Implementing Portfolios Using Tk20: An Educational Assessment System

Jie Zhang, Ph.D.
Moira A. Fallon, Ph.D.
Allison M. Wright, M.A.
Department of Education and Human Development
The College at Brockport State University of New York

The purpose of this paper is to share results of collaborative effort introducing special education portfolios into an inclusive teacher education program using the Tk20 assessment system. Tk20 is an assessment system for both providing evidence of educational skills and achieving that evidence in such a way as to demonstrate growth of teacher candidates. This is not only important for the teacher candidates as they push themselves professionally, but it is also a crucial aspect of accreditation requirements for teacher education programs. Therefore, the focus of the paper is on the usefulness of standards based, working and exit electronic special education portfolios in teacher education. The three instructors report teacher candidates' learning outcomes and professional development by analyzing data in a special education portfolio via Tk20 from special education courses in three phases of a teacher preparation program prior to student teaching practicum. We describe the lessons learned and focus on victories and challenges in our planning and implementation process. We also suggest recommendations for others to implement the interdisciplinary efforts for effective collaboration into a college wide, electronic educational assessment system in order to track the performances of teacher candidates over time.

Introduction

In many, if not most cases, teacher candidates from any given country are different in a variety of cultural ways from one another and from their instructors (Brown, 2010). These teacher candidates are active learners with unique backgrounds and skills. They have multi-layered lives with increasing demands and responsibilities and they move at a hectic pace. They juggle competing interests, the least of which might be their college course demands. Often, they are more technologically savvy than their instructors in the use of multimedia and communication tools. It is the role of the college instructor, however, to capture the quality of the student performance often in relationship to program or college standards. The difficulty for most teacher education programs is how to accurately evaluate the ever changing performance of each teacher candidate across time (Fallon, Wright, Lalonde, & Browning, 2012).

Ecology of technology use is rapidly changing across the globe. With increasingly diverse college classrooms in every country, technology integration is both a challenge and an opportunity (Zhang, J., Fallon, M., & Russo, T., 2015). New technology has colleges and universities rethinking the tools to manage the ever changing needs of program assessments. Of critical importance is the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Regardless of the discipline or the country in which the program originates, the content must be taught so that all teacher candidates have the opportunity to understand the information and are given the chance to demonstrate their knowledge and skills. Using these instructional strategies, the instructor role seems to shift, from that of a director or controller of the intake of learning to that of a facilitator or provider of learning opportunities. This shift in role for the instructors can better mesh with the salient characteristics of diverse learners and improve the quality of the learning process for all (Fallon & Brown, 2010).

What is the usefulness of special education portfolios and Tk20?

Tk20 is a comprehensive learning outcomes software tool purchased to support the assessment of student learning on college campuses using an archive that acts as an electronic portfolio of the teacher candidate's cumulative performances. Tk20's functionality includes support for defining goals and outcomes related to college and program mission, mapping of the outcomes to curriculum, support of course-based assessments with rubrics aligned to professional and state standards, surveys, field and clinical experience assessments completed by supervisors and faculty, reporting, and tracking of data driven decisions. This is an assessment system for both providing evidence of educational skills and archiving that evidence in such a way as to demonstrate growth of teacher candidates (Fallon, Lalonde, Wright, & Browning, 2012). The system enables assessment at the student,

program, and unit levels, with data collected at the student level and aggregated for review at the program and unit levels for successful national accreditation by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Educators (NCATE), which is now transferred to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Portfolios in teacher education, such as the special education portfolio used in this project, have several unique features that are of importance to any teacher education program in the world. They are flexible, allowing the contents to reflect the uniqueness of the teacher candidate and the individual path of the program. They allow a teacher candidate to document his/her progression from introductory level to mastery of professional skills or to extend the development of the teaching performance from an initial level in coursework to integration in the internship experience. In an electronic assessment system, the contents are permanently archived, yet easily accessible to the teacher candidate and any other person with whom the teacher candidate wishes to share. Tk20 allows for unlimited number of Presentations Portfolios, pulling artifacts from a variety of sources in multiple versions and reflecting multiple viewpoints for both teacher candidates and instructors.

This means instructors incorporate into their teaching course assessments that assist teacher candidates to preview, organize, understand, remember, and retrieve critical concepts. These assessments can be correlated into a presentation portfolio using Tk20 on any given topic or concept. By incorporating presentation portfolios into their teaching, instructors literally teach student how to understand, apply, and demonstrate their skills in any content area. Thus, teacher candidates can apply the same techniques to their studying and the retrieval of the information in test situations. For any teacher candidate, the ability to do self-evaluation on their teaching practices is critical (Fallon, Ackley, & Brown, 2003). A major influence upon a teacher's sense of self as a professional is their ability to reflect upon their dispositions, knowledge, and professional skills using reflection and self-analysis. Thus, teacher education instructors can require the addition of reflection and self-evaluations to the portfolio. This means to incorporate that self-evaluation into the portfolio, making specific plans for future changes that promote the learning of all teacher candidates.

Standards from several professional organizations are embedded into each assignment on Tk20. The flexibility of Tk20 allowed the integration of the content major, along with our dual certification teacher education program. The challenge was developing a special education portfolio that meets content standards in English Language Arts, Foreign Languages, Mathematics, Social Studies, and the Sciences, along with standards for special education. The special education portfolio had to focus on meeting standards in special education. As a result,

faculty, assessment staff, and teacher candidates needed to collaborate in ways they never had before. Working across disciplines is an integral part of a major and minor, a scholarly self, what each person brings to education, and their passions in a multifaceted way. This collaboration led to greater understanding of each other's perspective and of the contribution to student success assessment can have.

