Special Education Program Approval Report

Lewis & Clark College
Graduate School of Education & Counseling

Scott Fletcher
Dean, Graduate School of Education & Counseling

Vern Jones
Chairman, Department of Education

Christine Moore
Director, Special Education Programs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

<div align="center">

Lewis & Clark College
Graduate School of Education & Counseling

<u>Special Education Program Approval Report</u>

</div>

1. Program Description (Description of program including educator area, level (UG/G), degree awarded, modifications to approved program, etc.

<u>Introduction</u>

The special education endorsement program at the Graduate School of Education & Counseling (GSEC), Lewis & Clark College is designed to develop special education teachers who are proficient in the policies, procedures and practice of special education in Oregon public schools. The GSEC special education endorsement program was created to teach knowledge and skills that enable special educators to problem solve creatively in ways that produce efficient and effective strategies for promoting the academic growth of students with disabilities.

The Executive Summary of <u>Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers, requires</u> teacher education to,

> "…shift away from a norm which emphasizes academic preparation and course work loosely linked to school-based experiences. Rather, it must move to programs that are fully grounded in clinical practice and interwoven with academic content and professional courses."

> Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation & Partnerships for Improved Student Learning. NCATE. November, 2010

From inception, the Lewis & Clark program has both provided and received inspiration, incentive, advice and assistance from school-based special education teachers and administrators. The exchange between public school educators, administrators, and the Lewis & Clark College GSEC faculty has facilitated an endorsement program able to make *adaptive* changes in practice (Heifetz & Linsky, *Leadership on the Line.* 2002), as opposed to *technical* changes, which are more superficial structural changes to format or presentation. An essential aspect of special education at any level of practice, *adaptive* change recognizes and responds to the

realities of clinical practice in the field, while providing the leadership necessary for research based innovation. Federal special education law, as well as Oregon, and district interpretations of special education law are foundational considerations in the adaptive change process.

<u>Original Endorsement Program</u>

Beginning in 1994, a group of public school special education directors approached the faculty of Lewis & Clark College, requesting that they consider adding a **Basic Handicapped Learner Endorsement,** to their excellent pre-service programs in elementary and secondary education. In collaboration with this group of directors, the faculty of Lewis & Clark GSEC designed a program to exhibit the substantive and procedural requirements of Oregon special education standards current at that time. The original **Basic Handicapped Learner Endorsement** program was 15 semester hours. For every hour of time spent participating in graduate classes, an equal amount of time was expected in practical application of materials. A program of 15 semester hours required 225 hours of class time, and a minimum of an additional 225 hours of practical application of knowledge and skills through field experiences in school settings. The program was designed not only to reflect special education standards, but to meet the demands of public school clinical practice in special education. Instructors in the original program were a combination of graduate school teacher education faculty and practicing special education administrators. This practice of combining public school and higher education faculty has continued. Candidates in the original endorsement program held Basic and/or Basic/Standard Teaching certification. Program candidates were, and continue to be, fully certified teachers on entry into the Lewis & Clark graduate level special education endorsement program. The majority of these teachers were, and currently are, employed by a school district to teach special education. As practicing special education teachers they have had some experience in special education. This provides them with a realistic perspective on their own needs as a special education teacher, and the needs of their program. The original 15 semester hours (SH) of courses were as follows:

       SPED 510   Educating Students with Special Needs

SPED 511   Behavior Change Interventions

SPED 516   Interventions for Severely Challenged Students

SPED 513   Assessment & Diagnosis

SPED 514   Curriculum & Instruction

SPED 544   Practicum

Modifications to the Approved Program

Building on this strong foundation, the Lewis & Clark special education program has undergone several changes since it began in 1996. The major impetus for change in the program has been revision of the special education legislation, IDEA & subsequent Regulations (1997/99 & 2004/06). Input from students and special education faculty practicing in public schools has also been a significant motivation for change.

As part of the accreditation review in 2006, the special education endorsement program began using the Council of Exceptional Children (CEC) Standards for Beginning Special Education Teachers to review and make changes in program courses and practica. Using the CEC standards insured that courses, field experiences and practica were consistent with national perspectives in special education. The CEC standards were incorporated directly into the Practicum Observation Form and formed the foundation for the year-long practicum experience. These same CEC Standards are the basis for the current OAR 584-065-0035.

Modifications to the approved program have included removing one credit of practicum, formerly embedded in SPED 513, making it a separate course (SPED 545 Practicum I). SPED 544, the original practicum course, is now SPED 546 Practicum II. The GSEC practicum experience begins in September (SPED 545) consistent with the public school year calendar of most districts, and continues through May, or June, depending on candidates' needs. In 2005, SPED 517, Teaching Reading for Students with Special Needs was added to the special education endorsement program. In 2006, Current Issues in Special Education was added to the special education endorsement program. In 2002, TSPC approved the use of the special education endorsement/CTL courses for completion of a Basic Exceptional Learner I. The Standard Exceptional

Learner I was a 15 semester hour program of education electives approved by the student's special education advisor. Consistent with other educational areas in which the Standard is offered, the program requirement is now 10 semester hours. All course changes in the special education program have been subject to review and approval by the GSEC Faculty Curriculum Committee.

Program Goal & Program Description

The goal of the Special Education Endorsement Program at the GSEC, Lewis & Clark is to support teachers, through training in research based practices with demonstrated effectiveness, to create specially designed instruction that increases the quality of the performance of students with disabilities as outlined by state standards. Special educators require skills in adapting general education curricula and making them accessible to all students with disabilities at all grade levels. Building on the teaching skills required to create reflective, collaborative, research enriched classrooms, special educators develop instructional strategies that help each individual student "learn-how to-learn." To do this, candidates examine research on learning and teaching, become familiar with the schedule of language acquisition in both L1 and L2, cultural bias and sensitivity, assessment paradigms and practices, behavior management, instruction adaptations, legal requirements, and effective family support paradigms. The Lewis & Clark College GSEC special education program emphasizes the application of theoretically sound and experimentally validated instructional practices for working with students who present a range of learning abilities and disabilities across the domains of cognitive, language, motor, and social/emotional/behavioral development from prekindergarten through 12th grade.

Special Education Endorsement

Teachers who hold an Initial Teaching License, Continuing Teaching License, Conditional Assignment Permit (CAP) or restricted license may apply for the special education endorsement program at Lewis & Clark College.

Total credit hours: 18 semester hours

Program Offering: Part time (summer and evening classes):

Time to complete: 14 months

Program start date: June

The current special education endorsement program is an 18 semester hour program. Courses are offered in summer sessions and in the evenings during the school year. Practica are offered during the school day, and must be in a public school special education setting in which the teacher-of-record is required to be a special education teacher. Throughout the program, increasing knowledge and skills are applied in school-based special education settings with students eligible for special education based on one or more of the legally recognized special education eligibilities. Knowledge of current legislation and case law are essential to appropriate implementation of the special education process and are rigorously observed in all aspects of the endorsement training program.

Courses

All courses listed and described are required for the special education endorsement.

SPED 510 Educating Students with Special Needs

SPED 511 Behavior Change Interventions

SPED 516 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students

SPED 513 Assessment & Diagnosis

SPED 545 Practicum I

SPED 514 Curriculum & Instruction

SPED 546 Practicum II

SPED 517 Teaching Reading for Students with Special Needs

SPED 535 Current Issues in Special Education

Course Descriptions:

SPED 510 Educating Students with Special Needs
Analysis of child/adolescent development and the cognitive, linguistic, motor, behavioral, and learning characteristics of individuals with special needs. With the focus on progress monitoring and accountability, topics include history,

current policies and procedures, the practice of special education based on scientific research, incorporation of technology, and legal issues. Students develop and refine a research-based foundation in the education of students with special needs, including the impact of linguistic and cultural variability on special education eligibility and practice.
Prerequisites: None.
Credits: 2 semester hours.

SPED 511 Behavior Change Interventions
Study of developmental backgrounds of students with significant emotional/behavioral problems, and practices to help these students develop more productive behaviors. Emphasis on procedures for completing a functional behavior analysis (FBA) and a behavior intervention plan (BIP), research-based interventions including environmental modifications, positive behavior supports and interventions (PBIS), social-skills training, cognitive-behavioral interventions, self-monitoring, contracting, and the use of outside agencies to support the school in assisting students.
Prerequisites: SPED 510, SPED 626 or Consent of Instructor.
Credits: 2 semester hours.

SPED 516 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students
Endorsement candidates learn instructional practices to increase the functional performance and academic success of students with severe disabilities (e.g., autism spectrum disorder, severe mental retardation, or multiple disabilities). Participants learn research-validated strategies with demonstrated effectiveness in increasing communication skills, appropriate behavior, social skills, and life-skill routines for severely disabled students. Emphasis is placed on data-driven instruction in the least restrictive environment, and working with paraprofessionals.
Prerequisites: SPED 510/626.
Credits: 2 semester hours.

SPED 513 Assessment and Diagnosis
Assessment, diagnosis, and eligibility for special education as defined by federal and state law. Emphasis is placed on accountability measures and progress monitoring, current assessment instruments/practices, curriculum-based assessment/curriculum-based measurement, and response to intervention (RtI) with information relevant to special education eligibility, specially designed instruction (SDI) and student progress. Participants design a progress monitoring paradigm which includes selecting, administering, and scoring individual academic assessments; interpreting scores/profiles; and providing SDI recommendations across grade levels and academic areas.
Prerequisites: SPED 510/626 or advisor consent required.
Co-requisites: SPED 545/645.
Credits: 3 semester hours.

SPED 545 Practicum I

Public school based field experience to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning the application of essential skills required by the Oregon Special Education Standards associated with the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License. Observations are collaboratively scheduled by the endorsement candidate and practicum supervisor with pre- and post-observation analysis. Participants are required to document time spent providing all aspects of the special education process with the emphasis on assessment and progress monitoring.
Prerequisites: SPED 510/621.
Corequisites: SPED 513/632 (1 credit).
Credits: 1 semester hour.

SPED 514 Curriculum and Instruction for Students with Special Needs

Research-validated curriculum and specially designed instruction (SDI) for students with disabilities. Based on state standards/state assessment (OAKS), participants review and adapt general education curricula appropriate to their authorization level to create specially designed instruction (SDI) that emphasizes and supports progress across academic areas, learning strategies and appropriate accommodations. This course uses curriculum-based assessment/measurement data to craft effective, substantively and procedurally correct individual education plans (IEPs);and specially designed instruction(SDI)based on student achievement data. Candidates will demonstrate all skills necessary to facilitate an IEP meeting including group dynamics and conflict resolution strategies.
Prerequisites: SPED 513/SPED 632 or consent of advisor.
Co-requisites: SPED 546/646.
Credits: 3 semester hours.

SPED 546 Practicum II

Clinical field experience to provide each candidate with observation and feedback concerning essential skills required by the Special Education Standards associated with the Special Education Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License. Observations are collaboratively scheduled by the participant and practicum supervisor with pre- and post-observation analysis. SPED 545 observations have provided formative assessment of a candidate's demonstrated knowledge, skills and dispositions related to special education practice. SPED 546 provides summative assessment of the candidate Candidates document time spent providing all aspects of the special education process with emphasis on progress monitoring, Individual Education Plans (IEPs)and SDI.
Prerequisites: SPED 510/621.
Corequisites: SPED 514/633.
Credits: 1 semester hour.

SPED 517 Teaching Reading to Students with special needs

Curriculum and instructional practices based on validated research for teaching reading and writing to students with disabilities. Topics include the causes and

correlates of reading difficulties, research validated reading curricula, programs, models of reading instruction (K-12) emphasizing reading comprehension outcomes, basic reading skills, learning strategy acquisition, and progress monitoring with SDI in reading based on the general education curricula.
Prerequisites: SPED 514/SPED 633 or consent of advisor.
Credits: 2 semester hours.

SPED 535 Current Issues in Special Education
Provides an integrated summary of current content, pedagogy, learning and special education legal issues that have direct impact on the practice of special education in k-12 public schools. The faculty in conjunction with endorsement candidates jointly selects topics for additional emphasis based on participants' backgrounds and cumulative experiences in the Special Educator Endorsement Program. Focus is on application of all components of special education standards in Oregon.
Prerequisites: Completion of all coursework for the Special Education Endorsement.
Credits: 2 semester hours

Authorization Level

On completion of the 18 semester hours, candidates are recommended by the Lewis & Clark College GSEC for the special education endorsement. The authorization level recommendation is based on the student's practica experiences and may be either, or both ECE/elementary level or middle/high school level. Endorsement candidates may use their current special education teaching assignment site as a practicum setting. The practicum requires a minimum 125 hours of documented special education work across all areas of the special education process. Work must be with eligible special education students whose disabilities are mild, moderate or severe depending on the student, the setting and the district where the practicum is completed. Each practicum has a minimum of two observations by a Special Education Supervisor with extensive experience in public schools. A pre-conference provides the context for the specially designed instruction to be observed in terms of the observed students' IEPs and Oregon State Standards. A post-conference provides an opportunity to review the success of the specially designed instruction based on student outcomes and review of special education procedures and required paperwork.

The Special Education endorsement provides 18 semester hours of opportunities to learn and/or refine skills in each aspect of the special education process from referral to reevaluation. Faculty approach courses, field experiences and practica as opportunities

to examine and resolve daily problems and concerns and to consider the possibilities that present themselves which are all part of educating students with disabilities, pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Each course emphasizes interactive problem solving that is effective, efficient, practical, and based on valid research; designed to ensure that graduates of the program are well equipped to serve students with special needs.

Other Licenses

Exceptional Learner: Basic & Standard

Teachers who hold a Basic or Standard teaching license can earn their Basic Exceptional Learner I endorsement at Lewis & Clark by completing the coursework required for the Special Education endorsement. As part of the requirement, the Standard Exceptional Learner I endorsement requires the completion of an additional 10 semester hours of coursework in special education.

M.Ed Special Education

The Lewis & Clark College GSEC also offers the M.Ed in Special Education. The M.Ed is a 37 semester hour program which provides students with advanced training in curriculum, strategies, programs and techniques for working with students who are eligible for special education. The initial 18 hours of the 37 hour program is the 18 hours for the special education endorsement. The remaining 19 hours are determined by the candidate and the candidate's advisor and include graduate research courses. Advanced courses build on the initial special education endorsement work in specially designed instruction, behavior strategies and functional skills and routines for severely disabled students. A candidate's M.Ed program may also include a focus on areas related to special education such as ESOL, reading or math. Candidates who meet the requirements for practica and field experiences in these areas may complete the second endorsement as part of their master's program. The objective of the M.Ed in special education is to provide a teacher with strong content knowledge and research validated skills in special education and related fields.

Lewis & Clark
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
EDUCATION AND COUNSELING

Special Education Endorsement with option of Continuing Teaching License*
(18 SH)

Candidate_____ Subject Field _____

Date Program Approved_____ Program Adviser _____

SPECIAL EDUCATOR ENDORSEMENT (18 SH):

No.	Course Title	SH	Sem/Year	Grade
SPED 510	Educating Students with Special Needs	2		
SPED 511	Behavior Change Interventions	2		
SPED 516	Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	2		
SPED 513	Assessment and Diagnosis	3		
SPED 545	Practicum I: Special Education	1		
SPED 514	Curriculum and Instruction	3		
SPED 546	Practicum II: Special Education	1		
SPED 517	Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	2		
SPED 535	Current Issues in Special Education	2		

COURSES ACCEPTED BY TRANSFER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

COURSES APPROVED FOR WAIVER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

A complete signed waiver form must be in your file in the Teacher Ed Office.

* To be recommended for the Continuing Teaching License you must meet the following requirements:
1. Completed a program that includes the coursework required for the Continuing Teaching License.
2. Be admitted to the Lewis & Clark College Continuing License Program.
3. Masters degree in education or a closely related field.
4. Five years of licensed teaching in a K-12 school.

Program approved:

_____   _____
Student   Date/initials   Program Adviser   Date/initials

All candidates seeking an endorsement must have passing scores on the:

NES (ORELA): Special Education-Score _____
(Praxis Specialty Area Test #20353 if taken before September 1, 2010 - Score_____)

Endorsement Authorization Level: EC/EL _____   ML/HS _____

Students must apply for an endorsement through the Educational Career & Licensing Services Office. Please consult the web page for additional information. www.lclark.edu/graduate/career_and_licensing/

Lewis & Clark
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

COUNSELING

Special Education Endorsement with option of Continuing Teaching License*
District Affiliated Programs
(18 SH)

Candidate _____ Subject Field _____

Date Program Approved _____ Program Adviser _____

SPECIAL EDUCATOR ENDORSEMENT (18 SH):

No.	Course Title	SH	Sem/Year	Grade
SPED 626	Educating Students with Special Needs	3		
SPED 629	Behavior Change Interventions	2		
SPED 628	Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	2		
SPED 632	Assessment and Diagnosis	3		
SPED 645	Practicum I: Special Education	1		
SPED 633	Curriculum and Instruction	3		
SPED 646	Practicum II: Special Education	1		
SPED 627	Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	2		
SPED 635	Current Issues in Special Education	1		

COURSES ACCEPTED BY TRANSFER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

COURSES APPROVED FOR WAIVER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

A complete signed waiver form must be in your file in the Teacher Ed Office.

* To be recommended for the Continuing Teaching License you must meet the following requirements:
1. Completed a program that includes the coursework required for the Continuing Teaching License.
2. Be admitted to the Lewis & Clark College Continuing License Program.
3. Masters degree in education or a closely related field.
4. Five years of licensed teaching in a K-12 school.

Program approved:

_____ _____
Student   Date/initials   Program Adviser   Date/initials

All candidates seeking an endorsement must have passing scores on the:
NES (ORELA): Special Education - Score _____
[Praxis Specialty Area Test #20353 if taken before September 1, 2010 – Score_____]

Endorsement Authorization Level: EC/EL ___ _____   ML/HS_____

Students must apply for a license, renewal or added endorsement through the Educational Career & Licensing Services Office. Please consult the web page for additional information. www.lclark.edu/graduate/career_and_licensing/

Lewis & Clark
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
EDUCATION AND

COUNSELING

Exceptional Learner Basic and Standard Endorsements
(For those whose first Oregon teaching license was granted prior to January 15, 1999)
(18 SH)
Program Planning Sheet

Candidate_____ Date Program Approved_____

Subject Field _____ Program Adviser_____

EXCEPTIONAL LEARNER BASIC ENDORSEMENT REQUIREMENTS (18 SH):

No.	Course Title	SH	Sem/Year	Grade
SPED 510	Educating Students with Special Needs	2		
SPED 511	Behavior Change Interventions	2		
SPED 516	Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	2		
SPED 513	Assessment and Diagnosis	3		
SPED 545	Practicum I: Special Education	1		
SPED 514	Curriculum and Instruction	3		
SPED 546	Practicum II: Special Education	1		
SPED 517	Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	2		
SPED 535	Current Issues in Special Education	2		

EXCEPTIONAL LEARNER STANDARD ENDORSEMENT (10 Additional SH in Special Education or Education as approved by a Lewis & Clark College advisor)

No.	Course Title	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

COURSES ACCEPTED BY TRANSFER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

COURSES APPROVED FOR WAIVER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

A complete signed waiver form must be in your file in the Teacher Ed Office. Credit for courses waived may not count toward the total hours required for the endorsement.

Endorsement program approved:

_____   _____
Student   Date/initials   M.Ed. Program Adviser   Date/initials

All candidates seeking an endorsement must have passing scores on the:

NES (ORELA): Special Education - Score _____

(Praxis Specialty Area Test #20353_____ if taken before September 1, 2010)

 Authorization Level : EC/EL _____   ML/HS _____

Students must apply for a license, renewal or added endorsement through the Educational Career & Licensing Services Office. Please consult the web page for additional information. www.lclark.edu/graduate/career_and_licensing/

Lewis & Clark
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

COUNSELING

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
EDUCATION AND

Exceptional Learner Basic and Standard Endorsements
District Affiliated
(For those whose first Oregon teaching license was granted prior to January 15, 1999)
(18 SH)
Program Planning Sheet

Candidate_____ Date Program Approved_____

Subject Field _____ Program Adviser_____

EXCEPTIONAL LEARNER BASIC ENDORSEMENT REQUIREMENTS (18 SH):

No.	Course Title	SH	Sem/Year	Grade
SPED 626	Educating Students with Special Needs	3		
SPED 629	Behavior Change Interventions	2		
SPED 628	Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	2		
SPED 632	Assessment and Diagnosis	3		
SPED 645	Practicum I: Special Education	1		
SPED 633	Curriculum and Instruction	3		
SPED 646	Practicum II: Special Education	1		
SPED 627	Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	2		
SPED 635	Current Issues in Special Education	1		

EXCEPTIONAL LEARNER STANDARD ENDORSEMENT (10 Additional SH in Special Education or Education as approved by a Lewis & Clark College advisor)

No.	Course Title	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

COURSES ACCEPTED BY TRANSFER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

COURSES APPROVED FOR WAIVER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

A complete signed waiver form must be in your file in the Teacher Ed Office. Credit for courses waived may not count toward the total hours required for the endorsement.
Endorsement program approved:

_____   _____
Student   Date/initials   M.Ed. Program Adviser   Date/initials

All candidates seeking an endorsement must have passing scores on the:
NES (ORELA): Special Education - Score _____
(Praxis Specialty Area Test #20353 if taken before September 1, 2010 - Score_____)
 Authorization Level : EC/EL _____   ML/HS _____

Students must apply for a license, renewal or added endorsement through the Educational Career & Licensing Services Office. Please consult the web page for additional information. http://education.lclark.edu/dept/ecls/.

Students must apply for a license, renewal or added endorsement through the Educational Career & Licensing Services Office. Please consult the web page for additional information. http://education.lclark.edu/dept/ecls/.

2.   Program Variant-Narrative: Identification of the "standard offering" as well as variations of the program. May be different location, week day, weekend, night variation.

Standard Offering

The standard program for the Special Education Endorsement or Basic Exceptional Learner I is an on-campus program at the **Graduate School of Education & Counseling, Lewis & Clark College**. The 18 semester hour program has evening courses. A Saturday meeting is occasionally part of the course schedule for summer course offerings. The M. Ed in special education is also offered on campus and in Central Oregon. The M. Ed is a 37 semester hour program, the first 18 hours of which are the hours required for the special education endorsement. The remaining hours of the M. Ed program are selected from an academic area (e.g. reading or math) by the candidate and the special education program coordinator.

Program Variant: Central Oregon

The Special Education Endorsement (or Exceptional Learner I) is also offered in Central Oregon. This program has been offered since 1997. The 2009/2010 school year was an exception, as the program was not offered that year. The same courses make up the program offering both on-campus and in Central Oregon. On campus courses are listed as 500 level courses. Off-campus courses are listed as 600s. The 18 semester hour program includes:

> **SPED 510/626 Educating** Students with Special Needs
>
> **SPED 511/629 Behavior** Change Interventions
>
> **SPED 516/628 Interventions** for Severely Challenged Students
>
> **SPED 513/632 Assessment** & Diagnosis
>
> **SPED 545/645 Practicum** I
>
> **SPED 514/633 Curriculum** & Instruction
>
> **SPED 546/646 Practicum** II
>
> **SPED 517/627 Teaching** Reading for Students with Special Needs

SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education

Total credit hours: 18 **semester hours**

Program Offering: Full time (summer and evening classes):

Time to complete: 14 months

Program start date: June

The special education endorsement program is an 18 semester hour program. Courses are offered in summer sessions, and in the evenings during the school year. Practica are offered during the day, and must be in a public school special education setting in which the teacher-of-record is required to be a special education teacher. Throughout the program, knowledge and skills are applied by candidates in school-based special education settings with students eligible for special education based on one or more of the legally recognized special education eligibilities. Current legislation and case law are essential to appropriate implementation of the special education process and are rigorously observed in all aspects of the special education endorsement training program.

Courses

All courses listed and described are required for the special education endorsement.

SPED 510/626 Educating Students with Special Needs
Analysis of child/adolescent development and the cognitive, linguistic, motor, behavioral, and learning characteristics of individuals with special needs. With the focus on progress monitoring and accountability, topics include history, current policies and procedures, the practice of special education based on scientific research, incorporation of technology, and legal issues. Students develop and refine a research-based foundation in the education of students with special needs, including the impact of linguistic and cultural variability on special education eligibility and practice.
Prerequisites: None.
Credits: 2 semester hours.

SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions
Study of developmental backgrounds of students with significant emotional/behavioral problems, and practices to help these students develop more productive behaviors. Emphasis on procedures for completing a functional behavior analysis (FBA) and a behavior intervention plan (BIP), research-based interventions including environmental modifications, positive behavior supports and interventions (PBIS), social-skills training, cognitive-behavioral interventions,

self-monitoring, contracting, and the use of outside agencies to support the school in assisting students.
Prerequisites: SPED 510, SPED 626 or Consent of Instructor.
Credits: 2 semester hours.

SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students

Endorsement candidates learn instructional practices to increase the functional performance and academic success of students with severe disabilities (e.g., autism spectrum disorder, severe mental retardation, or multiple disabilities). Participants learn research-validated strategies with demonstrated effectiveness in increasing communication skills, appropriate behavior, social skills, and life-skill routines for severely disabled students. Emphasis is placed on data-driven instruction in the least restrictive environment, and working with paraprofessionals.
Prerequisites: SPED 510/626.
Credits: 2 semester hours.

SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis of Students with Special Needs

Assessment, diagnosis, and eligibility for special education as defined by federal and state law. Emphasis is placed on accountability measures and progress monitoring, current assessment instruments/practices, curriculum-based assessment/curriculum-based measurement, and response to intervention (RtI) with information relevant to special education eligibility, specially designed instruction (SDI) and student progress. Participants design a progress monitoring paradigm which includes selecting, administering, and scoring individual academic assessments; interpreting scores/profiles; and providing SDI recommendations across grade levels and academic areas.
Prerequisites: SPED 510/626 or advisor consent required.
Co-requisites: SPED 545/645.
Credits: 3 semester hours.

SPED 545/645 Practicum I

Public school based field experience to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning the application of essential skills required by the Oregon Special Education Standards associated with the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License. Observations are collaboratively scheduled by the endorsement candidate and practicum supervisor with pre- and post-observation analysis. Participants are required to document time spent providing all aspects of the special education process with the emphasis on assessment and progress monitoring.
Prerequisites: SPED 510/621.
Corequisites: SPED 513/632 (1 credit).
Credits: 1 semester hour.

SPED 514/ 633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students with Special Needs

Research-validated curriculum and specially designed instruction (SDI) for students with disabilities. Based on state standards/state assessment

(OAKS),participants review and adapt general education curricula appropriate to their authorization level to create specially designed instruction (SDI) that emphasizes and supports progress across academic areas, learning strategies and appropriate accommodations. This course uses curriculum-based assessment/measurement data to craft effective, substantively and procedurally correct individual education plans(IEPs);and specially designed instruction(SDI)based on student achievement data. Candidates will demonstrate all skills necessary to facilitate an IEP meeting including group dynamics and conflict resolution strategies.
Prerequisites: SPED 513/SPED 632 or consent of advisor.
Co-requisites: SPED 546/646.
Credits: 3 semester hours.

SPED 546 Practicum II

Clinical field experience to provide each candidate with observation and feedback concerning essential skills required by the Special Education Standards associated with the Special Education Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License. Observations are collaboratively scheduled by the participant and practicum supervisor with pre- and post-observation analysis. SPED 545 observations have provided formative assessment of a candidate's demonstrated knowledge, skills and dispositions related to special education practice.
SPED 546 provides summative assessment of the candidate Candidates document time spent providing all aspects of the special education process with emphasis on progress monitoring, Individual Education Plans (IEPs)and SDI.
Prerequisites: SPED 510/621.
Corequisites: SPED 514/633.
Credits: 1 semester hour.

Course Format, Faculty Course Schedules

Since 1997, the special education endorsement program has been offered every year, with the exception of the 2009-2010 school year. As with the program on-campus, the special education endorsement was started at the request of public school special education administrators in Central Oregon. With no program easily accessible for students in this part of the state, administrators in special education collaborated with the special education faculty at GSEC Lewis & Clark College to ensure a quality program that could meet the needs of teachers who wanted to pursue an endorsement in special education.

Faculty

Faculty from the GSEC on-campus and Central Oregon programs work together to ensure consistency between courses at both sites. Faculty who teach in the GSEC

special education endorsement program, have taught courses in Central Oregon, but the majority of instructors in Central Oregon, as with the on campus program are administrators currently practicing in special education. Having public school special education personnel teaching in the program ensures the strongest possible relevance to the needs of local education agencies.

Course Schedule

To accommodate the needs of endorsement candidates who are working full time, courses in Central Oregon are offered in a weekend format. Each semester hour is 15 hours of in class course time. This need is met by scheduling courses on Friday evening, Saturday, and occasionally a Sunday, multiple weekends during the Fall and Spring semesters.

Summer offerings both on campus at the GSEC and in Central Oregon are offered in an intensive format. Three courses are offered consecutively, one at a time, for several hours of contact time each day. The schedule is created by the course instructor in collaboration with students in the class. This format has helped to ensure that commuting distances and times can be managed.

Communication between the faculty who teach courses on-campus and in Central Oregon has helped to ensure consistent, high quality special education course offerings while considering the needs of individuals at each site.

Lewis & Clark
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

COUNSELING

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
EDUCATION AND

Special Education Endorsement with option of Continuing Teaching License*
District Affiliated Programs
(18 SH)

Candidate _____ Subject Field _____

Date Program Approved _____ Program Adviser _____

SPECIAL EDUCATOR ENDORSEMENT (18 SH):

No.	Course Title	SH	Sem/Year	Grade
SPED 626	Educating Students with Special Needs	3		
SPED 629	Behavior Change Interventions	2		
SPED 628	Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	2		
SPED 632	Assessment and Diagnosis	3		
SPED 645	Practicum I: Special Education	1		
SPED 633	Curriculum and Instruction	3		
SPED 646	Practicum II: Special Education	1		
SPED 627	Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	2		
SPED 635	Current Issues in Special Education	1		

COURSES ACCEPTED BY TRANSFER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

COURSES APPROVED FOR WAIVER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

A complete signed waiver form must be in your file in the Teacher Ed Office.

* To be recommended for the Continuing Teaching License you must meet the following requirements:
1. Completed a program that includes the coursework required for the Continuing Teaching License.
2. Be admitted to the Lewis & Clark College Continuing License Program.
3. Masters degree in education or a closely related field.
4. Five years of licensed teaching in a K-12 school.

Program approved:

_____   _____
Student   Date/initials   Program Adviser   Date/initials

All candidates seeking an endorsement must have passing scores on the:
NES (ORELA): Special Education - Score _____
[Praxis Specialty Area Test #20353 if taken before September 1, 2010 – Score_____]

Endorsement Authorization Level: EC/EL _____   **ML/HS**_____

Students must apply for a license, renewal or added endorsement through the Educational Career & Licensing Services Office.

Please consult the web page for additional information. www.lclark.edu/graduate/career_and_licensing/

Exceptional Learner Basic and Standard Endorsements
District Affiliated
(For those whose first Oregon teaching license was granted prior to January 15, 1999)
(18 SH)
Program Planning Sheet

Candidate _____ Date Program Approved _____

Subject Field _____ Program Adviser _____

EXCEPTIONAL LEARNER BASIC ENDORSEMENT REQUIREMENTS (18 SH):

No.	Course Title	SH	Sem/Year	Grade
SPED 626	Educating Students with Special Needs	3		
SPED 629	Behavior Change Interventions	2		
SPED 628	Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	2		
SPED 632	Assessment and Diagnosis	3		
SPED 645	Practicum I: Special Education	1		
SPED 633	Curriculum and Instruction	3		
SPED 646	Practicum II: Special Education	1		
SPED 627	Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	2		
SPED 635	Current Issues in Special Education	1		

EXCEPTIONAL LEARNER STANDARD ENDORSEMENT (10 Additional SH in Special Education or Education as approved by a Lewis & Clark College advisor)

No.	Course Title	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

COURSES ACCEPTED BY TRANSFER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

COURSES APPROVED FOR WAIVER:

L&C requirement fulfilled	Course Number & Name	Institution	SH	Sem/Year	Grade

A complete signed waiver form must be in your file in the Teacher Ed Office. Credit for courses waived may not count toward the total hours required for the endorsement.
Endorsement program approved:

_____   _____
Student   Date/initials   M.Ed. Program Adviser   Date/initials

All candidates seeking an endorsement must have passing scores on the:
NES (ORELA): Special Education - Score _____
(Praxis Specialty Area Test #20353 if taken before September 1, 2010 - Score_____**)**
 Authorization Level : EC/EL _____   ML/HS _____

Students must apply for a license, renewal or added endorsement through the Educational Career & Licensing Services Office. Please consult the web page for additional information. http://education.lclark.edu/dept/ecls/.

