

**CHARTER COLLEGE OF EDUCATION and UNIT
CTC Credential Program Biennial Report
2012-2014**

Section A – Credential Program Specific Information

Program Name: Education Specialist Credentials in Special Education

Department/Division Name: Division of Special Education and Counseling

I. Contextual Information

Description of the Program:

The Education Specialist credential program is housed in the Division of Special Education and Counseling. The program offers flexibility with multiple entry points that enable candidates at the undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, and graduate level to enter the field of special education. There are several programs of study including the undergraduate blended, internship, preliminary, and clear. Credential options are available in the areas of early childhood special education, mild/moderate disabilities, moderate/severe disabilities, physical and health impairments, and visual impairments. Candidates may pursue added authorizations in autism and other health impairments.

Credential candidates comprise a diverse group and include students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, students who are bilingual, students who are the first in their family to graduate from college, and students who are pursuing career changes. Los Angeles County is the primary service area. The program has more than 100 internship affiliations with local schools. The program also serves surrounding counties in the southern half of California, from San Diego to Bakersfield, due to the limited number of university programs offering certification in low incidence disability areas.

Program Changes as a result of 2009-2011 Biennial Report: (bulleted lists are acceptable)

The prior biennial report identified collaboration as an area for enhancement. Collaboration was addressed in candidates' early practicum through the addition of readings and instruction emphasizing conflict resolution and identifying specific communication skills. Data from the current biennial report indicates candidates are satisfactory in this area (e.g. site administrator and university supervisor ratings; candidates' perceptions of the quality of instruction in the area of collaboration during their practicum as well as in the Current Student Annual Survey). Previously, data were not collected on candidates completing their Level II credential. With the introduction of the Clear credential, new measures examining candidates' performance on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession have been added. The program tracks candidates' perceptions of growth from the end of student teaching to the clearing of their preliminary credential.

Data collection processes are being improved through the use of electronic tools such as Survey Gizmo and those available in the Learning Management System.

Brief Description of Program Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity (e.g., Program Assessment or Site Visit):

Core credential classes were infused with content related to Autism spectrum disorders, English learners, assistive technology, and transition. Faculty members facilitated the transition from the *Level I* to the *Preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential* requirements, as well as developed fieldwork assignments for meeting the *Clear* fieldwork requirements. This included assignments assessing candidates’ skill and knowledge in universal design and meeting the needs of English learners. Seminars have been added for interns to address the requirement for extended supervision hours and to provide in-depth support for teaching English learners. The Special Education program added a new certificate in *Teaching Learners with Special Needs in the General Education Classroom*. This will allow general educators to better address the needs of children with disabilities included in their classrooms. The Charter College is now preparing for the conversion from a quarter to semester system and courses are being redesigned so that all CTC standards are reflected in the new configuration.

Alignment of the Program with the Conceptual Framework: The conceptual framework of the Charter College of Education (CCOE) represents the shared vision and contributions of the faculty and programs within the college. The framework, clearly illustrated in course syllabi, serves as a foundation for program development, improvements, and the conceptualization and implementation of a meaningful assessment system within the program. Faculty is focused on offering collaborative ventures to promote enhanced learning outcomes for all learners.

Program Specific Candidate Information

Program Specific Candidate Information		
Site – on campus	Number of Candidates in the Program in Spring 2012 - Winter 2014	Number of Completers or Graduates Spring 2012 - Winter 2014
Site – on campus	Number of Candidates in the Program in Spring 2013 - Winter 2014	Number of Completers or Graduates Spring 2013 - Winter 2014

II. Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

Primary Candidate Assessments Preliminary Credential

Assessment Instrument	Description
1. Foundations Assessment	This tool is a pre/post 24 item multiple-choice assessment that measures candidate knowledge of basic concepts in special education such as assessment practices, special education law and regulations, and effective teaching strategies. It is administered at three time points: a) program entry, b) mid-way through coursework, and c) completion of coursework.
2. Observation of Candidate Teaching Performance	Candidates are assessed twice during practicum: midway and at the end of the credential program. A five point rubric is used to score candidates in each of four domains: a) managing the teaching and learning environment, b) assessment, c) collaboration, and d) curriculum. Mean scores from each time point are compared in each domain as well as the overall total proficiency score. Scores range from 0-20.
3. Administrator/ Master Teacher Evaluation of Candidate Teaching Performance	Candidate performance is rated by the evaluating administrator if they are an intern, and by a master teacher if they are a traditional student teacher. Candidates are assessed on 13 items using a 5-point Likert scale. The items include topics such as knowledge of pedagogy, collaborative techniques, and effective assessment practice.