What is the role of assessment in special education programs?

The educational process has become a matter of compliance and fulfillment of requirements. This compliance view of education does not require much from the teacher candidates beyond recalling and recognizing key facts and skills, being able to paraphrase and summarize material provided by the instructor, and following directions well enough to provide the instructor "what they want." Instructors in inclusive classrooms recognize the unique individual within each student and work to motivate teacher candidates to participate by relating their individual experiences and perspectives with those reflected within the classroom community and curriculum. Developing uniform units of study can assist teacher candidates in recognizing what they already know and can do, anticipating the types of experiences they will have within a course or activity, and planning for their intentional involvement in the learning process (Parkison, 2010).

Accreditation systems have necessitated a re-thinking of the type and manner of assessments developed for individual courses and within programs. Learning to balance the teaching and learning process is the critical job of the college instructor. College instructors (Fallon, 2010) need to use instructional and assessment strategies that increase retention and retrieval of critical information in ways that were not used in the past. Developing an interdisciplinary assignment is necessary for potential special educators and should be based on planning, teaching, and assessing individual needs of learners using Response To Intervention (RTI) as model and data analysis.

For the special education portfolios, it is important that the teacher candidates were in charge of representing their mastery of meeting the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards using artifacts they create. These artifacts served as examples of their professional growth throughout the program – from entrance into the program when they are being introduced to and practicing knowledge and skills necessary for teaching teacher candidates with disabilities to the final phase of student teaching.

To truly demonstrate "mastery" the teacher candidates must be able to read and understand the CEC standards, create instruction (for example) that reflects an understanding of the CEC standards, and then present and speak to what they have developed and how it meets the standards. If this process was too directed by college

supervisors in student teaching, the end result will represent a combination of the supervisors' and teacher candidates' mastery, not the teacher candidates' alone. This is not only important for the teacher candidates as they push themselves professionally, but it is also a crucial aspect of accreditation requirements for a program.

Why have portfolios in Teacher Education programs?

Inclusion programs have general education and teacher education integrated with each other, generally referred to as dual certification programs. Dual certification programs are similar to a double major. Within a dual certification program, the use of portfolios has long been a strategy used worldwide to document a teacher candidate's progress (Fallon, & Watts, 2001). There are two approved programs with majors in some area of general education and also in special education. Teacher education certification may also be available using an alternative path. Portfolios may be one method of documenting that a teacher candidate has demonstrated the skills necessary to reach certification through the alternative path. One example of this type of portfolio might be an inclusive unit and lesson plan portfolio, demonstrating the ability to plan and teach inclusively.

Teachers naturally feel a responsibility to teacher candidates to guide them and help them understand what our expectations are. Every instructor develops key assessments for his or her course based on course objectives and laid out in the syllabus. Tk20 can be used to share key assessment electronically with the teacher candidates in the class, for teacher candidates to share their work back to the instructor as evidence of meeting course requirements, and for the instructor to provide the teacher candidates with grades on their performance. Tk20 uses this process of sharing files between instructor and student electronically. Results are then archived with each student who then has an electronic academic record of his or her performance in the course. Why might teacher candidates want an assessment record of their performance developed? Every student has access to a complete record of their performance within a class and across a program. This may also be used in job hunting or as evidence of special education professional growth and development. One of the benefits of using Tk20 is the fact that teacher candidates will have access to work uploaded to Tk20 even after they have graduated. Empowering them now will ensure they have the skills they need to successfully use Tk20 to the fullest extent in their professional careers.

Most states have both conventional and alternative paths to certification that often use a portfolio as evidence of program completion. Most colleges and universities have approved programs requiring portfolios as partial fulfillment of requirements. This means they can recommend teacher candidate to states for certification upon conferring of the degree based on the evidence in the exit portfolio. The exit or Credential Portfolio demonstrates

that the teacher candidate's professional abilities and he/she meets standards for teaching in inclusive environments and in the core content areas. The portfolio may also be used as a Master Teacher Portfolio for National Board Certification or as a Showcase Portfolio for job hunting.

Methods

Accredited institutions must have programs that are consistent with national and international standards. In any given syllabus, course objectives are coded with whatever professional standards that are met within the course requirements. In the initial stage of this project, an extensive campus-wide needs assessment of student learning outcomes assessment needs was conducted at a medium size college in western New York in 2009-2010. Results of this needs assessment indicated a campus-wide need to have technology to support assessment of student learning from the planning stages, to data collection, data analysis, data review, data decision making, and tracking of program improvements based upon the data driven decisions. In 2011, Tk20, a comprehensive learning outcomes software tool, was purchased to support the assessment of student learning outcomes campus-wide (www.tk20.com). In the same way, the assessments on Tk20 are coded to the same standards as evidence of performance meeting those standards. In summary, instructors must predetermine the key assessments in a course that meet these standards, measure teacher candidates' performance on the assessments to those standards, and provide feedback to teacher candidates through an assessment system such as Tk20. Instructor training sessions were provided and a "soft rollout" for teacher candidates was planned in the following semester. The purpose of the trainings and soft rollout was to allow stakeholders time to learn the system and develop course based assessments.

