

Assessment 1 (required) - Content Knowledge:
Assessment of content knowledge in special education
Section IV – Evidence for Meeting Standards

Content-Based Special Educator Portfolio Review

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

NO CHANGES

Assessment 1 (required) - Content Knowledge:
Assessment of content knowledge in special education
Section IV – Evidence for Meeting Standards

Content-Based Special Educator Portfolio Review

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

NO CHANGES

3. A brief analysis of data findings

Findings from Assessment 1, *Content Based Portfolio Review* include 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 data and are organized by each component of the assessment including an overall assessment score for both years. Overall averages are provided for the component data. Final portfolio data is reported here (assessed at the end of the PB SPED program) although candidates receive ongoing feedback and evaluation related to portfolio progress throughout the program.

Findings from Assessment 1, *Content Based Portfolio Review*, show that 100% of PB SPED candidates met or exceeded expectations on all 10 components of this assessment. The lowest ratings appeared to be related to Standard 3 (Instructional Strategies) and Standard 6 (Language). The strongest ratings appear to be related to components that assessed Standards 2, 3, 9, and 10. The individual component data and overall data revealed improvement in scores from 06-07 to 07-08. In 06-07 only 12% of candidates exceeded expectations on this assessment and in 07-08 a majority of candidates (75%) exceeded expectations on this assessment. See attached data tables for Assessment 1.

4. Interpretation of how data provide evidence for meeting standards

This assessment was refined and implemented in 2006-2007. The assessment targets the special education knowledge components of all 10 standards. Candidates receive ongoing support in the development of artifacts, reflection on the artifacts, and construction of the portfolio. There is a preliminary review at the beginning of the internship experiences, a mid-year review between internships and a final review at the end of the internship and program (final data reported here). Candidates who do not show sufficient evidence documenting progress related to content knowledge in their portfolio are provided with an improvement plan. If lack of progress continues, the candidate will not be allowed to continue in the program.

The data clearly shows that candidates have successfully met or exceeded expectations related to the standards assessed by the components of the assessment tool. In this case, all 10 standards were assessed. The aggregate data provided here will help us to examine ways to improve how we build special education content knowledge throughout our program and will help to inform the future curriculum development of graduate level special education certification programs at KSC. After the 2006-2007 academic year, it was clear that we needed to communicate this new portfolio process more effectively to students as well as to faculty who teach in the program. In effect, this first year was a pilot and after examining data we made minor adjustments to the process and were more comfortable in using the assessment.

While the data here is positive, anecdotal information and lower overall scores for certain components will help us to target program improvements. Since a high percentage of special education content knowledge is found in Standards 1-3, it will be important to look at how the foundational special education coursework addresses these standards and how these standards are documented as artifacts for the portfolio review. The Language standard as addressed in Component 6 of this assessment was also rated “average”. At both the undergraduate and

graduate levels, we have acknowledged the limitations in relation to documenting content knowledge related to this standard and plan to implement a new assessment targeted at the Language Standard.

Assessment Documentation

Assessment 1 PB SPED 4

ATTACHMENT A

Assessment Tool or Description of the Assessment

Content-Based Portfolio Review

NO CHANGES TO DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSESSMENT

Scoring Guide for Assessment

Content-Based Portfolio Review

NO CHANGES TO SCORING GUIDE/RUBRIC

Data for Assessment 1: Portfolio Review**ATTACHMENT C****2006-2007; 2007-2008****Number of Candidates Who Completed Assessment 1**

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

Assessment 1: 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	
	06-07		07-08		06-07		07-08		06-07		07-08		06-07	07-08
Standard 1 Foundations	0	0%	0	0%	7	88%	6	75%	1	12%	2	25%	2.13	2.25
Standard 2 Development and Characteristics of Learners	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	1	13%	6	75%	7	87%	2.75	2.88
Standard 3 Individual Learning Differences	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	1	13%	7	87%	7	87%	2.88	2.88
Standard 4 Instructional Strategies	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	4	50%	0	0%	4	50%	2.00	2.50
Standard 5 Learning Environments and Social Interactions	0	0%	0	0%	6	75%	2	25%	2	25%	6	75%	2.25	2.75
Standard 6 Language	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	6	75%	0	0%	2	25%	2.00	2.25
Standard 7 Instructional Planning	0	0%	0	0%	6	75%	3	38%	2	25%	5	62%	2.25	2.63
Standard 8 Assessment	0	0%	0	0%	5	63%	5	63%	3	37%	3	37%	2.38	2.38
Standard 9 Professional and Ethical Practice	0	0%	0	0%	3	38%	1	13%	5	62%	7	87%	2.63	2.88
Standard 10 Collaboration	0	0%	0	0%	5	63%	1	13%	3	37%	7	87%	2.38	2.88

Summary of Overall Assessment 1 Scores

A minimum overall score of 20 is a passing score for Assessment 1. Candidates can range from 0-30 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.

Year	0-19		20-25		26-30	
	Needs Improvement (1)		Meets Expectations (2)		Exceeds Expectations (3)	
2006-2007	0	0%	7	88%	1	12%
2007-2008	0	0%	2	25%	6	75%
Total	0	0%	9	57%	7	43%

