more useful for progress monitoring; rubrics and charts need to correspond to outcomes for progress monitoring	3 Excellent use of informal assessment to monitor progress of relevant student behavior and learning; assessment appropriate to learning outcomes; specific plan to use rubrics, charts, or work samples, if appropriate
	COMMENTS		

STANDARD 4 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES STANDARD 5 LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS STANDARD 7 INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING **6. Anticipated Problems** ☐ Consider factors that may interfere with participation in lesson and propose ways to deal with these factors (e.g., development, language, communication, attention, social and behavioral issues, confusion, difficulty with materials, cultural or language barriers)	1 Little or no planning for barriers to learning; lack of anticipation of students not responding to lesson plan	2 Lesson plan provides insight into anticipated learning needs of individual students; evidence of understanding differentiated learning styles/ needs of students	3 Lesson plan includes section that anticipates individual learning needs of students; specific ideas on ways to modify lesson/ procedures based on response of student to lesson; e.g,, developmental, language, attention, memory, cultural, or behavior barriers
	COMMENTS		
STANDARD 8 ASSESSMENT **7. Reflection on Lesson Effectiveness** ☐ Effectiveness of the lesson in terms of the materials, strategies, interventions, and language and communication needs ☐ Appropriateness of the lesson objective and targets for the lesson ☐ Participation level of the students, positives aspects about the lesson, and problems encountered ☐ Reflection about challenges and next steps for your improvement	1 Reflection of lesson is general and descriptive but not analytical; little sense of aspects of lesson that worked or didn't work; little attention to individual students	2 Reflection of lesson focuses on a few aspects of the lesson; basic approach of beginning teacher who focuses on global aspects of lesson but not specific attention to individual students and their progress; some personal insight	3 Reflection of lesson demonstrates analytical thinking on the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson plan and implementation; insight into adjustments that can be made for future lesson; utilizes informal assessment data to monitor progress of individual students; open and honest appraisal of own attitude, behavior, and ways of communicating
	COMMENTS		
STANDARD 7 INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING **8. Organization and Technical Aspects of Lesson Plan** ☐ Headings included ☐ Sentences clear, concisely worded, and easily understood ☐ Logic and sequence is easy to follow ☐ Organization and format allows for a colleague to follow the lesson if asked to teach it ☐ Writing is free of mechanical errors, including spelling, grammar, and punctuation	1 Written language of candidate is unprofessional with difficulties in numerous areas including organization, vocabulary, grammar, or other writing mechanics	2 Written language of candidate is professional with minor difficulties in a couple of areas including organization, vocabulary, grammar, or other writing mechanics	3 Written language of candidate is professional with few or no difficulties in organization, vocabulary, grammar, andr other writing mechanics
	COMMENTS		

FINAL SCORE/GRADE FROM OVERALL RATINGS   _____/24

Number of Candidates Who Completed Assessment 3

2006-2007 Candidates, N=	8
2007-2008 Candidates, N=	8
Total Candidates	16

Assessment 3: Data Summary

For each component of the assessment, scores are reported by number of candidates and corresponding percentages. For each year an average is provided for each component.

Component of Assessment	Needs Improvement (1)				Meets Expectations (2)				Exceeds Expectations (3)				Average	Average
Bold faced targeted CEC standard	06-07		07-08		06-07		07-08		06-07		07-08		06-07	07-08
Instructional Objective CEC Standards: **4, 7**	1	13%	0	0%	2	25%	5	63%	5	62%	3	37%	2.50	2.38
Rationale CEC Standards: 2, 3	0	0%	0	0%	7	88%	5	63%	1	12%	3	37%	2.13	2.38
Resources, Materials, Supplies, and Space CEC Standards: **4, 7**	0	0%	0	0%	6	75%	3	38%	2	25%	5	62%	2.25	2.63
Procedures CEC Standards: **4, 5, 7**	0	0%	0	0%	7	88%	4	50%	1	12%	4	50%	2.13	2.50
Assessment CEC Standards: 8	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	3	38%	0	0%	5	62%	2.00	2.63
Anticipated Problems CEC Standards: **4, 5, 7**	1	13%	1	13%	2	25%	1	13%	5	62%	6	75%	2.13	2.63
Reflection on Lesson Effectiveness CEC Standards: 8,10	1	13%	0	0%	6	75%	5	63%	1	12%	3	37%	2.00	2.38
Organization and Technical Aspects of Lesson Plan CEC Standards: **7**	0	0%	0	0%	4	50%	3	38%	4	50%	5	62%	2.50	2.63

Summary of Overall Assessment 3 Scores

A minimum overall score of 16 is a passing score for Assessment 3. Candidates can range from 0-24 points on their overall score for the work sample. Overall scores are reported in the following ranges by percentage and number of candidates in each of the three categories.

	0-15		16-20		21-24	
Year	Needs Improvement (1)		Meets Expectations (2)		Exceeds Expectations (3)	
2006-2007	1	13%	6	75%	1	12%
2007-2008	1	13%	3	38%	4	50%
Total	2	12%	9	57%	5	31%