Once the Tk20 system was ingrained into the teacher education program, the study was developed to better evaluate the effectiveness of key assessments and the Tk20 system. The purpose of this study was to explore the use of Tk20 as a platform of a special education portfolio in teacher education programs to prepare teacher candidates for meeting professional standards of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). This study was investigation on developing a special education portfolio using Tk20 in inclusive childhood and adolescence teacher education programs in a middle-sized public college located in the northeastern part of the United States. The research question to be explored was: Can a teacher preparation program demonstrate teacher candidates' professional performance and development by using a special education portfolio via Tk20?

Participants

Three instructors from inclusive childhood and adolescence teacher education programs in a middle-sized public college in the northeastern part of the United States participated in this study. All of the three instructors required their teacher candidates to submit core course work into electronic portfolios, and assess their teacher candidates' learning outcomes using the platform of Tk20.

Procedures

Based on the CEC 2001 preparation standards for special educators, a panel of three experts in special education developed core assessments across the special education courses and student teaching practicum during the four phases in the inclusive teacher education programs. All of the experts had doctoral degrees in special education, and had been teaching in the inclusive teacher education programs at the research site for three years or more. Each of the core assessments was initially developed by one instructor who taught the course. It was revised by the panel of experts for accuracy and appropriateness for the alignment with the CEC 2001 standards. Each of the core course assessments was then implemented in an all three special education courses designed to prepare teacher candidates for inclusive classrooms, including teaching students with disabilities. Table 1 indicates the alignment between the core course assessments and the CEC 2001 standards.

Insert Table 1 about here.

Appendix A gives an example of the instructional guideline and scoring rubrics for one of the core course assessments, Standardized Assessment Report (SAR), in EDI 419 Assessments for Special Education. SAR requires teacher candidates to administer and score a norm referenced test, selected on the basis of the needs of a learner. It is followed by the Individualized Education Program (IEP) case study. The assessments of SAR and IEP refer primarily to CEC 2001 Standards 2 & 8. Table 2 provides an example of how the components of the core course assessment of SAR and IEP are aligned to the CEC 2001 standards. By aligning the teacher candidates' performance indicators to the professional organization's standards, the instructors are able to provide teacher candidates specific expectations and feedback on their performance. Furthermore, the department is able to make data-driven decisions regarding the course and the program improvement.

Insert Table 2 about here.

Data Analysis

Descriptive analysis were used to investigate teacher candidates' performance on the core course assessments using Tk20. Both frequency and percentage of the teacher candidates' performance at the categories of

exemplary, proficient, developing, and unacceptable by courses were reported. In addition, the frequency and percentage of the teacher candidates' incompletion of each core course assessment were analyzed and reported.

Results

From Fall 2011 through Spring 2014, in the course of EDI 413, Introduction of Special Education, a total number of 71 teacher candidates' performance met or exceeded the "Developing" criteria of the Family Systems Theory (FST) paper (81.6%). However, 11 teacher candidates failed to submit their FST paper into the Tk20 e-portfolio (12.6%). A total number of 61 teacher candidates' performance met or exceeded the "Developing" criteria of the Functional Behavioral Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plan (FBA/BIP) (70.1%). However, 11 teacher candidates failed to submit their FBA/BIP into the Tk20 portfolio (12.6%). In the course of EDI 414, Methods and Materials in Inclusive Classrooms, a total number of 265 teacher candidates' performance met or exceeded the "Developing" criteria of the Unit Planning Assessment (96.0%). However, seven teacher candidates failed to submit their Unit Plans into the Tk20 portfolio (2.5%). A total number of 269 teacher candidates' performance met or exceeded the "Developing" criteria of the Lesson Planning Assessment (97.5%). However, six teacher candidates failed to submit their Lesson Plans into the Tk20 portfolio (2.2%). In the course of EDI 419, Assessments for Special Education, a total number of 225 teacher candidates' performance met or exceeded the "Developing" criteria of the Standardized Assessment Report (SAR) (81.5%). Only one teacher candidate failed to submit the SAR into the Tk20 portfolio (0.4%). A total number of 235 teacher candidates' performance met or exceeded the "Developing" criteria of the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) (85.1%). However, 20 teacher candidates failed to submit their IEP into the Tk20 portfolio (7.2%). More detailed data analyses were reported in Table 3. Since more than one assessment is mapped to each CEC 2001 standards, the number and percentage of teacher candidates whose performance met or exceeded the "Developing" criteria of the core course assessments indicated that, in general, each standard was met successfully.

Insert Table 3 about here.

Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore the use of Tk20 as a platform of a special education portfolio in teacher education programs to prepare teacher candidates for meeting professional standards of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). This study was investigation on developing a special education portfolio using Tk20 in inclusive childhood and adolescence teacher education programs in a middle-sized public college located in the

northeastern part of the United States. The current study was an investigation exploring the following research question: Can a teacher preparation program demonstrate teacher candidates' professional performance and development by using a special education portfolio via Tk20? The results of this study indicate that the use of electronic assessment systems such as Tk20 can be a valuable tool in the growth and development of teacher candidates worldwide.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations associated with this study. The first limitation pertains to the use of data collected from the courses taught by the three participating instructors. Each of the three special education courses was offered by multiple instructors, so the data reported in this study did not cover all teacher candidates' performance. Another limitation was the different sample size across the three courses. Over the three school years, since the participating instructors taught more sessions of special education courses at higher levels, that is, EDI 414 Methods and Materials in Inclusive Classrooms and EDI 419 Assessments for Special Education, more data were reported and analyzed from these two courses, compared to the data from EDI 413 Introduction of Special Education. Because of these limitations, findings of this study should be interpreted with caution.