Primary Candidate Assessments Clear Credential

Assessment Instrument	Description
4. Master Teacher/ Support Provider Assessment of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.	This measure is used by both the candidate and the master teacher or support provider to evaluate candidate's evidence for meeting each of the CSTP domains using a 4 point Likert-type scale (0 = no evidence – 3 = outstanding evidence). This measure is administered at the end of student teaching/demonstration of competencies to identify areas the candidate can focus on as they transition to induction and clearing the preliminary credential. It provides a baseline for comparing candidates' perceptions of their growth in skill once they have completed their Clear credential.
5. Self-assessment of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession at the beginning of the induction process.	This measure asks candidates to rate their performance for each domain of the CSTP (Making Subject Matter Comprehensible, Assessing Student Learning, Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning, Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences, Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments, and Developing as a Professional Educator.) using a 5 point Likert-type scale (1= competency not met – 5 = competency met). Candidates self-assess at the <i>beginning of the induction process to help them focus on areas for improvement.</i>
6. Self-assessment of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession at the end of the induction process.	This measure asks candidates to rate their performance for each domain of the CSTP (Making Subject Matter Comprehensible, Assessing Student Learning, Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning, Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences, Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments, and Developing as a Professional Educator.) using a 5 point Likert-type scale (1= competency not met – 5 = competency met). Candidates self-assess at the <i>end of the induction process to reflect on their growth in the areas selected for improvement.</i>

Primary Candidate Assessments Added Authorizations

Assessment Instrument	Description
7. Demonstration of Knowledge in Evidence Based Practice for Autism.	This key assignment examines candidate understanding of evidence based practice in autism. Candidates investigate one topic in the autism literature that has led to the development of intervention strategies, best practice, diagnostics, or curriculum differentiation that can be used in the field.
8. Planning and Implementing Instruction in Social Communication for Students with Autism.	This key assignment evaluates candidates' ability to conduct a social and communicative assessment of a student with autism and to use the findings to develop and implement an intervention plan for the student
9. Assessment of Key Assignments in Other Health Impairments.	Candidates are assessed for mastery of content related to the authorization in Other Health Impairments through a series of key assignments. Candidate performance is tracked at the individual candidate level as they move through the program. Data on candidate performance of relevant standards is displayed in a table in section III.

Additional Information on Candidate, Program Completers, and Program Performance Effectiveness

Assessment Tool	Description
10. Learning Center Surveys	This survey asks students enrolled in EDSP 407 to self rate their ability to use instructional strategies during their first fieldwork experience. In addition, it asks students to indicate the extent to which instruction during fieldwork helped them acquire these skills.
11. Current Student Survey	This is an annual survey administered by the Charter College that surveys all special education credential candidates about the effectiveness of their program, the extent to which the coursework emphasizes the College's Mission and Vision, and their satisfaction with various offices and faculty performance.
12. Community Advisory Survey and Meeting	Community members (district administrators, master teachers, principals, school psychologists, etc.) meet with Special Education faculty to discuss the preparation of candidates. Notes are also taken during the annual meeting with the community members and are later triangulated with the Community Advisory Survey. Former candidates were surveyed about the value of their coursework in preparing them to be educators.

III. Analysis and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

Program trends:

- *How does candidate data from the first year compare to the second year within this report?*
 - Performance is not significantly different from one year to the next. Overall performance is either proficient or higher.
- *How does candidate data from one group or service delivery option compare to another?*
 - Candidate performance is commensurate across program areas.
 - Interns tend to score higher than either traditional candidates or ULRN/Blended majors.
 - Candidates earning added authorizations demonstrate a thorough knowledge of standards related to their area.
- *What factors may or may not have contributed to the differences (if any)?*
 - Interns have more opportunities to integrate their knowledge with practice.
 - Candidates pursuing added authorizations have additional coursework and field assignments.

