

SPECIAL EDUCATION DATA
POST-BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS

John H. Hoover
Special Education & Teacher performance Assessment

February, 2015

SPECIAL EDUCATION DATA POST-BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS

Executive Summary

A. Overall Findings

1. All candidates in the three-year period met the criterion set for passing the *professional behavior* standards (e.g., passed over 85% of the 23 variables at levels 3-5).
2. For the 55 candidates for whom data were available, 100% met the criterion for effective performance in *classroom management*.
3. Of the 32 *E/BD* candidates for whom *teaching skills* were coded, all but one candidate (96.9%) met the criterion for mastery in lesson planning and development and the one candidate only missed one more item than the criterion of mastering the 20 items. .
4. Complete data were available for *teaching skills* on 22 (of 23) candidates for licensure in *developmental disabilities*. All candidates met the criterion of having met the standards of passing 85% of measured teaching variables.
5. Another way to summarize the above data is to note that across the three domains, 100% of candidates met criteria, that is that they scored three or above on the set of variables across classroom management, professional behavior, and teaching standards.
6. Specifics by domain and category are laid out below. Data analyses are shown in the report.

B. Classroom Management Skills and Dispositions

1. The ability of SCSU advanced candidates to perform the tasks associated with classroom management was universally high. Only one candidate attained scores below three—and that was on only a couple of items.
2. Particular strengths were noted in three domains, positions self in room, scans and circulates, and “uses specific praise. These items appear to reflect positively on the curriculum and instruction in the behavior management course (SPED 505) and in the domain-specific methods courses.
3. Though candidates earned high marks on all behavior management skills, the following three items reflect areas that could be slightly tightened. Notice, however, that these are only *relative* weaknesses because of the program’s strong showing overall
 - Creates rules for transitions
 - Arranges physical space appropriately
 - Establishes/posts/discusses rules and consequences

C. Professional Behavior Skills and Dispositions

1. Across the three years, candidates scored exceptionally well on dispositional items related to professionalism (Table 2). Only one candidate (an E/BD major scored below the acceptable rate—and for that candidate only on four items.

2. Advanced candidates scored particularly strongly (all exceeding 4.71 of 5) on “accepts ideas,” “engages in positive discussions about input,” “time commitments,” “conducts lessons without excess clarification,” “positive relationships,” and “ongoing professional feedback.”
3. As noted above, no program weaknesses in were noted in professional behavior. The following three items might represent domains that we could slightly tune (all means below 4.3 of 5):
 - Lesson/ program flexibility
 - Ongoing professional growth
 - Written communication proficiency

D. Lesson Presentation: (1) Emotional & Behavioral Disorders

1. Teachers of E/BD candidates performed very strongly in terms of developing and delivering lessons (see Table 3), with an average across items, by year of 4.35 (of 5), 4.13 and 4.27. The lowest proportion of criterion met by items (not individual) was 97.78, equal to one candidate per item.
2. The strongest items were “requires active participation,” and “delivers attentional cues and prompts.” This supports the effectiveness of the overall program but particularly of the terminal methods class.
3. As has been true of other categories, in the E/BD instructional domain, no programmatic weaknesses appeared, however three items appeared slightly lower than the rest—indicating domains where preparation could be improved:
 - Establishes seatwork procedures
 - Provides error drill on missed concepts
 - Maintains performance records and graphs

E. Lesson Presentation: (2) Developmental and Cognitive Disabilities

1. Students licensed at the post-graduate level in developmental and cognitive disabilities performed extremely well. The following items stood out as programmatic strengths on which to build:
 - Implements mobility techniques
 - Integrates art, music, movement
 - Allocates instructional time
 - Establishes clear routines
 - Designs/adapts lessons: Independent living
 - Designs/adapts lessons :Social skills
2. While candidates performed well across domains, a few could be tuned to strengthen the program even further, all in the life- and functional-skills domain:
 - Manages medical student support needs
 - Uses augmentative aids for language
 - Teaches self-advocacy/determination
 - Teaches community participation

SPECIAL EDUCATION DATA POST-BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS

Background/ Context/Method

Four documents are employed by the Department of Special Education to collect information about in-vivo skills and dispositions. These are listed and briefly described below. These instruments have all been formally approved by members of the department and vetted over at least three iterations by members of our advisory panels.