In spite of these limitations, as reported in the "Results" section, since more than one assessment is mapped to each CEC 2001 standards, the number and percentage of teacher candidates whose performance met or exceeded the "Developing" criteria of the core course assessments indicated that, in general, each standard was met successfully. The results of this study indicated that a teacher preparation program can demonstrate teacher candidates' professional performance and development by using a special education portfolio via Tk20. Beyond the scope of this study, there are lessons learned about special education portfolio implementation that we discuss as follows.

What are the lessons learned about special education portfolio implementation?

Overall, this was a valuable experience and one that was worth it at this institution. However, the stakeholders in this project learned some valuable lessons that changed the outcomes of the project. The first lesson was that analytical and reflective thinking is important to our institution. This lesson is consistent with the research literature on self-evaluation (Fallon, Ackley, & Brown, 2003). However, there was a short time line for training and implementation of this project. In hindsight, additional time for faculty conversations, training, and troubleshooting would have been helpful. Purposeful and intentional conversations with supervisors, faculty, staff, and teacher

candidates about portfolio usage would have been valuable. Such discussions might have averted some problems in archiving critical performances in realistic settings. Early on in the implementation process, some instructors viewed the submission and grading of artifacts in Tk20 as optional. Therefore, a policy was written for the Professional Education Unit (PEU) that was explicit in detailing required course assessments. Perhaps earlier conversations with instructors and supervisors could have avoided this issue.

Another lesson learned in this study was to be explicit in directions to teacher candidates about the core assessments and accompanying rubrics. The researchers in this study suggested that one issue should be addressed early in process is to stress that the work in Tk20 needs to be the teacher candidates' own work. Since the special education 's portfolio is meant to showcase and highlight the teacher candidates' abilities to use CEC standards to guide their creation and implementation of instruction to all learners, only artifacts that are of their own original design should be uploaded into the portfolios. If a student has created an original artifact using other previously created resources as inspiration, credit should be given to the original author(s) (using APA 6th ed.) so credit is being given where it is due. In the case of a core assessment that is the product of group work, each teacher candidate must identify his/her own contributions. References and footnotes can be used to identify where any shared work is evident.

Colleges and universities worldwide have policies on honesty and honor. Such policies are commonly explained in handbooks, orientations, and in course syllabus. The researchers in this study advise that those policies should be reviewed in light of electronic systems such as Tk20 for authenticity and application to online sources. Academic honesty and plagiarism policies should be part not only of instructors' and supervisors' syllabus but also incorporated into the core assessments themselves. College instructors may choose to also give teacher candidates explicit examples of acceptable ways of sharing ideas and information and ways in which honesty may be compromised. In this study, the researchers found that teacher candidates did not always have a clear understanding of when honesty was compromised.

Unlike some course managements systems, users of Tk20 do not see the same information at the same time. This is an area that the researchers in this study suggest should be carefully studied for effects on quality of the core assessments. Instructors do not see a final core assessment until the teacher candidate has submitted it for feedback or grading. Therefore, it would be helpful for both teacher candidates and instructors to download guides and tutorial for one another. Course instructors and supervisors should look at the tutorials and guides for teacher candidates.

Teacher candidates should review the information available to instructors so as to better understand the process of Tk20 submissions. Such a process of “training” both the college instructors and teacher candidates in the mechanics of submitting core assessments is an important matter of efficacy of electronic portfolios.

Future studies should also focus on the transition from a teacher education program to the first year of teaching in public schools and beyond. Some studies (Fallon & Brown, 2002) have found that this transition from promising teacher candidate to novice teacher can be difficult for some. Tk20 has the capability to allow teacher candidates to continue archiving their performances, thus continuing to document electronically their growth as professional. The results of this study are promising for teacher education programs on an international level in finding new ways to document the development of critical skills for new teachers on the global stage.

References

Beane, J. (2005). *A reason to teach: Creating classrooms of dignity and hope -- the power of the democratic way.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Boostrom, R. (2005). *Thinking: The foundation of critical and creative learning in the classroom.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Costa, A. L. (2008). *The School as a home for the mind: Creating mindful curriculum, instruction, and dialogue* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Davis, B., Sumara, D., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2008). *Engaging minds: Changing teaching in complex times* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fallon, M., (2010). *Changing Instructional Strategies and Methods to Meet the Needs of All Learners.* In M. Fallon & S. Brown (Eds.) *Teaching Inclusively in Higher Education.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Co.

Fallon, M., Ackley, B., & Brown S., (2003). Reflection as a strategy for teaching performance-based assessment. *Brock Education, 13*(1), 40-49.

Fallon, M., & Brown, S., (2002). Crossing over from student teaching to first year teaching. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue, 4*(1), 37-46.

Fallon, M., & Watts, E. (Winter, 2001). Portfolio assessment: Navigating uncharted territory. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 24*(1), 50-57.

Fallon, M. Wright, A. Lalonde, K. and Browning, M. (2012) "Implementing TK20 Assessment System: A Collaborative Effort," *The Spectrum: A Scholars Day Journal*: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 2.
Available at: http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/spectrum/vol2/iss1/2

Fallon, M., Lalonde, K., Wright, A., & Browning, M. (April, 2012). *Implementing Tk20 Assessment System* Scholar's Day, State University of New York-College at Brockport, Brockport, NY.