Program strengths:

- *What does the data say about candidate competence?*
 - Candidates demonstrate strong performance in both fieldwork placements.
 - As candidates progress through their program, their skill and knowledge increases. This is true for traditional candidates, interns, and ULRN/blended majors.
 - Master teachers, site administrators, and former candidates indicate the program is effective in producing competent, knowledgeable, and well-prepared teachers.
- *What does the data say about program effectiveness?*
 - The program produces consistent and strong results across areas and groups.

Program areas of improvement:

- *What areas for improvement have been identified through the analysis of the data?*
 - Candidates' ability to assess student performance and use that information to inform instruction is relatively weak compared to other areas.
- *What program changes should be made to improve candidate readiness and program quality?*
 - Specific suggestions for tackling candidate competence in the area of formative assessment is provided in the action plan at the end of the document.

1. FOUNDATIONS ASSESSMENT

A total of 24 points is possible on the Foundations Assessment. The measure is administered three times throughout the program: once early in the candidate's career, during the first practicum, and again in the final practicum.

**An analysis of variance demonstrated no significant differences between overall performance of all candidates in 2013 and 2014 despite slightly lower scores in 2014.*

Candidates demonstrate growth over time and interns tend to score slightly higher.

Foundations Assessment: ALL CANDIDATES						
Time Point	Number		Mean		Std. Deviation	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Time 1 (EDSP 300)	83	58	12.61	11.86	4.3	4.0
Time 2 (EDSP 407)	95	63	17.67	17.57	2.8	2.9
Time 3 (EDSP 489)	58	69	18.52	17.54	2.3	2.6
Total	178	190	16.3*	15.82*	3.1	4.1

Foundations Assessment: INTERNS						
Time Point	Number		Mean		Std. Deviation	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Time 1 (EDSP 300)	candidates in EDSP 300 do not meet the requirements for being an intern					
Time 2 (EDSP 407)	data unavail	11	data unavail	18.	data unavail	2.3
Time 3 (EDSP 489)	47	24	16.5	18.8	2.0	2.4
Total	47	34	16.5	18.5	2.0	2.4

Foundations Assessment: ULRN and BLENDED MAJORS*						
Time Point	Number		Mean		Std. Deviation	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
300 (Beginning of Program)	25	12	12.1	11.3	3.1	4.
407 (Middle of Program)	26	18	17.7	17.8	3.0	3.6
489 (Final Fieldwork)	9	13	19.0	17.4	1.5	3.2
Total	60	43	15.5	15.4	4.2	4.4

* Once ULRN/Blended major candidates reach their final fieldwork, they have earned their B.A.

2. OBSERVATION OF CANDIDATE TEACHING PERFORMANCE BY UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS

Performance is conceptualized as developmental. The following scores demonstrate a passing score in the following classes: EDSP 407 Learning Center (early practicum) a score of 8-12 is expected performance. In EDSP 407 or 489 (final practicum) – a score of 12-16 is expected performance. A score of 18 - 20 is considered outstanding performance (20 is the highest one can score). Each domain (assessment, curriculum, teaching and learning, and collaboration) is rated on a scale of 1- 5 with a 1 signifying not proficient, 3 is proficient, and 5 considered a mentor teacher level.

Candidates are well within expected levels and demonstrate growth over time. Interns score higher. The area of assessment is slightly lower than other domains.

Observation of Candidate Performance by Placement 2013-2014						
Time Point	Number		Mean		Std. Deviation	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014
Early Practicum	94	30	12.28	13.73	1.8	1.7
Student Teacher Final Fieldwork	30	26	16.30	15.23	2.5	1.9
Intern Final Fieldwork	47	26	16.51	15.62	1.9	2.5
Total	171	81	15.05	14.86	2.0	2.0

Observation of Candidate Performance by Placement and Domain 2013-2014					
		Assessment	Curriculum	Teaching and Learning	Collaboration
Time Point	Number	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Early Fieldwork	30	3.23 (.43)	3.37 (.56)	3.53 (.57)	3.60 (.62)
Student Teacher Final Fieldwork	26	3.58 (.58)	3.77 (.51)	3.77 (.51)	4.12 (.65)
Intern Final Fieldwork	26	3.73 (.67)	3.85 (.73)	3.96 (.77)	4.08 (.69)

