

California State University, Fresno (06-08)
Section A-1

Contextual Information

Special Education

California State University, Fresno is one of twenty-three universities in the California State University system. Fresno State began as a normal school in 1911 and has a strong history of service and preparation of education professionals. The Dean of the Kremen School of Education and Human Development is the Unit Head that oversees 16 programs. Our last joint accreditation (NCATE/CCTC) visit was in March 2006.

The Special Education Credential Program at Fresno State has two levels: Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Credential Program and Professional Level II Education Specialist Credential Program. The level I credential program consists of 33 units in teacher education courses and 12 units of fieldwork completed in three phases/semesters. The Special Education Credential Program is based on a clearly stated rationale that requires candidates to complete foundational classes and content-specific pedagogy coursework while concurrently practicing the application of these concepts and teaching skills in a field placement setting. The Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Credential has two areas of specialization: Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Disabilities. These areas of professional emphasis distinguish the student population with which the candidate seeks to pursue a special education career. Teacher candidates may pursue their credential goals through a Basic Program, an Internship Program or a Early Childhood Program and a Dual Certification Program at California State University, Fresno.

The Professional Level II credential program offers specialization in mild/moderate and moderate/severe disabilities after the candidates have completed the Preliminary Level I Specialist Credential Program. The selected level of disability will be consistent with the work setting in which the candidate is employed.

Candidates are expected to apply the theoretical and scholarly concepts, knowledge, and teaching skills in planning and implementing effective and appropriate lesson and units of study. The program provides extensive opportunities for candidates to learn to teach using the state adopted K-12 academic content standards to all students. All content-specific courses are based on the CCTC Standards and the state-adopted content standards and frameworks. Fieldwork placements are made in diverse settings. Table 1, Program Decision Points, provides an overview of the number of candidates admitted and completed for 2007-2008.

Table 1: 2007-08 Program Decision Points (data doesn't match with what I received from Ivy. Don't have data from Level II program.)

Program Name	No. of Applicants to Level I Program	No. Completing Level I Program	No. of Applicants to Level II Program	% Admitted to Level II Program	% Completing Level II Program
Special Education	35	32			

<u>Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document</u>	<u>Date</u>
1. CTC EL Authorization Approval	Fall 07
2. Student evaluation of lesson plans, behavior support plans, and IEP development were added to Preliminary Level I evaluations. A Master's Project evaluation and Candidate Writing Proficiency Assessment were added to the Master's Degree and Level II program evaluations.	Fall 07
3. The Summer Achievement Center, a collaborative teacher training program with Fresno Unified School District, in the areas of Autism and Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, was developed and implemented for three consecutive summers. (%) of teachers have been employed in the areas they were trained.	Summer 06
4. Three new faculty were hired; two in Mild/Moderate and one in Moderate/Severe Disabilities.	Fall 07, 08
5. Dual Student teaching, Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe and Multiple Subjects) was changed from a one-semester experience to two semesters.	Fall 07

**California State University, Fresno (06-08)
Section A-2**

Candidate Assessment/Performance & Program Effectiveness Information

Special Education Credential

A. Candidate Assessments the program used to and through recommending credential

List of Key Assessments

1. Level I Candidate Portfolio
2. Level II Candidate Portfolio
3. Class Management Plan
4. Disposition Survey

Summary of Data

Level I Portfolio ---This assessment requires students to include the following in a file box or binder : (1) vitae (2) letters of recommendation (3) CSUF forms (4) philosophy statement (5) assessment report, (6) behavior management plan, (7) IEP (8) curriculum unit/ lesson plans (9) resource listing, (10) best practices paper, and (11) photos/artifact and (12) videos and reflection of their teaching. Table 2 illustrates the numbers and percentages of Level candidates meeting CCTC standards.