Parkison, P., (2010). *The Changing Role of Instructors as Both Leaders and Learners***.** In M. Fallon & S. Brown (Eds.) *Teaching Inclusively in Higher Education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Co.

Zhang, J., Fallon, M., & Russo, T. (2015). Impact of technology devices on college students' comfortable levels of using technology. *International Journal of Technology, Teaching, and Learning, 11(2)***,** 90-103.

Zmuda, A. (2008). Springing into active learning: Giving teacher candidates ownership of learning. *Educational Leadership, 66*(3), 38-42.

TABLE 1. ***Alignment Between the Core Assessments and CEC 2001 Standards***

Assessment	**CEC 2001 Standards**								
	1 Foundations	**2 Development & Characteristics of Learners**	**3 Individual Learning Differences**	**4 Instructional Strategies**	**5 Learning Environments & Social Interacti**	**6 Language**	**7 Instructional Planning**	**8 Assessment**	**9 Professional & Ethical Practice**

						ons						
1. Family Systems Theory (FST) Paper in EDI 413 (Phase I)	X			X								
2. Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA) & Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP) in EDI 413 (Phase I)		X		X								
3. Inclusive Unit Planning and Lesson Planning Assessment in EDI 414 (Phase II)					X		X		X			
4. Standardized Assessment Report (SAR) and Individualized Education Program (IEP) Case Study in EDI 419 (Phase III)		X								X		
5. Performance-based Student Teaching Evaluation in Special Education Student Teaching Practicum (Phase IV)					X		X	X	X	X	X	X
6. Professional Education Unit (PEU) Global Assessment of Candidate Performance (GACP) in Special Education Student Teaching Practicum (Phase IV)					X		X		X	X	X	

TABLE 2.
Alignment Between EDI 419 Working Portfolio Artifact Core Course Assessment Components and CEC 2001 Standards

Special Education Standardized Assessment Report (SAR) and Individualized Education Plan (IEP)	
CEC 2001 Standard	**Assessment Component**
ICC8K1, ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K4, IGC8K1, IGC8K2, IGC8K3	SAR: General information on the standardized test: Understand assessment terminology, legal provisions and ethical principles, assessment procedures, and its limitations
ICC2K1, ICC2K2, ICC2K3, ICC2K5, ICC2K6	SAR: Test-taker information: Understand human development, educational implications of exceptionalities, and individuals with and without exceptional learning needs
ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S7, ICC8S9, IGC8S2, IGC8S3	SAR: Test administration information: Conduct non-biased assessment with technology, and report results
ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S8, IGC8S1, IGC8S4, IGC8S5	SAR: Test result interpretation and recommendation: Interpret assessment information, and monitor progress
ICC2K1, ICC2K2, ICC2K3, ICC2K5, ICC2K6, ICC2K7, IGC2K1, IGC2K2	IEP: Present Levels of Performance and Individual Needs (PLOP): Understand human growth and development, educational implications of exceptionalities, similarities and differences among individuals with and without exceptional learning needs
ICC2K2, ICC2K3, ICC2K7, IGC2K2, IGC2K4	IEP: Annual Goals/Short-term Objectives: Understand educational implications of characteristics of exceptionalities, sensory impairments, physical and health needs, psychological and social-emotional characteristics of individuals with exceptional learning needs
ICC8K1, ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K4, ICC8S5, IGC8K1, IGC8K2, IGC8K3, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8	IEP: Evaluation and Recommendations: Understand assessment terminology, legal provisions and ethical principles, assessment procedures, and its limitations; Interpret assessment information, and monitor progress

TABLE 3.
Descriptive Analyses by Assessment
EDI 413. FST Paper: Performance (Frequency, %) & Mean Score

Term	Exemplary (95-100)	Proficient (87-94)	Developing (77-86)	Unacceptable (-76)	Incomplete	Total
Fall 2011	22 (75.9%)	2 (6.9%)	2 (6.9%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (6.9%)	29
Spring 2012	13 (61.9%)	1 (4.8%)	2 (9.5%)	3 (14.3%)	2 (9.5%)	21
Spring 2013	12 (80%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (6.7%)	15
Spring 2014	4 (18.2%)	11 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.5%)	6 (27.3%)	22
Total	51 (58.6%)	15 (17.2%)	5 (5.7%)	5 (5.7%)	**11 (12.6%)**	87
Total Number of Teacher Candidates Meeting Performance Criterion of *Developing* or Better (N = 87)						**71**

						(81.6 %)

EDI 413. FBA/BIP: Performance (Frequency, %) & Mean Score

Term	Exemplary (95-100)	Proficient (87-94)	Developing (77-86)	Unacceptable (-76)	Incomplete	Total
Fall 2011	9 (31.0%)	9 (31.0%)	5 (17.2%)	5 (17.2%)	1 (3.4%)	29
Spring 2012	2 (9.5%)	7 (33.3%)	1 (4.8%)	9 (42.9%)	2 (9.5%)	21
Spring 2013	3 (20%)	7 (46.7%)	3 (20%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (6.7%)	15
Spring 2014	12 (54.5%)	3 (13.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (31.8)	22
Total	26 (29.9%)	26 (29.9%)	9 (10.3%)	15 (17.2%)	**11 (12.6%)**	87
Total Number of Teacher Candidates Meeting Performance Criterion of *Developing* or Better (N = 87)						**61 (70.1 %)**