Observation of Candidate Performance by Credential Area in Final Fieldwork 2013-2014						
Time Point	Number		Mean		Std. Deviation	
	2013	2014	2013	2014	2013	2014

Mild/ Moderate	57	24	16.70	15.87	2.0	2.1
Moderate/ Severe	20	10	15.65	14.10	2.4	2.7
Ph/Health Impairments	5	0	16.00	0	2.1	0
Visual Impairment	10	5	15.20	16.60	.79	1.5
Early Childhood		13		15.15		2.1
Total	92	52	15.89	15.51	1.8	2.1

3. ADMINISTRATOR/MASTER TEACHER EVALUATION OF CANDIDATE TEACHING PERFORMANCE

In addition to the university supervisors' ratings of candidates, each candidate is evaluated by either their supervising master teacher or, if an intern, the site administrator. Scores for the M/M, M/S, and PHI credential areas are described in the table below (ECSE and VI have different items are reported separately. VI made a change in reporting format from 2013 to 2014). Overall, master teachers and site administrators' ratings of candidates are high.

Description of Rating Scale for Site Administrators and Master Teachers	
1	competency not met
2	competency met at minimal level
3	competency met at average level
4	competency met at above average level
5	competency met at outstanding level

Means and Standard Deviations of Site Administrator and Master Teacher Ratings of Candidates by Item						
PHI, M/M, M/S						
Items	PHI		Mild/Moderate		Moderate/Severe	
	2013 N=2	2014 N=1	2013 N=43	2014 N=30	2013 N=11	2014 N=20
Uses professional practices when interacting students with and without disabilities and their families.	4.50 (.71)	5	4.51 (.94)	4.63 (.49)	4.73 (.47)	4.60 (.60)
Works effectively with students from diverse backgrounds.	4.50 (.71)	5	4.67 (.57)	4.79 (.41)	4.91 (.30)	4.50 (.61)

Effectively manages learning environments that are safe and effective.	4.50 (.71)	5	4.51 (.77)	4.50 (.50)	4.72 (.47)	4.30 (.80)
Uses effective behavior management strategies when teaching.	4.50 (.71)	5	4.23 (.84)	4.48 (.57)	4.55 (.69)	4.45 (.69)
Collaborates and communicates effectively with individuals with disabilities and their parents, other family members and primary caregivers.	5.00 (.00)	5	4.53 (.96)	4.67 (.62)	4.73 (.47)	4.40 (.68)
Collaborates and communicates effectively with general teachers, school administrators, other specialists, paraprofessionals, related service personnel, and community agency personnel.	5.00 (.00)	5	4.58 (.79)	4.67 (.48)	4.64 (.50)	4.30 (.73)
Uses effective instructional strategies, including the supplementary aids, services, and technology for individuals with disabilities.	4.50 (.71)	5	4.47 (.70)	4.53 (.63)	4.68 (.46)	4.33 (.61)
Uses assessment information to evaluate students' needs and achievements, and for the purpose of making ongoing program improvements and IEP planning.	4.00 (1.41)	5	4.35 (.97)	4.45 (.51)	4.50 (.50)	4.55 (.77)
Uses effective instructional strategies that are appropriate for students with and without disabilities across a variety of educational settings.	4.50 (.71)	5	4.60 (.62)	4.63 (.49)	4.77 (.41)	4.42 (.69)
Uses and communicates the results of a variety of individualized assessments and evaluation approaches appropriate for students with disabilities.	4.00 (1.41)	5	4.30 (1.12)	4.39 (.63)	4.04 (1.49)	4.21 (.85)
Makes appropriate educational decisions about students' needs on the basis of comprehensive assessment data.	4.50 (.71)	5	4.35 (.92)	4.56 (.51)	4.27 (1.49)	4.21 (.79)
Demonstrates methods and instructional strategies for teaching specialized communication skills.	4.50 (.71)	4				
Modifies curricular materials for use by students with motor impairments.	4.00 (.00)	4				
Uses appropriate techniques of physical management of students with physical impairments.	4.50 (.71)	5				
Communicates effectively to related services providers (therapists, APE specialists,	4.50 (.71)	5				

nurses, etc.)				
Participates and consults in pre-referral and referral procedures.		2.88 (2.29)	4.56 (.77)	
Demonstrates proficiency in ongoing case management.		3.35	4.58 (.70)	
Uses effective communication and interactions with students with moderate to severe disabilities that facilitate an increase in their social interactions with students with and without disabilities.				4.18 (1.47) 4.41 (.71)
Demonstrates the ability to support students' movement, mobility, sensory, and specialized health care needs.				4.27 (1.49) 4.53 (.64)

