**Assessment 7 - Addresses CEC standards 8 (Assessment) and 7 (Instructional Planning). Assessment Case Study Project**

**Description:** Instructional planning and assessment are at the center of special education practice. This is a new assessment developed from a similar activity. This is a new assessment added to the **SPED 3365 course.** This assignment is a principal assessment of CEC Standard VII and VIII and is aligned with **CEC (IGC and IIC) Knowledge and Skills**. This assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching process of special educators and their use of multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions. Candidates are required to develop long-range individualized instructional plans anchored in both general and special curricula and based on assessment data. In addition, special educators systematically translate collected data into individualized goals, objectives, and plans. They must take into consideration an individual's abilities and needs, the learning environment, and a myriad of cultural and linguistic factors. Special educator candidates use the results of ongoing assessments to help identify exceptional learning needs and adjust instruction in response to ongoing learning progress.

For this particular assignment, candidates are required to demonstrate an understanding of informal and formal assessments and how to use that data to design learning experiences that support the growth and development. This assessment is a narrative description of a selected student and their instructional needs from a fairly intensive assessment composed during a field experience in collaboration with the local LEA. Candidates will be assigned a student that will allow the candidates the opportunity to demonstrate the knowledge of assessment and management with individuals with special needs.

This assessment is the Assessment Case Study Project in the junior level SPED 3365 course. The Assessment Case Study Project includes the evaluation and assessment of a student at a local LEA or as a case study as part of a required course for all candidates seeking certification at the EC-12 and supplemental special education level. The candidates gain familiarization with formal and informal assessments and what those assessments results suggest about modifications and accommodations strategies. This course requires lab time in public school classrooms and candidates engage in these Field Experiences a minimum of 10 hours, which provides an authentic experience for these candidates.

<div align="center">Assessment Case Study Project</div>

This assessment is part of the junior level SPED 3365 course and requires lab time in public school classrooms so candidates can engage in a minimum of 10 hours of Field Experience. This particular assignment, candidates are required to demonstrate an understanding of informal and formal assessments and how to use that data to design learning experiences that support the growth and development. Each candidate will be required to evaluative and assess a student at a local LEA (or as a case study) as part of a required course for all candidates seeking certification at the EC-12 and supplemental special education level. Each candidate will be required to gain familiarization with formal and informal assessments and what those assessments results suggest about modifications and accommodations strategies.

**Purpose:**
Effective teaching requires assessment of student learning on an ongoing basis. For this task you will provide a description of the ways in which you conduct informal and formal assessment in your classroom. You will provide a copy of a formal assessment you used to analyze what students learned across several lessons. You will be asked to cite specific examples of what students know and are able to do based on the student work samples you provide. The analysis of what students have learned should also provide a basis for future instructional plans.

**Process:**
This assessment will be a narrative description of a selected student and their instructional needs from a fairly intensive assessment composed during a field experience in collaboration with the local LEA. Candidates will be assigned a student that will allow the candidates the opportunity to demonstrate the knowledge of assessment and management with individuals with special needs. Begin your paper by reflecting on the ways in which you evaluate what students know and are able to do as a result of your teaching. In the course of working with a student, select an informal and one formal assessment that you will use as the basis for this paper.

1. Select an informal assessment (e.g., a pre-test, a homework assignment, checklist, in class task) that you use to assess what students know, to help them self-assess, and to help you determine where you need to redirect your instruction.
2. Select a formal assessment that addresses learning across several lessons (e.g., a quiz, a project, a paper, or a test). The assessment must be an assessment you designed or modified for your class and for which you have samples of student work. You must include the evaluation criteria you used for this assessment. Projects, models, or oral assessments are acceptable as long as you can document them in your paper.
3. Select the work of at least one student who is representative of the class (e.g., low, medium, and high performing) to illustrate your analysis of student learning through these assessments.