	Phase I: Complete Initial Courses & Assessments	Phase 2: Admissions Data	Phase 3 Practicum I Formative I	Phase 4 Practicum I Formative 2	Phase 5 Practicum II Formative 3	Phase 6 Practicum II Summative	Phase 7 NES: ORELA Special Education	Phase 8 Portfolio Review
SPED 510 Teaching Students with Special Needs: Learning & Legal Issue **Self Evaluation: SDI Teaching Practices** As part of the initial coursework in the endorsement, candidates are given a self evaluation which asks them to review their teaching practices. Looking at items common across teaching such as guided practice or attention, endorsement candidates review their teaching history and describe how their current teaching demonstrates their ability to support and strengthen the desired student behavior. The Scoring Guide for this self-evaluation is linked to the Practicum I Scoring Guide to provide supervisors with the candidate's view of their teaching practice. This evaluation is intended as a formative assessment based on self-report	**X**							

SPED 510 Teaching Students with Special Needs: Learning & Legal Issues **Self Evaluation:** **Knowledge of Special Education Standards** The assessment is a short form review of key elements of the special education standards. Given to candidates new to the endorsement program, it provides a view of their understanding of the learning & legal foundations of special education, and knowledge of the special education process. The Scoring Guide for this assessment is linked to the Practicum I Scoring Guide to provide practicum supervisors with the candidate's background information in special education. This assessment is intended as a formative evaluation of the candidate.	**X**							

SPED 511 Behavior Change Interventions for Students w/ .Serious Emotional & Behavioral Disorders **Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA)&** **Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP)**	**X**							

Endorsement candidates prepare an analysis of the behavior of a student from data provided and/or observation. This analysis focuses on all essential elements of the observation protocol. The FBA is the basis for the behavior intervention plan (BIP) which the candidates complete. Candidates are trained in the techniques of behavior observation and analysis essential to the practice of special education. This course completes both formative and summative assessments, relative to the FBA & BIP.								
SPED 516 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students **Behavioral Routines for Severely Challenged Students** Endorsement candidates review data and student behavior, and then prepare programs which contain key elements in special education practice including, baseline, successive approximation, data systems and data monitoring for students with severe	X							

communication and behavioral issues. The Scoring Guide for this self-evaluation is linked to the Practicum I Scoring Guide to provide supervisors with the candidate's view of their teaching practice. This evaluation is intended as a formative assessment based on self-report								
		By the conclusion of 510,511,516						

SPED 545 Practicum I Practicum for special education endorsement candidates focuses on application of all appropriate elements of the special education standards in a public school special education setting. Practicum I emphasizes the initial aspects of the special education process; Pre-referral, Referral, Evaluation & Eligibility. Candidates participate in conferences before and after each observation by practicum supervisors. This practicum completes Formative1 and Formative 2 practicum reviews.			**X**	**X**				

SPED 546 Practicum II Practicum for special education endorsement candidates focuses on application of all appropriate elements of the special education standards in a public school special education setting. Practicum II emphasizes key elements of the special education process; IEP & Placement. Particular focus is on the relationship between the IEP and instruction provided. Candidates participate in conferences before and after each observation by a practicum supervisor. This course completes Formative 3 and the Summative evaluations of candidate practice.					**X**	**X**	**X**	
NES(ORELA): Special Education State testing required to obtain a special education endorsement. Endorsement candidates must complete the examination sometime during their year in the program with a passing score This is a summative assessment.								
Portfolio Review Each candidate compiles								**X**

a portfolio containing the graded copy of the two key assignments in each class. These assignments are designated by the instructor. The portfolio is reviewed by two members of the special education faculty to ensure that all essential elements of the special education standards have been met by the endorsement candidate through assignments & practica. The Portfolio Scoring Guide provides a rating of Meets, Exceeds, or Does Not Meet requirements. A student not meeting requirements at the Portfolio Review will be given the opportunity to demonstrate competence in all areas of the special education process, through another field experience. This is a summative assessment.							

4. Program Alignment

Special Education Program Alignment

Standards	SPED 510/626 — Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 — Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 — Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 — Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 — Practicum I	SPED 514/633 — Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 — Practicum II	SPED 517/627 — Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 — Current Issues in Special Education	Assessment 1 — Standards Pre & Post Assessment	Assessment 2 — Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) Instruction Pre & Post	Assessment 3 — Grades tied to Standards via Courses	Assessment 4 — Admissions Data	Assessment 5 — Sped 545 Practicum I Formative Eval. 1	Assessment 6 — SPED 545 Practicum I Formative Eval. 2	Assessment 7 — SPED 546 Practicum II Formative Eval 3	Assessment 8 — SPED 546 Practicum II Summative Evaluation	Assessment 9 — NES(ORELA):SPED	Assessment 10 — Portfolio Assessment/Portfolio Review	OTHER ASSESSMENTS — Exit Survey
x=data available for former standards on request										Not available 09-10	Not available 09-10	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Data available for new special education standards										Data available May, 2011	Data available, May, 2011	X	X	Available May 2011	Available May 2011	Available May 2011				Available July 2011
[SPED] OAR 584-065-0035 (4a.) Standard 1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A,1B,1C,1D	1B,1C,1D	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D,	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
[SPED] OAR 584-065-0035 (4b.) Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners. Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C,	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A. 2B, 2C	2	2A, 2B, 2C	2A	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X
[SPED] OAR 584-065-0035 (4c.) Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences. Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B , 3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[SPED] OAR 584-065-0035 (4d.) Standard 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	4, 4A, 4B,4C	4, 4A, 4B, 4C		4, 4A, 4B, 4C	4, 4B, 4C	4A, 4B, 4C	4	4, 4A, 4B, 4C	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
[SPED] OAR 584-065-0035 (4e.) Standard 5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	5B,5E	5B, 5E		5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F	5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F	5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F		5E, 5F			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[SPED] OAR 584-065-0035 (4f.) Standard 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	6C	6A, 6B,6C,	6	6D	6,6A, 6B, 6C,	6D	6A, 6B,6C, 6D	6	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[SPED] OAR 584-065-0035 (4g.) Standard 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.		7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G7H		7,7A,7B,7C,7D,7E, 7F,7G7H	7,7A7B,7C,7D,7E, 7F,7G,7H	7,7A7B,7C,7D,7E,7 F,7G,7H	7, 7A,7B,7C,7D,7E,7 F	7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[SPED] OAR 584-065-0035 (4h.) Standard 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	8A,8D, 8E,8F	8A,8B,8D,8E,8F	ALL 8 -8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	8F,8G, 8H, 8I	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X
[SPED] OAR 584-065-0035 (4i.) Standard 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	9D,9H	9D,	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F,9H	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F, 9H	9B,9H	9A,9E,9F, 9H	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[SPED] OAR 584-065-0035 (4j.) Standard 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	10A, 10C, 10D,10E	10A,10C,10D,10E	10,10A,10C,10D	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10A,10C, 10D, 10E	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10D, 10E	10A,10C,10D,10E	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[CTL] OAR 584-017-0160 (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL1	CTL 1	CTL 1	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[CTL] OAR 584-017-0160 (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		CTL 2	CTL2	CTL 2	CTL 2	CTL 2	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X
[CTL] OAR 584-017-0160 (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[CTL] OAR 584-017-0160 (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4					X	X	X	X		X	X
[CTL] OAR 584-017-0160 (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5	CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
[CTL] OAR 584-017-0160 (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.		CTL 6	CTL6		CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6		X			X	X	X	X		X	X
[CTL] OAR 584-017-0160 (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7		X			X	X	X	X		X	X
[CTL] OAR 584-017-0160 (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8		X			X	X	X	X		X	X
[CTL] OAR 584-017-0160 (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					CTL 9		CTL 9		CTL 9		X			X	X	X	X		X	X
[CTL] OAR 584-017-0160 (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					CTL 10		CTL 10		CTL 10		X			X	X	X	X		X	X

5. Program field experience matrix - Two dimensional table (Program term (horizontal) -Program field experience (vertical) -Program field experience includes data related to number of weeks/hours, etc.

Each component of the Field Experience Matrix indicates the number of hours of training that a candidate receives during scheduled class time. An estimation of the number of hours required outside of class time to complete all aspects of the targeted training, e.g. CBM, is also provided. Time outside of class is a compilation of information from candidates in each class. Individual candidates may take more or less time outside of class than what is reported here. All elements which are part of this field experience matrix are completed by individual candidates with the exception of the experiences in SPED 535 Current Issues. These experiences are completed as simulations of a school based special education team and must be completed with other candidates.

Candidates are evaluated in terms of their performance as specified in each individual syllabus. As elements of these field experiences are required items for the candidates final Special Education Portfolio, candidates whose performance does not demonstrate proficiency are given a second opportunity to meet proficiency, either within the course or through an incomplete. All candidates must meet proficiency in all field experiences. Candidates who are willing to continue to work toward proficiency will be given additional opportunities through coursework and/or additional practica. Candidates who do not meet proficiency and do not desire to continue to work toward this goal are requested to confer with the Program Coordinator and the Instructor to consider an alternative career choice.

	Summer I	Fall	Spring	Summer II
SPED 511: Behavior Change Interventions for ED/BD students. Create Functional Behavior Analysis (FBA). Create Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP). Demonstrate understanding of PBIS.	30 hours training 15-30 Observe students, review data, complete FBA & BIP			
SPED 516: Interventions for Severely Challenged Students. Discrete Trial Training, Pivotal Behavioral Routines. Functional Behavior & Academic Skills for ASD and severely cognitively disabled students.	30 hrs. training 20-30 hrs. developing student programs in DDT, PRT Functional Routines based on observation of student s			
SPED 513: Assessment & Diagnosis: Demonstrate mastery of diagnosis & eligibility requirements for all special education disabilities. Testing and test interpretation.		45 hrs. training 45-90 hrs. field work to include assessment administration/scoring & interpretation, CBM in reading/math		
SPED 545 Practicum I Demonstrate competence of special education process; Pre-referral, Referral, Evaluation, Eligibility. Formative I & II		125 hrs minimum - 720 (30 weeks/24 hrs per week) Demonstrate proficiency in all areas of SPED Process-Substantive & Procedural		

	Summer I	Fall	Spring	Summer II
SPED 514: Curriculum & Instruction for Students w/ Special Needs. Demonstrate competence in IEP, SDI, progress monitoring and improved student outcomes through OAKS testing.			45 hours training 45-90 hrs field work Focused on IEP, specially designed instruction linked to the IEP and appropriate adaptations.	
SPED 546 Practicum II: Demonstrate mastery of all aspects of the special education process. Formative evaluation of practicum (III). Summative evaluation of practicum experiences.			45 hrs. training 125-840 (35 weeks/24 hrs per week) Demonstrate proficiency in all areas of SPED Process-Substantive & Procedural	
SPED 517: Reading for Students with Special Needs. Demonstrate competence of language acquisition in five key areas of reading, reading assessment &intervention.				30 hrs. training 15-30 hrs. field work Create reading assessment/ instruction paradigm for designated student's grade level.
SPED 535: Current Issues. Practical application of most recent / most critical aspects of SPED process substantive/procedural.				30 hrs. experience Create all SPED related forms; rev .discipline process ;review behavior analysis & management

6. Institutions will provide (a) summary of assessments and guides used for data collection.

The requirements of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning, (NCATE. November, 2010) have been used as a template for reviewing and revising the key assessments for the special education endorsement program. This report "…recommends sweeping changes in how we deliver, monitor, evaluate, oversee and staff clinically based preparation to nurture a whole new form of teacher education." Continuing, the report calls for:

- ✓ More Rigorous Accountability,
- ✓ Strengthening Candidate Selection and Placement,
- ✓ Revamping Curricula, Incentives and Staffing,
- ✓ Supporting Partnerships, and
- ✓ Expanding the Knowledge Base to Identify and Support Continuous Improvement

Essential to all aspects of these requirements is an emphasis on of how well the special education endorsement program identifies and addresses the needs of schools, and the essential goal of improved K-12 student learning. To impact student learning we must continually work to improve candidate proficiency. The Lewis & Clark GSEC special education endorsement program will use the following assessments to determine each candidate's successful acquisition of the substantive and procedural knowledge essential for special education teachers, and proficiency demonstrated through skills necessary to the practice of special education in public schools.

1. Standards Pre & Post Assessment
2. Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) Pre & Post Assessment
3. Grades linked to Standards
4. Admissions Data
5. Practicum I (Formative Assessment I)
6. Practicum 2 (Formative Assessment 2)
7. Practicum 3 (Formative Assessment 3)
8. Practicum 4 (Summative Assessment)
9. NES (ORELA): Special Education
10. Portfolio Review

The knowledge and skills to be demonstrated occur at strategic points in the special education program where they can be used to make decisions about a candidate's progress, and possible

need for additional support, information and training. These data will also be used as part of the information necessary for making changes to the special education endorsement program overall. Examples of all assessments and guides, those linked to the former standards and those geared to current standards follow this narrative.

Assessment 1: Standards Pre & Post Assessment

The Standards Pre & Post Assessment was intended to determine an incoming candidate's knowledge relative to the new Oregon state special education standards. The assessment is in the form of a multiple choice/short answer assessment given to candidates the first class meeting of SPED 510/626: Educating Students with Special Needs. Candidates will be told the Pre assessment is to determine their general information about the practice of special education at the beginning of the program. Many of the items have multiple answers that are partially correct. The most complete or most accurate answer is intended to reflect growth in special education knowledge/skills when the Post test is administered. The Post test will be administered in the same form in SPED 535/635: Current Issues in Special Education, the final class in the candidate's special education program. Candidates will again be asked to select the most appropriate answer. The Standards Pre & Post Assessment has 22 items, requiring approximately 45 minutes to complete. Candidates will be asked to score the Post Assessment as a review of the evolution of their knowledge/skills during the program. This assessment can also provide a comparison of candidates in both the GSEC on campus and Central Oregon sites. Faculty will review the assessment to determine adequacy both in terms of the degree to which it assesses knowledge and skills necessary for the practice of special education as well as providing information useful to creating a special education endorsement program which trains candidates who can improve the learning of public school students.

Assessment 2: Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) Pre & Post Assessment

Federal legislation (IDEA, 2004) describes special education as being essentially specially designed instruction (SDI). To improve student learning, specially designed instruction requires the special education teacher to have extensive knowledge of each individual special education student, the general education curriculum across subjects at the appropriate grade levels, the students' disabilities, and research based instructional strategies. The SDI Pre & Post Assessment is a ten item, self-report analysis of instructional strategies. Candidates are asked to examine their own teaching practice and report on how they support student attention, model appropriate task completion, etc. This assessment was originally provided as part of SPED 514/633: Curriculum & Instruction. Review of the information provided suggested that using it

as a Pre / Post assessment could prove useful to all program faculty. It was further determined that this assessment should be reviewed with practicum observation data. Candidates complete this assessment of their teaching at the beginning of SPED 510/626: Educating Students with Special Needs. The Post assessment will be given during the SPED 535/635. Faculty will review the assessment to determine its adequacy both in terms of the degree to which it assesses knowledge necessary for the practice of special education and provides information which can be used to improve the special education endorsement program. This assessment can also provide a comparison of candidates in both the GSEC on campus and Central Oregon sites in terms of specially designed instruction

Assessment 3: Course grades: Standards proficiency assessment

At the Lewis & Clark College Graduate School of Education & Counseling candidates may take up to six semester hours before being admitted to a program. In special education, this is SPED 510/626, SPED 511/629, & SPED 515/628. The grades in the first three courses form an essential transition point for endorsement candidates. Candidates must achieve at least a grade of B- in each of these courses to continue in the endorsement program. The goal in grading is to rate candidate performance in terms of essential field experience components, which will eventually become part of the candidate's Special Education Portfolio. As examples, SPED 510 requires determining appropriate accommodations. SPED 511 requires completion of a Functional Behavior Analysis and Behavior Intervention Plan with PBS emphasis. SPED 516 requires the application of Discrete Trial (DTT) and Pivotal Response Training (PRT) programs and creation of a program of Functional Routines for students with ASD and other severe disabilities. Faculty will review use of grades to determine their adequacy both in terms of the degree to which they provide a view of the knowledge and skills necessary for the practice of special education, as well as providing information which can used to improve the endorsement program. This assessment also provides a comparison of candidates in both the GSEC on campus and Central Oregon sites.

Assessment 4: Admissions Data Analysis Assessment

Admissions data are provided and reviewed in the following areas: Academic Preparation, Resume/Experience, Personal Statement/Essay, Diversity Experience, Letters of Recommendation and a final Overall Rating. Though each area provides important information, faculty reviewers focus most closely on the Letters of Recommendation and Resume/Experience. As part of the key assessments, special education endorsement candidates will be required to expand on their background in public schools and related

activities. The GSEC will then be able to make comparisons relative to the differences between students and the effects of those differences on their success in completing field experiences and practica. Many of the candidates for the endorsement will have requested a recommendation from a principal or assistant principal with whom they have worked. Each individual's resume provides an indication of how much teaching experience a candidate has, and if any of that experience has been in teaching in special education. Faculty reviews the admissions information to determine its adequacy both in terms of the degree to which it demonstrates knowledge necessary for the practice of special education, as well as providing information which can used to improve the special education endorsement program. On the basis of those reviews, a section elaborating on the experiences of candidates will be added to the Admissions form and become part of the Admissions data analysis. This assessment will also provide a comparison of candidates in both the GSEC on campus and Central Oregon sites.

Assessments 5, 6, 7, & 8: Practicum I & Practicum II Assessments

The practica in the Lewis & Clark GSEC special education endorsement program are one hour each semester. They are the core of the special education program enabling candidates to practice, reflect, revise and practice again substantive and procedural skills learned in courses. Related course numbers are SPED 545/645 and SPED 546/646. Candidates are required to log practicum hours across age levels within the authorization level sought and across disabilities. All aspects of special education practice are required as part of the log (e.g. special education paperwork). Practica experiences are in public school and/or public school affiliated special education settings. Practica may be practice in self-contained classrooms or fully included practice in general education classrooms. Many students are able to use their current special education position as their practicum site. [These students are fully certified teachers working under a TSPC-Conditional Assignment Permit (CAP).] Those not currently teaching in special education follow a district's requirements for volunteering in a specific schools' special education program. Practicum begins in the fall of each year, and concludes at the end of the school calendar year. The Lewis & Clark GSEC practica were specifically designed to provide endorsement candidates with special education experience from beginning to end of public school year. A practicum covers all aspects of special education and is linked to field experiences which are intensive practice usually with a specific disability category (e.g., ED, ADD/ADHD or ASD) for a more limited time period. Practicum experiences must be in the authorization area in which the candidate is intending to be certified.

The GSEC special education practicum work is observed and evaluated according to state special education standards a minimum of twice per semester. The two practicum

supervisors staff candidates weekly to determine their level of proficiency as required by state endorsement standards. Candidates are provided as many opportunities as necessary to demonstrate proficiency. Candidates must demonstrate the relationship between what they are teaching and student IEPs. Practica are reviewed as formative and finally summative evaluations of a candidate's ability to implement the special education process and achieve proficiency in each benchmark of each standard (See Practicum Observation Forms, Practicum Log, and Appendix).

For each observation there is a Pre-conference and a Post-Conference. Candidate self-evaluation is considered an essential part of the practicum observation. It occurs during the post conference. Practica are evaluated by trained observers who are former special education administrators thoroughly familiar with staff evaluation. Candidates are assessed in terms of demonstrated ability to perform proficiently in all areas of the special education process. The size of the program allows for candidate's individualized weekly staffings to determine progress and provide goals for the next evaluation. When appropriate, supervisors evaluate a candidate together enabling them to target related, but different, aspects of the specially designed instruction during the same evaluation. As an example, one supervisor could review student's task approach, time-on-task and task completion, while the other supervisor is analyzing the relationship of the instruction content to the students' IEPs and state standards.

The practica have been reviewed a minimum of twice yearly and restructured to ensure candidate proficiency. Initially, practica experiences were reviewed through the lens provided by the Council of Exceptional Children (CEC) Standards. The fall semester 2010, was the initial trial of the practicum observation process based on the new state standards. (See attachments this item for a history of practicum review instruments.) From the beginning of the program, practicum observations were targeted to increase proficiency in the practice of special education. The CEC standards, and now the current Oregon standards have refined this process. Formerly, practicum experience was reviewed in narrative form, containing descriptions of the observation, questions for the candidate, and recommendations for changes to be discussed during the post-conference. With this information, the most recent version of the observation form will allow supervisors to rate the candidate's performance on items related to the Oregon special education endorsement standards, to compare candidates, and to determine progress toward proficiency.

Assessment 9: NES (ORELA): Special Education

The NES (ORELA): Special Education is the special education assessment currently required by the state of Oregon. This assessment must be completed and the score provided

before the GSEC Lewis & Clark College GSEC will recommend a candidate to TSPC as having successfully completed the endorsement program This current test was initiated in September, 2010. To date, one candidate has taken and passed the NES (ORELA): Special Education

In previous years, the endorsement candidates have been required to take the Praxsis II, Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge. The required score for passing the Praxsis II in Oregon is 162. The range of scores for candidates who completed the Praxsis II from both Lewis & Clark program sites was 172-192. Faculty will review the information provided by the NES (ORELA): Special Education to determine the degree to which it assesses knowledge necessary for the practice of special education and the degree to which it can provide information useful to ongoing improvements in the endorsement program.

Assessment 10: Portfolio Review

The Portfolio is a compellation of the key assignments in each special education course and practicum. The required assignments are outlined for the candidates at the start of the program, in each class as they begin the class and in advising appointments. Candidates are required to keep their original work with Instructor's review, comments, and grade. It is this original work, with grade and comments that is organized into a Portfolio. Practicum observations and practicum logs remain part of the candidate's master file in the Education Department Office.

The purpose of the Portfolio has been to provide a summative review of all of a candidate's key assignments for both the candidate and the faculty. In organizing the required elements of this portfolio, the candidate will review a course, their work in that course, and the instructor's review of their work as well. This portfolio is not a 'clean' copy of the candidate's best work. It demonstrates the candidate's progress toward proficiency on the key assignment which is tied to the appropriate field experience. The special education portfolio is a review of the candidate's work on substantive and procedural aspects of special education assessments such as IEPs, special education eligibility, and instructional and behavioral strategies essential to the practice of special education in the public schools. The portfolio is a tangible, multiple lens reflection of a candidate's performance in the special education endorsement program.

As with other key assessments, the format through which the portfolio is reviewed has progressed to a rating of the candidate as not meeting, meeting or exceeding the requirements of the special education endorsement program as operationalized in state standards. Faculty review the information provided by the candidates' portfolios to determine the degree to which information is provided about a candidate's ability to proficiently practice special education, as

well as the degree to which the portfolio provides information useful for the ongoing improvement in the Lewis & Clark GSEC special education endorsement program.

Name: _____

Date:_____

Authorization Level:_____

Special Education Standards

The following questions are intended to determine your background information about the knowledge, skills and abilities required for the Special Education Endorsement in the Oregon Administrative Rules (584-065-0035).

The questions have multiple possible answers. Provide the **best answer** to each question.
[The results of this assessment will be used to help us target our instruction to meet your needs.]

1. The role of assessment in special education is:
    a. very significant
    b. somewhat significant
    c. significant in some settings but not others
    d. related only to the students disability
    e. not significant

2. The law which defines special education practice is:
    a. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act
    b. Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act
    c. NCLB the Elementary & Secondary Education Act
    d. Americans with Disabilities Act
    e. all of the above.

3. The role of special education in school districts is dependent on the theoretical & philosophical perspective of the district.
    a. somewhat
    b. significantly
    c. under certain circumstances
    d. most of the time
    e. rarely

4. Demonstrating respect for the special education student is:
    a. essential in special education practice for some students,
    b. best practice for all students,
    c. appropriate for most students,
    d. significant but not required,
    e. required but not significant.

5. Modifications of the general education curriculum are:
    a. required in special education,
    b. based on the curriculum,
    c. based on the needs of the student,
    d. significant changes in special education,
    e. decided by the student's teacher.

6. Individuals with disabilities could have:
    a. cognitive differences compared to their age level peers,
    b. linguistic differences compared to their grade level peers,
    c. differences in motor abilities or sensory abilities,
    d. multiple disabilities,
    e. any of the above.

7. Second language differences can be considered a disability when:
    a. the student does not read in L1,
    b. the student does not read and write in L1,
    c. the student has difficulty learning L2,
    d. when learning difficulties are reported by his teacher,
    e. none of the above

8. Instructional strategies can support special education students:
    a. learning grade level curriculum,
    b. in all areas of learning,
    c. across multiple academic areas,
    d. learning functional and/or behavioral skills,
    e. all of the above.

9. Accommodations and modifications are:
    a. adaptations of curriculum in setting, timing & response,
    b. required for special education students,
    c. used for students who are eligible under Autism Spectrum Disorder,
    d. none of the above,
    e. all of the above.

10. Physicians are responsible for:
    a. diagnosing the disability of a special education student,
    b. determining special education eligibility,
    c. interpreting medical issues for school faculty,
    d. providing content for the IEP,
    e. none of the above.

11. Special education is:
    a. small group instruction,
    b. remedial instruction,
    c. specially designed instruction,
    d. providing extended time for completing core academic tasks,
    e. none of the above.

12. Special education services provide:
    a. organized, grade level activities,
    b. special curricula based on student needs,
    c. individualized instruction,
    d. disability related knowledge and skills,
    e. none of the above

13. Special education eligibility:
    a. is based on a medical diagnosis of a disability,
    b. is based on the adverse educational impact of a disability,
    c. determined by response to the general education curriculum,
    d. provides all students with accommodations to curriculum,
    e. is a process determined by the school district.

14. Special education strategy instruction:
    a. emphasizes the development, maintenance, and generalization of knowledge and skills,
    b. emphasizes skills across environments and settings.
    c. changes based on the determined eligibility,
    d. a and c,
    e. a and b.

15. It is part of the role of the special education teacher to:
    a. assess the personal and social skills of the student,
    b. create a behavior support plan,
    c. monitor a student's behavior,
    d. participate in disciplinary procedures,
    e. all of the above

16. Which of these is not an essential focus of special education instruction?
    a. task completion and evaluation skills,
    b. directed response questioning,
    c. appropriate language usage,
    d. looping,
    e. small, interactive group instruction.

17. Which of the following would <u>not</u> be part of a behavior support plan?
    a. planned ignoring,
    b. different responses to student behavior,
    c. signal interference,
    d. logical consequences,
    e. all of the above

18. Post-secondary planning & experiences for special education students is:
    a. transition planning,
    b. the responsibility of outside support agencies, (e.g. Voc. Rehab.),
    c. an essential activity for all high school special education students,
    d. required only for students with severe disabilities,
    e. all of the above.

19. Oral language development is:
    a. not directly related to reading instruction,
    b. essential to written language instruction
    c. a prerequisite for developing spelling skills.
    d. an appropriate focus for instruction of special education students,
    e. none of the above.

20. Assessment in special education is:
    a. only at the initial evaluation for special education eligibility.
    b. ongoing as progress monitoring,
    c. based on the organization of the curriculum,
    d. group assessment,
    e. none of the above

21. Please list and define the steps in the Special Education Process:

22. Describe the role of parents in special education:

Scoring Guide: Pre- and Post-Special Education Standards Information Survey

I. Each item has a best answer. There are twenty multiple choice questions. The highest point total is 40 points. There are two short answer questions. The point total for correct answers is 19.

Total points for Standards Survey: 59
- **2 points** = A complete and accurate answer to the question
- **1 point** = A partial but accurate answer to the question
- **0 points** = incorrect or no answer

Question 21 possible point total: 14
- **2 point** = All steps in the special education process are represented accurately
- **1 point** = All steps in the special education process are represented somewhat accurately
- **0 points** = incorrect or no answer

Question 22 possible point total: 5
- **5 points** = complete answer
- **2 points** = incomplete answer that is partially correct
- **0 points** = incorrect or no answer

Score Interpretation

Emerging: **49 & below**

Proficient: **55-50**

Mastery :   **56-59**

Candidates entering the program would be expected to score in the emerging range. Those with previous special education experience would be expected to score in the high emerging or low proficient range.

Candidates completing the program would be expected to score in the mastery range.

Name:_____

Date:_____

Authorization Level:_____

Please read each question. Consider your own teaching and student learning history. Respond as if you were observing your teaching performance in a general education classroom. Provide two examples of teaching strategies you have used to answer each question.

0 = Unacceptable	1 = Emerging	2 = Proficient	3 = Excellent
No observable strategies in responses.	Some observable strategies. Not in all answers, or not complete	Observable strategies that *could be* appropriate.	Observable, appropriate strategies, based on validated research.

I. <u>Student motivation</u>
   a. How do I *demonstrate* learning is valued in my work with students?
   1.

   2.

   b. How do I center my instruction the learner?
   1.

   2.

II. <u>Student attention</u>
   a. How do I support student attention?
   1.

   2.

b. How do I discover & minimize distractions?
1.

2.

c. How do I <u>differentiate instruction</u>?
    1.

    2.

III. Supportive <u>environment</u>
  a. How do I encourage risk taking?
    1.

    2.

b. How do I respond to errors or mistakes?
    1.

    2.

c. What is the most frequent comment I make in class?

IV. Modeling
How often do students have the opportunity to see me "do the task" I'm teaching?

    Always   Almost always   Often   Some of the time   Occasionally Rarely Never

Cite two examples of modeling you use:
     1.

     2.

V. Activating a student's prior knowledge
    a. What do I do to have students think about what they already know about the skill or content I'm teaching?
     1.

      2.

b. What do I do to assist students in linking what they know to the current topic/task?
     1.

      2.

VI. Instruction Pacing: (Circle or fill in your answer)
1. What is my rate?   (fast   fast average   average average slow   slow)

2. What is my tone?

3. What is my manner?

VII. <u>Student practice</u>
    a. How often do my lessons contain guided practice?

     Always   Almost always   Often   Some of the time Occasionally Rarely Never

    b. If I use guided practice, at what point in a lesson do I use it?

VIII. <u>Feedback</u>
    a. How do my students know they are learning?
      1.

      2.

IX. <u>Acquisition/Repetition/Maintenance</u>
    a. How do I know when a student has learned the skill/knowledge behavior I'm teaching?
      1.

      2.

X. Generalization:
   a. How do I know when the student is ready to apply the skill/knowledge/behavior in a new setting?
      1.

      2.

    b. How do I keep track of and report student learning (monitor progress)?
      1.

      2.

Lewis & Clark Graduate School of Education and Counseling
ADMISSION EVALUATION SHEET

Student Name: _____	**ID#:** _____
Program: _____	**Term:** _____
Faculty Reviewer:_____	**Date:** _____

Instructions: Please circle only one rating for each of the areas below. Please complete all sections on both sides of the form. Sign, date, and return the completed sheet to the applicant's file. Your ratings and comments provide important information for the admissions process. NOTE: Admission Evaluation Sheets do not remain in the applicant file and do not become a part of the student's permanent record. Thank you!

Rubric score definitions
1* = Does not meet standards. Major elements are missing.
2* = Approaches standards. Most elements are satisfactory.
3 = Meets standards.
4 = Exceeds standards.
NA = Use when not required by program.
* Please include in the comments section specific and objective rational for assigning this score.

1. Academic Preparation	1	2	3	4	NA
Transcripts: Minimum 2.75 GPA undergraduate 3.0 GPA graduate					
Transcripts include relevant coursework					
Post-baccalaureate work					
Overall Academic Preparation Rating	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**NA**

Comments: Include thoughts on deficiencies, honors, scholarships, awards.

2. Statement/Essays	1 (weak)	2 (acceptable)	3 (strong)	4 (excellent)	NA
Content thoughtfully and effectively addresses the required questions and essay topics					
Fit with program or field					
Writing ability: Organization & development, voice, style, grammar/syntax, spelling, punctuation. etc.					
Overall Statement for Essay Rating	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**NA**

Comments:

3. Relevant Experience (Resume)	1	2	3	4	NA

Comments:

4. Potential for Multicultural Competence	1	2	3	4	NA

Comments:

5. Recommendations (role of letter writer)	1 (do not recommend)	2 (rec. with reservation)	3 (recommend)	4 (strongly recommend)	NA
#1 _____					
#2_____					
#3_____					
Overall Recommendation Rating	1	2	3	4	NA

Comments:

6. Testing (GRE, PRAXIS, CBEST, WEST-B, TOEFL, ILETS)	1	2	3	4	NA

If minimum scores or passing scores are not required and scores are submitted, please feel free to rate the testing if pertinent to your admissions recommendation.

Overall Faculty File Rating	1	2	3	4	NA

Comments:

Faculty admissions recommendation based on the file reading. (choose one)	Admit	Deny	Hold	Waitlist	Conditional/ Probationary Admit

Comments:

GSECAdmissions 10.2010

Lewis & Clark Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Special Education Endorsement
ADMISSION EVALUATION SHEET PART II

Student Name: _____   ID#: _____

Program: **Special Education**   Term: _____

Faculty Reviewer: Date: _____

Instructions: Please circle only one rating for each of the areas below. Please complete all sections on both sides of the form. Sign, date, and return the completed sheet to the applicant's file. Your ratings and comments provide important information for the admissions process. NOTE: Admission Evaluation Sheets do not remain in the applicant file and do not become a part of the student's permanent record. Thank you!