Means and Standard Deviations of Site Administrator and Master Teacher Ratings of Candidates by Item Early Childhood Special Education		
	2013 N=2	2014 N=10
1 Strongly Disagree - 5 Strongly Agree		
Monitors students' progress on an ongoing basis and uses appropriate formal assessment instruments to measure progress toward IEP goals.	4.50 (.71)	4.6 (.55)
Communicates well with parents; involves parents in student's assessment and instruction	2.50 (.54)	4.9 (.38)
Modifies curriculum effectively to meet the individual learning needs of each student; interacts responsively and effectively with each student	4.50 (.71)	5.0 (0)
Is familiar with state pre-K standards, curriculum goals and individual student IEP goals.	4.50 (.71)	4.7 (.50)
Plans learning activities that are developmentally appropriate and engaging, and embeds specific strategies and learning opportunities that address students' individual goals.	4.50 (.71)	5.0 (0)
Effectively plans and manages students' disruptive behavior appropriately, using positive behavior support techniques.	5.00 (.00)	4.8 (.44)
Prevents and/or manages students' disruptive behavior appropriately, using positive behavior support techniques.	5.00 (.00)	4.9 (.33)
Interactions with administrators, DIS personnel, teaching staff, paraprofessionals and families are appropriate and professional.	5.00 (.00)	4.9 (.44)

Means and Standard Deviations of Site Administrator and Master Teacher Ratings of Candidates by Item Education Specialist Credential in Visual Impairment and Blindness 2014	
1 Strongly Disagree - 5 Strongly Agree (There are multiple items for each of the domains below which are summed for a single domain value.)	2014 12 unit (N=6)
Assessment	4.16 (.36)
Curriculum and Specialized Instruction	4.26 (.14)
Managing Teaching and Learning Environments	4.20 (.29)
Collaboration and Professionalism	4.16 (.38)
Visual Impairment Specific Standards	4.32 (.26)

Means and Standard Deviations of Site Administrator and Master Teacher Ratings of Candidates by Item Education Specialist Credential in Visual Impairment and Blindness 2013	
1 Strongly Disagree - 5 Strongly Agree	2013 12 unit (n = 5)
1. Uses professional practices when interacting students with and without disabilities and their families.	4.40 (.54)
2. Works effectively with students from diverse backgrounds.	4.50 (.57)
3. Effectively manages learning environment that are safe and effective.	4.80 (.44)
4. Uses effective behavior management strategies when teaching.	4.50 (.57)
5. Collaborates and communicates effectively with individuals with disabilities and their parents, other family members and primary caregivers.	4.60 (.54)
6. Collaborates and communicates effectively with general education teachers, school administrators, other specialists, paraprofessionals, related service personnel, and community agency personnel.	4.50 (.57)
7. Uses effective instructional strategies, including the supplementary aids, services, and technology for individuals with disabilities.	4.40 (.54)
8. Uses assessment information to evaluate students; needs and achievements, and for the purpose of making ongoing program improvements and IEP planning.	3.50 (.57)
9. Uses effective instructional strategies that are appropriate for students with and without disabilities across a variety of educational settings.	4.50 (.57)
10. Uses and communicates the results of a variety of individualized assessments and evaluation approaches appropriate for students with disabilities.	4.25 (.50)
11. Make appropriate educational decisions about students; needs on the basis of comprehensive assessment data.	4.50 (.57)
VISUAL IMPAIRMENT DISABILITIES STANDARDS ONLY	
12. Participants and consults in pre-referral and referral procedures.	4.40 (.54)
13. Demonstrates proficiency in ongoing case management.	4.75 (.50)
14. Demonstrates methods and instructional strategies for teaching specialized skills and access to the general education curriculum.	4.40 (.54)
15. Modifies curricular materials for use by students with Visual Impairment.	4.60 (.54)
16. Communicates effectively with related services providers, paraprofessionals, parents, and other team members.	4.60 (.54)
17. Manages student behavior and environment to encourage appropriate social interactions with students with and without disabilities.	4.60 (.54)

DATA ON THE CLEAR CREDENTIAL PROGRAM

At the end of their final fieldwork, candidates complete a self-assessment of their performance on each of the CSTP in consultation with their university supervisor. In addition, the Master Teacher or Support Provider also rates the candidate on the same 5 point scale (1=competency not met – 5=competency met at an outstanding level). This information is used to identify areas of focus during the induction process. At the beginning of induction, candidates revisit the CSTP and assess their performance again. They complete the process at the end of induction by analyzing their performance and self-assessing a final time.