**Product:**
1. A copy of an informal assessment - Prepare a copy of the informal assessment instrument that you used. Include the directions you provided to the student (if not written on the assessment or if communicated orally), evaluation criteria or rubric (if applicable), an answer key or response guide (if applicable), and a description of how you intended to use the information obtained from this assessment.
2. A copy of a formal assessment and scoring criteria - Prepare a copy of the formal assessment instrument that you developed. Include the directions you provided to the student (if not written on the assessment or if communicated orally), evaluation criteria or rubric, an answer key or response guide (if applicable), and a description of how feedback was communicated.
3. Marked copies of the students' work that reflect your evaluation and the feedback provided to the students Provide samples of work from the three or four students whose work provides a representative sample from the class. The work should include your evaluation and any written comments you provided to the students. If the work was completed by students working in groups, a group product is acceptable. If the

assessment was based on an oral discussion or oral presentation, please document the student performance using video- or audio-tape.

4. Commentary on the assessment and its results - Describe the informal and formal assessments (e.g., test, project, task, or other assessment) and what you expected to learn from their use. How do the assessments address the concepts you were teaching? What provisions (e.g., in terms of time and circumstances, tasks), if any, did you make on the assessments for individuals who have particular learning differences or needs?

5. For both the informal and formal assessments, describe the criteria you used to evaluate the work. Why did you use these criteria? How did you communicate the criteria to your students?

6. What did you learn about this student from evaluating their performance? Use specific examples from the student work (for both the informal and formal assessments) to illustrate your points. Synthesize what you believe the student knows. What are they able to do now that they weren't able to do before the instruction? What do they still need to learn? Give specific examples from both assessments to support your analysis.

7. Aggregation of the data from other data collected by ASU candidates. Where does the performance of your representative students fit within the performance of the whole group.

8. Disaggregation of the data - Select one student characteristic (e.g., ability, gender, race, age, etc.) and separate your data accordingly. Analyze the assessment results for the group you created, and compare them. For instance, if you disaggregate the results according to gender, compare the performance of boys to girls. Use specific examples to illustrate your conclusions.

9. Describe any ways in which you involved students in self-assessment? How did you communicate the information you learned through the assessment to the students? What did they do with the information?

10. Compare lesson objectives for student learning to the student learning you observed. What did you learn about the instruction based on the student performances? What would you do differently the next time if you taught the lessons? Why would you make these changes? What, if anything, would you do to improve the assessment instruments?

**Standards: Your paper will provide evidence of ways in which you address the following: CEC standards 8 (Assessment) and 7 (Instructional Planning) for the IGC and IIC Knowledge and Skills.**