Guide to scoring
1 = No experience
2 = Some experience.
3 = Experience teaching SPED individuals
4 = Employed as SPED teacher.
.
* Please include in the comments section specific and objective rational for assigning this score.PE

Academic History	1	2	3	4
Describe Background relevant to special education				

3. Relevant Experience	1	2	3	4
Experience with individuals w/ mild disabilities:				
Experience with individuals w/ moderate/severe disabilities:				
Experience teaching individuals w/ disabilities				
Experience as **SPED Instruction Assistant** ?				
Related Service Professional				

O=Not Acceptable	1= NNO (Necessary element missing)	2= Emerging	3=Proficient	4= Excellent	Not Observed
Does not demonstrate understanding of disabilities Does not adapt teaching to substantive requirements Does not adapt teaching to procedural requirements	Does not demonstrate teaching element required by setting circumstance/disability Provides incorrect explanation of substantive & procedural requirements	*Demonstrates* a *partial* understanding of the elements required by setting/circumstance/ disability *Does not* complete all requirements effectively Provides incomplete explanation	*Demonstrates* understanding of elements required by setting/circumstance/disability Completes *most* requirements, effectively Provides complete explanation of substantive & procedural	*Demonstrates* effective understanding of the elements required by setting/circumstance/ disability. Provides complete, research-based explanations of requirements	

Candidate's Name:_____**Faculty Observer:** _____ __

Date(s):_____**Setting/School:**_____**Authorization Level**:_____

Students being recommended for the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teacher Education License must at least meet Proficient level in all categories. Standards 1- 10 would be reflected in each area observed and specifically as noted in an area as outlined below.

Standard I: Foundations Candidate demonstrates evidence based principles, theories and relevant legal requirements.

Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of the Learner Candidate demonstrates respect for students and understanding of human development.

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences **Standard 4: Instructional Strategies**

GSEC Component 1.a 1, 1.a.2., 1.a.3., Create an Environment of Safety and Respect

1a.1 Teacher-Student Interaction (1/1 –small group—class)	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed
Observation /Description						

1.a.2. Student Interaction	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed
Observation /Description						

58

1.a.3. Manage Behavior (FBA/BIP)	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

1.a.4. Utilize Physical Space	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences. Candidate demonstrates understanding of the effects of the learners' exceptional condition(s).

Standard 4: Instructional Strategies: Candidate demonstrates a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies for facilitating critical thinking, problem solving, self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem across settings.

1.a.5. Manage SPED Process and all related Forms	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

59

Standard 5: Learning Environments & Social Interaction Candidate creates & facilitates learning environments to encourage, independence, self-motivation, self-direction and self-advocacy. Component 1.c. Establish a Culture for Learning						
1.c.1. Respond to Learner's Interests and Needs (Relevance to IEP)	**0** **Not acceptable**	**1** **Necessary** **N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not Observed**
Observation /Description						
Facilitate attention, & **support student participation [task approach, organization ,time-on-task, task completion, task evaluation]**	**0** **Not acceptable**	**1** **Necessary** **N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not Observed**
Observation Description						
Standard 6: Language Candidate demonstrates understanding of exceptional learner's language acquisition and development across language content, form and use. Component 2.b. Teaching-Learning Cycle						
Shapes environments to support development of communication skills. 2.b.2. Communicate Clearly and effectively	**0** **Not acceptable**	**1** **Necessary** **N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not Observed**
Observation Description						

Standard 7: Instructional Planning Candidate demonstrates individualized decision-making and individualized instruction								
2.b.3. Uses a Variety of Techniques to Promote Student Participation and Learning **(Differentiated Instruction Accommodations-Modifications)**	**0** **Not acceptable**	**1** **Necessary N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not Observed**		
Observation /Description								

Standard 8: Assessment Candidate's practice evidences multiple forms of assessment (formal and informal, formative and summative) to make educational decisions at all stages of the special education process. Data analysis is an integral program component. Component 2.c. Assessment Cycle								
2.c.1. Demonstrates Flexibility and Responsiveness to Students **(Data System & Integration)**	**0** **Not acceptable**	**1** **Necessary N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not Observed**		
Observation/Description								

Standard 9 Professional & Ethical Practices Candidate demonstrates awareness and ongoing attention to legal matters, professional growth and ethical practices. **Standard 10 Collaboration** Candidate collaborates with families, general educators, community agencies and professionals outside the school setting in support of the exceptional learning needs of individuals.
Observation Description

Lewis & Clark College
Department of Teacher Education
Special Education Practicum Activity Log

NAME: **PRACTICUM SITE:**

DATE	FROM-TO	SETTING/ACTIVITY	Code	Severity	DESCRIPTION OF YOUR WORK

Student:_____**Reviewer 1:**_____

Date Received_____**Reviewer 2:**_____

Instructions: Please check only one rating for each of the areas below. Indicate date of materials; sign and date review on last page, and return completed review to program director.

SPED 510: Educating Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Answer Manual: Procedural, Substantive, Legal; Pedagogy Analysis and Applications			
2. Instructional Paradigm: Case Study and Presentation			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 511: Behavior Change Interventions for Students with Serious Emotional Behavioral Disorders	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
3. Functional Behavioral Analysis: Instructor's notes			

(SPED 511, continued)			
4. Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP aggressive/disruptive student): Instructor's notes			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 513: Assessment and Diagnosis	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
5. Case Study: Assessment Portfolio for Special Ed. Eligibility: Survey level test(s), achievement tests, supporting criterion reference assessment			
6. Case Study: Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM): Reading or Math			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 545: Practicum I	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Log: Assessment Hours			
2. Observation /Conference Form (filed by Supervisor)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 514: Curriculum and Instruction for Special Needs Students	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
7. Curriculum Study: GE Curriculum & Standards Integration, Lesson Plan 5			
8. IEP Project and Critique Notes			

9. Facilitated IEP Meeting and Critique			
(SPED 514, continued)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 516: Interventions for Severely Challenged Students: STAR and FACTER Case Study	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 546: Practicum II	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Observation Form			

2. Observation and Conference (filed by supervisor)			
(SPED 546, continued)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 517: Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
Reading Instruction Assessment/Instruction System			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 535: Successful Completion of Summary Experience	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.

Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):

Reviewer 1:_____**Date:**_____

Reviewer 2:_____**Date:**_____

Additional Comments (optional):

Student: **Reviewer 1:**

Date Received   **Reviewer 2:**

Instructions: Please check only one rating for each of the areas below. Indicate date of materials; sign and date review on last page, and return completed review to program director.

SPED 626: Educating Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Assigned Disability			
2. Presentation of Disability Report			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 629: Behavior Change Interventions for Students with Serious Emotional Behavioral Disorders	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
3. Functional Behavioral Analysis: Instructor's notes			

(SPED 629, continued)			
4. Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP aggressive/disruptive student): Instructor's notes			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 628: Interventions for **Severely Challenged Students**	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
5. Summary Reflection Project and Paper			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 632: Assessment and Diagnosis	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
6. Case Study: Assessment Portfolio for Special Ed. Eligibility (standardized assessment test & report)			

(SPED 632, continued)			
7. Case Study: Curriculum-Based Assessment			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 645: Practicum I	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Log Hours			
2. Observation and Conference (filed by supervisor)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

ED 633: Curriculum and Instruction for Special Needs Students	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
8. Completed IEP Project			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 627: Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
9. Reading Outline: Detailed Description in 5 Key Areas			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 646: Practicum II	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Log Hours			
2. Observation and Conference (filed by supervisor)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 635: Current Issues in Special Education	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
10. Participation and Completion of Seminar Project			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

Reviewer 1:   **Date:**

Reviewer 2:   **Date:**

Additional Comments (optional):

7. Institutions will provide data for each program approved by the commission

The faculty in the special education endorsement program meet in groups by courses (e.g., in SPED 535) the two faculty teaching together meet, and then again as an entire faculty several times a year to discuss and analyze data related to program review. This process will continue for the key assessments. The items listed here are both items which have formerly been part of the review process, and additional assessments which have been crafted to represent the new Oregon state special education endorsement standards. As several items are new, or the way these items will now be used has changed to reflect the new standards, data are incomplete. What is provided here is a list of the Assessments (Item 6 reviews), and a review of data with analysis of the items where data is currently available. These data have been crafted to support ongoing program improvement.

The items with data provided here have evolved over the history of the endorsement program. The most recent additions are: Assessment 1: Standards Pre & Post, and Assessment 2: Specially Designed Instruction, Pre & Post. Data and/or analysis formats are presented here from the following assessments:

- ➢ **Assessment 1: Standards Pre & Post Assessment**
  Data on this assessment will be available June, 2011.

- ➢ **Assessment 2: Specially Designed Instruction Pre & Post Assessment**
  Data on this assessment will be available June, 2011.

- ➢ **Assessment 3: Course grades: Standards Proficiency.**
  Candidates' work in their first three courses: SPED 510, SPED 511, & SPED 516 in addition to candidates' ongoing work in SPED 513, SPED 514, SPED 517 & SPED 535 are presented.

- ➢ **Assessment 4: Admissions Data Analysis**
  Current admissions form and additions to the admissions form that will be addenda February, 2011.

- ➢ **Assessments 5, 6,7, & 8: Practicum I (Formative Assessments) & Practicum II (Formative & Summative Evaluations)**
  Past observation forms, current observation form, and practicum hours log

- ➢ **Assessment 9: NES: ORELA Special Education Scores**

- ➢ **Assessment 10: Portfolio Review**
  Portfolio review form example

Faculty discussions take two forms. First, faculty discuss individual candidate's progress and determine whether special support or a plan of assistance is necessary to help a candidate make adequate progress toward meeting all program requirements. Second, program faculty

review the data to determine whether course content provides candidates with opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with program standards. The following section summarizes and provides an analysis of this data as it applies to program improvement. Additional information or examples of candidate items referenced here are available on request.

Name: _____

Date:_____

Authorization Level:_____

Special Education Standards

The following questions are intended to determine your background information about the knowledge, skills and abilities required for the Special Education Endorsement in the Oregon Administrative Rules (584-065-0035).

The questions have multiple possible answers. Provide the **best answer** to each question.
[The results of this assessment will be used to help us target our instruction to meet your needs.]

1. The role of assessment in special education is:
    a. very significant
    b. somewhat significant
    c. significant in some settings but not others
    d. related only to the students disability
    e. not significant

2. The law which defines special education practice is:
    a. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act
    b. Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act
    c. NCLB the Elementary & Secondary Education Act
    d. Americans with Disabilities Act
    e. all of the above.

3. The role of special education in school districts is dependent on the theoretical & philosophical perspective of the district.
    a. somewhat
    b. significantly
    c. under certain circumstances
    d. most of the time
    e. rarely

4. Demonstrating respect for the special education student is:
    a. essential in special education practice for some students,
    b. best practice for all students,
    c. appropriate for most students,
    d. significant but not required,
    e. required but not significant.

5. Modifications of the general education curriculum are:
    a. required in special education,
    b. based on the curriculum,
    c. based on the needs of the student,
    d. significant changes in special education,
    e. decided by the student's teacher.

6. Individuals with disabilities could have:
    a. cognitive differences compared to their age level peers,
    b. linguistic differences compared to their grade level peers,
    c. differences in motor abilities or sensory abilities,
    d. multiple disabilities,
    e. any of the above.

7. Second language differences can be considered a disability when:
    a. the student does not read in L1,
    b. the student does not read and write in L1,
    c. the student has difficulty learning L2,
    d. when learning difficulties are reported by his teacher,
    e. none of the above

8. Instructional strategies can support special education students:
    a. learning grade level curriculum,
    b. in all areas of learning,
    c. across multiple academic areas,
    d. learning functional and/or behavioral skills,
    e. all of the above.

9. Accommodations and modifications are:
    a. adaptations of curriculum in setting, timing & response,
    b. required for special education students,
    c. used for students who are eligible under Autism Spectrum Disorder,
    d. none of the above,
    e. all of the above.

10. Physicians are responsible for:
    a. diagnosing the disability of a special education student,
    b. determining special education eligibility,
    c. interpreting medical issues for school faculty,
    d. providing content for the IEP,
    e. none of the above.

11. Special education is:
    a. small group instruction,
    b. remedial instruction,
    c. specially designed instruction,
    d. providing extended time for completing core academic tasks,
    e. none of the above.

12. Special education services provide:
    a. organized, grade level activities,
    b. special curricula based on student needs,
    c. individualized instruction,
    d. disability related knowledge and skills,
    e. none of the above

13. Special education eligibility:
    a. is based on a medical diagnosis of a disability,
    b. is based on the adverse educational impact of a disability,
    c. determined by response to the general education curriculum,
    d. provides all students with accommodations to curriculum,
    e. is a process determined by the school district.

14. Special education strategy instruction:
    a. emphasizes the development, maintenance, and generalization of knowledge and skills,
    b. emphasizes skills across environments and settings.
    c. changes based on the determined eligibility,
    d. a and c,
    e. a and b.

15. It is part of the role of the special education teacher to:
    a. assess the personal and social skills of the student,
    b. create a behavior support plan,
    c. monitor a student's behavior,
    d. participate in disciplinary procedures,
    e. all of the above

16. Which of these is not an essential focus of special education instruction?
    a. task completion and evaluation skills,
    b. directed response questioning,
    c. appropriate language usage,
    d. looping,
    e. small, interactive group instruction.

17. Which of the following would <u>not</u> be part of a behavior support plan?
    a. planned ignoring,
    b. different responses to student behavior,
    c. signal interference,
    d. logical consequences,
    e. all of the above

18. Post-secondary planning & experiences for special education students is:
    a. transition planning,
    b. the responsibility of outside support agencies, (e.g. Voc. Rehab.),
    c. an essential activity for all high school special education students,
    d. required only for students with severe disabilities,
    e. all of the above.

19. Oral language development is:
    a. not directly related to reading instruction,
    b. essential to written language instruction
    c. a prerequisite for developing spelling skills.
    d. an appropriate focus for instruction of special education students,
    e. none of the above.

20. Assessment in special education is:
    a. only at the initial evaluation for special education eligibility.
    b. ongoing as progress monitoring,
    c. based on the organization of the curriculum,
    d. group assessment,
    e. none of the above

21. Please list and define the steps in the Special Education Process:

22. Describe the role of parents in special education:

Scoring Guide: Pre- and Post-Special Education Standards Information Survey

I. Each item has a best answer. There are twenty multiple choice questions. The highest point total is 40 points. There are two short answer questions. The point total for correct answers is 19.

Total points for Standards Survey: 59
- **2 points** = A complete and accurate answer to the question
- **1 point** = A partial but accurate answer to the question
- **0 points** = incorrect or no answer

Question 21 possible point total: 14
- **2 point** = All steps in the special education process are represented accurately
- **1 point** = All steps in the special education process are represented somewhat accurately
- **0 points** = incorrect or no answer

Question 22 possible point total: 5
- **5 points** = complete answer
- **2 points** = incomplete answer that is partially correct
- **0 points** = incorrect or no answer

Score Interpretation

Emerging: 49 & below

Proficient: 55-50

Mastery :   56-59

Candidates entering the program would be expected to score in the emerging range. Those with previous special education experience would be expected to score in the high emerging or low proficient range.

Candidates completing the program would be expected to score in the mastery range.

Name:_____

Date:_____

Authorization Level:_____

Please read each question. Consider your own teaching and student learning history. Respond as if you were observing your teaching performance in a general education classroom. Provide two examples of teaching strategies you have used to answer each question.

0 = Unacceptable	1 = Emerging	2 = Proficient	3 = Excellent
No observable strategies in responses.	Some observable strategies. Not in all answers, or not complete	Observable strategies that *could be* appropriate.	Observable, appropriate strategies, based on validated research.

I.   **Student motivation**
    a. How do I *demonstrate* learning is valued in my work with students?
    1.

    2.

    b. How do I center my instruction the learner?
    1.

    2.

II. **Student attention**
    a. How do I support student attention?
    1.

    2.

b. How do I discover & minimize distractions?
    1.

    2.

c. How do I <u>differentiate instruction</u>?
    1.

    2.

III. Supportive <u>environment</u>
  a. How do I encourage risk taking?
    1.

    2.

b. How do I respond to errors or mistakes?
    1.

    2.

c. What is the most frequent comment I make in class?

IV. Modeling
How often do students have the opportunity to see me "do the task" I'm teaching?

   Always   Almost always   Often   Some of the time   Occasionally Rarely Never

Cite two examples of modeling you use:
    1.

    2.

V. Activating a student's prior knowledge
    a.   What do I do to have students think about what they already know about the skill or content I'm teaching?
    1.

     2.

b. What do I do to assist students in linking what they know to the current topic/task?
    1.

    2.

VI. Instruction Pacing: (Circle or fill in your answer)
1. What is my rate?   (fast   fast average   average average slow   slow)

2. What is my tone?

3. What is my manner?

VII. Student practice
    a. How often do my lessons contain guided practice?

    Always   Almost always   Often   Some of the time Occasionally Rarely Never

    b. If I use guided practice, at what point in a lesson do I use it?

VIII. Feedback
    a. How do my students know they are learning?
      1.

      2.

IX. Acquisition/Repetition/Maintenance
    a. How do I know when a student has learned the skill/knowledge behavior I'm teaching?
      1.

      2.

X. Generalization:
  a. How do I know when the student is ready to apply the skill/knowledge/behavior in a new setting?
      1.

      2.

  b. How do I keep track of and report student learning (monitor progress)?
      1.

      2.

Special Education Program Instruction Survey Scoring Guide

There are 35 answers. Each answer is rated as described. Points are then assigned to provide an overall score:

No Answer: **0**

Answer Incomplete: **1**

> **The answer does not describe a teaching technique/strategy completely, or the strategy described does not respond to the question**

Answer Emerging: **2**

> **The answer demonstrates a partial understanding of the elements required in the strategy described. The answer or explanation provided is incomplete.**

Answer Proficient:

> **The answer demonstrates understanding of the elements required by the strategy described. The answer is complete.**

Answer Excellent: **3**

> **The answer is clear, complete and based on scientifically valid research.**

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 510

Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues | Analysis of child/adolescent development and the cognitive, linguistic, motor, behavioral, and learning characteristics of individuals with special needs. With the focus on progress monitoring and accountability ,topics include history, current policies and procedures, the practice of special education based on scientific research, incorporation of technology, and legal issues. Students develop and refine a research-based foundation in the education of students with special needs, including the impact of linguistic and cultural variability on special education eligibility and practice. | A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by presentation and exam.
B = completion of all projects demonstrating a good understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project.
C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project.
D = all projects not completed or some projects only partially complete.
(Summer 2009) | 94% (16) earned an A
6% (1) Earned a B+
(Summer 2009) | 100% | A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by presentation and exam.
B = completion of all projects demonstrating a good understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project.
C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project.
D = all projects not completed or some projects only partially complete.
(Summer 2010) | 74% (14) earned an A
26% (5) earned an A-
(Summer 2010) | 100% |

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	**Distribution of grades**	**% meeting minimum expectation**	**Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined**	**Distribution of grades**	**% meeting minimum expectation**
SPED 626 (Central Oregon) Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	Analysis of child/adolescent development and the cognitive, linguistic, motor, behavioral, and learning characteristics of individuals with special needs. With the focus on progress monitoring and accountability ,topics include history, current policies and procedures, the practice of special education based on scientific research, incorporation of technology, and legal issues. Students develop and refine a research-based foundation in the education of students with special needs, including the impact of linguistic and cultural variability on special education eligibility and practice.	Program/course not offered	-	-	A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by presentation and exam. B = completion of all projects demonstrating a good understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. D = all projects not completed or some projects only partially complete. (Summer 2010)	100% (8) = A (Summer 2010)	100%

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 511 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	Study of developmental backgrounds of students with significant emotional/behavioral problems, and practices to help these students develop more productive behaviors. Emphasis on procedures for completing a functional behavior analysis (FBA) and a behavior intervention plan (BIP), research-based interventions including environmental modifications, positive behavior supports and interventions (PBIS), social-skills training, cognitive-behavioral interventions, self-monitoring, contracting, and the use of outside agencies to support the school in assisting students.	Written and Oral Presentation of Chosen Topic: 15% Written Functional Assessment Exercises: 10% Written Behavior Intervention Plan Exercises: 15% Final Exercise: 50% Class Participation: 10% Grade of A: 93% Grade of B: 83% Grade of C: 73% (Summer 2009)	69% (18) =A 27% (7) =A- 4% (1)= Incomplete (Summer 2009)	96%	Written and Oral Presentation of Chosen Topic: 15% Written Functional Assessment Exercises: 10% Written Behavior Intervention Plan Exercises: 15% Final Exercise: 50% Class Participation: 10% Grade of A: 93% Grade of B: 83% Grade of C: 73% (Summer 2010)	68% (15) = A 18% (4) = A- 9% (2) = B 5% (1) = Incomplete (Summer 2010)	95%

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 629 (Central Oregon) Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	Study of developmental backgrounds of students with significant emotional/behavioral problems, and practices to help these students develop more productive behaviors. Emphasis on procedures for completing a functional behavior analysis (FBA) and a behavior intervention plan (BIP), research-based interventions including environmental modifications, positive behavior supports and interventions (PBIS), social-skills training, cognitive-behavioral interventions, self-monitoring, contracting, and the use of outside agencies to support the school in assisting students	Program/course not offered	-	-	Written and Oral Presentation of Chosen Topic: 15% Written Functional Assessment Exercises: 10% Written Behavior Intervention Plan Exercises: 15% Final Exercise: 50% Class Participation: 10% Grade of A: 93% Grade of B: 83% Grade of C: 73% (Summer 2010)	71% (5) = A 29% (2) = A- (Summer 2010)	100%
SPED 516 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	Students learn instructional practices to increase the functional performance and academic success of students with severe disabilities (e.g., autism spectrum disorder, severe mental retardation, or multiple disabilities). Participants learn research-validated strategies with demonstrated effectiveness in increasing communication skills, appropriate behavior, social skills, and life-skill routines for severely disabled students. Emphasis is placed on data-driven instruction in the least restrictive environment, and working with paraprofessionals.	A- = 91-93% A = 94-100% B- = 81-83% B = 84-87% B+ = 88-90% C- = 71-73% C = 74-77% C+ = 78-80% D = 61-70% F = less than 61% (Summer 2010)	94% (15) = A 6% (1)= Incomplete (Summer 2009)	94%	A- = 91-93% A = 94-100% B- = 81-83% B = 84-87% B+ = 88-90% C- = 71-73% C = 74-77% C+ = 78-80% D = 61-70% F = less than 61% (Summer 2010)	75% (18) = A 13% (3) = A- 8% (2) = B+ 4% (1) = Incomplete (Summer 2010)	96%

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 628 (Central Oregon) Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	Students learn instructional practices to increase the functional performance and academic success of students with severe disabilities (e.g., autism spectrum disorder, severe mental retardation, or multiple disabilities). Participants learn research-validated strategies with demonstrated effectiveness in increasing communication skills, appropriate behavior, social skills, and life-skill routines for severely disabled students. Emphasis is placed on data-driven instruction in the least restrictive environment, and working with paraprofessionals.	Program/course not offered	-	-	A- = 91-93% A = 94-100% B- = 81-83% B = 84-87% B+ = 88-90% C- = 71-73% C = 74-77% C+ = 78-80% D = 61-70% F = less than 61% (Summer 2010)	100% (6) =A (Summer 2010)	100%
SPED 513 Assessment and Diagnosis	This course explores educational assessment as it relates to decision-making in special education. Selection, administration, scoring, and interpretation of a variety of measures are taught through demonstrations, practice, and case studies. Relationships between assessment, eligibility decision-making, instructional planning and accountability issues are examined, including monitoring student performance using curriculum-based and related measurements and summative evaluation using the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS). Students will be introduced to issues regarding assessment of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Functional, practical assessments are emphasized, within the context of the IDEA's conceptual and procedural requirements.	Short write-ups/brief papers: 40 points Tests/quizzes: 50 points Individual Academic Assessments: 25 points Case studies: 70 points Total points possible: 185 A=95% B=85% C=75% (Fall 2009)	39% (7) = A 22% (4) = A-21% 17%(3) = B+ 5% (1) = B 5% (1) = B- 5% (1) = C* 5% (1) = D (Fall 2009)	95%	Short write-ups/brief papers: 40 points Tests/quizzes: 50 points Individual Academic Assessments: 25 points Case studies: 70 points Total points possible: 185 A=95% B=85% C=75% (Fall 2010)	74% (14) = A 5% (1) = A- 16% (3) = B+ 5% (1) = Incomplete (Fall 2010)	95%

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	**Distribution of grades**	**% meeting minimum expectation**	**Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined**	**Distribution of grades**	**% meeting minimum expectation**
SPED 632 (Central Oregon) Assessment and Diagnosis	This course explores educational assessment as it relates to decision-making in special education. Selection, administration, scoring, and interpretation of a variety of measures are taught through demonstrations, practice, and case studies. Relationships between assessment, eligibility decision-making, instructional planning and accountability issues are examined, including monitoring student performance using curriculum-based and related measurements and summative evaluation using the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS). Students will be introduced to issues regarding assessment of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Functional, practical assessments are emphasized, within the context of the IDEA's conceptual and procedural requirements.	Program/course not offered	-	-	Short write-ups/brief papers: 40 points Tests/quizzes: 50 points Individual Academic Assessments: 25 points Case studies: 70 points Total points possible: 185 A=95% B=85% C=75% (Fall 2010)	100% (9) =A (Fall 2010)	100%
SPED 545 Practicum I	Practicum I Designed to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning essential skills associated with the Special Education Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License. Observations are collaboratively scheduled by the participant and practicum supervisor with pre- and post-observation analysis as part of each site visit. Participants document time spent providing specially designed instruction for students with individual education plans (IEPs) and all aspects of special education practice.	Credit based on completion of practicum at emerging or proficient level as measured by observation and completion of practicum log.	100% (16)=Credit (Fall 2009)	100%	Credit based on completion of practicum at emerging or proficient level as measured by observation and completion of practicum log.	85% (17) = Credit 15%(3) =Incomplete (Fall 2010)	85%

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 645 (Central Oregon) Practicum I	Practicum I Designed to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning essential skills associated with the Special Education Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License. Observations are collaboratively scheduled by the participant and practicum supervisor with pre- and post-observation analysis as part of each site visit. Participants document time spent providing specially designed instruction for students with individual education plans (IEPs) and all aspects of special education practice.	Credit based on completion of practicum at emerging or proficient level as measured by observation and completion of practicum log.	-	-	Credit based on completion of practicum at emerging or proficient level as measured by observation and completion of practicum log.	100% (11)=Credit (Fall 2010)	100%

94

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 514 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	Research-validated curriculum and specially designed instruction (SDI) for students with disabilities. Based on state standards/state assessment(OAKS),participants review and adapt general education curricula appropriate to their authorization level to create specially designed instruction (SDI) that emphasizes and supports progress across academic areas, learning strategies and appropriate accommodations. This course uses curriculum-based assessment/ measurement data to craft effective, substantively and procedurally correct individual education plans(IEPs);and specially designed instruction(SDI)based on student achievement data. Candidates will demonstrate all skills necessary to facilitate an IEP meeting including group dynamics and conflict resolution strategies.	A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by each project. B = completion of all projects demonstrating proficiency with substantive and procedural aspects of each project. C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. D = project(s) partially completed; project(s) not appropriate, not accurate, demonstrating little understanding F = project(s) not completed; competencies not demonstrated	50% (9) = A 22% (4) = A- 22% (4) = B+ 6% (1) =Incomplete (Spring 2010)	94%	A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by each project. B = completion of all projects demonstrating proficiency with substantive and procedural aspects of each project. C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. D = project(s) partially completed; project(s) not appropriate, not accurate, demonstrating little understanding F = project(s) not completed; competencies not demonstrated	May,2011-	-

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 633 (Central Oregon) Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	Research-validated curriculum and specially designed instruction (SDI) for students with disabilities. Based on state standards/state assessment(OAKS),participants review and adapt general education curricula appropriate to their authorization level to create specially designed instruction (SDI) that emphasizes and supports progress across academic areas, learning strategies and appropriate accommodations. This course uses curriculum-based assessment/ measurement data to craft effective, substantively and procedurally correct individual education plans(IEPs);and specially designed instruction(SDI)based on student achievement data. Candidates will demonstrate all skills necessary to facilitate an IEP meeting including group dynamics and conflict resolution strategies.	Program/course not offered	-	-	A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by each project. B = completion of all projects demonstrating proficiency with substantive and procedural aspects of each project. C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. D = project(s) partially completed; project(s) not appropriate, not accurate, demonstrating little understanding F = project(s) not completed; competencies not demonstrated	-	-
SPED 546 Practicum II 96	Practicum II Designed to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning essential skills associated with the Special Education Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License. Observations are collaboratively scheduled by the participant and practicum supervisor with pre- and post-observation analysis as part of each site visit. Participants document time spent providing specially designed instruction for students with individual education plans (IEPs) and all aspects of special education practice	Practicum grades are credit/no credit. Credit is based on completion of the Practicum Log and Observations.	94% (17) = Credit 6% (1) = Incomplete (Spring 2010)	94%	Credit based on completion of practicum at emerging or proficient level as measured by observation and completion of practicum log.	May,2011	

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 646 (Central Oregon) Practicum II	Practicum II Designed to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning essential skills associated with the Special Education Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License. Observations are collaboratively scheduled by the participant and practicum supervisor with pre- and post-observation analysis as part of each site visit. Participants document time spent providing specially designed instruction for students with individual education plans (IEPs) and all aspects of special education practice	Program/course not offered	-	-	Practicum grades are credit/no credit. Credit is based on completion of the Practicum Log and Observations	May, 2011	

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 517 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	The most common aspect of any special education student's eligibility is reading disability. With schools implementing RtI practices, the population of students made eligible for special education will have persistent reading difficulties compounded by their disability. This course considers reading from beginning literacy into adulthood. According to national reading assessments… … Seen in the context of NAEP, 35% of Oregon grade 4 students read below grade level. In other words, more than 1 out of 3 students in grade 4 does not have the reading skills necessary to meet Basic (grade-level expectations) on the NAEP. Nearly 24% of grade 8 students read below grade level. This means that nearly 1 out of 4 grade 8 students does not have the reading skills necessary to read grade-level material. At high school level: … on the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS) for Reading/Literature. …, about 34% of students read below grade level (from the three combined categories, Nearly Meets, Low, and Very Low). This means that 34% of grade 10 students do not have the fundamental reading skills necessary to read grade-level textbooks with proficiency. Students eligible for special education often have more reading difficulty than their age/grade level peers. This course reviews and considers specially designed instruction to improve the reading performance, particularly the comprehension of eligible students.	50% - Class participation. This includes completing all assignments on time, participating in class discussions, and completing assigned readings. 30% - Quality of Reading Reflections 20% - Application Assignments	82% (9) = A 18% (2) = A- (Summer 2009)	100%	50% - Class participation. This includes completing all assignments on time, participating in class discussions, and completing assigned readings. 30% - Quality of Reading Reflections 20% - Application Assignments	100% (9) = A (Summer 2010)	100%

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 627 (Central Oregon) Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	The most common aspect of any special education student's eligibility is reading disability. With schools implementing RtI practices, the population of students made eligible for special education will have persistent reading difficulties compounded by their disability. This course considers reading from beginning literacy into adulthood. According to national reading assessments… … Seen in the context of NAEP, 35% of Oregon grade 4 students read below grade level. In other words, more than 1 out of 3 students in grade 4 does not have the reading skills necessary to meet Basic (grade-level expectations) on the NAEP. Nearly 24% of grade 8 students read below grade level. This means that nearly 1 out of 4 grade 8 students does not have the reading skills necessary to read grade-level material. At high school level: … on the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS) for Reading/Literature. …, about 34% of students read below grade level (from the three combined categories, Nearly Meets, Low, and Very Low). This means that 34% of grade 10 students do not have the fundamental reading skills necessary to read grade-level textbooks with proficiency. Students eligible for special education often have more reading difficulty than their age/grade level peers. This course reviews and considers specially designed instruction to improve the reading performance, particularly the comprehension of eligible students.	50% - Class participation. This includes completing all assignments on time, participating in class discussions, and completing assigned readings. 30% - Quality of Reading Reflections 20% - Application Assignments (Summer 2009)	100% (9) = A (Summer 2009)	100%	May, 2011	-	-

Course Name and Number	Course Description	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% meeting minimum expectation
SPED 535 Current Issues in Special Education	Provides an integrated summary of current content, pedagogy, learning and special education legal issues that have direct impact on the practice of special education in k-12 public schools. The faculty,in conjunction with endorsement candidates, jointly select topics for additional emphasis based on participants' backgrounds and cumulative experiences in the Special Educator Endorsement Program. Focus is on application of all components of special education standards in Oregon. Prerequisites: Completion of all coursework for the Special Education.	Credit based on participation in all course activities at proficient level as measured by project completion	100% (13) = Credit (Summer 2009)	100%	Credit based on participation in all course activities at proficient level as measured by project completion	100% (14) = Credit (Summer 2009)	100%

Lewis & Clark Graduate School of Education and Counseling
ADMISSION EVALUATION SHEET

Student Name: _____	**ID#:** _____
Program: _____	**Term:** _____
Faculty Reviewer: _____	**Date:** _____

Instructions: Please circle only one rating for each of the areas below. Please complete all sections on both sides of the form. Sign, date, and return the completed sheet to the applicant's file. Your ratings and comments provide important information for the admissions process. NOTE: Admission Evaluation Sheets do not remain in the applicant file and do not become a part of the student's permanent record. Thank you!