Table 2: Candidate Portfolio Performance at Level I/ Fall 06-Fall 07

<p>Fall 06 – N = 11 MM = 7 MS = 4</p> <p>Lower Areas include: (Below 80%): None Noted</p> <p>High Areas: (90% or above): Standard 10 - Professional, Legal And Ethical Practice Standard 12 - Educating Diverse Learners With Disabilities Standard 13 - SPED Field Experiences with Diverse Populations Standard 16 - Effective Communication And Collaborative Partnerships Standard 19 - Knowledge And Skills Of Assessment In General Education Standard 20 - Curriculum And Instruction Skills In General Education Standard 25 (MS) - Communication And Social Networks Standard 26 (MS) - Curriculum Standard 27 (MS) - Movement, Mobility And Specialized Health Care</p>	<p>Spring 07 – N = 21 MM = 11 MS = 10</p> <p>Lower Areas include (Below 80%): None Noted</p> <p>High Areas (90% or above): All students received a 90% in the following standards: #10,14,19,21,25 (MM) Standard 10 - Professional, Legal And Ethical Practice Standard 14: Special Education Field Experiences With Diverse Populations Standard 19: Knowledge And Skills Of Assessment In General Education Standard 21: General Education Field Experiences Standard 25 (MM): Characteristics And Needs Of Individuals With Mild - Moderate Disabilities</p>	<p>Fall 07 – N = 16 MM = 11 MS = 5</p> <p>Lower Areas include (Below 80%): Standard 16 - Effective Communication And Collaborative Partnerships (26% below) Standard 20 - Curriculum And Instruction Skills In General Education (20% below) Standard 21: General Education Field Experiences (14% below) Standard 22 – Assessment and Evaluation of Students (21% below) Standard 23 – Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction (12% below) Standard 24 – Positive Behavior Support (20 % below) Standard 25 (MM) – Characteristics and Needs of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Disabilities ((27% below)</p> <p>High Areas (90% or above): All students received a %100 in the following MS standards: # 26, 27 Standard 13 - SPED Field Experiences with Diverse Populations</p>
--	---	---

Level II Portfolio--This portfolio is divided into three sections. The first section includes the Professional Level II Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) and related forms. The second section includes materials or artifacts demonstrating student competency and ability to perform as a special education teacher. The third section contains the Program Completion Forms.

This portfolio is designed to examine the products of students' learning throughout the Level II Special Education Program. Preparing a portfolio is a formative evaluation method requiring on-going data collection and reflection. During the process of preparing their portfolio, students are required to conduct an evaluation, which contains three questions (1. Why did I select this item/artifact? 2. What did this item show? and 3. What did I learn from doing this?) In addition, a scoring rubric is included for evaluation by program faculty. The grades of Level II portfolio are depicted in Table 3. Results show that the portfolios were well organized. Candidates provided adequate to excellent narrative reflections showing a clear understanding and competence in standard. A thoughtful discussion of each goal for future professional development was related to each standard. All the means in the table are at or above 3.7 on a 1.0 -- 4.0 rating scale indicating that the students have a high level of competency in each area when they graduated from Level II program.

**Table 3: Special Education Professional Development Portfolio
Rubric Results From (Level II)**

No.	Evaluation Item	Spring 2006 N= 19	Fall 2006 N = 22	Spring 2007 N = 25	Fall 2007 Data not collected.	Spring 2008 N = 12
1	Overall Presentation	3.8	4	4		3.9
2	Evidence of Standards	3.9	3.8	4		3.7
3	Section of Narratives					3.7
4	Mean	3.8	3.8	3.9		3.7

Classroom Management Plan Evaluation-- Students complete and implement this management plan during their final supervised practicum experience at Level I. Many of our students are already teaching in their own classroom and a master teacher supervises some who have not yet been hired. The majority of candidates scored within the achieved and developing range in all areas on the classroom management assignment. The results are quite positive, which in part may be due to the fact that all of candidates have been required to write a plan for managing the classroom and behavior since the beginning of the Level I program. We will continue to require the same assignments specific to classroom and behavior management. Table 5 depicts the outcome data for candidate performance.

Table 4: Classroom Management Plan and Implementation Evaluation

Area to be Evaluated	Fall 07 N = 17 % of students scoring in each criteria area
<i>Philosophy Statement</i>	59% Achieved, 23% Developing, 6% Beginning, 6% Limited , 6% Not met
<i>Positive Learning Environment</i>	53% Achieved, 41% Developing 6% Beginning
<i>Classroom Rules</i>	53% Achieved, 41% Developing, 6% Beginning
<i>Procedures</i>	59% Achieved, 35% Developing, 6% Beginning
<i>Prevention Strategies</i>	59% Achieved, 41% Developing
<i>Response to Minor Disruptions</i>	70% Achieved, 18% Developing, 6% Beginning, 6% Limited
<i>Response to Major Disruptions</i>	47% Achieved, 41% Developing,, 6% Beginning, 6% Not Met
<i>Crisis Plan</i>	59% achieved, 29% developing 6% beginning, 6% not met
<i>Plan for Generalization & Maintenance</i>	41% achieved, 41% developing, 12% limited, 6 % not met
<i>Collaboration</i>	65% achieved, 23% developing, 6% beginning, 6% not met
<i>Resources</i>	70% achieved, 18% developing, 6% beginning, 6% not met
<i>Spelling/ Grammar</i>	65% achieved, 29% developing, 6% not met