The means and standard deviations are reported for 10% (N=20) of the candidates, selected randomly by program, who earned their clear credential from 2012-2014. These are not reported by credential area because the number of candidates would be too small to make meaningful comparisons; however, the sample is composed of equal numbers of candidates from mild/moderate, moderate/severe, early childhood, physical and health impairments, and visual impairment.

Master teacher/support provider ratings of candidates were high (scores of 4 or above) with the exception of *Assessing Student Learning* (met at an average level). Self-assessment ratings indicate that candidates feel more confident of their skills at the end of the induction process.

4. MASTER TEACHER/SUPOPRT PROVIDER ASSESSMENT: CALIFORNIA STANDARDS FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSION.

Means and Standard Deviations of Master Teachers' Ratings of Candidate Mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession		
	2013	2014
Making subject matter comprehensible to students	4.25 (.95)	4.42 (.53)
Assessing student learning	4.00 (.81)	3.83 (.98)
Engaging and supporting students in learning	4.00 (.81)	4.57 (.53)
Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students	4.00 (.81)	4.28 (.95)
Creating and maintain effective environments for student learning	3.75 (1.5)	4.28 (.75)
Developing as a professional educator	4.50 (1.0)	4.42 (.53)

5. A SELF ASSESSMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSION AT THE BEGINNING OF THE INDUCTION PROCESS.

Means and Standard Deviations of Candidates' Self Perceptions of Mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession		
	2013	2014
Making subject matter comprehensible to students	3.28 (.48)	3.37 (.91)
Assessing student learning	3.14 (.89)	3.25 (1.1)
Engaging and supporting students in learning	3.42 (.78)	3.75 (.88)
Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students	3.57 (.78)	3.25 (1.0)
Creating and maintain effective environments for student learning	3.28 (1.1)	3.87 (.83)
Developing as a professional educator	3.38 (.95)	3.75 (.70)

6. A SELF ASSESSMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSION AT THE END OF THE INDUCTION PROCESS.

Means and Standard Deviations of Candidates' Self Perceptions of Mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession		
	2013	2014
Making subject matter comprehensible to students	4.28 (.75)	4.00 (.89)
Assessing student learning	3.85 (.69)	4.16 (.75)
Engaging and supporting students in learning	4.42 (.53)	4.16 (.75)
Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students	4.42 (.53)	4.00 (.89)
Creating and maintain effective environments for student learning	3.85 (.89)	4.16 (.75)
Developing as a professional educator	4.28 (.48)	3.83 (.40)

DATA ON THE ADDED AUTHORIZATIONS

The Division of Special Education and Counseling offers two added authorizations: *Autism* and *Other Health Impairments*. Candidate effectiveness is ascertained through evaluation of competencies embedded in key assignments.

7. Demonstration of Knowledge in Evidence Based Practice for Autism

and

8. Planning and Implementing Instruction in Social Communication for Students with Autism.

Candidates seeking an added authorization in autism complete several key assignments that develop their knowledge and skill in working with students with autism spectrum disorders. Data is collected and analyzed systematically on two competencies: a) identifying and critiquing evidence based practices and b) planning and implementing instruction in social communication for students with autism.

Performance is generally high across both academic years reported. The vast majority of candidates demonstrated the ability to conduct a literature search, analyze an intervention, and apply evidence-based interventions in classrooms and other educational settings.

Percentage of Candidates Demonstrating Levels of Performance in Competencies for Autism 2014			
	Standards for Competency not Meet	Meets Standards for Competency	Exceeds Standards for Competency
Identifying and critiquing evidence based practice.	03% (N=2)	29% (N=26)	67% (N=61)
Planning and implementing instruction in social communication for students with autism.	12% (N=3)	88% (N=21)*	

* Candidates are required to complete the assignment to mastery and submit multiple iterations until all criteria have been met.