Rubric score definitions
1* = Does not meet standards. Major elements are missing.
2* = Approaches standards. Most elements are satisfactory.
3 = Meets standards.
4 = Exceeds standards.
NA = Use when not required by program.
* Please include in the comments section specific and objective rational for assigning this score.

1. Academic Preparation	1	2	3	4	NA
Transcripts: Minimum 2.75 GPA undergraduate 3.0 GPA graduate					
Transcripts include relevant coursework					
Post-baccalaureate work					
Overall Academic Preparation Rating	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**NA**

Comments: Include thoughts on deficiencies, honors, scholarships, awards.

2. Statement/Essays	1 (weak)	2 (acceptable)	3 (strong)	4 (excellent)	NA
Content thoughtfully and effectively addresses the required questions and essay topics					
Fit with program or field					
Writing ability: Organization & development, voice, style, grammar/syntax, spelling, punctuation. etc.					
Overall Statement for Essay Rating	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**NA**

Comments:

3. Relevant Experience (Resume)	1	2	3	4	NA
Comments:					

4. Potential for Multicultural Competence	1	2	3	4	NA
Comments:					

5. Recommendations (role of letter writer)	1 (do not recommend)	2 (rec. with reservation)	3 (recommend)	4 (strongly recommend)	NA
#1 _____					
#2_____					
#3_____					
Overall Recommendation Rating	1	2	3	4	NA

Comments:

6. Testing (GRE, PRAXIS, CBEST, WEST-B, TOEFL, ILETS)	1	2	3	4	NA

If minimum scores or passing scores are not required and scores are submitted, please feel free to rate the testing if pertinent to your admissions recommendation.

Overall Faculty File Rating	1	2	3	4	NA
Comments:					

Faculty admissions recommendation based on the file reading. (choose one)	Admit	Deny	Hold	Waitlist	Conditional/ Probationary Admit
Comments:					

GSECAdmissions 10.2010

The mean score of our candidates' *Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge* Praxis II was well above the state minimum required score. Further, 100% of our 2009-2010 program completers exceeded the state minimum score.

Praxis II content knowledge mean test score among SPED program completers

Praxis II Test		State of Oregon Minimum Score	2010		
			(n)	mean	range
Special Education	Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge	162	10	180.8	172-192

O=Not Acceptable	1= NNO (Necessary not observed)	2= Emerging	3=Proficient	4= Excellent	Not Observed
Does not demonstrate understanding of disabilities Does not adapt teaching to substantive requirements Does not adapt teaching to procedural requirements	Does not demonstrate teaching element required by setting circumstance/disability Provides incorrect explanation of substantive & procedural requirements	*Demonstrates* a *partial* understanding of the elements required by setting/circumstance/ disability *Does not* complete all requirements effectively Provides incomplete explanation	*Demonstrates* understanding of elements required by setting/circumstance/disability Completes *most* requirements, effectively Provides complete explanation of substantive & procedural	*Demonstrates* effective understanding of the elements required by setting/circumstance/ disability. Provides complete, research-based explanations of requirements	

Candidate's Name:_____ **Faculty Observer:** _____ __

Date(s):_____ **Setting/School:** _____ **Authorization Level**:_____

Students being recommended for the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teacher Education License must least meet Proficient level in all categories. Standards 1- 10 would be reflected in each area observed and specifically as noted in an area as outlined below.

Standard I: Foundations Candidate demonstrates evidence based principles, theories and relevant legal requirements.

Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of the Learner Candidate demonstrates respect for students and understanding of human development.

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences **Standard 4: Instructional Strategies**

GSEC Component 1.a 1, 1.a.2., 1.a.3., Create an Environment of Safety and Respect

1a.1 Teacher-Student Interaction (1/1 –small group—class)	**0** **Not acceptable**	**1** **Necessary N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not Observed**
Observation /Description						

1.a.2. Student Interaction	**0** **Not acceptable**	**1** **Necessary N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not Observed**
Observation /Description						

1.a.3. Manage Behavior (FBA/BIP)	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

1.a.4. Utilize Physical Space	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences. Candidate demonstrates understanding of the effects of the learners exceptional condition(s).

Standard 4: Instructional Strategies: Candidate demonstrates a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies for facilitating critical thinking, problem solving ,self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem across settings.

1.a.5. Manage SPED Process and all related Forms	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

105

1.c.1. Respond to Learner's Interests and Needs (Relevance to IEP)	**0** **Not** **acceptable**	**1** **Necessary** **N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not** **Observed**
Observation /Description						

Facilitate attention, & **support student participation [task approach, organization ,time-on-task, task completion, task evaluation]**	**0** **Not** **acceptable**	**1** **Necessary** **N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not** **Observed**
Observation Description						

Standard 6: Language Candidates demonstrate understanding of exceptional learner's language acquisition and development across language content, form and use. Component 2.b. Teaching-Learning Cycle

Shapes environments to support development of communication skills. 2.b.2. Communicate Clearly and effectively	**0** **Not** **acceptable**	**1** **Necessary** **N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not** **Observed**
Observation Description						

Standard 7: Instructional Planning Candidate demonstrates demonstrate individualized decision-making and individualized instruction

2.b.3. Uses a Variety of Techniques to Promote Student Participation and Learning (**Differentiated Instruction Accommodations-Modifications)**	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed	Date	Evaluator
Observation /Description								

Standard 8: Assessment Candidates practice evidences multiple forms of assessment (formal and informal, formative and summative) to make educational decisions at all stages of the special education process. Data analysis is an integral program component.

Component 2.c. Assessment Cycle

2.c.1. Demonstrates Flexibility and Responsiveness to Students (**Data System & Integration)**	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed	Date	Evaluator	Course
Observation/Description									

Standard 9 Professional & Ethical Practices Candidates demonstrate awareness and ongoing attention to legal matters, professional growth and ethical practices.

Standard 10 Collaboration Candidates collaborate with families, general educators, community agencies and professional outside the school setting in support of the exceptional learning needs of individuals.

Observation Description

Student:_____**Reviewer 1:**_____

Date Received_____**Reviewer 2:**_____

Instructions: Please check only one rating for each of the areas below. Indicate date of materials; sign and date review on last page, and return completed review to program director.

SPED 510: Educating Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Answer Manual: Procedural, Substantive, Legal; Pedagogy Analysis and Applications			
2. Instructional Paradigm: Case Study and Presentation			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 511: Behavior Change Interventions for Students with Serious Emotional Behavioral Disorders	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
3. Functional Behavioral Analysis: Instructor's notes			

(SPED 511, continued)			
4. Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP aggressive/disruptive student): Instructor's notes			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 513: Assessment and Diagnosis	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
5. Case Study: Assessment Portfolio for Special Ed. Eligibility: Survey level test(s), achievement tests, supporting criterion reference assessment			
6. Case Study: Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM): Reading or Math			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 545: Practicum I	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Log: Assessment Hours			
2. Observation /Conference Form (filed by Supervisor)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 514: Curriculum and Instruction for Special Needs Students	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
7. Curriculum Study: GE Curriculum & Standards Integration, Lesson Plan 5			
8. IEP Project and Critique Notes			

9. Facilitated IEP Meeting and Critique			
(SPED 514, continued)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 516: Interventions for Severely Challenged Students: STAR and FACTER Case Study	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 546: Practicum II	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Observation Form			

2. Observation and Conference (filed by supervisor)			
(SPED 546, continued)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 517: Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
Reading Instruction Assessment/Instruction System			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 535: Successful Completion of Summary Experience	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.

Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):

Reviewer 1:_____**Date:**_____

Reviewer 2:_____**Date:**_____

Additional Comments (optional):

8. Institutions will provide an analysis and summary of data with indication of program changes

Data presented here represent assessment of the former special education standards and not the special education standards for which Lewis & Clark, GSEC, is presently requesting a program review. We have reviewed certain items from the Program Assessment Review list on the basis of data currently available. Data will be available as outlined in Figure 4: Standards/courses/assessments matrix.

Assessment 3: Course Grades: Standards Proficiency

Students are expected to do well academically in this program, and they do. Class sizes run from 8-18 which enables faculty to provide individual support for students. In addition, all faculty allow students to rework their assignments until they meet standards. When a candidate fails to meet standards in any aspect of the course, the faculty may assign them an incomplete and allow them to retake the course or access additional opportunities to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with mastering the standards. There have been occasions when unsuccessful candidates decided to withdraw from or were counseled out of the program. This occurs when students are unable to meet academic standards as measured through field based projects in one or more courses.

Assessment 4: Admissions Data Discussion

The Admissions summary presents two years of data for individuals admitted into the special education endorsement program. The two areas in which applicants have most often been assessed as needing additional support are the areas of experience and writing (Personal Statement/Essay). Though these categories clearly have relevance to successful performance in graduate school, they also have some predictive validity for success as a special education teacher. Some candidates have limited teaching experience, limited public school experience and/or limited experience with students with disabilities. The absences of these experiences reduce individual ratings in the area of "Resume/Experience when compared with other graduate school candidates. As described in several places in this report, many candidates enter the program during their first or second year in a special education teaching assignment and they receive the highest ratings in this the category of "experience". However, all candidates are licensed teachers, and most have some teaching experience that involves work with students with disabilities within a general education classroom. These experiences, when combined with practicum experiences targeted to clinical practice within the program, create a situation where the faculty is confident students leave the program proficient in substantive and procedural special education practices. Despite the fact all candidates have at least a bachelor degree and grade averages are quite high, the area in which candidates are most often rated

during admissions as requiring assistance relates to their writing skills. Standards for writing are very high in the Lewis & Clark Graduate School of Education and Counseling, and even candidates to the doctoral program are not infrequently rated as requiring additional support in this area. It is particularly important that future special education teachers are proficient in writing as specially designed instruction in written language is required by most special education eligible students. In response to this, several years ago the Graduate School created a writing center where students can seek individual support to improve their writing. In addition, faculty takes very seriously their role of providing students with feedback and support in the area of writing.

Assessments 5, 6, 7, & 8: Practica

The practica in the Lewis & Clark, GSEC special education endorsement program are one semester hour in each of fall and spring semesters (SPED 545/645 and SPED 546/646). Candidates are required to log practicum hours across age levels within the authorization level sought, including most disabilities and all severity levels. All aspects of special education practice are required as part of the log (e.g. special education paperwork). The practica experiences are in public school, or public school affiliated special education settings. Practica vary as do actual school based special education programs from self-contained classrooms to inclusion practices in general education classrooms. Many students are able to use their current special education position as their practicum site. [These students are fully certified teachers working under a TSPC-Conditional Assignment Permit (CAP).] Those not currently teaching in special education follow the district requirements for volunteering in a district's special education programs. Practicum begins in the Fall of each year, and concludes at the end of the school calendar year. The Lewis & Clark GSEC practica were specifically designed to provide endorsement candidates with special education experience at the beginning and end of a school year, in concert with field experiences which are intensive practice, usually with a specific disability category (e.g., ED, ADD/ADHD or ASD) for a more limited time period.

The Lewis & Clark GSEC special education practicum work is observed a minimum of twice per semester. The two practicum supervisors staff candidates weekly to determine their level of proficiency as required by state endorsement standards. Practica are reviewed as formative, and finally summative, evaluations of a candidate's ability to implement the special education process and achieve proficiency in each benchmark of each standard (See Practicum Observation Forms, Practicum Log). For each observation there is a Pre-conference and a Post-Conference. Candidate self-evaluation is considered an essential part of the practicum observation. It is provided during the post conference. Practica are evaluated by trained observers who are former special education administrators, thoroughly familiar with staff

evaluation. Candidates are assessed in terms of demonstrated ability to perform proficiently in all areas of the special education process. Supervisors staff candidates weekly to review the week's evaluations, determine progress and provide targets for the next evaluation. When appropriate, supervisors evaluate a candidate together enabling them to target related, but different, aspects of the specially designed instruction during the same evaluation. As an example, one supervisor could review student's task approach, time-on-task and task completion, while the other supervisor is analyzing the relationship of the instruction content to the student's IEPs and state standards.

The practica have been reviewed a minimum of twice yearly and restructured to ensure candidate proficiency. Initially, practica experiences were reviewed through the lens provided by the Council of Exceptional Children (CEC) Standards. Fall semester, 2010, was the initial trial of the practicum observation process based on the new state standards (see Appendix 8). From the beginning of the program, practicum observations were target to increase proficiency in the practice of special education. The CEC standards, and now the current Oregon standards, have refined this process. Formerly, practicum experience was reviewed in narrative form, containing descriptions of the observation, questions for the candidate, and recommendations for change to be discussed during the post-conference. With this information, the most recent version of the observation form which will allow the supervisors to rate the candidate's performance on items related to the Oregon special education endorsement standards.

Assessment 9: NES:ORELA: Special Education Test

Because virtually all students pass required tests on their first attempt, scores on the Praxis II (now the NES:ORELA: Special Education) test have not been a major area discussed by the faculty. Indeed if a student failed to pass on the first attempt, it is usually an indication the student has a history of difficulty with taking large scale assessments. The program director would begin working with the candidate to prepare them for their next attempt.

Assessment 10: Portfolio Review

Portfolios assessment provides the faculty with perhaps the most helpful data related to overall program effectiveness. The program director and previous director and current department chair review all portfolios and any areas where a pattern of weaker performance appears are brought to the full special education faculty for discussion. These discussions focus on course content/field experiences, whether a change should be made in the candidate's program, and whether a change should be made in the in the special education endorsement program. This data analysis has led to several program changes, the most notable of which was the addition of a course in teaching reading to students with special needs. Faculty review also contributed to the addition of a summative course where the students and faculty could each

year determine areas where additional academic content would strengthen the candidates' proficiency. This was initially a one semester hour course, but as data gathered during initial advising meetings with candidates entering the program indicated, they had more detailed background information in special education (e.g., disabilities), the faculty decided to reduce the initial introductory course from three to two semester hours, and add the semester hour to the summative course.

Key Assessments

Program Plan documents following this narrative provide additional documentation of changes to the special education endorsement program. With an increase in the number and scope of key assessments, additional aspects of the program will be reviewed systematically providing continuous program improvement.

Course Name/ Number	Course descriptions	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined (taken from the course syllabus)	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
SPED 510 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	Analysis of child/adolescent development and the cognitive, linguistic, motor, behavioral, and learning characteristics of individuals with special needs.	A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by presentation and exam. B = completion of all projects demonstrating a good understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. D = all projects not completed or some projects only partially complete. (Summer 2009)	94% (16) earned an A 6% (1) Earned a B+ (Summer 2009)	100%	A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by presentation and exam. B = completion of all projects demonstrating a good understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. D = all projects not completed or some projects only partially complete. (Summer 2010)	74% (14) earned an A 26% (5) earned an A- (Summer 2010)	100%
SPED 626 (Central Oregon) Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	Analysis of child/adolescent development and the cognitive, linguistic, motor, behavioral, and learning characteristics of individuals with special needs.	Program/course not offered	-	-	A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by presentation and exam. B = completion of all projects demonstrating a good understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each	100% (8) = A (Summer 2010)	100%

Course Name/ Number	Course descriptions	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined (taken from the course syllabus)	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
					project. D = all projects not completed or some projects only partially complete. (Summer 2010)		
SPED 511 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	Study of developmental backgrounds of students with significant emotional/behavioral problems, and practices to help these students develop more productive behaviors.	Written and Oral Presentation of Chosen Topic: 15% Written Functional Assessment Exercises: 10% Written Behavior Intervention Plan Exercises: 15% Final Exercise: 50% Class Participation: 10% Grade of A: 93% Grade of B: 83% Grade of C: 73% (Summer 2009)	69% (18) =A 27% (7) =A- 4% (1)= Incomplete (Summer 2009)	96%	Written and Oral Presentation of Chosen Topic: 15% Written Functional Assessment Exercises: 10% Written Behavior Intervention Plan Exercises: 15% Final Exercise: 50% Class Participation: 10% Grade of A: 93% Grade of B: 83% Grade of C: 73% (Summer 2010)	68% (15) = A 18% (4) = A- 9% (2) = B 5% (1) = Incomplete (Summer 2010)	95%
SPED 629 (Central Oregon) Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	Study of developmental backgrounds of students with significant emotional/behavioral problems, and practices to help these students develop more productive behaviors.	Program/course not offered	-	-	Written and Oral Presentation of Chosen Topic: 15% Written Functional Assessment Exercises: 10% Written Behavior Intervention Plan Exercises: 15% Final Exercise: 50% Class Participation: 10% Grade of A: 93% Grade of B: 83%	71% (5) = A 29% (2) = A- (Summer 2010)	100%

Course Name/ Number	Course descriptions	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined (taken from the course syllabus)	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
					Grade of C: 73% (Summer 2010)		
SPED 516 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	Students learn instructional practices to increase the functional performance of students with severe disabilities (i.e., autism spectrum disorder, severe mental retardation, or multiple disabilities).	A- = 91-93% A = 94-100% B- = 81-83% B = 84-87% B+ = 88-90% C- = 71-73% C = 74-77% C+ = 78-80% D = 61-70% F = less than 61% (Summer 2010)	94% (15) = A 6% (1)= Incomplete (Summer 2009)	94%	A- = 91-93% A = 94-100% B- = 81-83% B = 84-87% B+ = 88-90% C- = 71-73% C = 74-77% C+ = 78-80% D = 61-70% F = less than 61% (Summer 2010)	75% (18) = A 13% (3) = A- 8% (2) = B+ 4% (1) = Incomplete (Summer 2010)	96%
SPED 628 (Central Oregon) Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	Students learn instructional practices to increase the functional performance of students with severe disabilities (i.e., autism spectrum disorder, severe mental retardation, or multiple disabilities).	Program/course not offered	-	-	A- = 91-93% A = 94-100% B- = 81-83% B = 84-87% B+ = 88-90% C- = 71-73% C = 74-77% C+ = 78-80% D = 61-70% F = less than 61% (Summer 2010)	100% (6) =A (Summer 2010)	100%

Course Name/ Number	Course descriptions	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined (taken from the course syllabus)	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
SPED 513 Assessment and Diagnosis	Assessment, diagnosis, and eligibility for special education as defined by federal and state law. Specific attention to current assessment practices, curriculum-based assessment /curriculum-based measurement, and response to intervention (RTI) that provide information relevant to SPED eligibility and special education instruction.	Short write-ups/brief papers: 40 points Tests/quizzes: 50 points Individual Academic Assessments: 25 points Case studies: 70 points Total points possible: 185 A=95% B=85% C=75% (Fall 2009)	39% (7) = A 22% (4) = A-21% 17%(3) = B+ 5% (1) = B 5% (1) = B- 5% (1) = C* 5% (1) = D (Fall 2009)	95%	Short write-ups/brief papers: 40 points Tests/quizzes: 50 points Individual Academic Assessments: 25 points Case studies: 70 points Total points possible: 185 A=95% B=85% C=75% (Fall 2010)	74% (14) = A 5% (1) = A- 16% (3) = B+ 5% (1) = Incomplete (Fall 2010)	95%
SPED 632 (Central Oregon) Assessment and Diagnosis	Assessment, diagnosis, and eligibility for special education as defined by federal and state law. Specific attention to current assessment practices, curriculum-based assessment/curriculum-based measurement, and response to intervention	Program/course not offered	-	-	Short write-ups/brief papers: 40 points Tests/quizzes: 50 points Individual Academic Assessments: 25 points Case studies: 70 points Total points possible: 185 A=95% B=85% C=75% (Fall 2010)	100% (9) =A (Fall 2010)	100%

Course Name/ Number	Course descriptions	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined (taken from the course syllabus)	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
	(RTI) that provide information relevant to special education eligibility and special education instruction.						
SPED 545 Practicum I	Designed to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning essential skills associated with the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License.	Credit based on completion of practicum at emerging or proficient level as measured by observation and completion of practicum log.	100% (16)=Credit (Fall 2009)	100%	Credit based on completion of practicum at emerging or proficient level as measured by observation and completion of practicum log.	85% (17) = Credit 15%(3) =Incomplete (Fall 2010)	85%
SPED 645 (Central Oregon) Practicum I	Designed to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning essential skills associated with the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License.	Credit based on completion of practicum at emerging or proficient level as measured by observation and completion of practicum log.	-	-	Credit based on completion of practicum at emerging or proficient level as measured by observation and completion of practicum log.	100% (11)=Credit (Fall 2010)	100%

Course Name/ Number	Course descriptions	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined (taken from the course syllabus)	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
SPED 514 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	Research-validated curriculum and instructional practices for students with disabilities. Using state standards, participants review general education curricula and create specially designed instruction that emphasizes learning strategies and appropriate accommodations.	A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by each project. B = completion of all projects demonstrating proficiency with substantive and procedural aspects of each project. C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. D = project(s) partially completed; project(s) not appropriate, not accurate, demonstrating little understanding F = project(s) not completed; competencies not demonstrated	50% (9) = A 22% (4) = A- 22% (4) = B+ 6% (1) = Incomplete (Spring 2010)	94%	A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by each project. B = completion of all projects demonstrating proficiency with substantive and procedural aspects of each project. C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. D = project(s) partially completed; project(s) not appropriate, not accurate, demonstrating little understanding F = project(s) not completed; competencies not demonstrated	May, 2011-	-
SPED 633 (Central Oregon) Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	Research-validated curriculum and instructional practices for students with disabilities. Using state standards, participants review	Program/course not offered	-	-	A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by each project. B = completion of all projects demonstrating proficiency with substantive and procedural	-	-

Course Name/ Number	Course descriptions	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined (taken from the course syllabus)	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
	general education curricula and create specially designed instruction that emphasizes learning strategies and appropriate accommodations.				aspects of each project. C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project. D = project(s) partially completed; project(s) not appropriate, not accurate, demonstrating little understanding F = project(s) not completed; competencies not demonstrated		
SPED 546 Practicum II	Designed to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning essential skills associated with the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License.	Practicum grades are credit/no credit. Credit is based on completion of the Practicum Log and Observations.	94% (17) = Credit 6% (1) = Incomplete (Spring 2010)	94%	Credit based on completion of practicum at emerging or proficient level as measured by observation and completion of practicum log.	May,2011	
SPED 646 (Central Oregon) Practicum II	Designed to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning essential skills associated with the Special Educator Endorsement and the	Program/course not offered	-	-	Practicum grades are credit/no credit. Credit is based on completion of the Practicum Log and Observations	May, 2011	

Course Name/ Number	Course descriptions	2009-2010 (Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010)			2010-2011 (Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011)		
		Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Brief description of how the Course Grade is determined (taken from the course syllabus)	Distribution of grades	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
	Continuing Teaching License.						
SPED 517 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	Curriculum and instructional practices based on validated research for teaching reading and writing to students with disabilities.	50% - Class participation. This includes completing all assignments on time, participating in class discussions, and completing assigned readings. 30% - Quality of Reading Reflections 20% - Application Assignments	82% (9) = A 18% (2) = A- (Summer 2009)	100%	50% - Class participation. This includes completing all assignments on time, participating in class discussions, and completing assigned readings. 30% - Quality of Reading Reflections 20% - Application Assignments	100% (9) = A (Summer 2010)	100%
SPED 627 (Central Oregon) Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	Curriculum and instructional practices based on validated research for teaching reading and writing to students with disabilities.	50% - Class participation. This includes completing all assignments on time, participating in class discussions, and completing assigned readings. 30% - Quality of Reading Reflections 20% - Application Assignments (Summer 2009)	100% (9) = A (Summer 2009)	100%	May, 2011	-	-
SPED 535 Current Issues in Special Education	Provides an integrated summary of current learning and SPED issues that have direct impact on practitioners.	Credit based on participation in all course activities at proficient level as measured by project completion	100%(13) = Credit (Summer 2009)	100%	Summer 2010???????		-

Admission ratings of GSEC SPED Teacher Education Applicants

Category	2009-2010			2010-2011		
	Average rating	Inter-rater agreement*	% Proficient or above	Average rating	Inter-rater agreement*	% Proficient or above
Academic Preparation	3.34	100%	100%	3.40	94%	100%
Resume/Experience	2.94	**	83%	3.24	100%	82%
Personal Statement/Essay	3.12	100%	83%	2.64	100%	50%
Diversity Experience*	3.6	100%	100%	3.38	100%	88%
Letters of Recommendation	3.54	100%	100%	3.79	100%	100%
Overall Rating	3.23	100%	100%	3.14	100%	68%

*Inter-rater agreement defined as agreement between two independent applicant file raters within one scale point.
**Rated by only one reviewer
***Rating category changed to *Potential for Multicultural Competence* in 2010-2011 admission rating form

Data in the table above depicts the average rating, percentage of inter-rater agreement, and percentage of SPED applicants who met admission standards in each category. This assessment involved the collection and analyses of SPED applicant admissions data to document the admissions criteria/process; data will be gathered on a yearly basis and used to compare, longitudinally, the achievement and program satisfaction of our graduates. The four point response scale used in the admission rating form was as follows: **1** = Does not meet standards. Major elements are missing, **2** = Approaches standards, most elements are satisfactory, **3** = Meets standards, and **4 =** Exceeds standards. Further, data from the 2009-10 SPED completers is compared, when appropriate, to the 2010-11 SPED completers' results.

Lewis & Clark College
Department of Teacher Education
Special Educator Endorsement

Practicum Competency Form

Student Name: _____

Observer: _____

Date: _____

Students being recommended for their initial Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teacher Education License must be at the basic level in all categories.

Domain l: The Learning Environment

Component 1.a. Create an Environment of Safety and Respect

1.a.1. Teacher-Student Interaction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.2. Student Interaction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.3. Manage Classroom Procedures	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.4. Utilize Physical Space	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.5. Manage Student Behavior	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 1.c. Establish a Culture for Learning

1.c.1. Respond to Learner's Interests and Needs	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.c.2. Share Knowledge and Passion for Discipline	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 2.b. Teaching-Learning Cycle

2.b.2. Communicate Clearly and Effectively	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

2.b.3. Uses a Variety of Techniques to Promote Student Participation and Learning	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 2.c. Assessment Cycle

2.c.1. Demonstrates Flexibility and Responsiveness to Students	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator	Course
Observation							

Lewis & Clark College

Special Education
Practicum Competency Form

Student Name:_____

Observer: _____

Date:_____ _Setting:_____Authorization Level:_____

Students being recommended for their initial Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teacher Education License must be at the basic level in all categories. Competencies are based on the GSEC guidelines and CEC Standards of Professional Performance

Domain l: The Learning Environment

Component 1.a. Create an Environment of Safety and Respect **(CEC Standard # 2, #3 ,# 5 #10)**

1.a.1. Teacher-Student Interaction (1/1 –small group—class)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.2. Student Interaction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.3. Manage Behavior (FBA/BIP)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.4. Utilize Physical Space	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.5. Manage SPED Process & Related Forms	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 1.c. Establish a Culture for Learning **(CEC Special Educator Standards, # 1, 3, 4, 7)**

1.c.1. Respond to Learner's Interests and Needs (Relevance to IEP)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.c.2. Share Knowledge and Passion for Learning (**Facilitate attention**, **support participation**)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 2.b. Teaching-Learning Cycle   (CEC Special Educator Standard, # 6, # 7)

2.b.2. Communicate Clearly and Effectively	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

2.b.3. Uses a Variety of Techniques to Promote Student Participation and Learning (**Differentiated Instruction Accommodations-Modifications)**	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 2.c. Assessment Cycle   (CEC Special Educator Standard # 8)

2.c.1. Demonstrates Flexibility and Responsiveness to Students (**Data System & Integration**)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator	Course
Observation							

Lewis & Clark College

Special Education Practicum /Standards Competency Form

Candidates Name: _____ **_____**

Faculty Observer: _____ **_____**

Date(s): _____ Setting/School: _____ Authorization Level: _____

Students being recommended for the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teacher Education License must least meet basic level in all categories. Standards 1 through 10 would be reflected in each area observed and specifically as noted below.

Standard I: Foundations Candidate demonstrates evidence based principles, theories and relevant legal requirements.

Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of the Learner Candidate demonstrates respect for students and understanding of human development.

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences. Standard 4: Instructional Strategies

GSEC Component 1.a 1, 1.a.2., 1.a.3., Create an Environment of Safety and Respect

1a.1 Teacher-Student Interaction (1/1 –small group—class)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	
Observation /Description						
1.a.2. Student Interaction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Note observed	
Observation /Description						

1.a.3. Manage Behavior (FBA/BIP)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	

Observation /Description

1.a.4. Utilize Physical Space	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	

Observation /Description

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences. Candidate demonstrates understanding of the effects of the learners' exceptional condition(s).

Standard 4: Instructional Strategies: Candidate demonstrates a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies for facilitating critical thinking, problem solving ,self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem across settings.

1.a.5. Manage SPED Process and all related Forms	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	

Observation /Description

135

Standard 5: Learning Environments & Social Interaction Candidates create & facilitate learning
environments to encourage, independence, self-motivation, self-direction and self-advocacy.
Component 1.c. Establish a Culture for Learning

1.c.1. Respond to Learner's Interests and Needs (Relevance to IEP)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	
Observation /Description						

Facilitate attention,& **support student participation [task approach, organization ,time-on-task, task completion, task evaluation]**	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not observed	
Observation Description						

Standard 6: Language Candidates demonstrate understanding of exceptional learner's language acquisition
and development across language content, form and use. Component 2.b. Teaching-Learning Cycle

Shapes environments to support development of communication skills. 2.b.2. Communicate Clearly and effectively	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	
Observation Description						

Standard 7: Instructional Planning Candidate demonstrates demonstrate individualized decision-making and individualized instruction

2.b.3. Uses a Variety of Techniques to Promote Student Participation and Learning **(Differentiated Instruction Accommodations-Modifications)**	Unsatisf actory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation /Description						

Standard 8: Assessment Candidates practice evidences multiple forms of assessment (formal and informal, formative and summative) to make educational decisions at all stages of the special education process. Data analysis is an integral program component.

Component 2.c. Assessment Cycle

2.c.1. Demonstrates Flexibility and Responsiveness to Students **(Data System & Integration)**	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator	Course
Observation/Description							

Standard 9 Professional & Ethical Practices Candidates demonstrate awareness and ongoing attention to legal matters, professional growth and ethical practices.

Standard 10 Collaboration Candidates collaborate with families, general educators, community agencies and professional outside the school setting in support of the exceptional learning needs of individuals.

Observation Description

O=Not Acceptable	1= NNO (Necessary not observed)	2= Emerging	3=Proficient	4= Excellent	Not Observed
Does not demonstrate understanding of disabilities

Does not adapt teaching to substantive requirements

Does not adapt teaching to procedural requirements | Does not demonstrate teaching element required by setting circumstance/disability

Provides incorrect explanation of substantive & procedural requirements | *Demonstrates* a *partial* understanding of the elements required by setting/circumstance/ disability

Does not complete all requirements effectively

Provides incomplete explanation | *Demonstrates* understanding of elements required by setting/circumstance/disability

Completes *most* requirements, effectively

Provides complete explanation of substantive & procedural | *Demonstrates* effective understanding of the elements required by setting/circumstance/ disability.

Provides complete, research-based explanations of requirements | |

Candidate's Name:_____**Faculty Observer:** _____

Date(s):_____**Setting/School:**_____**Authorization Level**:_____

Students being recommended for the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teacher Education License must least meet Proficient level in all categories. Standards 1- 10 would be reflected in each area observed and specifically as noted in an area as outlined below.

Standard I: Foundations Candidate demonstrates evidence based principles, theories and relevant legal requirements.

Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of the Learner Candidate demonstrates respect for students and understanding of human development.

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences **Standard 4: Instructional Strategies**

GSEC Component 1.a 1, 1.a.2., 1.a.3., Create an Environment of Safety and Respect

1a.1 Teacher-Student Interaction (1/1 –small group—class)	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed
Observation /Description						

1.a.2. Student Interaction	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed
Observation /Description						

138

1.a.3. Manage Behavior (FBA/BIP)	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

1.a.4. Utilize Physical Space	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences. Candidate demonstrates understanding of the effects of the learners exceptional condition(s).

Standard 4: Instructional Strategies: Candidate demonstrates a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies for facilitating critical thinking, problem solving ,self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem across settings.