Disposition Survey--This assessment of dispositions begins when candidates enter the program and continues throughout the graduate program at Level I and Level II. Assessment provides feedback to university supervisors, to program instructors, and to the student. Listed in Table 5 is the progression of our assessments used to determine candidate dispositions. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-5, with one 3 representing well prepared, 2 indicating moderately prepared, 1 being poorly prepared and 0 being no knowledge.

Table 5: Disposition Survey (06-08)

DISPOSITION	Beginning of Level I	End of Level I	End of Level II	Mean
	N = 110	N = 33	N = 49	N = 192
1. Reflection	1.83	2.48	2.54	2.28
2. Critical thinking	1.62	2.38	2.60	2.20
3. Professional ethics	1.98	2.41	2.70	2.36
4. Valuing diversity	1.32	2.42	2.50	2.08
5. Collaboration	1.48	2.47	2.65	2.20
6. Life-long learning	1.71	2.09	2.70	2.17
7. Accumulative Mean	1.66	2.38	2.62	2.22

B. Addition information collected on completer performance and program effectiveness

List of Assessment

1. Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I and II)
2. Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator (Level I and II)
3. CSU Systemwide Survey
4. CSU Systemwide Exit Evaluation of Professional Teacher Preparation

Summary of Data

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I and II)--This survey is designed to assess whether program graduates believe that goals and objectives of the program are met. The instrument contains (1) a statement of purpose, (2) demographic information, (3) questionnaire examining the level of competency achieved by the Special Education Program graduates and (4) additional comments made by the graduates. This survey is conducted to each candidate twice when the candidate exits the Special Education Program at Level I and the candidate exits Special Education Program at Level II. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3, with 3 representing well prepared, 2 indicating moderately prepared, 1 being poorly prepared and 0 being no knowledge. Data are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes are made and subsequent assessment data analyzed. Table 6 and 7 depict the outcome data for candidate performance from Spring, 2006 to Spring 2008).

Table 6: Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I)

	Competency Statements	2006 Spring N = 17	2006 Fall N = 17	2007 Spring N = 32	2007 Fall N= 15	2008 Spring N =20	Mean N= 101
1	Collaborates and communicates effectively with family members, school administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals and other related service providers.	2.67	2.49	2.38	2.47	2.79	2.56
2	Knowledgeable of and able to conduct formal and informal assessments of pupils.	2.33	2.37	2.23	2.20	2.35	2.30
3	Communicates assessment information to parents and appropriate service providers, and makes instructional decisions that reflect both student needs and core curricula.	2.75	2.24	2.33	2.55	2.82	2.54
4	Collaboratively develops IEPs with parents and other service providers to include yearly goals and benchmark objectives that target the student's needs (transition for students age 14 and up).	2.80	2.43	2.38	2.35	2.80	2.55
5	Selects appropriate instructional goals, strategies, and techniques based on individual student needs identified in the IEP.	2.65	2.41	2.48	2.45	2.76	2.55
6	Plans, adapts, and provides effective instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings.	2.60	2.59	2.41	2.70	2.75	2.61
7	Maintains appropriate classroom management with positive behavioral support plans, proactive and respectful.	2.32	2.35	2.47	2.50	2.53	2.43
8	Demonstrates the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.	2.35	2.40	2.45	2.50	2.52	2.44
9	Utilized technology for instruction, communication, and/or assessment	2.80	2.24	2.46	2.50	2.82	2.56
10	Professional conduct is exhibited through open discussions of ideas, reflections on own practices, utilization of research based information and consideration of professional advice.	2.75	2.63	2.57	2.73	2.80	2.70
	Mean	2.60	2.42	2.42	2.50	2.69	2.52

Table 7: Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level II)