EDI 414. Unit Planning Assessment: Performance (Frequency, %) & Mean Score

Term	Exemplary (95-100)	Proficient (87-94)	Developing (77-86)	Unacceptable (-76)	Incomplete	Total
Fall 2011	56 (90.3%)	3 (4.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.8%)	62
Spring 2012	39 (92.9%)	2 (4.8%)	1 (2.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	42
Fall 2012	47 (88.7%)	3 (5.7%)	2 (3.8%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	53
Spring 2013	24 (61.5%)	8 (20.5%)	2 (5.1%)	3 (7.7%)	2 (5.1%)	39
Fall 2013	44 (80%)	4 (7.3%)	5 (9.1%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.6%)	55
Spring 2014	17 (68.0%)	4 (16.0%)	4 (16.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	25
Total	227 (82.2%)	24 (8.7%)	14 (5.1%)	4 (1.4%)	**7 (2.5%)**	276
Total Number of Teacher Candidates Meeting Performance Criterion of *Developing* or Better (N = 276)						**265 (96.0 %)**

TABLE 3. ***Descriptive Analysis by Assessment (Continued)***

EDI 414. Lesson Planning Assessment: Performance (Frequency, %) & Mean Score

Term	Exemplary (95-100)	Proficient (87-94)	Developing (77-86)	Unacceptable (-76)	Incomplete	Total
Fall 2011	53 (85.5%)	5 (8.1%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.8%)	62
Spring 2012	38 (90.5%)	1 (2.4%)	1 (2.4%)	1 (2.4%)	1 (2.4%)	42
Fall 2012	50 (94.3%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	53

Spring 2013	26 (66.7%)	9 (23.1%)	3 (7.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.6%)	39
Fall 2013	38 (69.1%)	9 (16.4%)	7 (12.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.8)	55
Spring 2014	19 (76.0%)	5 (20.0%)	1 (4.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	25
Total	224 (81.2%)	30 (10.9%)	15 (5.4%)	1 (0.4%)	**6 (2.2%)**	276
Total Number of Teacher Candidates Meeting Performance Criterion of *Developing* or Better (N = 276)						**269 (97.5 %)**

EDI 419. SAR: Performance (Frequency, %) & Mean Score						
Term	**Exemplary (95-100)**	**Proficient (87-94)**	**Developing (77-86)**	**Unacceptable (-76)**	**Incomplete**	**Total**
Fall 2011	17 (73.9%)	6 (26.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	23
Spring 2012	10 (71.4%)	1 (7.1%)	2 (14.3%)	1 (7.1%)	0 (0%)	14
Fall 2012	10 (13.7%)	44 (60.3%)	12 (16.4%)	6 (8.2%)	1 (1.4%)	73
Spring 2013	9 (21.4%)	9 (21.4%)	7 (16.7%)	17 (40.5%)	0 (0%)	42
Fall 2013	42 (52.5%)	6 (7.5%)	17 (21.3%)	15 (18.8%)	0 (0%)	80
Spring 2014	5 (11.4%)	18 (40.9%)	10 (22.7%)	11 (25.0%)	0 (0%)	44
Total	93 (33.7%)	84 (30.4%)	48 (17.4%)	50 (18.1%)	**1 (0.4%)**	276
Total Number of Teacher Candidates Meeting Performance Criterion of *Developing* or Better (N = 276)						**225 (81.5 %)**

EDI 419. IEP: Performance (Frequency, %) & Mean Score						
Term	**Exemplary (95-100)**	**Proficient (87-94)**	**Developing (77-86)**	**Unacceptable (-76)**	**Incomplete**	**Total**
Fall 2011	14 (60.9%)	9 (39.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	23
Spring 2012	4 (28.6%)	10 (71.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14
Fall 2012	28 (38.4%)	28 (38.4%)	10 (13.7%)	3 (4.1%)	4 (5.5%)	73
Spring 2013	10 (23.8%)	11 (26.2%)	5 (11.9%)	5 (11.9%)	11 (26.2%)	42
Fall 2013	29 (36.3%)	38 (47.5%)	5 (6.3%)	7 (8.8%)	1 (1.3%)	80
Spring 2014	20 (45.5%)	11 (25.0%)	3 (6.8%)	6 (13.6%)	4 (9.1%)	44
Total	105 (38.0%)	107 (38.8%)	23 (8.3%)	21 (7.6%)	**20 (7.2%)**	276
Total Number of Teacher Candidates Meeting Performance Criterion of *Developing* or Better (N = 276)						**235 (85.1 %)**

Appendix A. EDI 419 Working Portfolio Artifact-Special Education Standardized Assessment Report (SAR) and Individualized Education Plan (IEP)

Part 1: Special Education Standardized Assessment Report (SAR) Instructional Guideline and Scoring Rubrics

Description of Task

Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) are informed by the results of more than one assessment. Often, different people will administer each assessment. Create an assessment plan for one of your students. Select a **norm referenced assessment** based on the **individual needs** of the learner, **administer** it, and **determine allowable accommodations** based on the scoring. Write an assessment report on the test administered, responding to the prompts given by your instructor. Your goal is **to write a formal assessment report**.