| | Distinguished<br><span style="color:red">Consistently exceeds standards.</span><br>3 Points | Proficient<br><span style="color:red">Consistently meets standards.</span><br>2 Point | Basic<br><span style="color:red">Meets minimal standards.<br>1Point</span> | Unsatisfactory<br><span style="color:red">Does not or inconsistently meet standards.<br>0 Points</span> |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Multiple Assessments CEC *Standard 8-* ICC8K1, ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K4 ICC8K5, | The candidate uses multiple assessments that are aligned with the instructional objectives and the instructional methodology to provide a sample of student performance. The | The candidate uses multiple assessments that are aligned with the instructional objectives and the assessments include relevant content for good discussion making. | The candidate uses assessments that are only partially aligned with the instructional objectives (e.g., not all objectives assessed) or the instructional methodology. | The candidate uses assessments that are not aligned with the instructional objectives (e.g., not all objectives assessed) or the |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *IGC8K2, IGC8K3, IGC8K4* | informal assessment and the formal assessment include relevant content for excellent discussion making. | | | instructional methodology. |
| Clear Criteria *Standard 8- ICC8K1, ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K4 ICC8K5, IGC8K2, IGC8K3, IGC8K4* | The candidate provides clear criteria for assessment that allow for clear feedback to addresses the criteria and helps establish goals for learning. | The candidate provides clear criteria for assessment that provides feedback that addresses the instructional criteria. | The candidate provides clear criteria for assessment provides some feedback that helps establish goals for learning. | The criteria for assessment are not clear and limited feedback may make it difficult establish goals for learning. |
| Learner Differences Standard 8- ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8, ICC8S9, IGC8S, IGC8S, IGC8S3, IGC8S, IGC8S5 | All assessments are designed to accommodate all differences among learners in the classroom (e.g., variation in challenge) and include implementation that accommodates any specific needs of special education students. | The assessments together are designed to accommodate multiple differences among learners in the classroom (e.g., variation in challenge) and include implementation that accommodates any specific needs of special education students. | The assessments together are designed to accommodate at least one difference among learners in the classroom (e.g., variation in challenge) and include implementation that accommodates any specific needs of special education students. | The assessments do not take a range of learners with different approaches to learning into account. There is accommodation of specific needs of special education students. |
| Clear Record Standard 8- ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8, ICC8S9, IGC8S, IGC8S, IGC8S3, IGC8S, IGC8S5 | The student work and the candidate's evaluation and analysis provide a detailed record of what the student has learned, and results are communicated in detail. | The student work and the candidate's evaluation and analysis provide a clear record of what the student has learned, and results are clearly communicated. | The student work and the candidate's evaluation and analysis provide a basic record of what the student has learned, and results are moderately communicated to the student. | The candidate's evaluation and analysis provide a sense of what the student has learned and results are communicated t in a rudimentary way. |
| Effective Teaching Standard 8- ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8, ICC8S9, IGC8S, IGC8S, IGC8S3, IGC8S, IGC8S5 | The candidate evaluates student work from multiple assessments, and uses the information to develop concrete conclusions about the effectiveness of what is being taught. Specific examples of student work are used to illustrate these conclusions and to suggest ways to improve instruction. | The candidate evaluates student work and uses the information to develop concrete conclusions about the effectiveness of the teaching. Specific examples of student work are used to illustrate these conclusions | The candidate evaluates student work and uses the information to develop concrete conclusions about the effectiveness of the teaching. | The candidate's evaluation of student work is not entirely accurate and no specific examples of student work are used that illustrate these conclusions |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planned Instruction and intervention Standard 8- ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8, ICC8S9, IGC8S, IGC8S, IGC8S3, IGC8S, IGC8S5 | The candidate uses the evaluation information to propose instruction for the individual and the class at multiple levels, and to provide detailed feedback to individuals who will provide instruction in the future. | The candidate uses the evaluation information to plan instruction for individuals and the class at multiple levels, and to provide detailed feedback for other individuals that will provide instruction. | The candidate uses some of the evaluation information to assist in planning instruction for the class and to provide basic feedback on the individual. | The candidate's evaluation of student work is not entirely accurate. Feedback on individual is limited or not useful for instruction. |
| Writing Mechanics | The paper is written with no errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. | The paper is clearly written with little or no editing required for grammar, punctuation, and spelling. | Spelling, punctuation, and grammar errors distract or impair readability. | Errors in spelling, capitalization, punctuation, usage, and grammar repeatedly distract the reader and major revision is needed. |
| APA style | APA style and mechanics for referencing used correctly. | APA style and mechanics for referencing used mostly correct. | APA style and mechanics for referencing used with many mistakes | APA style, mechanics for referencing used in correctly or missing |
| Content | The content is written clearly and concisely, with a very logical progression of ideas. | The content reflects a fairly logical progression of ideas and does creates a strong sense of purpose. | The content is vague in conveying a point of view, does not stay on topic and does not create a strong sense of purpose. | The content lacks a clear point of view, is not on topic and lacks logical sequence. |
| Writing Style | The style of the paper is professional. Obviously paid attention to what is said as well as how it is said. | Style of paper is clear, clean, and readable. It sounds intelligent. | Style of paper is loose, almost casual, not professional yet. | Style reads like a casual chat with friends, not professional |

**Finding:** Given that data has just been collected, program faculty have noticed a need to strengthen candidates skills in all areas. Currently candidates are expected to score a minimum score of 1 in any given area and an overall score of at least 1.7 in all areas. Future overall scores for individual students are expected to be at least a 2.0 average. When additional data is available faculty will review and make additional recommendations for program and course improvement.