	Competency Statements	2006 Spring	2006 Fall	2007 Spring	2007 Fall	2008 Spring	Mean
		N = 17	N = 10	N = 15	N = 15	N = 12	N = 69
1	Collaborates and communicates effectively with family members, school administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals and other related service providers.	2.82	2.58	2.93	2.85	2.79	2.79
2	Knowledgeable of and able to conduct formal and informal assessments of pupils.	2.75	2.62	2.70	2.75	2.75	2.71
3	Communicates assessment information to parents and appropriate service providers, and makes instructional decisions that reflect both student needs and core curricula.	2.94	2.78	2.79	2.80	2.82	2.83
4	Collaboratively develops IEPs with parents and other service providers to include yearly goals and benchmark objectives that target the student's needs (transition for students age 14 and up).	2.94	2.90	2.73	2.70	2.80	2.81
5	Selects appropriate instructional goals, strategies, and techniques based on individual student needs identified in the IEP.	2.59	2.65	2.60	2.70	2.76	2.66
6	Plans, adapts, and provides effective instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings.	2.82	2.90	2.87	2.70	2.75	2.81
7	Maintains appropriate classroom management with positive behavioral support plans, proactive and respectful.	2.71	2.70	2.74	2.72	2.79	2.73
8	Demonstrates the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.	2.69	2.67	2.78	2.78	2.77	2.74
9	Utilized technology for instruction, communication, and/or assessment	2.73	2.80	2.76	2.81	2.82	2.78
10	Professional conduct is exhibited through open discussions of ideas, reflections on own practices, utilization of research based information and consideration of professional advice.	2.82	2.90	2.87	2.78	2.80	2.83
	Mean	2.78	2.75	2.78	2.76	2.79	2.77

Evaluation and Needs of Assessment Survey- Administrators (Level I and II)--This survey intended to examine the quality of the Special Education Program perceived by the administrators or supervisors who hire our graduates or provide sites for the candidates of our program to complete their final student teaching. This measure consists of 4 sections: (1) a cover letter explaining purposes of survey (2) demographic information (3) questionnaire and (4) additional comments. Practicum Administrator are surveyed twice: When the students have completed their final student teaching at their practicum sites at Level I and Level II. University supervisors are responsible for distributing this survey to district employers. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3, with 3 representing well prepared, 2 indicating moderately prepared, 1 being poorly prepared and 0 being no knowledge. Data are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Data collected are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes are made and subsequent assessment data analyzed. Table 9 and 9 depict the outcome data for candidate performance from Spring, 2006 to Spring 2008).

Table 8: Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator (Level II)

	Competency Statements	Mean N=10	Mean N= 11	Mean N= 29	Mean N= 3	Mean N= 14	N= 67
		2006 Spring	2006 Fall	2007 Spring	2007 Fall	2008 Spring	Mean
1	Collaborates and communicates effectively with family members, school administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals and other related service providers.	2.90	2.73	2.86	2.33	2.93	2.75
2	Knowledgeable of and able to conduct formal and informal assessments of pupils.	2.80	2.73	2.72	2.67	2.71	2.73
3	Communicates assessment information to parents and appropriate service providers, and makes instructional decisions that reflect both student needs and core curricula.	2.60	2.70	2.76	2.67	2.57	2.66
4	Collaboratively develops IEPs with parents and other service providers to include yearly goals and benchmark objectives that target the student's needs (transition for students age 14 and up).	2.90	2.55	2.90	2.67	2.50	2.70
5	Selects appropriate instructional goals, strategies, and techniques based on individual student needs identified in the IEP.	2.80	2.66	2.76	2.67	2.79	2.74
6	Plans, adapts, and provides effective instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings.	2.90	2.55	2.69	2.33	2.93	2.68
7	Maintains appropriate classroom management with positive behavioral support plans, proactive and respectful.	2.80	2.45	2.83	2.50	2.71	2.66
8	Demonstrates the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.	2.80	2.73	2.66	2.67	2.79	2.73
9	Utilized technology for instruction, communication, and/or assessment	2.70	2.45	2.72	2.67	2.57	2.62
10	Professional conduct is exhibited through open discussions of ideas, reflections on own practices, utilization of research based information and consideration of professional advice.	3.00	2.66	2.79	2.33	3.00	2.76
	Mean	2.82	2.62	2.77	2.55	2.75	2.70

Table 9: Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator (Level II)