1.a.5. Manage SPED Process and all related Forms	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

1.c.1. Respond to Learner's Interests and Needs (Relevance to IEP)	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed
Observation /Description						
Facilitate attention, & **support student participation [task approach, organization ,time-on-task, task completion, task evaluation]**	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed
Observation Description						

Standard 6: Language Candidates demonstrate understanding of exceptional learner's language acquisition and development across language content, form and use. Component 2.b. Teaching-Learning Cycle

Shapes environments to support development of communication skills. 2.b.2. Communicate Clearly and effectively	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed
Observation Description						

Standard 7: Instructional Planning Candidate demonstrates demonstrate individualized decision-making and individualized instruction

2.b.3. Uses a Variety of Techniques to Promote Student Participation and Learning (**Differentiated Instruction Accommodations-Modifications)**	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed	Date	Evaluator
Observation /Description								

Standard 8: Assessment Candidates practice evidences multiple forms of assessment (formal and informal, formative and summative) to make educational decisions at all stages of the special education process. Data analysis is an integral program component.

Component 2.c. Assessment Cycle

2.c.1. Demonstrates Flexibility and Responsiveness to Students (**Data System & Integration)**	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed	Date	Evaluator	Course
Observation/Description									

Standard 9 Professional & Ethical Practices Candidates demonstrate awareness and ongoing attention to legal matters, professional growth and ethical practices.

Standard 10 Collaboration Candidates collaborate with families, general educators, community agencies and professional outside the school setting in support of the exceptional learning needs of individuals.

Observation Description

The mean score of our candidates' *Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge* Praxis II was well above the state minimum required score. Further, 100% of our 2009-2010 program completers exceeded the state minimum score.

Praxis II content knowledge mean test score among SPED program completers

Praxis II Test		State of Oregon Minimum Score	2010		
			(n)	mean	range
Special Education	Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge	162	10	180.8	172-192

Portfolio of Evidence
Special Educator Endorsement/Continuing Teaching License

Course	**Evidence**	**Faculty Evaluation**

SPED 510   **Educating Students with Special Needs**

1. Final examination. Procedural/Substantive/Legal and Pedagogy Analysis and Applications

    1. _____

2. Instructional Paradigm: Case study & presentation

    2. _____

SPED 511   **Behavior Change Interventions for Students with Serious Emotional Behavioral Disorders**
3. Functional Behavioral Analysis

    3. _____

4. Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP aggressive/disruptive student)

    4. _____

SPED 513   **Assessment and Diagnosis**
5. Case Study 2: Assessment Portfolio for Special Ed. eligibility (survey level test(s); achievement tests(s); supporting criterion referenced assessment)

    5. _____

6. Case Study 3: Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) Reading

    6. _____

7. Assessment Practicum Log

    7. _____

SPED 514   **Curriculum and Instruction for Special Needs Students**
8. GE Curriculum, high incidence disabilities & learning: Curriculum Study:

    8. _____

9. IEP Project

    9. _____

10. Facilitated IEP meeting & critique

    10. _____

11. Adaptations Resource Notebook (Accomodations & modifications references/ materials/procedures/forms)

    11. _____

SPED 516   **Interventions for Severely Challenged Students**
                       12. Training checklist for paraprofessionals: 12. _____

                       13. Reflection Paper: Autism   13. _____

SPED 544   **Practicum**
                       14. Practicum observation/feedback form   14. _____

                       15. Post-Observation Conference   15. _____

SPED 517   **Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs**
                       16. Reading Instruction assessment/instruction system   16. _____

Student:_____**Reviewer 1:**_____

Date Received_____**Reviewer 2:**_____

Instructions: Please check only one rating for each of the areas below. Indicate date of materials; sign and date review on last page, and return completed review to program director.

SPED 510: Educating Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Answer Manual: Procedural, Substantive, Legal; Pedagogy Analysis and Applications			
2. Instructional Paradigm: Case Study and Presentation			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 511: Behavior Change Interventions for Students with Serious Emotional Behavioral Disorders	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
3. Functional Behavioral Analysis: Instructor's notes			

(SPED 511, continued)			
4. Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP aggressive/disruptive student): Instructor's notes			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 513: Assessment and Diagnosis	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
5. Case Study: Assessment Portfolio for Special Ed. Eligibility: Survey level test(s), achievement tests, supporting criterion reference assessment			
6. Case Study: Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM): Reading or Math			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 545: Practicum I	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Log: Assessment Hours			
2. Observation /Conference Form (filed by Supervisor)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 514: Curriculum and Instruction for Special Needs Students	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
7. Curriculum Study: GE Curriculum & Standards Integration, Lesson Plan 5			
8. IEP Project and Critique Notes			

9. Facilitated IEP Meeting and Critique			
(SPED 514, continued)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 516: Interventions for Severely Challenged Students: STAR and FACTER Case Study	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 546: Practicum II	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Observation Form			

2. Observation and Conference (filed by supervisor)			
(SPED 546, continued)			

Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):

SPED 517: Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
Reading Instruction Assessment/Instruction System			

Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):

SPED 535: Successful Completion of Summary Experience	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.

Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):

Reviewer 1:_____**Date:**_____

Reviewer 2:_____**Date:**_____

Additional Comments (optional):

9) Institutions will provide evidence of review by consortium of program data and any evidence of program response to consortium recommendations.

Documentation of the consortium's review of program data (which was presented via Lewis & Clark's "Annual Reports to TSPC") is attached. Per Keith Menk, additional information from the consortium will be provided to the commission as addenda following the January 27, 2011, meeting of Lewis & Clark's Educational Consortium.

Annual Report to TSPC 2005-'06

Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College

❖

Peter W. Cookson, Jr., Dean

Victoria Chamberlain, Executive Director
Teacher Standards and Practices Commission
465 Commercial Street
Salem, OR 97301

July 28, 2006

Dear Ms. Chamberlain,

I am delighted to submit the Lewis & Clark College Graduate School of Education and Counseling's Annual Report to the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. Prior to highlighting the activities of this year, I want to mention that there have been no changes to our mission statement and that Sharon Chinn will remain the liaison officer between the Lewis & Clark College Graduate School of Education and Counseling and the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

In October, 2005, we were notified by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education that we had received National Accreditation. We were particularly pleased that we met all standards; the only area for improvement noted by NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board was their statement that the Graduate School's education programs should receive greater financial support from the College.

This year we continued to analyze our data and respond in ways that will strengthen all our licensure and endorsement programs. We received an approximately one million dollar Department of Education grant to provide support for a dozen American Indian students to earn licensure in teaching, special education, and administration. During the past year, six of these students enrolled and two completed their administrative licensure programs. Next year we will have eight American Indian students enrolled, two working towards their middle level/high school teaching licenses, one working toward licensure in school counseling, and five completing coursework in our educational leadership program.

We have recently hired a Director of Research and Assessment to assist in all of our state and national licensure and accreditation work, Dr. Mollie Galloway. Mollie received her Ph.D. in Psychological Studies in Education with a minor in Psychology from Stanford University and is currently a Research Associate at the John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities. Prior to this, she was the Research Director of a school-based intervention, SOS - Stressed Out Students. We believe that she will be a valuable asset as we continue to expand the degree to which we use data to drive our decisions regarding program quality and change. We also hired Becky Haas as Director of Admissions. Becky has extensive experience in this role at three colleges and has been asked to develop a recruiting plan that will help to diversify our applicant pool.

We have also hired new full-time faculty in special education, mathematics education, the education of students whose first language is other than English, and educational research. We have been fortunate to hire faculty with extensive K-12 school experiences but who also have a rich academic background and are highly respected practitioners and scholars. Our doctoral program leadership is beginning its third year and currently has over 40 students enrolled, most of whom are educational leaders in this state. We believe this program enhances all of our licensure and endorsement programs and provides a rich opportunity for graduates of our institution to produce important research and become more skilled educational leaders.

We have begun an extensive planning process, entitled Programs for the Future, in which faculty are examining ways the Graduate School of Education and Counseling can become engaged with public schools, mental health agencies, and international organizations to have a positive impact on educational and mental health institutions in Oregon and around the globe. In addition, we continue to take a leadership role in developing approaches to supporting new Oregon teachers.

I continue to appreciate your leadership in Oregon education. Your hard work and commitment to high quality in licensing and program approval in this state is central to our efforts to insure that all students in Oregon schools receive a quality educational experience that allows them to meet the state's academic benchmarks. I took forward to continuing to work with you toward these goals. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Peter W. Cookson, Jr.
Dean

OAR 584-010-0050 Annual Report from the Institution

(1) Annual reports shall be submitted to the Commission by the institution by July 31 of each year.
(2) The unit shall identify:
(a) Changes to the mission statement and how it relates to the mission of the college or university;

The mission statement of the Graduate School of Education and Counseling at Lewis & Clark College remained the same during the 2005-'06 academic year:

> *The Lewis & Clark Graduate School of Education and Counseling is a community that values the rich diversity of voices and perspectives in a complex world. We reach out to those around us, explore new ideas, and pursue the best practice of education and counseling. We promote open dialogue, inquiry, respect, and social action to enhance the learning of adults and children.*

The mission of the Graduate School supports and is supported by the mission of Lewis & Clark College:

> *The mission of Lewis & Clark College is to know the traditions of the liberal arts, to test their boundaries through ongoing exploration, and to hand on to successive generations the tools and discoveries of this quest. By these means the College pursues the aims of all liberal learning: to seek knowledge for its own sake and to prepare for civic leadership.*

> *The College carries out this mission through undergraduate programs in the arts and sciences and postgraduate programs in the closely related professions of education, counseling, and law. The College mounts these programs as both separately valid and mutually supportive enterprises. In all its endeavors it seeks to be a community of scholars who are alive to inquiry, open to diversity, and disciplined to work in an interdependent world.*

(b) Long and short term strategic plans; and

Our goals and strategies, both short and long term, include the following:

- Broaden our student recruitment strategy to increase the ethnic and geographic diversity of our student population. While many of our students attended prestigious out-of-state colleges and universities, when they apply to our programs, most reside in the Portland metropolitan area.
    - We have hired a new Director of Admissions, Becky Haas, who has extensive recruitment background and have begun a national marketing campaign aimed at meeting our goal of increasing diversity.

- o Virtually every fund-raising project conducted during the 2005/06 academic year was developed to raise funds exclusively for scholarships to support minority students.
  - o We received an approximately one million dollar United States Department of Education grant entitled, "Northwest Consortium for Training and Developing American Indian Educators." This grant provides tuition, room, board and other costs for 12 American Indian students to earn degrees and/or licenses in educational administration, school counseling, or teaching.
  - o We have written a follow-up one million dollar grant to extend this work to include twelve additional American Indian Students.
  - o We received an approximately $100,000 Ford Foundation grant, entitled "Indigenous Ways of Knowing," to infuse tribal cultures, histories, and worldviews into existing coursework for master's degree programs and to establish relationships with indigenous communities.
  - o We have applied for a multi-million dollar grant from the Ford Foundation to continue this work.

- Create a well-organized and user-friendly system for developing collaborative partnerships with districts interested in enhancing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of their administrators, teachers, and school counselors. To meet this goal, we instituted the Office of District-Affiliated Programs. This program is coordinated by Sherri Carreker, an experienced public school administrator who has been on our faculty for four years and came here with a history of establishing school-university partnerships. Sherri has a full-time administrative assistant.

- Improve the quality and number of students served in our mathematics education program. To this end we hired Dr. Kasi Fuller who earned her doctorate in mathematics education from Stanford University and has both extensive K-12 teaching and national consulting experience to direct this program. In addition, we allocated time and money to allow this individual to be involved in program development and recruiting.

- Enhance the quality and scope of our Continuing Studies and Professional Development program. To accomplish this goal we contracted several consultants and hired a director.

- Increase scholarships for students from historically underrepresented groups. To meet this goal we have created a Development Office, hired a director for this office, and allocated significant resources to obtain funds for scholarships. Virtually every dollar raised from fund raising events this year was allocated to minority scholarships.

- Increase funds to support faculty research. To this end we are in the process of hiring a grant writer who will work with faculty to respond to grant opportunities. A significant role of the newly formed development office is to obtain funds to support faculty scholarship.

- Enhance the quality of our assessment of student learning outcomes. We hired Dr. Mollie Galloway, a Stanford University Ph.D. assessment expert, as Director of Research and Assessment. Mollie will have a full-time staff assistant with extensive background in data processing. In addition, in the Educational Leadership program we hired Dr. Dorothy Aguilera who has an extensive background in program assessment.

- Assume a lead role in working with faculty in implementing a statewide new teacher initiative. We held the New Teacher Summit at Lewis & Clark this past October.

- Provide leadership in innovative methods of pedagogy. We published our first edition of the journal, <u>Democracy & Education: The Magazine for Classroom Teachers</u>. Peter Cookson and Nancy Nagel are co-editors for quarterly journal, and it is our attempt to provide educators with current best practices in a variety of areas related to pedagogy and leadership.

(c) Program goals that reflect best practice and state and national standards for education.

<u>Education Department: Teacher Education, School Counseling and Educational Leadership</u>

<u>Initial Teacher Preparation Program</u>
- Expand the theoretical and applied content in the areas of serving students whose first language is not English and who have been identified as having special needs.
    - We hired Christine Moore, a full-time special education faculty whose role includes greater integration of special education content and skills into our preservice program. For many years Christine was the Director of Special Education for the Beaverton School District.
    - We hired Dr. Sara Exposito, our second Latino Ph.D. faculty hired in the past three years with extensive public school teaching experience and major academic and training work in California, to assist in integrating work with ESOL students into our preservice programs. Both Dr. Sara Exposito and Dr. Alejandra Favela work with our preservice program faculty and students to provide candidates with current best practice in serving second language learners and incorporating these methods into the candidate's work samples.
    - Our faculty completed a detailed analysis of all reading and assignments currently in place for assisting our preservice interns in developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions with special needs and ESOL students. This is being analyzed by both our faculty and outside consultants to determine the direction of additional content and practicum experiences
    - The faculty read and discussed material on best serving American Indian students, and a number of faculty attended the Indigenous Ways of Knowing Conference where over 45 Native leaders discussed ways programs in teacher education, counselor education, and educational leadership could work to better serve American Indian students.
- Increase the quality and best practice standards in our mathematics education program We hired Dr. Kasi Fuller who has been a leading researcher of current best practice in mathematics education
- Increase students knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the area of classroom management
    - We hired Louise Jones, a 32 year veteran elementary teacher who is co-author of one of the best selling classroom management texts in the country to teach all three elementary sections of classroom management.
    - We hired Gail Van Gorder, a 30 year veteran high school teacher/administrator to teach the three sections of classroom management
- Require a work sample at the second level of authorization
    - For the past 22 years, our interns have completed a year-long internship (end of August through the end of the school year in June) that had been associated with

our students being hired at a very high rate and administrators stating that our students entered the profession more like second- than first-year teachers. This internship also met the practicum requirements for their second level of authorization. In order to enhance their year-long internship, however, the program had been designed with both work samples completed at the same authorization level. While NCATE was exceptionally impressed with the quality of our program and internship – and what administrators said about the results – TSPC required that all students complete a work sample during their second authorization level practicum experience. As a result, we lengthened the practicum so that all students who will be recommended for two authorization levels complete a work sample at both levels. Despite opposition from school district personnel who complained that this reduced the emphasis on the year-long internship and put more pressure on them to provide a second extended experience, we implemented this procedure. We expressed concerns that while this program change reflected state standards, it actually contradicted best practice and recommendations by many leading educational writers and researchers. This belief was supported by an almost unanimous vote of the members of the Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Indeed, at OICA and OACTE meetings where support for the year-long internship was strong, no institution of higher education provided evidence to contradict the significant amount of research provided by the Lewis & Clark College faculty to support the year-long internship. Therefore, we would suggest that while this program change was consistent with state standards, it did not reflect our faculty's reading of research regarding best practice in the field.

Advanced Preparation Programs

ESOL/Bilingual Program
- As mentioned earlier, we hired Dr. Sara Expositio, a Ph.D. Latino faculty in our ESOL program. Along with Dr. Alejandra Favela, Cynthia Cosgrave, who was previously the Immersion Language Education Coordinator for the Portland Public Schools, and Linda Wolf, who was previously an ESOL teacher in Hillsboro, we rewrote all course syllabi in our ESOL/Bilingual program to represent current best practices.

Drama, Reading, and Special Educator Endorsement Programs
- No new program goals were implemented during the 2005/06 academic year and, at this point in time, none are planned for next year.

Educational Leadership: Administrative License Programs
- Given the focus on assessment in schools, we hired Dr. Dorothy Aguilera, an expert in school assessment whose background includes extensive assessment work with tribal education programs.
- We created a team of practicing educational leaders who worked with our faculty to redesign the Initial Administrator License program to meet new standards and are currently working with another team to revise our Continuing Administrative License program to meet the new state standards.

School Counseling Program
- Because the School Counseling program had made significant course revisions during the previous year, no major changes were made in the program during the 2005/06 academic year.

Counseling Psychology Department: School Psychology
- Having successfully been approved by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) this past year, The School Psychology program is clearly addressing national standards for the training and education of school psychologists.

- Having also undergone a combined review of our program by TSPC/NCATE, we have aligned ourselves with best practices at the national/state level by defining and collecting data on a set of "transition periods and items" as our students move through our three year program. The data we have begun collecting on these transition points enables us to better evaluate our effectiveness by attending to our student's progress in carefully delineated categories. Please see the table presented in (3)(a) below which outlines our transition periods and items.

(3) The unit shall show evidence of continual review of programs by:
(a) Reflecting on the degree of accomplishment in meeting the goals through student performance in course work, field studies, and work samples;

Education Department: Teacher Education, School Counseling and Educational Leadership

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
- In October, 2005, we received NCATE accreditation. This accreditation came with a statement that we had met requirements in all areas with no areas in which we were required to present a response. The only exception was that NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board believed the College was not providing adequate fiscal support for the educational programs reviewed.
- We continue to collect data similar to that which was presented during our NCATE and TSPC joint site visit regarding student progress and transition points related to coursework, supervisor and mentor assessment of students' work during their year-long field experience (we use the Intern Teaching Profile to document student performance and growth during their field site work), and work samples. This year we modified our work sample assessment form to document when students did not initially meet minimum standards on their work samples and the modifications they were required to make in order to demonstrate competence.
- As mentioned previously, we have continued to update the knowledge, skills, and disposition goals related to serving students with special needs and second language learners as well as the support we provide students in developing these skills. One goal for next year is to modify our Intern Teaching Profile and Work Sample scoring guides to reflect these new goals.
- All of our students completed a work sample at the second level of authorization. Our mentors, supervisors and college faculty consistently independently rated these work samples as very high quality. A number of candidates report appreciating the opportunity to have an expanded practicum and teaching responsibilities at the second level of authorization,

although building administrators and veteran teachers frequently expressed frustration with this change in our program.

- Our follow-up surveys and showed that students still view classroom management and serving students with special needs as areas in which they feel adequately prepared but not extremely well prepared.

Advanced Preparation Programs

- The special education program added a course, SPED 535/635: Current Issues in Special Education to provide students with a summary experience in which faculty and students co-construct a summative course that both reviews students' knowledge and skill acquisition and provides and opportunity for students to focus on specific knowledge and skills faculty and students believe need to be added to students' best practices repertoire prior to students being recommended for their endorsement. This change was made despite the fact that reviews of candidates portfolios, including their practicum observation reviews, indicated that students being recommended for their endorsement had high levels of skills.
- Graduates of the Educational Leadership program joined the faculty and other selected local administrators to write the new curriculum for the Initial and Continuing Administrator Licenses. This provided an opportunity for graduates and those who have hired graduates to reflect on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions obtained and demonstrated by program graduates and to integrate this knowledge into the new program plans.
- In a similar vein, graduates of the program joined faculty to rewrite the goals, objectives, and pedagogy for all courses in the ESOL/Bilingual endorsement program. Data on student outcomes as represented by students' work in courses as well as they summative portfolios were sources of input for making these changes.

Counseling Psychology Department: School Psychology

- The following table reflects the Transition Periods and Items from which data is collected regarding the progress of our students through the School Psychology program. These Transition Periods and Items reflect our student's abilities to demonstrate the educational goals and competencies of our program. Please see the section (3)(b) for an example of the ways in which the we continue to collect data from our students once they have left the program as graduates as well.

Table 1
Transition Periods and Items for the School Psychology Program (revised 7/06)

1 Admission Requirements	Complete application (Y/N) Undergraduate degree GPA GRE verbal score GRE quantitative score GRE writing score Reviewer 1 personal statement score Reviewer 1 resume score Reviewer 1 letters of recommendation score Reviewer 1 overall score Reviewer 2 personal statement score Reviewer 2 resume score Reviewer 2 letters of recommendation score Reviewer 2 overall score

	Group interview score CPSY Recommendation (Accept/Deny) Graduate admissions committee approval (Y/N)
2 **First Year Requirements**	First term advisor program planning worksheet (Y/N) Petitions for transfer credit/competency evaluations (Y/N/NA) CPSY-581 advisor pre-practicum registration approval form (Y/N) CPSY-585 advisor practicum registration approval form (Y/N) First year program GPA TSPC documents (Fingerprints, PA-1) (Y/N) Proof of practicum student insurance (Y/N) Practicum site pre-approval form (Y/N) Practicum site contract (Y/N) Practicum site supervisor resume (Y/N) Certification of first-aid skills (Y/N)
3 **Second Year Practicum Requirements**	Fall practicum student evaluation (items 1-10) Fall weekly record of service hours form (Y/N) Fall summary of hours form (total hours) Spring practicum student evaluation (items 1-10) Spring weekly record of service hours form (Y/N) Spring summary of hours form (total hours) Year end practicum site evaluation form (Y/N) Complete internship application (Y/N) Internship contract (Y/N) Internship supervisor resume (Y/N) Proof of internship student insurance (Y/N) Internship registration approval form (w/prog. coord.) (Y/N)
4 **Third Year Internship Requirements**	Fall internship student evaluation form (all items) Fall degree application form (Y/N) Spring internship student evaluation form (all items) Spring weekly record of service hours (Y/N) Spring summary of hours form (total hours) End of year internship site evaluation form (Y/N) Completion of Comprehensive Portfolio (Y/N) Exit interview w/ program coordinator (Y/N)
5 **Program Completion Requirements**	Proof of passing PRAXIS I or CBEST (total score) Proof of passing PRAXIS II (total score) Discrimination and the Oregon Educator Form (Y/N) Ed.S. degree granted (Y/N) License Only approval form (Y/N/NA) License recommendation to TSPC (C-2 Form) (Y/N)

(b) Reflecting on the degree of accomplishments in meeting the goals through follow-up of recent graduates; and

In 2005, two rounds of Web-based and printed surveys were sent to graduates of all education programs for the years 1997/1998, 1998/1999 and 2001/2002, 2002/2003 in an effort to capture two data collection ranges and reestablish a survey routine which had been briefly disrupted. Surveys are sent in date ranges of one year out and five years out from program completion. All

education program alumni surveys are currently on track and are within the survey schedule timelines. Surveys sent to the one year out group were newly revised based on current program content, while surveys sent to the five year out group were based on an updated version of the 2001 survey. All results from these years have been aggregated and distributed to department coordinators and chairs for outcomes analysis.

In addition, one survey was distributed to 2004 Special Education program completers as an exit survey, and an employer survey was sent in October, 2004 to preservice graduate employers for alumni from the years 2002/2003. Specific dates for individual programs are outlined below.

The next review and implementation of survey revisions for alumni and employers will take place in the fall of 2006, with subsequent rounds of Web-based and printed surveys for alumni who completed in 2004 scheduled to begin in January of 2006. Discussion is currently underway to determine ideal sending timelines to optimize return rates.

Education Department: Teacher Education, School Counseling and Educational Leadership

Preservice Early Childhood/Elementary Program
- Preservice alumni in the Early Childhood/Elementary program for the completion years 1997/1998, 1998/1999 and 2001/2002, 2002/2003 received surveys from May through July of 2005, with a turn-around time of 40 days, and a return rate of 22%. Qualitative and quantitative survey results were compiled and aggregated at the end of July, 2005.

- As reflected in the table below, 54% of respondents in the 02/03 survey groups felt they were "well" or "very well" prepared as an educator. The majority of respondents reported holding positions in the public school system (74.1%), with 55.6% teaching grades one through three and 33.3% teaching grades four through six.

Table 2
Program evaluation: How effective was the Early Childhood/Elementary Education program at:

| | | a. Preparing you as an Early Childhood/Elementary educator. | | | | Total |
		2=Somewhat	3=Adequately	4=Well	5=Very Well	
1998	Count	0	2	4	3	9
		.0%	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	100.0%
1999	Count	0	2	2	1	5
		.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
1998/1999	Count	0	4	6	4	14
	Mean	0%	28.5%	43%	28.5	100.0%
2002	Count	2	3	2	1	8
		25.0%	37.5%	25.0%	12.5%	100.0%
2003	Count	1	0	2	2	5
		20.0%	.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
2002/2003	Count	3	3	4	3	13
	Mean	23%	23%	31%	23%	100.0%

2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Preservice Middle-level/High School Program

- Preservice alumni in the Middle-level/High School program for the years 1997/1998, 1998/1999 and 2001/2002, 2002/2003 received surveys from June through July of 2005, with a turn-around time of 40 days, and a return rate of 17%. Qualitative and quantitative survey results were compiled and aggregated in August of 2005.

- As reflected in the table below, 50% of respondents in the 02/03 survey groups felt they were "well" prepared as an educator, with 20% feeling they were "very well" prepared. The majority of overall respondents (76.7%) reported working in the public school system, with 59.5% working in high school and 31% at the middle school level.

Table 3
Program evaluation: How effective was the Early Childhood/Elementary Education program at:

| | | a. Preparing you as a Middle-level/High School educator. | | | | Total |
		2=Somewhat	3=Adequately	4=Well	5=Very Well	
1998	Count	0	1	7	2	10
		.0%	10.0%	70.0%	20.0%	100.0%
1999	Count	1	0	7	3	11
		9.1%	.0%	63.6%	27.3%	100.0%
1998/1999	Count	1	1	14	5	21
	Mean	4.8%	4.8%	66.6%	23.8%	100.0%
2002	Count	1	2	8	1	12
		8.3%	16.7%	66.7%	8.3%	100.0%
2003	Count	0	3	2	3	8
		.0%	37.5%	25.0%	37.5%	100.0%
2002/2003	Count	1	5	10	4	20
	Mean	4.7%	24.4%	50%	20%	100.0%

ESOL/Bilingual, Reading, and Special Educator Endorsement Programs

- Inservice alumni in Language & Literacy: Reading, ESOL, and Special Education programs who graduated in the years 1997/1998, 1998/1999 and 2001/2002, 2002/2003 were sent surveys in March through April of 2005. (Data from the 1998/1999 data years was unavailable for ESOL and L & L.) Results for these survey groups were aggregated in May of 2005 and distributed to program coordinators and the TED department chair for outcomes analysis. The alumni survey was also given to Special Education program completers in 2004 as an exit survey. Average turn-around time and return rate for these groups was 37 days and 25% respectively.

- As reflected in the table below, 50% of respondents in the ESOL 02/03 survey groups and 41.6% of Special Education 02/03 alumni felt they were "well" prepared as an educator, while 50% of the Language and Literature alumni felt they were "very well" prepared. An overall majority of respondents from the ESOL and Language and Literature programs reported working in the public school system (96.3% and 66.7% respectively). This appears to be the case for Special Education alumni also; responses were self-reported and qualitative.

Table 4
How effective was the (ESOL/Bilingual; Language & Literacy: Reading; Special Education) Endorsement program at:

			a. Preparing you as an educator.				Total
Program			2=Somewhat	3=Adequately	4=Well	5=Very Well	
ESOL/Bilingual	2002	Count	0	1	4	2	7
			.0%	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	100.0%
	2003	Count	1	2	12	10	25
			4.0%	8.0%	48.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	02/03	Mean	3.1%	9.3%	50%	37.6%	100.0%
Lang & Lit: Reading	2002	Count	0	1	0	0	1
			.0%	100%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	2003	Count	0	0	1	2	3
			.0%	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	02/03	Mean	.0%	25%	25%	50%	100.0%
Special Education	2002	Count	0	0	2	1	3
			.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	2003	Count	1	3	3	2	9
			11.1%	33.3%	33.3%	22.2%	100.0%
	02/03	Mean	8.4%	25%	41.6%	25%	100.0%

School Counseling Program

- Surveys were sent to School Counseling program alumni for the completion years of 1997/1998, 1998/1999, 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 from July through August 2005. Qualitative and quantitative results were compiled and aggregated in September of 2005 and distributed to the program coordinator and department chair for outcomes analysis. Turn-around time for these survey groups was approximately 40 days, with a return rate of 19%.

- As reflected in the table below, 45.4% of respondents in the 02/03 survey groups felt they were "adequately" prepared as an educator, with 36.6% feeling they were "well" prepared. An overall majority of respondents (100%) reported working in the public school system, with 41.7% working in a middle school and high school setting, and 33.3% in a grade school setting.

Table 5
How effective was the School Counseling Program at:

			a. Preparing you as a School Counselor.			Total
			3=Adequately	4=Well	5=Very Well	
	2002	Count	3	3	2	8
			37.5%	37.5%	25.0%	100.0%
	2003	Count	2	1	0	3
			66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
	02/03	Count	5	4	2	11
		Mean	45.4%	36.6%	18%	100.0%

2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Educational Leadership: Administrative License Programs

- Educational Administration alumni who completed in the years 1997/1998, 1998/1999 and 2001/2002, 2002/2003 were sent surveys in January through February of 2006. Quantitative and qualitative results for these survey groups were aggregated in March of 2006 and distributed to the program coordinator and department chair for outcomes analysis. Average turn-around time was 53 days, and the return rate was 13% for the Basic/Initial Administrator program and 17% for Standard/Continuing Administrator program.

- With regard to overall program satisfaction, 100% of all respondents indicated that their educational experiences at Lewis & Clark met their expectations, and when asked if they would enroll in the program again, 81% indicated that they "Definitely Would." (The program preparation indicator question was not included in these surveys.) An average of 83.6% of all alumni surveyed in the Basic/Initial program reported working in the public school system, with the Standard/Continuing program showing an average of 90% in PPS. Alumni surveyed in the Standard/Continuing program reported a majority of 87.5% holding positions in the senior high and "other" categories. The majority of the positions held for the Basic/Initial program were at the elementary level (36.5%).

Counseling Psychology Department: School Psychology

- School Psychology alumni who graduated in the years 1997/1998, 1998/1999 and 2001/2002, 2002/2003 were sent surveys in October through November of 2005. (Data from the 1998/1999 data years was unavailable for ESOL and L & L.) Quantitative and qualitative results for these survey groups were aggregated in December of 2005 and distributed to the program coordinator and department chair for outcomes analysis. Average turn-around time was 40 days and return rate was 47%.

- With regard to overall program satisfaction within all groups surveyed, 86% responded that their educational experiences at Lewis & Clark met their expectations. When asked if they would enroll in the program again, 31% responded "Definitely Would." As reflected in the table below, 66.7% of respondents in the 02/03 survey groups and 33.3% of the 98/99 alumni felt they were "well" prepared as a school psychologist. An average of 92.3% alumni reported working in the public school system, with a majority working in an elementary school setting (76.9% for the 98/99 alumni; 90% for the 02/03 alumni).

Table 6
How well did your education at Lewis & Clark prepare you:

			For your first year as a School Psychologist.			Total
			2=Somewhat	3=Adequately	4=Well	
	1998	Count	2	2	1	5
			40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	2	2	3	7
			28.6%	28.6%	42.9%	100.0%
	98/99	Count	4	4	4	12
		Mean	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
	2002	Count	1	0	0	1
			100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	2003	Count	0	2	6	8
			.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	02/03	Count	1	2	6	9
		Mean	11.1%	22.2%	66.7%	100.0%

2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Table 7
Alumni Surveys

98/02 & 99/03 PROGRAMS	PIN # RANGE	DATE SENT	DATE CLOSED	DURATION	# SENT	RETURNED	RETURN RATE
TED Inservice Reading	0001-0014	3/05	5/05	41 days	15	7	47%
TED Inservice ESOL	0015-0123	3/05	5/05	37 days	109	35	32%
TED Inservice SPED	0124-0184	3/05	5/05	35 days	60	16	27%
TED Preservice EC/EL	0240-0390	5/05	7/05	40 days	134	29	22%
TED Preservice ML/HS	0391-0647	6/05	8/05	40 days	256	43	17%
School Counseling	0650-0760	7/05	9/05	39 days	107	20	19%
School Psychology	0185-0233	10/05	12/05	40 days	49	23	47%
EDAD Basic/Initial	0761-0896	1/06	3/06	53 days	136	18	13%
EDAD Stand/Conti	0897-0961	1/06	3/06	53 days	66	11	17%

(c) Statement of future goals for next academic year with the indicators to be used for measurement of accomplishment.

Education Department: Teacher Education, School Counseling and Educational Leadership

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
- Students continued to request additional information on working with students identified as having special needs (students on IEPs for 504 plans). We have hired a full-time special education coordinator and allocated a significant amount of her time to working with our preservice candidates to respond to this need. We will monitor students' work samples and ITP scores as well as end-of-the-year feedback from interns, mentors, and supervisors to determine whether students increase their knowledge, skills and dispositions in these areas.