**Interpretation of data:** In this case, the data related to our current undergraduate program has just been collected for two semesters. However there is enough information to suggest a need to strengthen candidate's skill in two areas. The first is the areas of Clear Criteria (providing clear criteria for assessment that can provide help in establishing goals for learning) and Effective

Teaching (evaluates student's work and uses the information to develop concrete conclusions about the effectiveness of the teaching).  This information suggests there is a need to increases training in the courses used as a foundation for these skills. This assessment of initial data was collected in the fall of 2009 and spring 2010.

**Attached is the assessment table**
This table presents undergraduate program data over the past two years.  It does appear that there is work to be done. The data that is available support an need for additional instruction and practice in the areas of candidates using clear criteria for assessment that helps establish goals for learning, designing assessments to accommodate for differences among learners, Using assessments to provide detailed record of what the student has learned, and using information to develop concrete conclusions about the effectiveness of the teaching.  These are areas that still need work.

## Assessment 7 - Assessment Case study project by CEC standards

| | Score Possible | Spring 2009 N= 20 Point average | Spring 2010 N=36 Point average | Spring 2011 N=___ Point average | 3 Year average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CEC *Standard 8:* Multiple Assessments:  The candidate uses assessments that are only partially aligned with the instructional objectives (e.g., not all objectives assessed) or the instructional methodology. *-ICC8K1, ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K4 ICC8K5, IGC8K2, IGC8K3, IGC8K4* | 3 | 2.0 | 2.1 | | 2.05 |
| *Standard 8-* Clear Criteria: The candidate provides clear criteria for assessment provides some feedback that helps establish goals for learning. *- ICC8K1, ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K4 ICC8K5, IGC8K2, IGC8K3,* | 3 | <u>1.6</u> | **<u>1.6</u>** | | 1.6 |
| Standard 8- Learner Differences:  The assessments together are designed to accommodate at least one difference among learners in the classroom (e.g., variation in challenge) and include implementation that accommodates any specific needs of special education students. ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8, ICC8S9, IGC8S, | 3 | <u>1.6</u> | 1.8 | | 1.7 |
| Standard 8Clear Record: The student work and the candidate's evaluation and analysis provide a basic record of what the student has learned, and results are moderately communicated to the student. -ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8, ICC8S9, IGC8S, IGC8S, IGC8S3, IGC8S, IGC8S5 | 3 | <u>1.5</u> | 1.7 | | 1.6 |
| Standard 8- Effective Teaching: Candidate evaluates student's work and uses the information to develop concrete conclusions about the effectiveness of the teaching. ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8, ICC8S9, IGC8S, IGC8S, IGC8S3, IGC8S, IGC8S5 | 3 | <u>1.3</u> | **<u>1.5</u>** | | 1.4 |
| Standard 8-Planned Instruction and intervention:  candidate uses some of the evaluation information to assist in planning instruction for the class and to provide basic feedback on the individual. ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8, ICC8S9, IGC8S, IGC8S, IGC8S3, IGC8S, IGC8S5 | 3 | 1.7 | 1.8 | | 1.75 |
| Overall Class Average  ***expected minimum score is 1.7*** | | 1.6 | 1.75 | | |

**Assessment 7 - Assessment Case Study Project**

| Year | Unsatisfactory Does not or inconsistently meets standards. | Basic Meets minimal standards. | Proficient Consistently meets standards. | Distinguished Consistently exceeds standards. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assessment Case study project** | | | | |
| Spring 2009 N = 20 | N = 0 (0%) | N = 8    (40%) | N = 12 (60%) | N = 0 (0%) |
| Spring 2010 N = 36 | N = 0 (0%) | N = 12 (36%) | N = 21 (58%) | N = 3 (8%) |
| Spring  2011 N = 34 | | | | |
| Totals N = 56 | 0 | 36% | 59% | 5% |

Rubric points  - grade % total points
 1.1      - 70.0 %
 1.2      - 72.5
 1.3      - 74
 1.4      - 75.5
 1.5      - 77
 1.6      - 78.5
 1.7      - 80
 1.8      - 81.5
 1.9      - 83
 2.0      - 84.5
 2.1      - 86
 2.2      - 87.5
 2.3      - 89
 2.4       -90.5
 2.5      - 92
 2.6      - 93.5
 2.7      - 95
 2.8      - 96.5
 2.9      - 98
 3.0      - 100