	Competency Statements	Mean N = 10	Mean N = 7	Mean N = 14	Mean N=16	Mean N = 7	N= 54
	Academic Semester	2006 Spring	2006 Fall	2007 Spring	2007 Fall	2008 Spring	Mean
1	Collaborates and communicates effectively with family members, school administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals and other related service providers.	2.70	3.00	3.00	2.94	3.00	2.93
2	Knowledgeable of and able to conduct formal and informal assessments of pupils.	2.80	2.86	2.64	3.00	3.00	2.86
3	Communicates assessment information to parents and appropriate service providers, and makes instructional decisions that reflect both student needs and core curricula.	2.80	3.00	2.79	3.00	2.86	2.89
4	Collaboratively develops IEPs with parents and other service providers to include yearly goals and benchmark objectives that target the student's needs (transition for students age 14 and up).	2.70	2.71	2.93	2.94	3.00	2.86
5	Selects appropriate instructional goals, strategies, and techniques based on individual student needs identified in the IEP.	2.70	2.83	2.79	3.00	2.86	2.84
6	Plans, adapts, and provides effective instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings.	2.60	2.71	2.64	2.93	2.86	2.75
7	Maintains appropriate classroom management with positive behavioral support plans, proactive and respectful.	2.70	2.57	2.86	3.00	3.00	2.83
8	Demonstrates the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.	2.70	2.86	2.57	2.88	3.00	2.80
9	Utilized technology for instruction, communication, and/or assessment	2.70	2.43	2.79	3.00	2.57	2.70
10	Professional conduct is exhibited through open discussions of ideas, reflections on own practices, utilization of research based information and consideration of professional advice.	2.70	2.86	3.00	2.94	3.00	2.90
	Mean	2.71	2.78	2.80	2.96	2.92	2.83

CSU Systemwide survey -- In this survey (employers) and first-year graduates are asked to rate the quality of their program in 13 areas. The validity of the survey results is questionable given the low response rate in 2005-06 (7 respondents) compared to previous years. We used the data collected in the survey from 2001-2005 for a more accurate reflection of our candidate's performance in the areas assessed. Table 10 summarizes the results of supervisors and first-year graduates in two parts with Part I including supervisors' rating and Part II first-year graduates' rating. For comparison purpose, two sets of means (%) are provided for each part in Table 10.

Table 10: CSU System wide Survey (2001-2005)

Evaluation Area		Part I		Part II	
		SUPERVISORS		First -Year Graduates	
		% Well Prepared & Adequately Prepared		% Well Prepared & Adequately Prepared	
		CSU Fresno	CSU Wide	CSU Fresno	CSU Wide
1	Overall Effectiveness	78.25	82.75	73.75	74.00
2	Plan Instruction	79.00	83.75	82.50	79.00
3	Motivate Students	80.50	84.00	81.75	81.75
4	Manage Instruction	76.50	83.00	75.75	76.75
5	Using Education Technology	77.50	76.25	59.50	58.25
6	Pedagogy Across the Curriculum	78.25	84.00	79.00	77.75
7	Assess and Reflect on Instruction	79.50	83.25	80.75	79.75
8	Equity and Diversity in Teaching	77.00	83.25	80.25	79.50
9	Teaching Young Children (K-3)	Date Not Available		Date Not Available	
10	Teaching Middle- Grade Pupils (4-8)	Date Not Available		Date Not Available	
11	Teaching High School Students (9-12)	Date Not Available		85.25	81.50
12	Teach English Learners	83.00	83.00	76.25	77.25
13	Teach Special Learners in Special Education	78.50	84.00	78.50	77.75

CSU Systemwide Exit Survey--The purpose of the survey is to provide information that the Deans, other CSU leaders, and faculties can use in making improvements in teacher education programs. Graduates surveyed are asked to rate the quality and effectiveness of their CSU preparation. In Table 11 and 12, ratings of CSU Fresno and CSU System wide are reported and compared. Three areas of strength and three areas of weakness are identified.