You must administer a standardized test to someone (sibling, parent, significant other, classmate, roommate, etc.) with permission of your instructor based on individual circumstances. If you could, you are encouraged to give the test to a child with disabilities, **but ONLY with the permission of his/her school-based teacher educator, his/her parents, and the student if appropriate**. There are not enough tests to go around, so groups of two or three will each choose a test. The test will be passed around within the group until **everyone has had an opportunity to administer it**. Score the test and write an assessment report with recommendations. Based on the information provided by standardized tests and other assessments, your student may be identified with one or more of the 13 categories of disabilities and then an IEP may be developed for your student based on the assessment report.

Your report and IEP should include the following information: test information, including type of test, strengths, weaknesses, reliability, validity, scoring, and standardization sampling. You must also describe: the test environment, student behavior, monitoring of performance, unusual impacts to testing, and any other influences. **List any additional assessments you will need to conduct and why.** Describe your timetable for these assessments. Include in your report what allowable accommodations will be used during testing and in the classroom. You will be graded on organization, completeness of the report, grammar conventions, and recommendations for the student's programming. You must add a reflection on your own performance of this assignment. Be specific in your areas of strength and those in which you need to grow as a professional. Graduate students will also be graded on their use and appropriateness of the American Psychological Association (APA) style.

Rationale

A standardized test is a test administered and scored consistently and strictly based on standard procedures. It is a critical component to provide information during the identification and education process for students with disabilities. Within the Childhood and Adolescence Inclusive programs, each teacher candidate was introduced to different standardized tests, their administration, scoring, and interpretation procedure. It is the intent of this assignment to help teacher candidates develop a better understanding of standardized tests and demonstrate the skills needed to administer and score the test, and interpret the test results through a formal assessment report.

Alignment with CEC Standards (CEC 2001 Standards 2 and 8)

This assessment meets or exceeds standards set by NCATE, CEC, ACEI, and other content area professional organizations, including the following standards: CEC *2001 standards 2. Development and characteristics of learners, and 8. Assessment.*

Prompts

A. Prompts for General Information on the Standardized Test:

- Test Name:
- Test Purpose(s):
- Who administers the assessment?
- Test Type:
    - Criterion-referenced
    - Norm-referenced
- Environment of the assessment:
- Test format:
- Scoring procedures:
- Standardization:
- Overall achievement or specific dimension:
- Reliability:
- Validity:

B. Prompts for Test Administration Information:

- Type of test administration setting:
- Age of the student:
- Gender of the student:
- Grade level of the student:
- Primary language of the student:
- How long did test administration take? Number of sessions?

- Assessment Results:
- Benefits of test selected:
- Weaknesses of test selected:
- Interpretations/Recommendations:
- Feedback to guide the student's future learning/How the results will be used to help the student:

What feedback do you provide for the student to address his/her individual strengths and continuing needs based on the results of the standardized test?

How will you as a teacher support the student to apply the feedback to guide improvement in the specific area?

How will you as a teacher support the student to move toward using error prevention strategies, self-assessment, self-instruction, and/or self-correction?

- Using assessment to inform instruction/Future monitoring of the student:

Describe next steps for instruction to reinforce current strengths of the student;

Describe next steps for instruction to support further progress in the curriculum;

Based on what the student knows and can do and your next steps, describe implications for the student's IEP goals and/or curriculum.

C. Personal Reflection: A paragraph reflecting on your skills as a test administrator:

What do you feel you did well?

What have you learned during the process of this assignment which may contribute to your professional growth?

What skills do you still need to develop?

D. Prompts for Report and IEP Writing - In addition to the completeness of your report, the following will also be considered in grading:

1. Report organization:
2. Grammar and spelling:

- APA (for students enrolled in EDI 519):

Points Possible:
Total Points Achieved:

Rubric and Grading Criteria

All sections of this assignment must be loaded into Tk20 within the time limits given by your instructor. Your instructor will use the following rubric to evaluate the evidence you provided based on the assignment criteria and the specific CEC standards incorporated into the rubric:

CEC Standard	Exemplary (3)	Proficient (2)	Developing (1)	Unacceptable (0)
General information on the standardized test: Understand assessment terminology, legal provisions and ethical principles, assessment procedures, and its limitations (ICC8K1, ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K4, IGC8K1, IGC8K2, IGC8K3)	Teacher candidate **demonstrates understanding of** the appropriate **use and limitations** of various types of assessments; **AND demonstrates understanding of** the **legal policies and ethical principles of measurement and assessment** related to referral, eligibility, program planning, instruction, and placement for individuals with and/or without exceptional learning needs (ELN), including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds by **addressing all topics on** appropriate selection of the test, assessment environment, scoring procedure, and explanation of benefits and weaknesses of the assessment.	Teacher candidate **demonstrates understanding of** the appropriate **use and limitations** of various types of assessments; **OR demonstrates understanding of** the **legal policies and ethical principles of measurement and assessment** related to referral, eligibility, program planning, instruction, and placement for individuals with and/or without exceptional learning needs (ELN), including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds by **addressing most but not all topics on** appropriate selection of the test, assessment environment, scoring procedure, or explanation of the benefits and weaknesses of the assessment.	Teacher candidate **demonstrates understanding of** the appropriate **use and limitations** of various types of assessments by addressing on some topics on appropriate selection of the test, or assessment environment, or scoring procedure, or explanation of the benefits, or weaknesses of the assessment.	Teacher candidate's **understanding of** the appropriate **use and limitations** of various types of assessments **is not addressed**.
Test-taker information: Understand human development, educational implications of exceptionalities, and individuals with and without exceptional learning needs (ICC2K1, ICC2K2, ICC2K3, ICC2K5, ICC2K6)	Teacher candidate knows and **demonstrates respect** for students first as unique human beings; **understands** the **similarities and differences in human development** and the characteristics between and among individuals with and/or without ELN; **AND understands** how **exceptional conditions** can **interact** with the domains of human development, and **knowledge and skills to use this knowledge to respond to the**	Teacher candidate knows and **demonstrates respect** for students first as unique human beings; demonstrates **understanding of** the **similarities and differences in human development** and the characteristics between and among individuals with and/or without ELN; **OR demonstrates some understanding of** the **similarities and differences in human development** and the characteristics between and among individuals with and/or without	Teacher candidate **demonstrates understandings of** the **similarities and differences in human development** and the characteristics between and among individuals with and/or without ELN by **making loose connections between the selected test with learner's development and characteristics**, such as age, gender, grade level, primary language, and ability level.	Teacher candidate **respect** for students first as unique human beings is not present; OR **understanding of** the **similarities and differences in human development** and the characteristics between and among individuals with and/or without ELN **OR understanding of** how **exceptional conditions** can **interact** with the domains of human development, and **knowledge and skills to use this knowledge to respond to the varying abilities and**