Percentage of Candidates Demonstrating Levels of Performance in Competencies for Autism 2013			
	Standards for Competency not Meet	Meets Standards for Competency	Exceeds Standards for Competency
Identifying and critiquing evidence based practice.	07% (n=6)	36% (N=30)	57% (N=47)
Planning and implementing instruction in social communication for students with autism.	02% (N=1)	98% (N=39)*	
* Candidates are required to complete the assignment to mastery and submit multiple iterations until all criteria have been met.			

9. Demonstration of Knowledge in Other Health Impairments: Candidate Performance on Signature Assignments: 2012-2014

Candidates seeking an added authorization in Other Health Impairments complete a key assignment in each of the four courses that comprise the authorization. Because the program is small, data is collected and analyzed systematically for each of candidates to ensure mastery of the specified standards.

Performance is high across both academic years with the majority of candidates reaching a criterion of 90% or above.

	Standard #1 Characteristics	Standard #2 Assessment, Communication, Educational Access and Adaptations	Standard #3 Specialized Health Care	Standard #4 Transition & Collaboration
Signature Assignment	Disability Characteristics Report - 100	Augmentative & Alternative Communication Project - 80	Feeding Protocol Case Study - 50	Conference Interview - 30
Candidate Name				
1	100/100	80/80	50/50	30/30
2	100/100	80/80	45/50	30/30
3	96/100	76/80	39/50	25/30
4	81/100	68/80	50/50	30/30
5	93/100	80/80	50/50	25/30
7	97/100	80/80	45/50	25/30
8	85/100			25/30

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON CANDIDATE, PORGRAM COMPLETERS, AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVENESS

The following are indirect measures of candidate perceptions' of program effectiveness for the preliminary and clear credentials and added authorizations. Current and past candidates are generally positive about the curricular aspects of the program; however, the Current Student Survey indicates some dissatisfaction with receiving adequate program advisement.

10. LEARNING CENTER SURVEY - This survey asks students enrolled in their early fieldwork to rate the extent to which instruction during fieldwork helped them acquire the skills and information below.

Learning Center Surveys Items Regarding Quality of Instruction						
Instructional Topic	Year	N	Instruction was inadequate	Instruction was somewhat adequate	Instruction was good	Instruction was excellent
Checking for student understanding and adjust teaching as needed	2014	30	0%	10%	37%	53%
	2013	59	0%	3%	36%	61%
Drawing on students' backgrounds, interests, and developmental needs in planning lesson	2014	30	0%	3.3%	30.0%	66%
	2013	59	0%	2%	29%	69%
Communicating learning objectives and instructional procedures of the lesson	2014	30	0%	10%	40%	50%
	2013	59	0%	5%	22%	73%
Ensuring students are on-task and engaged in learning activities	2014	30	0%	10%	23%	67%
	2013	59	0%	7%	22%	71%
Differentiating instruction based on students' learning needs	2014	30	3.3%	6.7%	40%	50%
	2013	59	0%	5%	25%	70%
Using effective questioning and provide feedback to promote student learning	2014	30	0%	10%	20%	70%
	2013	59	0%	8%	22%	70%
Pacing the lesson according to the content, learner, and situation	2014	30	0%	10%	43%	47%
	2013	58	0%	2%	37%	61%
Establishing and maintaining positive classroom climate, efficient routines, and effective behavioral management	2014	30	0%	6.7%	17%	77%
	2013	59	0%	3%	12%	85%
Collaborating respectfully and effectively with colleagues during planning and instructional process	2014	30	0%	7%	20%	73%
	2013	59	0%	3%	12%	85%
Communicating respectfully with students and families	2014	30	0%	3%	20%	77%
	2013	59	0%	2%	13%	85%
Overall, the LC experience has contributed significantly to my development as an effective teacher.	2014	30	0%	6%	17%	77%

11. CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY (Winter 2013 and Winter 2014) This is an annual survey administered by the Charter College that asks all special education credential candidates about the effectiveness of their program, the extent to which the coursework emphasizes the College’s Mission and Vision, and their satisfaction with various offices and faculty performance.