- Evaluation for classroom management: This form is collected across all candidates enrolled in field experiences and during student teaching. It consists, aside from basic demographics, of 14 items related to performance in the field. The items intercorrelate enough to constitute a scale ($\alpha = .96$). This suggests that the most reliable (e.g., consistent) metric exists across items.
- Professional behavior and Dispositions. A 23-item scale dealing largely with dispositions. The coefficient alpha reflecting internal consistency reliability = .93; this suggests that the items can reliably be combined into a scale.
- Lesson content: Developmental and Cognitive Disabilities. This instrument consists of 17 items related to the development, delivery and assessment of lessons associated best practice in developmental disabilities.
- Lesson content: Teachers of students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders. Via this 20-item scale, we assess programming for teachers of students with mild to moderate disabilities. Items relate to both skills and dispositions related to planning, delivering, and assessing lessons ($\alpha = .98$).

Data were collected from paper copies kept in files over the past three academic years. These data are laid out by survey instrument below. Only a brief discussion is presented as an executive summary. I lay out data presenting a mean value (utilizing standard deviation as a measure of dispersion), followed by a qualitative description of the percentage of students meeting criteria (e.g., scoring 3 [satisfactory] or above). Data, in all cases, are laid out by year. University supervisors observed candidates with the checklist in hand.

Departmental program developers expressed the sentiment that to be considered competent, candidates need to pass 85% of the standards assessed across the three domains professionalism, behavior management, and lesson development. These “overall pass rates” by candidate are presented at the top of the executive summary.

Results: Classroom Management

Table 1. Evaluation for classroom management over three years arranged in reverse order by 2014 means (ratings run from 1 to 5).

Items	2012/ N = 19			2013/ N = 28			2014/ N = 15		
	Mean	SD	Percent Meeting Criteria	Mean	SD	Percent Meeting Criteria	Mean	SD	Percent Meeting Criteria
Positions self In room with high visibility	4.68	.58	100.0	4.43	.69	100.0	4.47	.64	100.0
Scans and circulates in room for monitoring	4.63	.68	100.0	4.50	.75	100.0	4.47	.74	100.0
Uses specific praises contingently	4.63	.49	100.0	4.39	.88	96.4	4.40	.51	100.0
Provides advance expectations	4.53	.61	100.0	4.11	.92	96.4	4.27	.80	100.0
Uses nonverbal signals whenever possible	4.26	.87	100.0	4.25	.75	100.0	4.20	.56	100.0
Rules for respect with verbal reminders	4.47	.61	100.0	4.11	.96	92.9	4.13	.74	100.0
Incorporates student self-management	4.53	.70	100.0	4.11	.83	96.4	4.13	.74	100.0
Keeps transition times short	4.47	.51	100.0	4.14	.80	100.0	3.93	.59	100.0
Demonstrates acceptable/non-acceptable behavior	4.21	.79	100.0	4.04	1.17	100.0	3.87	1.25	100.0
Implements and cites rule when disruptive	4.42	.69	100.0	4.18	.86	96.4	3.73	1.28	100.0
Requires student rehearsal of rules with feedback	4.21	.71	100.0	3.61	1.50	100.0	3.67	.82	100.0
Creates rules for transitions	4.42	.69	100.0	3.82	1.12	100.0	3.60	1.18	100.0
Arranges physical space appropriately	4.26	.73	100.0	4.00	1.05	100.0	3.53	1.64	100.0
Establishes/posts/discusses rules and consequences	4.26	.65	100.0	3.93	.81	96.4	3.53	1.19	100.0
Mean ALL	4.43	.54	100.0	4.12	.76	98.2	3.99	.64	100.0
Mean Performance Developmental Disabilities License	5.00	---	100.0	4.07	.70	100.0	3.91	.68	100.0
Mean Performance: Emotional-Behavioral Disorders License	4.36	.56	100.0	4.17	.84	96.7	4.07	.63	100.0

¹Indicated levels 3 (“Satisfactory”), 4 (“Above Average”), and 5 (“Excellent/Exceptional”).

Because of small N, the data above are summarized across disability categories. However, note that at the bottom of the table, separate figures are provided for LD and E/BD. This convention is retained across analyses unless otherwise specified.

Results: Professional Behavior

Table 2. Evaluation for “professional behavior” over three years arranged in reverse order by 2014 means (ratings run from 1 to 5).