Table 11: The effectiveness of CSU Education Specialist Teaching Credential Program Areas of Strength (2006-2007)

No.	Evaluation Area	CSU Fresno	CSU System wide
1	To organize and manage student behavior and discipline satisfactorily	96.4 %	93.5 %
2	To evaluate and reflect on my own teaching and to seek out assistance that leads to professional growth.	96.4%	95.3%
3.	To conduct educational assessments as defined in students' assessment plans	94.6 %	92.4%

Table 12: The effectiveness of CSU Education Specialist Teaching Credential Program Areas of Weakness

No.	Evaluation Area	CSU Fresno	CSU System wide
1	To teach mathematics according to California Content Standards	76.4%	82.6%
2	To develop and implement transition plans for special education students	76.4%	86..3%
3.	To use computer-based technology for instruction, research and record keeping	70.4 %	78.4%

**California State University, Fresno: 2007-08
Section A-3**

Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

The candidate assessment data presented in the previous section of this report indicate that the program is meeting its goal of adequately preparing candidates to teach students with special needs in a variety of school settings. The data reveal a number of program strengths as well as some areas for improvement within the Special Education credential program. The data did not demonstrate any areas of significant concern regarding program effectiveness or candidate competence. Areas of strength and areas for improvement derived from the data are outlined below:

Program Strengths

- The Special Education program is well organized and includes relevant courses as well as field placement assignments that allow for the integration of theory and practice.
- All Level I candidates demonstrated proficiency in all required CCTC standards at the “applying” or “developing” level in final student teaching.
- All Level II candidates demonstrated proficiency through portfolio evaluation and observation of all CCTC required standards at the end of the program.
- University Supervisor Evaluation of Candidate Portfolio and Performance in Practicum of CCTC standards at Level I indicates our students score highest in the areas of professional and ethical practice and in Educating diverse learners with disabilities. Supervisor evaluation of Candidate Portfolio and Performance at Level II indicates that our candidates have a high level of competency in all CCTC standards when they graduate from the Level II program.
- University supervisor evaluation of candidates’ Classroom Management Plan and Implementation in the classroom indicates that our candidates score at the achieving or developing skill level in all elements required on the plan.
- Overall candidates completing the Level I program show significant growth in all disposition areas.
- Program Evaluation Surveys completed by our candidates at the end of Level I and II indicate a perceived increase in competency in all areas evaluated.
- Program Evaluation Surveys completed by Administrators/Employers of our candidates rank our Level I and Level II candidates high in the areas; Level II scores indicated growth in 90% of the areas evaluated.
- The CSU Systemwide Exit Survey rates our candidates higher than candidates systemwide in the areas: organizing and managing student behavior and discipline; evaluating and reflecting on their own teaching and seeking assistance that leads to professional growth, and in conducting assessments as defined in students’ IEPs.

Areas for Improvement

- Program requirements are not sufficiently clear to all candidates.
- In the CSU Systemwide Exit Survey, Special Education candidates demonstrated less confidence in teaching math, developing transition plans, and in the use of computer-based technology for instruction, research, and record keeping than in most other areas of knowledge and skills.
- In the Candidate/Employer Evaluation of Program Exit Survey, candidates reported less confidence in the knowledge and skills needed to:
 - Communicate and collaborate with other professionals, parents, and service providers in general and specifically in IEP meetings
 - Write and implement of Behavior Support Plans
 - Utilize technology for instruction, research, and record keeping in the classroom
 - Have an in-depth understanding of characteristics and appropriate interventions for students with mild/moderate disabilities than in most other performance areas

Section A-4

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate & Program Performance

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Data Source	Data Focus	Action(s)	Contact Person	Timeline
CSU Systemwide Exit Survey	Clarity of Program Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations to be incorporated into revised program orientation materials and Handbook. 	Dana Powell/Hong Shen	2009 -10
CSU Systemwide Survey	Proficiency in teaching math, developing transition plans, and in the use of computer-based technology for instruction, research, and record keeping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and implement specific assignments in SPED 135 targeting teaching math; consult with Multiple Subject faculty to consider adding a 1-2 unit math class Develop and implement specific assignments to facilitate integration of knowledge and practice in developing transition plans, and in the use of computer-based technology for instruction, research, and record keeping 	SPED Faculty	2009-10
LV I & II Special Education Program Program Exit Surveys	Proficiency in communicating and collaborating with other professionals, parents, and service providers in general and specifically in IEP meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teach communication skills and conflict resolution strategies in SPED 155. Utilize role-play and simulation activities to practice appropriate communication skills, specifically to collaborate in writing IEPs. Require candidates to collaborate, plan, and team-teach with a general education teacher in final student teaching. Candidates will be asked to reflect on the experience, identifying strengths and weaknesses in communication and in lesson plan implementation. 	SPED Faculty	2009-10
LV I & II Special Education Program Exit Surveys/ Portfolio Assessment (Level I)			Cheryl McDonald	2009-10
			Cheryl McDonald/ Practicum Instructors	2009-10