Advanced Preparation Programs
- We continue to respond to district requests to provide our ESOL and reading endorsements to district and building staff as part of the District's staff development program. We always review course evaluations, do follow-up meetings with administrators, and in some cases work with the district or building to develop short and mid-term assessments related to student behavior and achievement (Franklin High School is an example of this).
- We plan on offering a special education program that is less extensive than an endorsement but which provides teachers, counselors, and administrators with the knowledge, skills and dispositions to work more effectively with students identified as having special needs. We are currently working with district personnel to determine the best sequence of learning events to accomplish this goal. We will work with our new Director of Research and Assessment to determine ways to collaborate with district personnel to evaluate outcomes associated with educators being involved in this program.
- The Special Educator Endorsement program faculty has developed, and will implement during summer, 2007, the new SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education. This will provide the faculty with an opportunity to review students' competencies as well as add content in areas the faculty believes students in a particular cohort may need additional work. It will also allow students to select areas in which they believe they need additional work prior to being recommended for their Special Educator Endorsement. This will be evaluated

based both on feedback from students, from the employer follow-up surveys, and through discussions at faculty meetings.

- The Educational Leadership program will bring its newly designed Initial Administrator License program before TSPC in the fall and will be implementing this program next year.
- The Educational Leadership program will complete the redesign of its Continuing Administrator Program and bring it to TSPC in the winter.
- There have been tentative discussions about integrating the School Counseling, School Psychology and Special Education programs into a department so they can more easily collaborate to develop innovative approaches to helping their students learn methods for collaborating with those colleagues with whom they will work extensively in the school setting. This would involve some coursework taken jointly, jointly designed conferences, and shared program leadership.

Counseling Psychology Department: School Psychology

- We have identified the following three goals that we will be focusing on in the following year to continue to improve our program:

  1) Transition periods and items:
  Now that we have the Transition periods and items in place, we will look forward to collecting data on how our students are doing at demonstrating skills in the content areas they represent. This data will allow us to identify areas of improvement and strength in the program.

  2) Mid-term course evaluations:
  In order to insure quality instruction throughout our program, each course offered in the School Psychology program this year will include a mid-term evaluation. The data collected by the program coordinator will include instructors addressing the following two questions: What has worked well in your teaching this term? What changes/improvements were made to the course based on the data gathered in the mid-term evaluation?

  3) Graduate surveys:
  We will take steps to improve the response rate to our graduate surveys in order to collect the best evaluation data of our program possible from our graduates.

(4) The unit shall report:
(a) Any deviation from approved programs;
(b) Modifications of programs;

Education Department: Teacher Education, School Counseling and Educational Leadership

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
- No deviations occurred from the approved program, and it is anticipated that no program modifications will occur for the 2006/07 programs.

Advanced Preparation Programs
- The Language and Literacy: Reading endorsement program modified their program to incorporate Continuing Teaching License competencies so that candidates completing the 15 semester hour program can also be recommended to for the Continuing Teaching License.
- The Initial and Continuing Administrator Licensure programs are being completely revised to incorporate the new standards and these will be submitted to TSPC during the 2006/07 academic year.

Counseling Psychology Department: School Psychology
- We have made no substantial changes or modifications to the programs that were previously approved by TSPC.

(c) Any change in the liaison officer;

Sharon Chinn will remain the liaison officer between the Lewis & Clark College Graduate School of Education and Counseling and the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

(d) Off-campus programs or courses;

Education Department: Teacher Education, School Counseling and Educational Leadership

Initial Teacher Preparation Program

- This program has never been offered off-campus and there are no plans for this to occur.

Advanced Preparation Programs

Special Educator Endorsement Program
As it has for the past 10 years, this program has been offered in central Oregon. Eleven students will be enrolled in this program during the 2006/07 academic year.

ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement Program
This was the fourth year of a five year ExCELL Project, a National Professional Development Program funded by the U.S. Department of Education. The project provides tuition for licensed teachers and administrators to complete their ESOL endorsement coursework. In addition, the Task West federal grant provides funding for two district-affiliated cohorts working towards their ESOL/Bilingual endorsement. Table 8 provides a list of sites where courses are offered through our grants and district-affiliated programs office.

Language and Literacy: Reading Endorsement Program
During the 2005/06 academic year we had an increased demand on our program that provides the reading endorsement. Table 8 provides a list of sites where courses are being offered next year related to this endorsement. Because of this, we have hired a .53 faculty to assist in teaching and coordinating these courses. This person will work with Sherri Carreker, Director of District Affiliated Programs, to respond to district requests, meet with district and building staff, advise students, and teach. We also incorporated the

Continuing Teaching License competencies into the coursework and practicum for the Language and Literacy Program (reading endorsement) so candidates completing the 15 semester hour program can also be recommended for the Continuing Teaching License.

Educational Leadership – Administrative Licensure Programs
This is another area in which we have had increased demand for our administrative licensure programs. Table 8 includes a list of sites where we expect to provide coursework during the 2006/07 academic year. Because of the increased school district demands for this program, we hired a new full-time tenure track faculty. We were fortunate to hire Dorothy Aguilera who has extensive background in Native American educational issues and program assessment.

Table 8
Lewis & Clark College Graduate School of Education and Counseling
District-Affiliated Programs for 2005/06

District/School	Program
Central Oregon	Continuing Administrative License
The Dalles School District	Continuing Administrative License
Eastern Oregon	Continuing Administrative License
Central Oregon	Special Education Endorsement
Portland Public Schools/Atkinson Elementary	Reading Endorsement
Portland Public Schools/Binnsmead MS	Reading Endorsement
Portland Public Schools/Lane Middle School	Reading Endorsement
Gladstone School District	Reading Endorsement
Reynolds School District	Reading Endrosement
Portland Public Schools – East Side	ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
Portland Public Schools – Roosevelt HS	ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
East Multnomah County – Reynolds, David Douglas,	ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
Hillsboro, Forest Grove, Beaverton	ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
Hillsboro, Beaverton	ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
Klamath Falls	Continuing School Counseling License

<u>**Counseling Psychology Department: School Psychology**</u>

- This program is not offered off-campus and there are no plans for this to occur.

(e) Evidence that the consortium has reviewed evaluation results and made recommendations for improvement of program design and operation; and

- Please see the attached Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 Educational Consortium Meeting Minutes.

(f) Evidence that the institution has provided written response to consortium recommendations.

Table 9
Institutional Response to Educational Consortium Recommendations
NB: this chart is shared with Consortium members

RECOMMENDATION FROM CONSORTIUM	INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE
1. **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the following statement be sent to TSPC on behalf of the consortium: "Prior to our Fall Meeting, consortium members had the opportunity to review Lewis & Clark College's *Rejoinder to TSPC Site Visit Report 2005* and to offer feedback. At our Fall Meeting, the Educational Consortium had a second opportunity to review the rejoinder. Following an accreditation update by Associate Dean Nancy Nagel, consortium members unanimously approved sending a letter in support of Lewis & Clark College's rejoinder to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. The consortium fully supports Lewis & Clark College's proposed corrective actions and the timelines set forth for implementation of those actions." (13 October 2005)	1. The statement (and rejoinder) moved forward to TSPC and was accepted by the Commission and the Commission's Executive Director via an official letter. (3 November 2005)
2. **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the *Operating Guidelines* of the Educational Consortium be amended as proposed (and with two additional "friendly amendments"). (13 October 2005)	2. The proposed amendments were incorporated into the *Operating Guidelines*. (13 October 2005)
3. **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Lewis & Clark College's Educational Leadership program move the redesigned Initial Administrator License program forward to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission's Program Approval Committee at the first available opportunity. (25 May 2006)	3. A letter, including the Consortium's motion, was signed by Consortium Chair, Nancy McCusker, and will be included in the redesigned program proposal which will move to the Commission for consideration at their November 2006 meeting. (25 May 2006)
4. **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Lewis & Clark College's Educational Consortium supports the college's expansion of the off-campus Initial and Continuing Administrator License program offerings. The consortium recommends that the Educational Leadership program inform the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission of this modification at the first available opportunity. (25 May 2006)	4. A letter, including the Consortium's motion, was signed by Consortium Chair, Nancy McCusker, and was included in materials forwarded to the TSPC Executive Director for approval. (25 May 2006)
5. **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the proposed modifications to the Consortium's Operating Guidelines be accepted as proposed. (25 May 2006)	5. The proposed amendments were incorporated into the *Operating Guidelines*. (25 May 2006)

NOTE: Annual reports subsequent to year one are intended to be updates only.

2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Educational Consortium Meeting Minutes
Fall 2005—pages 21-23
Spring 2006—pages 24-26

<div align="center">

Educational Consortium
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College
Fall Meeting Minutes
13 October 2005
Room 417, Rogers Hall, South Campus

</div>

Members in Attendance
Vanessa Bunker, Emily Mickelsen, Nancy McCusker, Rolf Hanlon, Sherri Carreker, Danielle Torres
Non-voting Members in Attendance
Nancy Nagel, Sharon Chinn

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at approximately 4.30 PM by **Sharon Chinn**. Consortium members introduced themselves and then Sharon gave an overview of the charge to the Educational Consortium.

Review of *Annual Report to TSPC 2005*
Sharon Chinn began by providing consortium members with an explanation of TSPC's required annual reports. Consortium members, having received the 2005 report in advance, commented positively on the information and data presented in the report. Although not directly related to the report, **Nancy Nagel** mentioned that the Graduate School now also hosts the "Democracy & Education" journal.

Educational Administration Initial and Continuing Redesign
On behalf of Educational Leadership program director, Dick Sagor, **Sharon Chinn** brought consortium members up-to-date on the latest information regarding TSPC's redesigned *Oregon Administrative Rules* for Initial and Continuing Administrator License programs. She informed members that they would be reviewing and approving the Initial Administrator License redesign at the Spring 2006 meeting.

NCATE-TSPC-NASP Accreditation Update
Nancy Nagel reminded the consortium of the accreditation process. Details included:

NCATE: NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board is scheduled to meet from October 17 - 23. We should hear the results of their deliberations in the weeks following the meeting.

"NCATE reports all accreditation decisions to the U.S. Department of Education. Accreditation decisions (including the designation of "accredited with conditions," "provisionally accredited," and "accredited with probation") are also indicated in published lists of accredited institutions and on NCATE's website. The listings indicate the semester and year of the on-site visit. An institution is also required to notify its candidates of a conditional, provisional, or probationary accreditation decision.

NCATE communicates the action of the UAB to the institution via a letter and an action report from NCATE's president to the chief executive officer and the unit head of the institution. The appropriate state agency receives a copy of this correspondence if the institution is located in a partnership state. The action report relays one of the decisions outlined below. If the decision is conditional or provisional, the action report also identifies areas for improvement related to unmet standards. If the decision is denial or revocation, all areas for improvement are listed on the action report."

<div align="center">

21
2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

</div>

NASP: Fully approved by NASP and, if in a unit accredited by NCATE, nationally recognized by NCATE for the period January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2010.

Consortium members expressed concern over the cost and amount of work involved in preparing for and hosting a joint NCATE-TSPC accreditation review.

Rejoinder to TSPC

Sharon Chinn thanked consortium members for having read and provided input re: the college's *Rejoinder to TSPC*. The rejoinder was written in response to three areas that were deemed "unmet" following the Graduate School's April 2005 joint NCATE-TSPC site visit. The Graduate School received no "unmet" areas from NCATE.

The three "unmet" areas from TSPC included: course syllabi; student teaching; and the work sample at two authorization levels. The rejoinder lays out the proposed plan of correction for these three areas. The Graduate School does not know, at this point, whether TSPC will accept this proposed plan, but are proceeding as if they will.

In support of the college's *Rejoinder to TSPC*, consortium members approved the following motion:

> **Motion:** It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the following statement be sent to TSPC on behalf of the consortium:
>> "Prior to our Fall Meeting, consortium members had the opportunity to review Lewis & Clark College's *Rejoinder to TSPC Site Visit Report 2005* and to offer feedback. At our Fall Meeting, the Educational Consortium had a second opportunity to review the rejoinder. Following an accreditation update by Associate Dean Nancy Nagel, consortium members unanimously approved sending a letter in support of Lewis & Clark College's rejoinder to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. The consortium fully supports Lewis & Clark College's proposed corrective actions and the timelines set forth for implementation of those actions."

New Faculty Hires, 2005-'06

Nancy Nagel presented consortium members with the following new faculty hires for 2005-'06:

Stella Beatriz Kerl, Associate Professor of Counseling Psychology
Stella earned her doctorate and masters in Counseling Psychology at the University of Texas at Austin in 1995 and her B.A. in Speech Communication at the University of Washington. Stella has published widely in the areas of multi-cultural counseling, assessing professional performance, and diversity. We are delighted that she is joining us and will serve as a model for the socially engaged professor who is also a scholar and outstanding teacher.

Sara Exposito, Assistant Professor of Education
Sara received her Ph.D. in Education from Claremont Graduate University and her B.A. from California State University in Los Angeles. She will be teaching in our ESOL/Reading program and brings to us a wide variety of experiences in the area of second language learning and bilingual education. We are delighted to welcome Sara to our community.

Educational Leadership Program Director, Dr. Richard David Sagor. Dick Sagor is a nationally recognized leader in the area of educational leadership. He has published

voluminously and was principal and assistant superintendent in the West Linn School District. He received tenure in the Department of Administration and Supervision at Washington State University, and most recently was Executive Director for the Institute for the Study of Inquiry in Education in Vancouver. Dick received his Ph.D. from the University of Oregon, two MA's from the University of Oregon and a BA in political science from New York University. Dick will join us as a full professor.

Elementary Education Program, Dr. Elizabeth Meador. Liz Meador is currently Assistant Professor at California State University, Monterey Bay, Department of Education. She has wide experience in education as a teacher and a principal and is the author of numerous publications. Liz has been quite successful in securing grants to support her work. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Colorado in the Social, Multicultural and Bilingual Foundations of Education, a MA at the University of Denver, and a BA in Anthropology from San Diego State. Liz will be joining us as an assistant professor.

Language Arts Education, Dr. Kimberly Hill Campbell. Kim Campbell has been at the Graduate School for several years in a teaching capacity and after a national search we have offered her the position of Assistant Professor of Language Arts. Kim has published widely and is well known throughout the state of Oregon as a keynote speaker and a consultant. She received her Ph.D. in educational leadership from Portland State University, an M.A.T. from the Lewis & Clark Graduate School, and her BA in English from Lewis & Clark. She also earned a Law Degree from Willamette University.

Revising Consortium's *Operating Guidelines*
Based on feedback from consortium meetings over the past several years, **Sharon Chinn** presented members with proposed amendments to the consortium's *Operating Guidelines*.

> **Motion:** It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the *Operating Guidelines* of the Educational Consortium be amended as proposed (and with two additional "friendly amendements").

New Business

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Winter 2005 and Spring 2005 Educational Consortium minutes be accepted, as written.

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Nancy McCusker serve as the Educational Consortium Chair (term of service: 2005-'06 and 2006-'07).

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 6 P.M. by Nancy McCusker.
Notes taken and submitted by Educational Consortium Executive Secretary, Sharon Chinn.

<div align="center">

Educational Consortium
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College
Spring Meeting Minutes
25 May 2006
Room 107, South Campus Conference Center

</div>

<u>**Members in Attendance**</u>
Vanessa Bunker, Kristen Winn, Nancy McCusker, Rolf Hanlon, Anna Pandey, and Danielle Torres
<u>**Non-voting Members in Attendance**</u>
Sharon Chinn
<u>**Special Guests**</u>
Mike Howser and Dick Sagor

<u>**Call to Order**</u>
The meeting was called to order at approximately 4.40 PM by **Sharon Chinn**. Consortium members introduced themselves and then Sharon gave an overview of the charge to the Educational Consortium.

<u>**Educational Administration: Initial Administrator License Redesign**</u>
Mike Howser, coordinator of the Initial Administrator License program, distributed copies of the proposed redesigned Initial Administrator License program, along with a document summarizing the modifications. Consortium members took time to read the proposed redesigned program. Once the review was completed, Mike walked members through the redesign.

Mike began by explaining that the new *Oregon Administrative Rules* for Initial Administrator License programs include seven standards with indicators. In thinking about the redesign of the existing program, subgroups of the Redesign Taskforce took stacks of strips, each containing one of the new indicators, and, thinking about aspiring administrators and what tools they would need to be successful, clustered the strips into possible course groupings. The course suggestions proposed by the subgroups were remarkably similar, including suggestions to add courses on ethics, the use of data, and engaging the community. Mike reminded consortium members that cultural competency is built into each standard.

Consortium members next began asking questions regarding the proposed redesign. **Sharon Chinn** first reminded Mike to be sure to check box #7 on the course matrix for EDAD 504A. **Dick Sagor** asked whether the practicum would address all of the standards; Mike replied that it would. **Vanessa Bunker** asked whether syllabi for the same course would be standardized, no matter the instructor. Mike replied that, for the most part, they would be standardized. **Anna Pandey** inquired as to why the practicum would be changing from 6 semester hours to 4 semester hours. Mike answered that, while the *Oregon Administrative Rules* provide no semester hour requirement for the practicum experience, there are clear guidelines provided for what must be accomplished during the practicum. She said that, currently, most students in the Initial Administrator License program double the current hours required (usually completing almost 700 contact hours, rather than the required 360 contact hours). With this in mind, the Redesign Taskforce determined that the practicum was, then, the best place to move hours in order to make them available for other courses. **Danielle Torres** asked how the decision was made to make the courses on budget and ethics one semester hour each. Mike said that there were not many indicators required for these two areas and, in talking with practitioners about the knowledge really needed for new administrators, it was determined that two one-semester hour courses would adequately provide the knowledge necessary for a beginning administrator in budget and ethics. **Nancy McCusker** commented

<div align="center">

24
2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

</div>

that she was impressed with the organization of the redesign and with the proposed curriculum; other consortium members echoed this praise.

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Lewis & Clark College's Educational Leadership program move the redesigned Initial Administrator License program forward to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission's Program Approval Committee at the first available opportunity.

Educational Administration: Off-site Licensure Programs

Dick Sagor, Director of Educational Leadership, began his comments by providing consortium members with the background of Lewis & Clark College's service to administrators throughout the state. After taking a year, post-accreditation, to review the need for off-site administrative licensure programs around the state, Educational Leadership is proposing to modify its approved program to provide off-site Initial and Continuing Administrator License programs. Dick said that these programs will serve a significant number of students and that the off-site programs will be faithful to those offered on-site.

Dick provided consortium members with a chart indicating the locations for the Initial (Portland, Central Oregon, Eastern Oregon, and South Coast) and Continuing (Portland, Central Oregon, Eastern Oregon, and Columbia Gorge) Administrator License programs. Dick said that the goal in providing the Initial and Continuing Administrator License programs in a variety of locations was to serve students and to provide comparable experiences in all locations. The primary difference between the on- vs off-site locations is that the off-site locations will run under a cohort model.

In reviewing the off-site model, **Kristen Winn** commented that this appeared to be a great opportunity, especially for candidates from rural districts. **Vanessa Bunker** asked the number of students expected in the program. Dick replied that there will be approximately 50 students in Eastern Oregon; 14 in the Columbia Gorge; and 10 in Central Oregon with the goal of having approximately 10 – 15 students per cohort. With Mike Howser and Tom Ruhl listed as the on- and off-campus program coordinators, **Danielle Torres** asked what this would mean for them as far as increased travel time. **Mike Howser** replied that she and Tom are already traveling; that the amount of travel would not increase beyond what they are already experiencing. **Anna Pandey** asked who would be supervising the practicum experiences. Dick replied that the on-site program coordinator would, in most cases, be providing practicum supervision.

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Lewis & Clark College's Educational Consortium supports the college's expansion of the off-campus Initial and Continuing Administrator License program offerings. The consortium recommends that the Educational Leadership program inform the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission of this modification at the first available opportunity.

Modifications to the Consortium's Operating Guidelines

Sharon Chinn provided consortium members with copies of proposed modifications to the *Operating Guidelines*. She explained that the proposals were an effort to bring the guidelines up-to-date with recent administrative changes in the Graduate School.

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the proposed modifications to the Consortium's *Operating Guidelines* be accepted as proposed.

2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

NCATE-TSPC-NASP Accreditation Update

Sharon Chinn gave consortium members the good news—that the Graduate School has received NCATE and NASP accreditation through Spring 2010 (with no conditions) and TSPC accreditation through August 2012. She reminded consortium members that, at their fall meeting, they had approved the Graduate School's rejoinder to the "unmets" found during the TSPC site visit and that the Commission had accepted the College's rejoinder.

New Business

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Fall 2005 Educational Consortium minutes be accepted, as written.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 6 P.M. by Nancy McCusker.

Notes taken and submitted by Educational Consortium Executive Secretary, Sharon Chinn.

Student Teaching Placements and
Work Samples at Two Authorization Levels

Early Childhood/Elementary—Pages 28-29
Middle Level/High School—Pages 30-31

Key to School Districts:

GBSD – Gresham-Barlow School District
NCSD – North Clackamas School District
OCSD – Oregon City School District
PPS – Portland School District
WLWV – West Linn-Wilsonville School District

Student Teaching Placements and
Work Samples at Two Authorization Levels

Early Childhood/Elementary

MATH COHORT

STUDENT	SWAP	GRADE	WS 1	SCHOOL	SD		PRIMARY	GRADE	WS 2	SCHOOL	SD
Asbahr, Nicole	EL	3	3	N Gresham	GBSD		EC	1	1	N Gresham	GBSD
Brixey, Teresa	EC	2	2	Hollydale	GBSD		EL	3/4	4	Hollydale	GBSD
Brower, Shannon	EC	2	2	N Gresham	GBSD		EL	3	3	N Gresham	GBSD
Chaney, Heather	EC	2	2	Clarendon	PPS		EL	3	3	Clarendon	PPS
Guttag, B everly	EL	5	5	Clarendon	PPS		EC	3	3	Clarendon	PPS
Hanlon, Rolf	EC	1	1	Davis	Reynolds		EL	4	4	Davis	Reynolds
Holmes, Nicole	EL	3	3	Irvington	PPS		EC	1	1	Irvington	PPS
Irwin, Rimma	EL	4	4	Cherry Park	Reynolds		EC	2	2	Cherry Park	Reynolds
Lider, Brita	EC	1	1	Clarendon	PPS		EL	5	5	Clarendon	PPS
McCoy, Caroline	EL	3	3	Sunnyside	PPS		EC	K	K	Sunnyside	PPS
Ramey, Marin	EL	5	5	N Gresham	GBSD		EC	2	2	N Gresham	GBSD
Riegler, Niji	EL	3	3	Richmond	PPS		EC	2	2	Richmond	PPS
Scribner, Ryan	EC	1/2	1/2	Vose	Beaverton		EL	4	4	Vose	Beaverton
Stevens, Megan	EL	3	3	Davis	Reynolds		EC	K	K	Clarendon	PPS
Torres, Amanda	EC	K	K	Vose	Beaverton		EL	4	4	Vose	Beaverton
Welch, Colleen	EC	1	1	Irvington	PPS		EL	3	3	Irvington	PPS
Williamson, Julia	EC	K	K	Vose	Beaverton		EL	5	5	Vose	Beaverton

L&L COHORT

STUDENT	SWAP	GRADE	WS 1	SCHOOL	SD		PRIMARY	GRADE	WS 2	SCHOOL	SD
Brenden-Locke, April	EC	1	1	Sojourner School	NCSD		EL	5/6	5/6	Sojourner School	NCSD
Cox, Hannah	EL	5	5	Alameda	PPS		EC	2	2	Alameda	PPS
Fernando, Wasana	EC	2	2	Bolton Primary	WLWV		EL	4	4	Bolton Primary	WLWV
Firestone, Jessica	EC	1	1	Arleta	PPS		EL	4/5	4/5	Arleta	PPS
Frisch, Molly	EL	4	4	James John	PPS		EC	K	K	James John	PPS
Gutmann, Sean	EC	1/2	1/2	Davis	Reynolds		EL	3	3	Davis	Reynolds
Helin, Kathleen	EC	K/1	K/1	Arleta	PPS		EL	3	3	Arleta	PPS
Kalmus, Johanna	EC	1	1	James John	PPS		EL	3	3	Alameda	PPS
Melton, McKenna	EL	5	5	Arleta	PPS		EC	K/1	K/1	Arleta	PPS
Middleton, Elizabeth	EL	5	5	Sunnyside Environ.	PPS		EC	1/2	1/2	Sunnyside Environ.	PPS
Morgan, Sharon	EC	2	2	Sunnyside Environ.	PPS		EL	5	5	Sunnyside Environ.	PPS
Pilz, Karen	EL	4/5	4/5	Elmonica	Beaverton		EC	1/2	1/2	Elmonica	Beaverton
Smith, Heather	EC	1	1	Elmonica	Beaverton		EL	5	5	Elmonica	Beaverton
Spitz, Maren	EC	1/2	1/2	Elmonica	Beaverton		EL	4/5	4/5	Elmonica	Beaverton
Stengel, Alex	EC	1	1	James John	PPS		EL	5	5	James John	PPS
Torres, Brian	EC	1	1	Elmonica	Beaverton		EL	4	4	Elmonica	Beaverton
Wahab, Jamila	EC	1	1	Bolton Primary	WLWV		EL	4/5	4/5	Bolton Primary	WLWV
Waters, Bradley	EC	K	K	James John	PPS		EL	4	4	James John	PPS
Willner, Laura	EC	K/1	K/1	Arleta	PPS		EL	2/3	2/3	Arleta	PPS

2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

SMT COHORT

STUDENT	SWAP	GRADE	WS 1	SCHOOL	SD		PRIMARY	GRADE	WS 2	SCHOOL	SD
Aubrecht, William	EC	2	2	Buckman	PPS		EL	5	5	Buckman	PPS
Denham, Carlie	EC	2	2	Hollydale	GBSD		EL	3	3	Hollydale	GBSD
Gates, Erin	EC	2	2	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public		EL	3	3	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public
Glaze, Shelley	EL	4/5	4	Winterhaven	WLWV		EC	3	3	Winterhaven	PPS
Hubler, Victoria	EC	K	K	Willamette	WLWV		EL	4	4	Willamette	WLWV
Johnson, Antje	EL	4	4	Boeckman Creek	WLWV		EC	2	2	Boeckman Creek	WLWV
Jones, Tonya	EL	5	5	Buckman	PPS		EC	1	1	Buckman	PPs
McCormick, Willow	EL	3	3	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public		EC	1	1	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public
Myers, Kathryn	EL	4	4	Willamette	WLWV		EC	K	K	Willamette	WLWV
Reed, Alyssa	EC	2	2	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public		EL	5	5	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public
Regalbuto, Kate	EC	2	2	Beaver Acres	Beaverton		EL	3	3	Beaver Acres	Beaverton
Rozman, Linda	EC	1	1	Buckman	PPS		EL	4	4	Buckman	PPS
Schubel, Megan	EC	3	3	Winterhaven	PPS		EL	4/5	4/5	Winterhaven	PPS
Smith, Charity	EC	1	1	Willamette	WLWV		EL	3	3	Willamette	WLWV
Snyder, Lindsey	EC	3	3	Beaver Acres	Beaverton		EL	4	4	Beaver Acres	Beaverton
Stevens, Kathleen	EC	2	2	Boeckman Creek	WLWV		EL	4	4	Boeckman Creek	WLWV
Wheeler, Thomas	EC	1	1	Beaver Acres	Beaverton		EL	4/5	4/5	Markham	PPS
Youm, Rachel	EC	K	K	Clarendon	PPS		EL	5	5	Clarendon	PPS
Yu, Chiung-Chen	EC	1	1	Winterhaven	PPS		EL	4/5	4/5	Winterhaven	PPS

2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Student Teaching Placements and
Work Samples at Two Authorization Levels

Middle Level/High School

05-06 COHORT A										
STUDENT	PRIMARY	GRADE	WS 2	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE	WS 1	SCHOOL	SD
Adamski, Mark	HS	10/12	10	Benson HS	PPS		ML	8	8	Beaumont MS	PPS
Aserlind, Kristen	HS	10/9	10	Westview HS	Beaverton		ML	7	7	Sellwood MS	PPS
Asher, Amanda	ML	7	7	Inza Wood MS	WLWV		No Swap Needed/ML Authorization only				
Behrens, Robert	ML	6	6	Highland Prk MS	Beaverton		HS	9/10	9/10	Sherwood HS	Sherwood
Bell, Erica	ML	7		Fowler MS	Tigard		HS	9/10	9/10	Wilson HS	PPS
Connolly, Bridget	HS	9/11	9	Sunset HS	Beaverton		ML	7	7	Beaumont MS	PPS
Ekman, Donald	HS	9/10	10	Wilson HS	PPS		ML	7	7	Kellogg MS	PPS
Henri, Jodie	ML	7	7	Athey MS	WLWV		HS	10	10	Sherwood HS	Sherwood
Lyon, Sarah	HS	9	9	West Linn HS	WLWV		ML	7	7	Sellwood MS	PPS
Marks, Allison	ML	7	7	Sellwood MS	PPS		HS	10	10	Madison HS	PPS
McPherren, Trisha	HS	10	10	Madison HS	PPS		ML	6	6	Clear Creek MS	GBSD
Moe, Laura	HS	10	10	Sunset HS	Beaverton		ML	8	8	Stoller MS	Beaverton
Moore, Michael	ML	6/8	8	Mt. Tabor MS	PPS		No Swap Needed/ML Authorization only				
Pandey, Annarose	HS	11/12	11/12	Reynolds HS	Reynolds		ML	8	8	Jackson MS	PPS
Saultz, Andrew	HS	12	12	West Linn HS	WLWV		ML	8	8	Binnsmead MS	PPS
Smith, Stacey	HS	9	9	Sunset HS	Beaverton		ML	7	7	Sellwood MS	PPS
Van Lehman, Gayle	ML	7	7	Sellwood MS	PPS		HS	10	10	Westview HS	Beaverton
05-06 COHORT B										
STUDENT	PRIMARY	GRADE	WS 2	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE	WS 1	SCHOOL	SD
Barry, Tricia	ML	6-8	8	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV		HS	9-12	9-12	Wilsonville HS	WLWV
Crane, Cari	HS	9	9	Southridge HS	Beaverton		ML	8	8	H B Lee MS	Reynolds
Crites, Robert	HS	10	10	Gresham HS	GBSD		ML	7	7	Robert Gray MS	PPS
Donaldson, Benjamin	ML	6	6	Sellwood MS	PPS		HS	10	10	West Linn HS	WLWV
Espinosa, Bianca	HS	11/12	11/12	PAIS - Marshall	PPS		ML	7	7	Lake Oswego Jr Hi	LOSD
Ferguson, Emily	ML	7	7	Robert Gray MS	PPS		HS	10	10	Sunset HS	Beaverton
Frese, Cynthia	HS	10		Southridge HS	Beaverton		ML	6	6	Five Oaks MS	Beaverton
Lowery, Jason	HS	9	9	PAIS - Marshall	PPS		ML	7	7	Sunnyside Environ MS	PPS
Nauert, James	HS	10 - 12	10	Southridge HS	Beaverton		ML	6-8	6-8	Sunnyside Environ MS	PPS
Obiesie, Frank	HS	9/11	9	Lake Oswego HS	LOSD		ML	8	8	West Sylvan MS	PPS
Rogers, Anne	HS	9-12	9-12	Lakeridge HS	LOSD		ML	7	7	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV
Schjoll, Kristen	ML	7	7	Five Oaks MS	Beaverton		HS	10	10	Roosevelt HS	PPS
Stamm, Natalie	HS	10	10	Franklin HS	PPS		ML	8	8	Sellwood MS	PPS
Swinehart, Michelle	ML	7	7	Highland Pk MS	Beaverton		ML	9-12	9-12	Marshall HS	PPS
Thornton, John	HS	9	9	David Douglas HS	DDSD		ML	7	7	Athey Creek MS	WLWV
Topness, Leslie	ML	6 - 8	6 - 8	da Vinci MS	PPS		HS	6 - 8	6 - 8	Marshall HS	PPS
Troutman, Jessica	ML	7	7	Winterhaven MS	PPS		HS	12	12	Lincoln HS	PPS
Vaughn, Peter	ML	6	6	Ockley Green MS	PPS		HS	11	11	David Douglas HS	DDSD
Werner, Julie	HS	10	10	West Linn HS	WLWV		ML	6	6	Highland Pk MS	Beaverton

2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

05-06 COHORT C										
STUDENT	PRIMARY	GRADE	WS 2	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE	WS 1	SCHOOL	SD
Alexander, Crystal	ML	7	7	Five Oaks MS	Beaverton		HS	12	12	Oregon City HS	OCSD
Barrett, Jonathan	HS	11/12	11/12	Oregon City HS	OCSD		ML	7	7	Five Oaks MS	Beaverton
Broadfoot, Rhonda	ML	8	8	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV		HS	11	11	Wilson HS	PPS
Chesler, Belle	HS	9-12	9-12	Southridge HS	Beaverton		ML	7/8	7/8	Waluga Jr. High	LOSD
Cole, Laura	HS	10	10	Westview HS	Beaverton		ML	7	7	Meadow Park MS	Beaverton
DeWaard, Brooke	HS	9-12	9-12	Roosevelt HS	PPS		ML	7/8	7/8	Lake Oswego Jr. High	LOSD
Ereckson, Ezra	HS	9-12	9-12	Parkrose HS	Parkrose		ML	6	6	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public
Fair-Layman, Eric	ML	7	7	Rosemont Rdg MS	WLWV		HS	11/12	11/12	The Marshall Campus	PPS
Hously, Dusty	HS	11	11	Wilsonville HS	WLWV		ML	7	7	Stoller MS	Beaverton
Hunter-Thomson, Kristin	ML	7	7	Winterhaven School	PPS		HS	10	10	Marshall Campus/LPA	PPS
Martin, Leah	ML	6	6	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV		HS	9	9	Clackamas HS	WLWV
Nichols, Jeffrey	HS	9/10	9/10	Marshall Campus/PAIS	PPS		ML	7	7	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV
Stephens, Caitlin	ML	6	6	Cedar Park MS	Beaverton		HS	11	11	West Linn HS	WLWV
Straube, Renee	ML	6	6	Five Oaks MS	Beaverton		HS	9-12	9-12	Lakeridge HS	WLWV
Swensen, Leslie-Anne	HS	9	9	Clackamas HS	NCSD		ML	6	6	Cedar Park MS	Beaverton
Taylor, Taren	HS	10	10	Roosevelt HS	PPS		ML	6	6	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV
Tomkins, Julie	HS	12	12	Lincoln HS	PPS		ML	8	8	West Sylvan MS	PPS
Wayne, Jeremy	HS	10	10	Southridge HS	Beaverton		ML	7	7	West Sylvan MS	PPS
Wilkinson, Caleb	HS	10	10	Parkrose HS	Parkrose		ML	7	7	Kellogg MS	PPS

2005-2006 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Summer 2006 Syllabi

Syllabi for Summer 2006 will be submitted under separate cover.