	varying abilities and behaviors of individuals with and/or without ELN by **making close connections between the selected test with learner's development and characteristics**, such as age, gender, grade level, primary language, and ability level.	ELN by **making some connections between the selected test with learner's development and characteristics**, such as age, gender, grade level, primary language, and ability level.		**behaviors of individuals** with and/or without ELN **is not addressed** and **makes no connections between the selected test with learner's development and characteristics**.

CEC Standard	Exemplary (3)	Proficient (2)	Developing (1)	Unacceptable (0)
Test administration information: Conduct non-biased assessment with technology, and report results (ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S7, ICC8S9, IGC8S2, IGC8S3)	Teacher candidate **demonstrates ability to conduct formal and informal assessments** of behavior, learning, achievement, and environments to design learning experiences that support the growth and development of individuals with and/or without ELN; **AND demonstrates knowledge and skills to collaborate** with families and/or other colleagues to assure **non-biased, meaningful assessments;** and **demonstrates knowledge and skills to use appropriate technologies** to support assessments.	Teacher candidate **demonstrates ability to conduct formal and informal assessments** of behavior, learning, achievement, and environments to design learning experiences that support the growth and development of individuals with and/or without ELN; **OR demonstrates knowledge and skills to collaborate** with families and/or other colleagues to assure **non-biased, meaningful assessments or demonstrates knowledge and skills to use appropriate technologies** to support assessments..	Teacher candidate **demonstrates knowledge and skills to conduct formal and informal assessments** of behavior, learning, achievement, and environments to design learning experiences that support the growth and development of individuals with and/or without ELN.	Teacher candidate's ability to **conduct formal and informal assessments** of behavior, learning, achievement, and environments to design learning experiences that support the growth and development of individuals with and/or without ELN **is not addressed**.
Test result interpretation and recommendation: Interpret assessment information, and monitor progress (ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S8, IGC8S1, IGC8S4, IGC8S5)	Teacher candidate **demonstrates knowledge and skills to** use the results of assessments to help identify ELNs and to develop and implement individualized instructional programs, as well as to adjust instruction in response to ongoing learning	Teacher candidate **demonstrates knowledge and skills to** use the results of assessments to help identify ELN and to develop and implement individualized instructional programs, as well as to adjust instruction in response to ongoing learning	Teacher candidate **demonstrates knowledge and skills to** use the results of assessments to help identify ELN and to develop and implement individualized instructional programs, as well as to adjust instruction in response to ongoing learning	Teacher candidate's ability to use the results of assessments to help identify ELN and to develop and implement individualized instructional programs, as well as to adjust instruction in

	progress; **demonstrates understanding of measurement theory and practices** for addressing issues of validity, reliability, norms, bias, and interpretation of assessment results; **AND demonstrates knowledge and skills to use** assessment information to **identify supports and adaptations** required for individuals with and/or without ELN to access the general curriculum and to participate in school, system, and statewide assessment programs by **making data-driven and evidence-based recommendations** to guide learner's future learning.	progress; **AND demonstrates understanding of measurement theory and practices** for addressing issues of validity, reliability, norms, bias, and interpretation of assessment results by **making data-driven and evidence-based recommendations** to guide learner's future learning.	progress by **making data-driven recommendations** to guide learner's future learning.	response to ongoing learning progress **is not addressed**.
Content	The content is written clearly and concisely, with a very logical progression of ideas, and creates a strong sense of purpose.	The content is written with a fairly logical progression of ideas, and creates a fairly strong sense of purpose.	The content is vague in conveying a point of view, does not stay on topic, and the purpose is vague.	The content lacks a clear point of view, does not stay on topic, and lacks logical sequence.
Writing Mechanics	The paper is written with no errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.	The paper is clearly written with 1-3 errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.	The paper is written with 4-6 errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.	The paper is written with 7 or more errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling, and major revision is needed.
APA Style (for EDI 519)	APA style and mechanics for referencing are used correctly with no errors.	APA style and mechanics for referencing are used mostly correct, but with 1-3 errors.	APA style and mechanics for referencing are used with 4-6 errors.	APA style and mechanics for referencing are used incorrectly with 7 or more errors, or missing.