<u>Items</u>	2012/ N = 21			2013/ N = 27			2014/ N = 15		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Meeting Criteria</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Meeting Criteria</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Meeting Criteria</u>
Accepts ideas and input	4.86	.36	100.0	4.33	.88	96.3	4.79	.43	100.0
Engages in positive discussions about input	4.86	.36	100.0	4.30	.87	96.3	4.79	.43	100.0
Time commitments	4.76	.44	100.0	4.41	.75	100.0	4.71	.47	100.0
Conducts lessons without excess clarification	4.76	.44	100.0	4.37	.74	100.0	4.71	.47	100.0
Positive relationships with staff/students	4.86	.36	100.0	4.38	.85	96.3	4.71	.47	100.0
Ongoing professional growth: Feedback/consulting	4.75	.44	100.0	4.23	.95	96.3	4.71	.47	100.0
Appropriately friendly behavior/mannerisms	4.90	.30	100.0	4.38	.75	100.0	4.69	.63	100.0
Independent lesson execution	4.71	.46	100.0	4.37	.69	100.0	4.64	.50	100.0
Effective listening	4.86	.48	100.0	4.41	.80	100.0	4.64	.50	100.0
Legal/ethical behavior: Confidential	4.67	.58	100.0	4.38	.75	96.3	4.62	.51	100.0
Oral communication proficiency	4.80	.41	100.0	4.27	.78	100.0	4.62	.51	100.0
Effective reflection during discussions	4.76	.44	100.0	4.38	.75	100.0	4.57	.51	100.0
Professional rapport: Acknowledge strengths/needs	4.76	.44	100.0	4.33	.83	96.3	4.57	.51	100.0
Respects staff and student boundaries	4.85	.37	100.0	4.38	.75	100.0	4.57	.51	100.0
Legal/ethical behavior: Staff	4.76	.44	100.0	4.35	.75	100.0	4.54	.52	100.0
Sound professional judgment	4.85	.37	100.0	4.27	.78	100.0	4.50	.65	100.0
Demonstrates effective problem solving	4.75	.44	100.0	4.19	.85	100.0	4.50	.52	100.0
Poised and confident manner	4.80	.41	100.0	4.31	.74	100.0	4.50	.65	100.0
Dress code	4.71	.46	100.0	4.44	.75	100.0	4.43	.85	100.0
Demonstrates industriousness/initiative	4.85	.37	100.0	4.35	.69	100.0	4.43	.65	100.0
Lesson/program flexibility	4.76	.44	100.0	4.41	.84	96.3	4.21	.89	100.0
Ongoing professional growth: Research/ Prof Dev	4.58	.61	100.0	4.36	.73	100.0	4.21	.70	100.0
Written communication proficiency	4.70	.57	100.0	4.15	.73	100.0	4.08	.76	100.0
Mean ACROSS ITEMS	4.77	.33	100.0	4.35	.71	98.8	4.55	.36	100.0
Mean Performance Developmental Disabilities License	4.90	.11	100.0	4.37	.69	99.7	4.60	.32	100.0
Mean Performance: Emotional-Behavioral Disorders License	4.74	.36	100.0	4.32	.75	98.0	4.50	.41	100.0

Because of small N, the data above are summarized across disability categories. However, note that at the bottom of the table, separate figures are provided for LD and E/BD.

Results: Lesson Planning and Delivery

(1) Candidates seeking E/BD licensure

Table 3. Evaluation for Lesson planning (for E/BD candidates over three years arranged in reverse order by 2014 means (ratings run from 1 to 5)).