Annual Report to TSPC 2006-'07

Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College

❖

Peter W. Cookson, Jr., Dean

Victoria Chamberlain, Executive Director
Teacher Standards and Practices Commission
465 Commercial Street
Salem, OR 97301

July 12, 2007

Dear Ms. Chamberlain,

I am delighted to submit the Lewis & Clark College Graduate School of
Education and Counseling's Annual Report to the Oregon Teacher Standards
and Practices Commission.

Highlights in the Graduate School have been numerous this year. From the
formation of a Dean's Council to the implementation of our Student Services
Team, we have set in place a strong foundation with which to meet our goals
for the future. Our graduates continue to make a positive impact on the
education community, regionally, locally, and nationally. The hiring of
award-winning faculty, such as Linda Christensen (Oregon Writing Project),
has brought positive insights and new direction to our education programs.

As you will see in our 2006-2007 Annual Report, this has been a year of
transition and triumphs for the entire Graduate School community and the
communities that are touched by our work. I look forward to the coming
academic year and to our continuing work together.

Sincerely,

Peter W. Cookson, Jr.
Dean

2006-2007 Annual Report to the Teacher Standards & Practices Commission
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College

<table>
<tr><td>

OAR 584-010-0050 Annual Report from the Institution

(1) Annual reports shall be submitted to the Commission by the institution by July 31 of each year.
(2) The unit shall identify:
(a) Changes to the mission statement and how it relates to the mission of the college or university;

</td></tr>
</table>

The mission statement of the Graduate School of Education and Counseling at Lewis & Clark College remained the same during the 2006-'07 academic year:

> *The Lewis & Clark Graduate School of Education and Counseling is a community that values the rich diversity of voices and perspectives in a complex world. We reach out to those around us, explore new ideas, and pursue the best practice of education and counseling. We promote open dialogue, inquiry, respect, and social action to enhance the learning of adults and children.*

The mission of the Graduate School supports and is supported by the mission of Lewis & Clark College:

> *The mission of Lewis & Clark College is to know the traditions of the liberal arts, to test their boundaries through ongoing exploration, and to hand on to successive generations the tools and discoveries of this quest. By these means the College pursues the aims of all liberal learning: to seek knowledge for its own sake and to prepare for civic leadership.*

> *The College carries out this mission through undergraduate programs in the arts and sciences and postgraduate programs in the closely related professions of education, counseling, and law. The College mounts these programs as both separately valid and mutually supportive enterprises. In all its endeavors it seeks to be a community of scholars who are alive to inquiry, open to diversity, and disciplined to work in an interdependent world.*

<table>
<tr><td>

(b) Long and short term strategic plans; and

</td></tr>
</table>

Goals and strategies for the Graduate School of Education and Counseling, both short and long term, include the following:

> Strengthen the Resource Base of the School by increasing the School's endowment by $3,000,000; increasing scholarships and student research by $1,500,000; and improving building and grounds;

> Strengthen the Resource Base for Faculty Development by *i*ncreasing faculty salary pool by 5% per year; naming four academic chairs; increasing research funds by $100,000 per year and travel funds by $100,000 per year.

Improve academic planning process through departmentally-based programs and cross-departmental initiatives.

Strengthen outreach and community engagement through departmental partnerships and by increasing the operating support of The Oregon center by a minimum of $150,000.

Resolve Budgeting Stress by increasing annual fund by $150,000 in 2007-2008, $200,000 in 2008-2009; and $250,000 in 2009-2010; lowering taxation and increasing incentives for entrepreneurship.

Continue to Raise Organizational Culture by increasing and improving communication and providing clearer processes.

Raise National Profile of School through on campus or Portland-based national conferences, faculty presentations and publications including *Democracy & Education* Journal.

(c) Program goals that reflect best practice and state and national standards for education.

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program

> The Department faculty continued its work to insert additional course content related to helping our initial teaching license candidates become better prepared to work with second language learners and students identified as having special learning and behavior needs.

Advanced Preparation Programs

> The Department faculty worked with tribal educators to write a second million dollar grant to provide support for Native American students to earn their teaching license.

> The Department faculty worked with five local school districts and one district in the Columbia River Gorge to write a 1.3 million dollar grant to provide support to these districts as they work to improve their services to second language learners.

> The Teacher Education and Educational Leadership programs have both developed new courses to better prepare candidates in working with students identified with special needs and students whose first language is not English

> The Educational Leadership program provided three sessions on integrating issues related to cultural competence into the curriculum for the Initial and Continuing Administrator Licenses. This series of workshops was attended by all contract faculty and many of the adjunct faculty.

> In its continued efforts to strengthen the graduate school faculty, a new tenure track faculty member was added to the Educational Leadership program. Dr. McGhee, currently acting director in the Educational Administration program at Texas State University and Co-Director, National Center for School Improvement at Texas State University-San Marcos will be joining the Graduate School in January 2008. Prior to accepting a university position, Dr. McGhee was, for 12 years, a K-12 principal.

<u>**Counseling Psychology Department**</u>

School Psychology Program

Having successfully been approved by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) in 2005 (until 2010), the School Psychology program is addressing national standards for the training and education of school psychologists and basing our evaluation of the program on successfully addressing those standards.

Having also undergone a combined review of our program by TSPC/NCATE, we have aligned ourselves with best practices at the national/state level by defining and collecting data on a set of "transition periods and items" as our students move through our three- year program. The data we have been collecting on these transition points enables us to better evaluate our effectiveness by attending to our student's progress in carefully delineated categories. Please see the table presented in (3)(a) below which outlines our transition periods and items.

(3) The unit shall show evidence of continual review of programs by:
(a) Reflecting on the degree of accomplishment in meeting the goals through student performance in course work, field studies, and work samples;

<u>**Education Department**</u>

Initial Teacher Preparation Program

The faculty worked collaboratively with a research subgroup of OACTE to examine the quality of work samples and their impact on students' achievement

The Teacher Education Department is committed to providing candidates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be effective and compassionate educators in the field. Each year, the department gathers data and feedback from students to continually evaluate our ability to meet their needs, uphold our guiding principles, and maintain accreditation standards. This year, the faculty approved modifications to our transition points model, which we use to assess student progress through the program. Our new model provides greater clarity and accountability around student progress (See Table 1 for a sample rubric).

Table 1
Middle Level/High School Transition Points

Transition Point 1: Admission Requirements (February – June Year 1)
- ❖ Applicant information
  - o Completed application
  - o Demographic data – these data will not be included in admissions decisions but are collected for analysis purposes
- ❖ Education
  - o BA/BS degree
  - o Minimum 2.75 GPA
  - o Official Transcripts
  - o Demonstration of area content knowledge (determined through education and work experience)
- ❖ Work, Volunteer, & Travel Experience, and Special Skills

- o Completed professional resume
- o Completed personal essay(s)
- ❖ Completed letters of recommendation
- ❖ Admissions ratings
  - o Each candidate is rated from 1=does not meet standard to 4=exceeds standards on academic preparation, experience, diversity, strength of essays, and strength of references. A final overall rating is also given to each candidate. Typically, students with ratings of 2.5 or greater are considered for admission
  - o Ratings are conducted by at least 1 faculty member; this individual brings his/her recommendation to a group of faculty; faculty discuss qualifications and make a final decision

---

Transition Point 2: Pre-field Experience Requirements (June Year 1– August)
- ❖ Fingerprints
- ❖ Completed PA-1 form
- ❖ Acceptance by school for internships (i.e., site placement)
- ❖ Summer term GPA (minimum of 3.0)

Transition Point 3: Requirements during field experience & before entrance to full-time student teaching (August – March)
- ❖ Completed swap form and reflective paper
- ❖ Formative ITP by supervisor and mentor
  - o Ratings (from 1=unsatisfactory to 4=distinguished) will be entered for each student
  - o If formative ITP is not adequate, a plan of action will be devised between student and advisor before student enters internship
- ❖ Fall term GPA (minimum of 3.0)

Transition Point 4: Requirements to complete full-time student teaching (March – June Year 2)
- ❖ Spring term GPA (minimum of 3.0)
- ❖ Minimum of 6 observations
  - o Observations will be coded as completed or not
  - o The Research & Assessment Office will also code and analyze supervisors' and mentors' descriptive reports for 20% of the candidates to examine knowledge, skills, dispositions and change in students' KSD's over time
- ❖ Summative ITP by supervisor and mentor
  - o Ratings (from 1=unsatisfactory to 4=distinguished) will be entered for each student

---

Transition Point 5: Before Program Completion (Summer Year 2)
- ❖ Satisfactory completion of Work Sample 1 and 2
  - o Teacher Education will indicate whether the work samples have met satisfactory completion. The Director of Research & Assessment will meet with faculty twice during the year to gather faculty perspectives on students' patterns of learning and core strengths and weaknesses in knowledge, skills, and dispositions evidenced in the work samples
- ❖ Candidates' perceptions of LC training & resources
  - o The Research & Assessment office will conduct exit interviews with 10% of candidates
  - o Surveys will be administered to gather candidates' perceptions on the program
- ❖ Summer 2 term 1 GPA (minimum 3.0)
- ❖ Successful completion of required coursework
  - o The Teacher Education Department will indicate whether all required coursework has been completed or not

o Cumulative GPA (minimum 3.0)	
❖ Passing test scores	
❖ Completed First Aid training	
❖ Completed Discrimination packet	
❖ Demonstration of completed license requirements	

Transition Point 6: Post Graduation Experience (Spring of Year 1, year 3, and year 6 teaching)
- ❖ Alumni employment information
  - o Employment data will be gathered and updated yearly from TSPC
  - o Alumni surveys in years 1, 3, and 6 post-graduation will included questions on current employment
- ❖ Alumni perceptions of LC preparation for the profession
  - o Surveys will be administered in April of their first year of teaching
- ❖ Alumni reports of the values and practices they implement in the classroom/school
  - o Surveys will be administered in April of their first, third, and sixth year of teaching
- ❖ Employer reports on LC alumni experience
  - o Surveys will be administered to a subset of LC employers in April of our graduates' first year in the profession

At the end of the academic year, the faculty gathered to examine exit survey responses from the previous year's preservice cohorts. Exits surveys asked for students' perspectives on how well prepared they felt across eight key indicators, including, for example, preparation to plan curriculum, preparation to assess student learning, and preparation to respond to individual and cultural differences in the classroom. Students were also invited to share feedback on how their mentor and supervisor contributed to their internship experience and overall learning. The faculty was given copies of students' comments for discussion at the final faculty meeting. During the discussion, faculty members were also asked to include thoughts on student work, particularly any patterns related to learning gaps or improvements they saw in student coursework and work samples. In small groups, faculty devised ideas and plans for the coming school year.

Consistent with national research results, our preservice graduates indicated they needed further assistance in providing differentiated instruction for second language learners and students who struggled with reading. Thirdly, they wanted even more classroom management than the two semester hour course and discussions in numerous student teaching seminars. The faculty is working on allocating three or four semester hours of coursework specific to the first two of these concerns and locating this coursework at the end of the students' year-long internship (May and early June) or immediately following this internship (mid to late June).

The Department continues to collect student course evaluations for each of our courses. Responses from students (N=689) during the Fall 2006 semester reflect the strength of the Lewis & Clark courses (see Table 2).

2006-2007 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Table 2
Mean Scores from Student Course Evaluations – Fall 2006*

	Mean	*SD*
FACULTY		
1. Knowledge of subject	4.83	0.45
2. Appropriate use of class time	4.34	0.86
3. Effective use of course materials	4.41	0.81
4. Engagement of students in meaningful classroom discussion	4.47	0.80
5. Respect for students' values, beliefs and ideas	4.75	0.61
6. Encouragement for students to ask questions and express ideas	4.70	0.66
7. Models and provides support for reflective and critical thinking	4.62	0.71
8. Approachability	4.79	0.55
9. Accessibility (office, phone, e-mail or fax)	4.83	0.44
10. Overall teaching effectiveness	4.57	0.74
Overall faculty	**4.63**	
COURSE		
11. Course materials and resources enhanced student learning	4.37	0.85
12. Assignments were valuable learning experiences	4.33	0.91
13. Appropriate attention to theory	4.56	0.75
14. Appropriate attention to practice	4.58	0.74
15. Relevance to professional development	4.61	0.71
16. Overall rating of course	4.48	0.78
Overall Course	**4.49**	
OVERALL MEAN	**4.56**	

*Rating scale for each item is from 1=Low to 5=High

The Office of Research & Assessment also implemented two new assessments this year. First, a random selection of graduates has been invited to participate in an exit interview with the Director of Research and Assessment. The goal of these interviews is to determine what knowledge, skills, and dispositions students feel they have gained (or have not gained) from our programs. Graduates are invited to reflect on their coursework and internship experiences, their development as professionals, and the successes and challenges they believe they will face when they leave Lewis & Clark and enter the teaching profession.

Second, the Director collaborated with the faculty to devise an online alumni survey, designed to gather the following: (1) alumni perspectives on their Lewis & Clark training, (2) alumni description of their current teaching philosophy, and (3) alumni reports on the practices they currently use in their classroom. More on this survey is shared in the following section.

Advanced Preparation Programs

Based on a review of both student and faculty feedback, the special education program added a new one credit course, SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education. The course is designed each year to provide the students about to complete their special education endorsement and the faculty teaching in the endorsement to review the year, consider the knowledge/skills the candidates still need in order to be as well prepared as possible after an endorsement program, and develop a set of instructional activities to enhance knowledge/skills in the selected content.

In a May, 2007 faculty meetings for the reading program faculty, we discussed the differences between district-affiliated and on-campus students and issues. We have made adjustments to add greater focus on helping students in our advanced programs learn ways to use their new knowledge in support of school-wide literacy practices that draw the school community together. We will also collect more work samples and create binders of excellent examples for each required assignment.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program

The following table reflects the *Transition Periods and Items* about which data is collected regarding the progress of our students through the School Psychology program. These Transition Periods and Items reflect our student's abilities to demonstrate the educational goals and competencies of our program. Please see the section (3)(b) for an example of the ways in which we continue to collect data from our students once they have left the program as graduates as well.

Table 3
Transition Periods and Items for the School Psychology Program (revised 7/06)

1 **Admission Requirements**	Complete application (Y/N) Undergraduate degree GPA GRE verbal score GRE quantitative score GRE writing score Reviewer 1 personal statement score Reviewer 1 resume score Reviewer 1 letters of recommendation score Reviewer 1 overall score Reviewer 2 personal statement score Reviewer 2 resume score Reviewer 2 letters of recommendation score Reviewer 2 overall score Group interview score CPSY Recommendation (Accept/Deny) Graduate admissions committee approval (Y/N)
2 **First Year Requirements**	First term advisor program planning worksheet (Y/N) Petitions for transfer credit/competency evaluations (Y/N/NA) CPSY-581 advisor pre-practicum registration approval form (Y/N) CPSY-585 advisor practicum registration approval form (Y/N) First year program GPA TSPC documents (Fingerprints, PA-1) (Y/N) Proof of practicum student insurance (Y/N) Practicum site pre-approval form (Y/N) Practicum site contract (Y/N) Practicum site supervisor resume (Y/N) Certification of first-aid skills (Y/N)
3 **Second Year Practicum**	Fall practicum student evaluation (items 1-10) Fall weekly record of service hours form (Y/N) Fall summary of hours form (total hours)

Requirements	
	Spring practicum student evaluation (items 1-10) Spring weekly record of service hours form (Y/N) Spring summary of hours form (total hours) Year end practicum site evaluation form (Y/N) Complete internship application (Y/N) Internship contract (Y/N) Internship supervisor resume (Y/N) Proof of internship student insurance (Y/N) Internship registration approval form (w/prog. coord.) (Y/N)
4 **Third Year Internship Requirements**	Fall internship student evaluation form (all items) Fall degree application form (Y/N) Spring internship student evaluation form (all items) Spring weekly record of service hours (Y/N) Spring summary of hours form (total hours) End of year internship site evaluation form (Y/N) Completion of Comprehensive Portfolio (Y/N) Exit interview w/ program coordinator (Y/N)
5 **Program Completion Requirements**	Proof of passing PRAXIS I or CBEST (total score) Proof of passing PRAXIS II (total score) Discrimination and the Oregon Educator Form (Y/N) Ed.S. degree granted (Y/N) License Only approval form (Y/N/NA) License recommendation to TSPC (C-2 Form) (Y/N)

This year, we invited the Director of Research and Assessment to conduct exit focus group sessions with our 2006-2007 graduates. Every completer participated. When asked whether they felt prepared for the profession, all (100%) of the graduating students noted that they felt well prepared to take a position in the field. The internship experience was typically noted as making the greatest impact on students' development as School Psychologists, because it offered them the opportunity to integrate and practice all they had learned. Numerous additional positive themes were shared by the graduating Ed.S. and licensure-only students. Students felt that the program promoted several essential values, particularly the value of diversity and social justice. For example, one graduate noted that the program teaches students to be "accepting of all the different types of people, [including] ethnicity, cultural values, gender, sexual orientation". Another shared that the program, "has a nice focus on a liberal minded education and being respectful of diversity in the environment and in the systems that you work in, and puts you out there to be competent in those areas." Students felt that the faculty modeled these values in their own teaching. Moreover, they felt the professors were "caring", "supportive", and passionate; "they have a lot of passion for what they're doing, and that's inspiring…You're just getting started and they're doing all this stuff in the field and are really excited about it. It's really encouraging."

The graduating students also mentioned areas for program improvement. In particular, they were interested in learning more about teaching methods, gaining more counseling strategies and practical counseling experience, and engaging more with assessment and intervention tools. Our

findings from these focus group sessions will be used for continued program improvement. The sessions will be conducted on an annual basis in order to monitor and best meet the needs of our students over time.

(b) Reflecting on the degree of accomplishments in meeting the goals through follow-up of recent graduates; and

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program

The Graduate School hired a full time Director of Research and Assessment, Dr. Mollie Galloway from Stanford University to assist in assessment of program goals and improving the type and amount of follow-up data obtained from recent graduates.

Our new alumni survey includes scales from previously validated work by Linda Darling Hammond and other nationally recognized research. Items and scales were chosen based on their connection to our guiding principles, with scales examining how well prepared our graduates feel in the following areas: promoting student learning, teaching critical thinking, fostering social development, and understanding leaders. We added additional items around preparation to teach English Language Learners. Questions on philosophy and practice examine teachers' perception of how well they create a learning-, knowledge-, and student-centered classroom environment. We invited 2000-01, 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06 graduates to participate in the survey. To date, we have gathered more than 100 responses. The survey will remain open until the beginning of July, and data will be analyzed in August and September. The faculty will meet again in the Fall to study the findings and discuss implications for our programs. However, analyses with our initial 100 respondents show positive results. For example, findings indicate that these graduates feel quite competent to teach their subject area (M=4.16, SD=.67, on a 1=not at all competent, to 5=highly competent). Most felt that they would chose Lewis & Clark again for their Teacher Education program (M=4.10, SD=1.11, on 1 1=definitely would not choose LC again, to 5=definitely would choose LC again). They also maintained high enjoyment for teaching their subject matter (M=4.55, SD=.69, with 1=no enjoyment, to 5= high enjoyment). Moreover, 62.4% reported that they would like to remain in their position or a similar position for as long as possible, with only 9.7% indicated that they would like to leave as soon as possible. Finally, the majority of our 100 respondents (70.7%) report that they have tried to effect change at their school with regard to policies, practices, school climate etc. These alumni remain highly engaged in the profession.

Future goals with indicators:

The department will use the updated transition point rubric to assess student learning and progress through each of our programs. The exit interviews, exit surveys, and alumni surveys will be conducted yearly during the spring and early summer to ensure continuous feedback from our students regarding their preparation. In addition, this coming year we plan to be more systematic in our analysis and review of student performance related to the work sample and internship. Several faculty will likely pilot a more extensive qualitative examination of the work sample, with attention to student revisions and patterns of learning and expression among

students in the same content area. Mentor and supervisor ratings of the interns will be entered into a database and will be analyzed and reviewed at the end of the year.

Advanced Preparation Programs

In the reading endorsement program, we have made plans to call the graduates of the past five years and have focus group meetings on campus, both to reconnect and to plan ahead.

All advanced programs had a program evaluation form sent to all graduates. These are being reviewed by program faculty to determine if program changes are suggested. Since, compared to the preservice follow-up surveys, the return rate was quite small on the advanced program surveys, we are planning to have students complete these surveys during their last class in the program. This will give us good baseline data that can be compared to follow-up data several years after students complete the program. Since virtually all of our advanced program candidates remain in K-12 education within Oregon, we now have a system in place to more effectively keep in touch with them.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program

School Psychology alumni who graduated in the years 1997/1998, 1998/1999 and 2001/2002, 2002/2003 were sent surveys in October through November of 2005. Quantitative and qualitative results for these survey groups were aggregated in December of 2005 and distributed to the program coordinator and department chair for outcomes analysis. Average turn-around time was 40 days and return rate was 47%.

With regard to overall program satisfaction within all groups surveyed, 86% responded that their educational experiences at Lewis & Clark met their expectations. When asked if they would enroll in the program again, 31% responded "Definitely Would." As reflected in the table below, 66.7% of respondents in the 02/03 survey groups and 33.3% of the 98/99 alumni felt they were "well" prepared as a school psychologist. An average of 92.3% alumni reported working in the public school system, with a majority working in an elementary school setting (76.9% for the 98/99 alumni; 90% for the 02/03 alumni).

Table 4
How well did your education at Lewis & Clark prepare you:

			For your first year as a School Psychologist.			Total
			2=Somewhat	3=Adequately	4=Well	
	1998	Count	2	2	1	5
			40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	2	2	3	7
			28.6%	28.6%	42.9%	100.0%
	98/99	Count	4	4	4	12
		Mean	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
	2002	Count	1	0	0	1
			100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	2003	Count	0	2	6	8
			.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	02/03	Count	1	2	6	9
		Mean	11.1%	22.2%	66.7%	100.0%

2006-2007 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

The Counseling Psychology Department and the Research & Assessment Office collaborated on the first alumni employment survey during the Spring of 2007. We invited all CPSY graduates since 2001 to participate. Twenty-four of the respondents were School Psychology graduates. The results from this survey indicate that 22 of the 24 (91.7%) are still currently working as School Psychologists. Many (47.8%) hope to remain in the same or a similar position as long as they are able. Only 1 School Psychology alumnus reported that he/she would like to leave the position as soon as possible. We have also learned that the majority of these responding graduates have continued their education in the field. For example, 15 of the 24 (77.3%) have gained a license or certification since graduating, and 22 of the 24 (91.7%) report that they typically attend more than one professional development training each year.

(c) Statement of future goals for next academic year with the indicators to be used for measurement of accomplishment.

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program

> The program faculty will develop two new courses to provide initial license candidates with additional instruction in working with second language learners and students identified as having special academic and behavior needs. These courses will be carefully reviewed by analyzing student feedback regarding the courses and obtaining feedback from our supervisors and mentors regarding these courses.

Advanced Preparation Programs

> In the reading endorsement program, we will use the Marshall Cohort (scheduled to begin this fall and supported by an Arthur Vinings Grant) as a case study to evaluate our program. We will collect base-line data during the first class, and have a research plan to continue to collect and analyze data from this 2-year sequence of courses at this site.

> In the special education endorsement program, the students and faculty have decided to create one evening session every semester for three semesters following the semester in which the students complete their program. These seminars will involve evening meetings where the students and faculty will meet to discuss issues graduates are facing in their first year of special education teaching.

> The ESOL faculty has been working very closely with local administrators to ensure that teachers are prepared to design English Language Development lessons as required by their districts. Teachers continue to be introduced to a variety of sheltered strategies appropriate for ELL students, but also design lessons for different acquisition levels based on the forms and functions embedded in the Oregon English Language Proficiency Standards.

> The Educational Leadership faculty has added a course in special education best practices and legal issues to provide candidates with better preparation in this area. We will review feedback from graduates to assess whether they find this work helpful in preparing them to better serve this student population and their families.

<u>Counseling Psychology Department</u>

School Psychology Program
> Last year, we identified the following three goals that we focused on in during the past year to collect data on to improve our program. We will continue to focus on these three goals as we move into the next year. Under each of the three following goals, we describe what we have accomplished this year and what we plan on attending to in the following year:

> 1) Transition periods and items

> Accomplished last year:
> We identified and delineated the Transition periods and items, communicated these items to faculty and students, and we began collecting data on how our students are doing at demonstrating skills in the content areas they represent.

> Still to do:
> This data has begun to help us to identify areas of improvement and strength in the program. One particular area we found we needed to focus on was having clear standards in place in order for students to transition from the first to the second to the third year in the program. We therefore created forms that our students must have signed in a meeting with their advisor in order to advance in the program for the following three areas: Pre-Practicum Registration From; Practicum Registration Approval Form; and Internship Registration Approval Form. By the end of the next academic year, we will be able to assess the effective of these forms and their ability to assess the competencies they reflect.

> 2) Mid-term course evaluations:

> Accomplished last year:
> In order to insure quality instruction throughout our program, each course offered in the School Psychology program this year included a mid-term evaluation. The data collected by the program coordinator will include instructors addressing the following two questions: What has worked well in your teaching this term? What changes/improvements were made to the course based on the data gathered in the mid-term evaluation?

> Still to do:
> We have found these mid-term evaluation to be very effective and making sure that necessary corrections to courses are made midway through the term instead of waiting until the term is over for the students to voice concerns. We have not been collecting the data of the midterm evaluations, but instead have allowed instructors to consult with the Program Coordinator on an as needed basis. We have not been 100% effective in getting each class within the program to use the midterm evaluations and our goal next year is to achieve that.

3) Graduate surveys:

Accomplished this year:
We have taken steps to improve the response rate to our graduate surveys in order to collect the best evaluation data of our program possible from our graduates. The hiring of Mollie Galloway as the Assessment Coordinator has been a big step in this direction. This year, Mollie took on the challenge of interviewing each of our graduating students in order to collect data on their experience in the program. A preliminary analysis of her findings was presented above. Throughout the year, the Program Coordinator will continue to work with Mollie to understand the findings of her Exit Interviews and make appropriate changes to our program.

Still to do:
Mollie plans to send a second alumni survey to our graduates, with particular attention to their perceptions of the preparation they received at Lewis & Clark. In addition, the program coordinator, the internship coordinator and Mollie will collaborate to ensure the data we currently gather from students (e.g., their evaluations of their internship site) is entered and analyzed to help better support students in their professional training.

(4) The unit shall report:
(a) Any deviation from approved programs;
(b) Modifications of programs;

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
       No deviation from our approved program.
       No modifications of our approved program.

Advanced Preparation Programs
       No deviation from our approved programs.

       The Special Educator Endorsement program added a one semester hour required course, SPED 635: Current Issues in Special Education

       The new standards and curriculum for the Initial Administrator License and the Continuing Administrator License were both approved by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and are being implemented.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program
       We have made no substantial changes or modifications to the programs that were previously approved by TSPC.

(c) Any change in the liaison officer;

There are no changes. Sharon Chinn will continue as our liaison officer.

(d) Off-campus programs or courses;

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
>No initial teaching license programs are offered off-campus

Advanced Preparation Programs
>The District-Affiliated Programs Office was moved into the Continuing Studies Unit and continues to work collaboratively with school districts to offer endorsement programs in reading, ESOL, special education, and the initial and continuing administrator license

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program
>This program is not offered off-campus and there are no plans for this to occur.

(e) Evidence that the consortium has reviewed evaluation results and made recommendations for improvement of program design and operation; and

Please see the attached Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 Educational Consortium Meeting Minutes.

(f) Evidence that the institution has provided written response to consortium recommendations.

Table 5
Institutional Response to Educational Consortium Recommendations
NB: this chart is shared with Consortium members

RECOMMENDATION FROM CONSORTIUM	INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE
1. **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Lewis & Clark College's Educational Leadership program move the modified Continuing Administrator License program forward to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission's Program Approval Committee at the first available opportunity. (5 October 2006)	1. A letter, including the Consortium's motion, was signed by Consortium Chair, Nancy McCusker, and will be included in the redesigned program proposal which will move to the Commission for consideration at their November 2006 meeting. (5 October 2006)

NOTE: Annual reports subsequent to year one are intended to be updates only.

Educational Consortium Meeting Minutes
Fall 2006—pages 18-19
Spring 2007—pages 20-22

<div align="center">

Educational Consortium
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College
Fall Meeting Minutes
5 October 2006
Room 201, Rogers Hall

</div>

Members in Attendance
Kristen Winn, Nancy McCusker, Rolf Hanlon, Alix Pickett, and Kimberly Campbell
Non-voting Members in Attendance
Vern Jones and Sharon Chinn
Special Guests
Tom Ruhl

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at approximately 4.15 PM by **Sharon Chinn**. Consortium members introduced themselves and then Sharon gave an overview of the charge to the Educational Consortium.

Educational Administration: Continuing Administrator License Modifications
Tom Ruhl began his comments with a brief history of Lewis & Clark's Educational Administration programs. He shared how the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), in a joint project with the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA), began the process of redesigning administrative license program and license rules in the mid- to late-1990s. By January 1999, all Educational Administration programs in the state had to conform to the new rules and TSPC moved to a new licensing structure which included the Initial Administrator License, the Continuing Administrator License, and the Continuing Superintendent License. Lewis & Clark had programs approved in all three licensure areas by TSPC.

In more recent years, new standards for the field of educational administration were adopted at the national level. TSPC called together a group of stakeholders to review the national standards for incorporation into Oregon's rules. The stakeholders, including COSA and college/university faculty, determined that the national rules were acceptable in some areas and did not go far enough in other areas. An expanded version of the national standards was adopted by TSPC, including standards in cultural competency and administrative ability.

With the adoption of new administrative rules came the need for existing programs to meet the new standards and to have their revised or modified programs reviewed and approved by TSPC. For Lewis & Clark's Initial Administrator License program, that meant a rewrite of the existing approved program. For the Continuing Administrator License program, major modifications of the existing approved program were deemed necessary.

Tom continued saying that the modifications that he was presenting to the Consortium were based strongly on student feedback, particularly feedback in support of retaining the historical flexibility in the Continuing Administrator License program. Students reported appreciating their ability to select courses in the existing approved program that most met their needs, professionally.

Following time to review the major modifications to the program, two suggestions were made, initially: First, to double-check the list of courses on the enclosed chart and, second, to change the cover sheet of the document to read "Major Modification."

<div align="center">

18
2006-2007 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

</div>

Tom also pointed out that all syllabi had been modified to include the new license standards and that a rubric to be used as an assessment tool for all courses was also included. Regarding the rubric, **Kimberly Campbell** asked how the rubrics fit into the actual assessment of student performance in the courses. Tom replied that, by the end of the program and via a portfolio, each student must demonstrate proficiency in all of the new standards. He said that the rubric doesn't drive the grade but that course instructors would give feedback to students based on the rubrics. **Alix Pickett** shared that, in School Counseling, rubrics are filled out by students before and after each course. She questioned whether this process would be the same in the modified Continuing Administrator License program. Tom said that the rubric, at an instructor's discretion, could be used in this way.

Tom continued to walk Consortium members through the proposed modifications. Members reviewed the addition of a newly required course specifically addressing cultural competency. Two additional courses were marked for deletion with their content spread amongst other courses. At the request of students in the program, two additional courses were added to the program offerings.