Item	Year	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree and SA	N/A
My faculty advisor provides me with adequate support and information about my program.	2014	211	5.7%	2.8%	16.1%	37%	35.6%	72.8%	2.8%
	2013	303	7.3%	3.3%	10.9%	36.3%	38%	74.3%	4.3%
My coursework provides the information needed to become a knowledgeable and skilled special education teacher.	2014	211	2.8%	1%	10%	46.9%	37.9%	84.8%	1.4%
	2013	302	3.6%	2.3%	8.9%	42.1%	38.4%	80.5%	4.6%
My coursework requires me to reflect on my understanding of teaching practices.	2014	211	1.9%	1.4%	8.5%	43.1%	44.6%	87.7%	.5%
	2013	302	2.7%	1.7%	6.3%	42.1%	43.4%	85.5%	4%
Special Education faculty are knowledgeable about the content they teach.	2014	211	1.9%	0%	6.6%	33.7%	57.8%	91.5%	0%
	2013	302	2.3%	0.3%	4%	33.8%	57.3%	91.1%	2.3%
Overall, I am satisfied with the program of professional preparation in special education at CSULA.	2014	211	2.4%	3.3%	8.1%	43.6%	42.2%	85.8%	.5%
	2013	302	2.7%	4.3%	9.3%	37.4%	42.7%	80.1%	3.6%

I feel confident in my ability to teach students with special needs.	2014	211	1.9%	1.0%	12.3%	43.6%	39.8%	83.4%	1.4%
	2013	302	1.3%	4.3%	7.3%	36.8%	47%	83.8%	3.3%
I feel confident in my ability to teach students who are English Language Learners	2014	211	1.4%	3.8%	17.5%	48.3%	28%	76.3%	1%
	2013	302	1.7%	5.6%	12.9%	41.1%	34.1%	75.2%	4.6%
I feel confident in my ability to collaborate with general education teachers.	2014	211	1.9%	.5%	8.5%	51.2%	37%	88.2%	1.0%
	2013	302	2.3%	1%	8.3%	38.4%	48%	86.4%	2%

12. COMMUNITY ADVISORY DAY SURVEY – Former candidates were surveyed about the value of their coursework in preparing them to be educators during the Advisory meeting. An Advisory Day was not held in 2014.

Community Advisory Survey 2013 Items Regarding Preparation for Teaching				
How important were your credential classes and fieldwork in developing your skill in:	Not important at all	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important
Assessment	3% (1)	11% (4)	37% (13)	49% (17)
Managing student behavior	3% (1)	14% (5)	40% (14)	43% (15)
Planning for instruction	0% (0)	14% (5)	40% (14)	46% (16)
Using effective instructional practices	0% (0)	6% (2)	26% (9)	68% (24)
Understanding the theories supporting specific instructional practices	0% (0)	11% (4)	43% (15)	46% (16)

IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Alignment of Program Changes to Data and Standards		
Data Source	Plan of Action	Applicable Program or Common Standards
Observation of Candidate Teaching Performance by University Supervisors	<p>Because performance was high on nearly all measures, we examined areas of relative weakness and looked for patterns across <i>all</i> data sources. This analysis indicated <i>assessment</i> would be an appropriate area for improvement.</p> <p>Action Plan Items:</p>	<p>Standard 3: Educating Diverse Students</p> <p>Standard 5: Assessment of Students</p> <p>Standard 10: Preparation to Teach English Language Learners</p>
Foundations Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decide which aspects of candidates' knowledge and skill in assessment to closely examine. 	
Current Student Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop an additional direct assessment that provides information on the selected area: (e.g. checklist, rubric). 	
Community Advisory Day Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify early and late courses (in the program sequence) to use as data collection points. Examine key assignments across the program to ensure they remain part of the courses to which they were initially assigned. 	
Administrator/Master Teacher Evaluation of Candidate Teaching Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a matrix identifying where CTC standards for English learners and Autism Spectrum disorders are addressed as well as the associated objectives/activities/assignments. The goal is to maintain program integrity in addressing these standards. <p>Non-Instructional/Non-Curricular Items</p>	
Assessments Examining Added Authorizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement "advisor check-in points" to improve advising to candidates (based on Current Student Survey). Improve data collection to systematically collect information about intern performance on additional outcomes. Improve data collection process on performance of candidates earning their clear credential and added authorizations. 	