Items	2012/ N = 16			2013/ N = 16			2014/ N = 5		
	Mean	SD	Percent Meeting Criteria	Mean	SD	Percent Meeting Criteria	Mean	SD	Percent Meeting Criteria
Requires overt/active participation	4.57	.51	100.0	4.19	.98	93.8	4.60	.55	100.0
Delivers attentional cues and prompts	4.44	.63	100.0	4.25	.86	93.8	4.60	.55	100.0
Allocates instructional time	4.47	.52	100.0	4.19	.75	100.0	4.40	.55	100.0
Establishes clear routines	4.29	.73	100.0	4.19	.98	93.8	4.40	.55	100.0
States lesson purpose and tasks	4.31	.60	100.0	4.13	.72	100.0	4.40	.55	100.0
Activates prior experiences and knowledge	4.33	.62	100.0	4.25	.86	100.0	4.40	.55	100.0
Models/points out learning strategies	4.44	.51	100.0	4.06	.77	100.0	4.40	.55	100.0
Maintains brisk pace	4.47	.52	100.0	4.13	.81	100.0	4.40	.55	100.0
Gains and maintains student attention	4.25	.58	100.0	4.19	.83	100.0	4.20	.84	100.0
Provides lesson review of previous day	4.57	.51	100.0	4.19	.98	93.3	4.20	.84	100.0
Relates topics/strategies to previous	4.44	.51	100.0	4.13	.89	93.8	4.20	.84	100.0
Provides organizational framework	4.40	.51	100.0	4.06	.93	100.0	4.20	.84	100.0
Distinctive features/examples/non-examples	4.43	.51	100.0	4.06	.68	100.0	4.20	.84	100.0
Provides error correction procedures	4.40	.51	100.0	4.13	.81	100.0	4.20	.84	100.0
Summarizes lesson/integrates with other lessons	4.13	.72	100.0	4.06	.77	100.0	4.20	.84	100.0
Summarizes lesson accomplishments	4.33	.62	100.0	4.19	.75	100.0	4.20	.84	100.0
Reteaches based on performance	4.27	.59	100.0	4.13	.89	93.8	4.20	1.10	100.0
Establishes seatwork procedures	4.21	.70	100.0	3.93	.96	93.3	4.00	1.00	100.0
Provides error drill on missed concepts	4.29	.61	100.0	4.13	.81	100.0	4.00	1.00	100.0
Maintains performance records and graphs	4.07	.62	100.0	3.93	.88	100.0	4.00	1.00	100.0
AVERAGE ACROSS ITEMS	4.35	.46	100.0	4.13	.74	97.78	4.27	.69	100.0

(2) Candidates seeking DD licensure

Table 3. Evaluation for Lesson planning (for DCD candidates over three years arranged in reverse order by 2014 means (ratings run from 1 to 5)).

<u>Items</u>	2012/ N = 6			2013/ N = 16			2014/ N = 5		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Meeting Criteria</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Meeting Criteria</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Percent Meeting Criteria</u>
Implements mobility techniques	4.50	.58	100.0	4.00	.77	100.0	4.33	.58	100.0
Integrates art, music, movement	5.00	.00	100.0	3.93	.73	100.0	4.25	.96	100.0
Allocates instructional time	4.67	.58	100.0	4.14	.77	100.0	4.20	.45	100.0
Establishes clear routines	4.50	.58	100.0	4.07	.73	100.0	4.20	.45	100.0
Designs/adapts lessons: Independent living	4.50	.58	100.0	4.21	.58	100.0	4.20	.84	100.0
Designs/adapts lessons :Social skills	4.50	.58	100.0	4.07	.83	100.0	4.20	.45	100.0
Gains and maintains student attention	4.25	.50	100.0	4.00	.78	100.0	4.00	.00	100.0
Assesses understanding/retention	4.50	.58	100.0	4.23	.83	100.0	4.00	.71	100.0
Uses/maintains adaptive equipment	4.67	.58	100.0	3.90	.57	100.0	4.00	.00	100.0
Uses task analysis and multisensory	4.75	.50	100.0	4.00	.78	100.0	4.00	1.00	100.0
Provides clear lesson overview	4.25	.50	100.0	4.00	.68	100.0	3.80	.84	100.0
Teaches functional academics	4.75	.50	100.0	4.50	.76	100.0	3.80	.84	100.0
Teaches self-care/health/safety	4.50	.58	100.0	4.00	.71	100.0	3.80	.84	100.0
Manages medical student support needs	4.50	.71	100.0	3.80	.84	100.0	3.75	.50	100.0
Uses augmentative aids for language	4.75	.50	100.0	4.17	.72	100.0	3.75	.50	100.0
Teaches self-advocacy/determination	4.50	.58	100.0	4.20	.79	100.0	3.75	.50	100.0
Teaches community participation	4.33	.58	100.0	4.10	.74	100.0	3.67	.58	100.0
MEAN	4.54	.31	100.0	4.08	.64	100.0	3.97	.40	100.0