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Lewis & Clark College's Educational Leadership program move the modified Continuing Administrator License program forward to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission's Program Approval Committee at the first available opportunity.

2005-'06 Annual Report to TSPC
Sharon Chinn reviewed the highlights of Lewis & Clark's *2005-'06 Annual Report to TSPC* with the Consortium members (the report had been sent to the members for their review prior to the meeting). She specifically addressed the institution's response to the Consortium motions over the past year.

Review of New Faculty Hires
Vern Jones handed out a comprehensive list of the new faculty hires in the Graduate School for the 2006-'07 academic year. He presented the expertise and professional background of each of the 7 hires. **Kristin Winn** asked how many of the positions were newly created vs filling existing vacancies. Vern answered that 3 of the 7 faculty hires were filling existing positions.

Review of Administrative Staff Changes
A handout was provided to Consortium members by **Vern Jones** indicating changes to administrative assignments in the Graduate School. A second handout introducing newly-hired administrators was also provided. Vern highlighted the skills and expertise brought to their roles by the new administrators.

New Business

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Spring 2006 Educational Consortium minutes be accepted, as written.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 5.15 P.M. by Nancy McCusker.
Notes taken and submitted by Educational Consortium Executive Secretary, Sharon Chinn.

<div align="center">

Educational Consortium
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College
Spring Meeting Minutes
10 May 2007
Room 201, Rogers Hall

</div>

Members in Attendance
Nancy McCusker, Sarah Weller, Kimberly Campbell, Dick Sagor
Non-voting Members in Attendance
Nancy Nagel and Sharon Chinn
Special Guests
Sherri Carreker, Vern Jones, Peter Cookson, Danielle Torres

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at approximately 4.35 PM by **Sharon Chinn**. Consortium members introduced themselves and then Sharon gave an overview of the charge to the Educational Consortium.

Educational Administration: New Director
Vern Jones, Education Department Chair, informed the Consortium that a new director for the Educational Administration program has been hired: Dr. Marla McGhee. Dr. McGhee, currently acting director in the Educational Administration program at Texas State University, will be joining the Graduate School in January 2008.

Other changes in the Educational Administration program include Dick Sagor stepping down from the position of program director and, instead, taking on the coordination of the doctoral program in Educational Leadership. Tom Ruhl will be leaving the Graduate School to become the program director of the new MAT program at Marylhurst University.

Redesign of Center for Continuing Studies
The director of the Center for Continuing Studies, **Sherri Carreker**, announced that the Graduate School's office of District Affiliated Programs has merged with the Center for Continuing Studies (CCS) and that she has been selected to direct the newly redesigned Center. Sherri handed out the Center's "working document"—a complete and dynamic list of all upcoming and future projects/classes/workshops/conferences. She said that the goal of the Center is to begin planning out the calendar at least a year in advance. She said that the newly reformed Center staff have been working together since March.

Dick Sagor commented that the Center is doing wonderful work and that their work is so tied to the mission of the Graduate School. Sherri said that the next step is to approach alumni regarding their needs and desires for continuing professional development opportunities. Dick agreed that Graduate School alumni should be sought for their input.

Faculty-wise, Sherri went on to say that she has enjoyed sitting down with faculty to see what types of support can be offered by the CCS in moving faculty initiatives forward. She said that CCS has created a system for faculty to bring forward ideas and that a liaison has been appointed to each department to look at budgets and to move proposed projects forward. For proposals coming from outside of the Graduate School, a faculty sponsor will be required. Also, the CCS has been going "on the road" to meet with school districts around Oregon regarding their programming needs.

<div align="center">

20
2006-2007 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

</div>

New Graduate School Program Approval Process (Curriculum Committee)
As the Consortium's representation to the Graduate School's Curriculum Committee, **Sharon Chinn** presented the members with a handout representing the school's newly approved flowchart for program approval. **Sarah Weller** asked whether the process had been used yet. **Nancy Nagel** replied that it had not. **Kimberly Campbell** commented that some minor tweaks to the chart had been made by faculty and that, overall, the faculty viewed the implementation of a clear approval process as a positive.

New Business

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Fall 2006 Educational Consortium minutes be accepted, as written.

Nancy McCusker was honoured for her years of service on the Educational Consortium as a member and as chair. The group wished her well as she heads into retirement. **Sharon Chinn** presented Nancy with one of the brand new "Graduate School" tee-shirts.

Goals of the Graduate School and Formation of Dean's Council
Dean of the Graduate School, **Peter Cookson**, began his comments by announcing the formation of a new Dean's Council. The goal in forming the Council was to try to find a governance structure that worded for the school. Peter said that the Graduate School is a true community and, therefore, a model of shared governance is a good fit. Prior to the formation of the Dean's Council, the Graduate School had attempted to operate with a School-wide Council and a Leadership Team as set out in the Blueprint document. With both groups, although decisions were clearly communicated in a variety of ways, there appeared to be a disconnect between the leadership groups and the Graduate School community, as a whole. To address this disconnect, the Dean's Council was formed and the School-wide Council and Leadership Team absorbed, for the most part, into the Council. The new Council provides the appropriate balance between decision-making and communication. **Nancy Nagel** commented that the Faculty Executive Committee was quite helpful in formulating the idea of the Council. **Kimberly Campbell** said that that Dean's Council was quite wonderful—providing cross-community interactions with actual decisions being made and communicated. **Sharon Chinn** reported that, from the administrative and non-exempt staff perspectives, it was positive to have a place where staff concerns and celebrations could be voiced. **Sarah Weller** added that she was glad to hear that faculty on the Council represent the student voice. **Nancy McCusker** asked how often the Dean's Council was meeting; Peter replied that the group meets weekly.

Peter then moved on to talk about the goals of the Graduate School. He stated the importance of the school established goals and pin-pointing the things that need true focus. Peter handed out to Consortium members the current Graduate School goals. Ultimately, he said, the Graduate School needs to earn its reputation, rejoice in it, and provide leadership in education and counseling. **Dick Sagor** commented on the importance that the goals represent of having a clear direction for the school; to have a "good strategy for uncertain times." Peter agreed and added that the school must stay steady on its already positive course. Sarah said that she was glad to hear discourse around tuition (one of the goals) and asked where students could go to add their input; the Dean's Council, Peter replied. Sarah also commented on the differences in students voice with some students attending for only one year in some programs and for several years in others. Peter added that, at some point, the school would reach the "tipping point" with regard to tuition.

Research and Assessment: Update on Transition Points
Sharon Chinn, on behalf of the Graduate School's Research and Assessment office, handed out a copy of the current Transition Points for all education programs. She re-oriented consortium members to the transition points and explained that the Research and Assessment office is currently working with all programs to update the points in anticipation of upcoming accreditation visits. **Sarah Weller** asked how often NCATE and TSPC visit; Sharon replied that they come on site every 5 to 7 years and that the Graduate School is scheduled for its next visit in April 2010. Sharon added that the Counseling Psychology programs are anticipating a site visit by CACREP in the next couple of years.

School Counseling: New TSPC Rules and Program Approval
Danielle Torres, Summer Director of School Counseling, and **Sharon Chinn** gave members an overview of the changes that TSPC has made to the school counseling program rules. Danielle said that the program faculty are currently comparing the existing program to the new rules and will bring the revised program forward to the Consortium in 2007-'08 for approval prior to moving on to TSPC for approval.

Danielle went on to say that TSPC has also made changes to the types of licenses issued to school counselors, moving to Initial I, Initial II, and Continuing Licenses (following the pattern of changes made earlier in the year to teaching licenses). She said that the differences between the Initial II and the Continuing Licenses are the routes to achieving both. Danielle concluded her remarks by saying that, because TSPC has now made the Continuing License optional, the School Counseling program is currently not admitting new students, giving faculty time to discuss the pros and cons of launching a program. She said that student input on the Continuing License program was currently being sought via a survey.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 6 P.M. by Nancy McCusker.
Notes taken and submitted by Educational Consortium Executive Secretary, Sharon Chinn.

Student Teaching Placements at Two Authorization Levels for 2006-'07 Preservice Students
And
Work Samples at Authorization Levels for 2006-'07 Preservice Students

Key to School Districts:

GBSD – Gresham-Barlow School District
LOSD – Lake Oswego School District
NCSD – North Clackamas School District
OCSD – Oregon City School District
PPS – Portland School District
WLWV – West Linn-Wilsonville School District

Student Teaching Placements and
Work Samples at Two Authorization Levels

Early Childhood/Elementary

MATHCOHORT

STUDENT		PRIMARY	GRADE/WS1	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE/WS2	SCHOOL	SD
Rodrigo	Aguirre	EL	4/5	Vose	Beaverton		EC	2	Vose	Beaverton
Melissa	Bakker-Del Castillo	EC	K	Vose	Beaverton		EL	5	Vose	Beaverton
Michael	Brantley	EL	4	Clarendon	PPS		EC	3	Clarendon	PPS
Jamie	Brown	EC	2	Buckman	PPS		EL	6	Buckman	PPS
Angela	Davis	EL	3	Vose	Beaverton		EC	1	Vose	Beaverton
Zachary	Dillon	EC	3	Beaver Acres	Beaverton		EL	5	Beaver Acres	Beaverton
Ian	Dorresteyn	EL	4/5	Willamette Primary	WLWV		EC	3	Willamette Primary	WLWV
Emily	Hoke	EC	2/3	Sexton Mountain	Beaverton		EL	4/5	Sexton Mountain	Beaverton
Allisen	Klang	EL	3	Duniway	PPS		EC	K	Duniway	PPS
Kira	Knowles	EC	K/1	Arleta	PPS		EL	5	Arleta	PPS
Alysson	McDonald	EL	3	Irvington	PPS		EC	1	Irvington	PPS
Theresa	Molter	EL	4	Irvington	PPS		EC	2	Irvington	PPS
Rebekah	Raymond	EC	3	Clarendon	PPS		EL	4	Clarendon	PPS
Dawn	Rossiter	EC	K	Willamette Primary	WLWV		EL	5	Willamette Primary	WLWV
Jennifer	Smart	EC	2	Vose	Beaverton		EL	4/5	Vose	Beaverton
Megan	Strauch	EL	3	Sexton Mountain	Beaverton		EC	2/3	Sexton Mountain	Beaverton
Susan	Waskey	EC	K	North Gresham	GBSD		EC	5	North Gresham .	GBSD
Sarah	Weller	EL	4/5	Beaver Acres	Beaverton		EC	3	Beaver Acres	Beaverton
Raina	Yarbrough	EL	3	Duniway	PPS		EC	1	Duniway	PPS

L&L COHORT

STUDENT		PRIMARY	GRADE/WS1	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE/WS2	SCHOOL	SD
Jessica	Alva	EL	4/5	Sexton Mountain	Beaverton		EC	2/3	Sexton Mountain	Beaverton
Timothy	Barnes	EL	4/5	MLC	PPS		EC	1	MLC	PPS
Sarah	Black	EL	3	Davis	Reynolds		EC	1/2	Davis	Reynolds
Emily	Eldred	EC	K	Duniway	PPS		EL	3	Duniway	PPS
Danielle	Gahr	EL	4	Highland	GBSD		EC	1	Highland	GBSD
Sarah	Gault	EL	4/5	Sexton Mountain	Beaverton		EC	2/3	Sexton Mountain	Beaverton
Brianne	Groh	EC	2	Buckman	PPS		EC	1	Highland	GBSD
Douglas	Hedeen	EL	4	Arleta	PPS		EC	K/1	Arleta	PPS
Elizabeth	Hoffman	EL	5	Buckman	PPS		EC	3	Buckman	PPS
Michael	Martin	EC	K/1	Sunnyside	PPS		EL	6	Sunnyside	PPS
Cristin	McElwee	EC	K/1	Arleta	PPS		EL	4	Arleta	PPS
Alexis	McKee	EL	4	Buckman	PPS		EC	2	Buckman	PPS
Kira	Pruch	EC	1	Russell Academy	Parkrose		EL	5	Russell Academy	Parkrose
Katharine	Purnell	EL	4	Sexton Mountain	Beaverton		EC	1	Sexton Mountain	Beaverton
Hannah	Ragsdale	EL	3	Alameda	PPS		EC	K	Alameda	PPS
Sarah	Rosman	EL	5	Atkinson	PPS		EC	1	Atkinson	PPS
Helen	Sherman-Wentz	EC	K	Alameda	PPS		EL	4	Alameda	PPS
Lauren	Sonnichsen	EL	3	Chehalem	Beaverton		EC	K	Chehalem	Beaverton
Jonathan	Vogel	EC	2	Arleta	PPS		EL	5	Arleta	PPS
Brian	VonDerahe	EL	5	Russell Academy	Parkrose		EC	1	Russell Academy	Parkrose
Richard	Will	EL	3/4	Highland	GBSD		EC	1	Highland	GBSD

2006-2007 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

SMT COHORT

STUDENT		PRIMARY	GRADE/WS1	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE/WS2	SCHOOL	SD
Amy	Ambrose	EC	K	Willamette Primary	WLWV		EL	4	Buckman	PPS
Lauren	Blodgett	EC	1/2	Sunnyside	PPS		EL	5	Sunnyside	PPS
Bevin	Brott	EL	4	North Gresham	GBSD		EC	1	North Gresham	GBSD
Kelly	Brown	EL	4	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public		EC	2	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public
Benjamin	Buehler	EL	4/5	Beaver Acres	Beaverton		EC	2	Beaver Acres	Beaverton
Travis	Bullard	EC	2	Willamette Primary	WLWV		EL	4/5	Willamette Primary	WLWV
Jennifer	Fenniman	EC	3	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public		EL	5	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public
Maura	Hanlon	EC	1	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public		EL	3	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public
Deborah	Kaplan	EC	1/2	West Tualatin View	Beaverton		EL	5	West Tualatin View	Beaverton
Tera	Kelley	EC	2	Elmonica	Beaverton		EL	5	Elmonica	Beaverton
Amanda	Lindley	EL	4/5	Salish Ponds	Reynolds		EC	1	West Tualatin View	Beaverton
John	Mayer	EC	2	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public		EL	4	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public
Caroline	McLaren	EC	2	Beaver Acres	Beaverton		EL	5	Beaver Acres	Beaverton
Laura	Morikawa	EL	5	Elmonica	Beaverton		EC	2	Elmonica	Beaverton
Eric	Reynolds	EC	3	Elmonica	Beaverton		EL	5	Elmonica	Beaverton
Amanda	Westersund	EL	5	North Gresham	GBSD		EC	2	North Gresham	GBSD

Fall Finishers

STUDENT		PRIMARY	GRADE/WS1	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE/WS2	SCHOOL	SD
Chris	Brown	EL	5	Clarendon	PPS		EC	3	Duniway	PPS
Erik	Davies	EL	3	Daivs	Reynolds		TBA			

2006-2007 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Student Teaching Placements and
Work Samples at Two Authorization Levels

Middle Level/High School

05-06 COHORT A									
STUDENT		PRIMARY	GRADE/WS2	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE/WS1	SCHOOL	SD
Adam	Betzelberger	HS	10	West Linn HS	WLWV		ML	8	Jackson MS	PPS
Britta	Blucher	HS	9 & 11	Canby HS	Canby		ML	7	West Sylvan MS	PPS
Moises	Curiel	HS	9	Franklin HS	PPS		ML	8	Stoller MS	Beaverton
Michael	Durfee	HS	9	Canby HS	Canby		ML	8	Mt. Tabor MS	PPS
Thomas	Hanes	HS	9-12	Oregon City HS	OCSD		ML	6	Mt. Tabor MS	PPS
Michael	Kee	ML	8	Jackson MS	PPS		HS	10	Franklin HS	PPS
Wendy	Miller	HS	9	Westview HS	Beaverton		ML	7	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV
Randi Anne	Miura	HS	10-12	Franklin HS	PPS		ML	6	Highland Park MS	Beaverton
Emily	Pollard	ML	6	Five Oaks MS	Beaverton		ML	6-8	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV
Adam	Randall	HS	9-12	Oregon City HS	OCSD		ML	8	Mt. Tabor MS	PPS
Amelia	Sisco	HS	9-12	Pacific Crest CS	Non-public		ML	6	Highland Park MS	Beaverton
Christopher	Snyder	HS	10	Beaverton HS	Beaverton		ML	7	Binnsmead MS	PPS
Terry	Tanada	ML	8	Mt. Tabor MS	PPS		HS	9-10	Franklin HS	PPS
Alexander	Taylor	HS	9-10	Oregon City HS	OCSD		ML	7	Highland Park MS	Beaverton
Matthew	Welander	HS	10-12	Lakeridge HS	LOSD		ML	8	Highland Park MS	Beaverton
Jennifer	Welburn	HS	9-11	Clackamas HS	NCSD		ML	8	Sellwood MS	PPS
Carol	Whitten	HS	12	West Linn HS	WLWV		ML	6	Mt. Tabor MS	PPS
Stephanie	Wood	HS	10-11	Parkrose HS	Parkrose		ML	8	Highland Park MS	Beaverton
Laura	Young	ML	7	Ackerman MS	Canby		HS	11	Westview HS	Beaverton
05-06 COHORT B									
STUDENT		PRIMARY	GRADE/WS2	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE/WS1	SCHOOL	SD
Megan	Balzer	HS	9	Clackamas HS	NCSD		ML	8	West Sylvan MS	PPS
Beth	Cookler	HS	11	Clackamas HS	NCSD		ML	6	Reynolds MS	Reynolds
Andrew	Dennis	MS	8	Stoller MS	Beaverton		HS	9-12	Franklin HS	PPS
Rebecca	Gundle	MS	8	West Sylvan MS	PPS		HS	9-12	Madison HS	PPS
Stasia	Honnold	MS	7	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public		HS	10	West Linn HS	WLWV
Gabrielle	Iversen	HS	10-12	Lincoln HS	PPS		ML	7-8	Lake Oswego JH	LOSD
Debora	Iyall	HS	9-12	Parkrose HS	Parkrose		ML	7-8	Parkrose MS	Parkrose
Jessica	Keskitalo	HS	9	Wilson HS	PPS		ML	7-8	Lake Oswego JH	LOSD
Erin	Piccolo	HS	9-12	Reynolds HS	Reynolds		ML	6-8	Waluga Jr. High	LOSD
Cailin	Rarey	HS	10	Sunset HS	Beaverton		ML	7	Reynolds MS	Reynolds
Walter	Romas	HS	11	Franklin HS	PPS		ML	6-8	da Vinci Arts MS	PPS
Jeanne	Seamone	ML	6-8	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV		HS	9-12	Wilsonville HS	WLWV
Jacob	Small	HS	9-12	Westview HS	Beaverton		HS	9-12	Oregon City HS	OCSD
Francis	Thomas	HS	10	Cleveland HS	PPS		ML	7	Lake Oswego JH	LOSD
Aron	Wagner	ML	8	Binnsmead MS	PPS		HS	9-12	West Linn HS	WLWV
Sarah	Wheeler	HS	9	Madison HS	PPS		ML	7-9	Pacific Crest CS	Non-public
W.M. Alexander	Wilson	ML	7	Rowe MS	NCSD		HS	11	Parkrose HS	Parkrose
Allison	Winningstad	HS	10	Southridge HS	Beaverton		ML	8	Reynolds MS	Reynolds
Chrystal	Young	ML	7	Clear Creek MS	GBSD		HS	9-12	Franklin HS	PPS

05-06 COHORT C									
STUDENT		PRIMARY	GRADE/WS2	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE/WS1	SCHOOL	SD
Tiffany	Aria	ML	8	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV		HS	12	Canby HS	Canby
Hayley	Barker	ML	7-8	Waluga Jr. High	LOSD		HS	9-12	Reynolds HS	Reynolds
Meghan	Ewing	HS	10-11	Westview HS	Beaverton		ML	7	Binnsmead MS	PPS
Gabriel	Griffin	ML	7	West Sylvan MS	PPS		HS	10	Oregon City HS	OCSD
Robin	Hampson	ML	7	Jackson MS	PPS		HS	7-12	Pacific Crest CS	Non-public
Gillian	Howe	HS	9, 11	Sunset HS	Beaverton		ML	6-8	Mt. Tabor MS	PPS
Amelia	Johnson	ML	8	Reynolds MS	Reynolds		HS	9-12	Cleveland HS	PPS
Hector	Kent	HS	10	West Linn HS	WLWV		ML	7	Athey Creek MS	WLWV
Laura	Knapp	ML	8	Lake Oswego JH	LOSD		HS	11	Franklin HS	PPS
Kevin	Marquardt	HS	9	Cleveland HS	PPS		ML	8	Stoller MS	PPS
Logan	Marquardt	HS	10-12	Franklin HS	PPS		ML	8	Mt. Tabor MS	Beaverton
Erin	Ocon	ML	7	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV		HS	9	Madison HS	PPS
Victoria	Owenius	HS	9	Canby HS	Canby		ML	7	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV
Rachel	Pass	HS	9-12	Cleveland HS	PPS		ML	6	Athey Creek MS	WLWV
A. Elizabeth	Reichle	ML	7	Binnsmead MS	PPS		HS	9-12	Cleveland HS	PPS
Tyler	Smith	HS	10	Westview HS	Beaverton		ML	7	Rowe MS	NCSD
Carrie	Sorric	HS	9-12	Reynolds HS	Reynolds		ML	6-8	Catlin Gabel	Non-Public
Anna	Tellez	ML	9-12	Metropolitan Learning Ctr	PPS		ML	7-8	Metropolitan Learning Ctr	PPS
Kelly	Turner	HS	9	Franklin HS	PPS		ML	8	Stoller MS	Beaverton
Karin	Wetzel	HS	10-12	Lincoln HS	PPS		ML	6-8	Reynolds MS	Reynolds

Fall Finishers	Fall Finishers									
STUDENT		PRIMARY	GRADE/WS2	SCHOOL	SD		SWAP	GRADE/WS1	SCHOOL	SD
Carolina	Barros	HS	9-12	Wilsonville HS	WLWV		ML	6-8	Rosemont Ridge MS	WLWV
Thais	Gruning	ML	9 & 11	Linus Pauling Acad.	PPS		ML	6	Inza Wood MS	WLWV
Laurie	Hilliard	HS	9-12	Cleveland HS	PPS		ML	6-8	Sunnyside Environmental	PPS
Gabriel	Minthorn	HS	12	Sunset HS	Beaverton		ML	6-8	Ackerman MS	Canby
Andrea	Walter	HS	9	Madison HS	PPS		ML	6-8	da Vinci Arts MS	PPS

Annual Report to TSPC 2007-'08

Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College

❖

Jane Monnig Atkinson, Interim Dean

Victoria Chamberlain, Executive Director
Teacher Standards and Practices Commission
465 Commercial Street
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Ms. Chamberlain,   27 June 2008

On behalf of Lewis & Clark College, I am pleased to submit our Graduate School of Education and Counseling's Annual Report to the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. As you will see in the following pages, the Graduate School has been active and successful on many fronts. In addition to what is contained in our report, I would note that Lewis & Clark had its ten year evaluation visit by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities this spring. The report by the evaluation team is positive and highlights a number of strengths of the Graduate School. And despite the current state of the economy, enrollment in our 2008-09 MAT/Initial Teaching License Preservice program is the largest in its history, with a total of 131 students—65 in Early Childhood/Elementary and 66 in Middle Level/High School.

It has been my privilege to serve as interim dean of the Graduate School for the past academic year. As you are aware, this has been a transitional year for the school as we undertook a search to replace Dr. Peter Cookson, who left the College last September. President Hochstettler engaged Storbeck-Pimentel, the same national search firm that brought him to Lewis & Clark, to assist with the search process. The search committee, made up of two members of the Board of Trustees, three faculty, two students, and myself, selected three finalists from a highly qualified national pool for campus interviews. Last month, President Hochstettler announced the appointment of Dr. Scott Fletcher, Chair of the Education Department at University of New Hampshire as the new Dean of the Graduate School.

Dr. Fletcher graduated summa cum laude with a major in philosophy from Ripon College, then went on to earn a master's degree in philosophy from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a Ph.D. in Social Foundations of Education from the University of Colorado-Boulder. His book *Education and Emancipation: Theory and Practice in a New Constellation* earned the American Educational Studies Association Critics' Choice Award in 2001. His distinctive accomplishments as a teacher, scholar, and academic leader give us confidence that he will advance our commitment to preparing students to become effective practitioners who possess both an analytical understanding of institutional and societal contexts in which they work and the critical tools to improve the schools and community institutions in which they serve.

Although Dean Fletcher's appointment does not begin until August 1, he has already spent the better part of a week on campus meeting with faculty and staff in preparation for the coming year. I know he looks forward to making your acquaintance and to taking an active part in education at the state and local levels here in the Northwest.

Sincerely,

Jane Monnig Atkinson
Vice President and Provost and Interim Dean of the Graduate School

2007-2008
Annual Report to the Teacher Standards & Practices Commission
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College

> ## OAR 584-010-0050 Annual Report from the Unit
>
> **(1) Annual reports will be submitted to the Commission by July 31 of each year...**
> **(2) The unit shall identify:**
> **(a) Changes to the mission statement and how it relates to the mission of the college or university;**

While the mission of the Graduate School remains unchanged, during the October 2007 meeting of the Graduate Faculty, the faculty voted to modify the language of the Graduate School's "Guiding Principles/Standards."   The revisions to the guiding principles and standards were undertaken in an effort to make the language inclusive of all of the Graduate School's programs and in anticipation of upcoming accreditation site visits with the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP), the Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), and the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC).

Guiding Principles/Standards—Original	Guiding Principles/Standards—Revised October 2007
Learning Environments Create democratic learning communities in which caring, equity, social justice, and inclusion are practiced and diverse perspectives, supported.	**Learning and Living Environments** Create democratic learning communities in which caring, equity, social justice, and inclusion are practiced and diverse perspectives are supported.
Content Knowledge Integrate fundamental and emergent components of disciplinary knowledge in ways that extend learners' experience and enhance their own and students' capacity to solve problems.	**Disciplinary Knowledge** Integrate fundamental and emergent components of disciplinary knowledge in ways that extend and enhance experiences of the diverse individuals and groups we serve. Use this knowledge to augment our own capacity to solve problems, even as we support individuals and communities in problem solving.
Teaching Approaches Engage students and school personnel in meaningful learning experiences responsive to individual differences, interests, developmental levels, and cultural contexts.	**Professional Practice** Engage individuals, families and the professionals who support them in meaningful learning, counseling and therapy, and community-building experiences responsive to individual differences, interests, developmental levels, and cultural contexts.
Connection to Community Design educational activities that cultivate connections between learners and their communities and region.	**Connection to Community** Design learning and counseling activities that cultivate connections between individuals, families, and their communities and region.
Educational Resources Incorporate a wide range of teaching and technological resources from the school and community into experiences that support learning.	**Professional and Technological Resources** Incorporate a wide range of professional and technological resources into experiences that support learning, mental health, and community well-being.
Assessment Assess, document, and advocate for the successful learning of all students and school stakeholders.	**Assessment** Assess, document, and advocate for the successful learning and living of all people involved in schools and communities.
Research and Reflection Adopt habits of personal and scholarly reflection that examine professional practice and lead to systemic renewal.	**Research and Reflection** Adopt habits of personal and scholarly reflection that examine professional practice and lead to systemic renewal.
Leadership and Collaboration Lead and collaborate with others to plan, organize, and implement educational practices and programs that confront the impact of societal and institutional barriers to academic success and personal growth.	**Leadership and Collaboration** Lead and collaborate with others to plan, organize, and implement educational and counseling practices and programs that confront the impact of societal and institutional barriers to academic success, personal growth, and community well-being.
Professional Life Pursue a professional identity that demonstrates respect for diverse peoples, ideas, and cultures.	**Professional Life** Pursue a professional identity that demonstrates a commitment to the legal, ethical, and professional responsibilities of our profession(s).

(b) Long and short term strategic plans; and

Long and short term strategic plans for the Graduate School include:

- Selection of a new associate dean to replace Dr. Nancy Nagel, who is returning the Teacher Education Faculty this fall.
- Completion of a successful hire of a new chair for the Ed.D. program to succeed Dr. Richard Sagor, who retired this year. (Pending this appointment, the School chose this spring to defer bringing in a new doctoral cohort, despite strong demand for the program, in order to ensure that students currently in the program have the faculty support they need for their dissertation work.)
- The Counseling Psychology Department will undergo review for CACREP accreditation in the coming academic year. School Counseling, housed in the Education Department, will be part of this review.
- Our Marriage, Couple and Family Therapy program will be reviewed for COAMFTE accreditation this year as well.
- Adoption of a new institutional formula for allocating costs for administrative services at the College that will lower the overhead charges to the Graduate School for district-affiliated courses taught off-campus. A recommendation for the new cost allocation formula is expected to go to the Board of Trustees this winter.
- Enhanced support for Graduate School development efforts has been promised by the Institutional Advancement division and a major gifts officer has been assigned to work long-term with the School to build the donor base and attract funding, particularly for student scholarships.

(3) The unit will show evidence of continual review of programs by:
(a) Reflecting on the degree of accomplishment in meeting the goals through student performance in course work, field studies, and work samples;

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
As it does every year, the Education Department faculty met in early May to review the data provided by the Office of Research and Assessment and determine if any program modifications were needed in light of this data. Students indicated a need for additional work on serving second language learners, and a two semester hour (3 quarter hour) course on this topic had already been built into the 2007/08 preservice program and began the next week. Some data suggests students also desire additional material on working with students identified as having special needs and the faculty scheduled a meeting in July to discuss how the new ESOL course had met student needs and incorporate this data into a discussion about the issue of additional work in special education.

In addition to the exit surveys that the program conducts each year (which ask students to provide feedback on program preparation, mentor and supervisor) the 2007-08 preservice graduates will be invited to participate in a focus group session with the Director of Research & Assessment. These sessions will provide students with opportunity to more deeply reflect upon and share about their experience in the MAT program. Focus group results will be shared with faculty in the 2008-09 school year.

Advanced Preparation Programs

> The ESOL and Special Educator endorsements had both undergone revisions in the past two years and, along with the Reading Endorsement program appear to be receiving very positive evaluations from students. In addition, given the large number of requests from school districts to provide these endorsements on site, it appears they are also meeting the needs of regional public schools.

> The Reading Endorsement program faculty received an Arthur Vinings Grant to provide a reading endorsement program at Marshall High School in Portland. The faculty has been collecting data regarding participants' work with their students.

> The Educational Leadership program completed its first year under its newly designed Initial and Continuing License programs. Faculty reviews of student evaluations of the coursework indicate students are finding the material meaningful. Since the Graduate School conducts no marketing, the increased enrollments for summer, 2008 (the highest in the past five years) suggest that participants are informing their colleagues that the program is providing them strong preparation.

> The School Counseling faculty met independently to review their data and reported that, based on their review of student input, they planned no curricular changes for the 2008/09 academic year.

> The Office of Research & Assessment developed a new exit survey for distribution to graduates and program completers across all programs. The first wave of data collection occurred in May 2008. The survey is designed to evaluate students' perceptions of their graduate school experience, including strengths and weaknesses of Lewis & Clark programs and student services. We also hope to gather employment information through this exit survey.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program

> This year the School Psychology Program produced a report for TSPC in which we demonstrated how our present configuration of courses aligns with the newly adopted standards by TSPC for programs in school psychology. These newly adopted TSPC standards are, in fact, the same NASP standards that our program have been aligned with since receiving NASP program approval in 2005. Our program recently received re-approval from TSPC based on the data provided in these tables.

> One of the most significant domains from the NASP/TSPC standards relates to programs having a comprehensive system in place to assess the performance of students in our program as well as the program itself as articulated in the language from the NASP domain IV listed below:

>> NASP Domain IV. PERFORMANCE-BASED PROGRAM ASSESSMENT
>> AND ACCOUNTABILITY
>> School psychology training programs employ systematic, valid evaluation of candidates, coursework, practica, Internship, faculty, supervisors, and resources and use the resulting information to monitor and improve program quality. A key aspect of program accountability is the assessment of the knowledge and capabilities of school psychology candidates and of the positive impact that

interns and graduates have on services to children, youth, families, and other consumers.

At LC, we see the questions listed in this TSPC document as congruent with this NASP domain. Therefore, we outline the goals we determined last year towards constructing and implementing this comprehensive assessment system regarding student performance, the steps we made toward accomplishing these goals over the past year, as well as what goals remain for next year.

Goals from 2007/2008 towards constructing/implementing our comprehensive assessment system
- Updating and revising the assessment sequence
- Creating coherence in curriculum between and among coursework
- Creating coherence in and understanding about "program flow"
- Creating student assessment checkpoints at important moments in the program
- Implementing a first year practicum

Steps we made toward accomplishing these goals over the past year
- Updating and revising the assessment sequence
    The goal with this project was to create coherence in the four course assessment sequence in our program. We have accomplished this by monthly meetings in which the instructors of these courses discuss the focus of the curriculum along with the program coordinator. Please see the language for the revised sequence in the section on program changes below.
- Creating coherence in curriculum between and among coursework
    The School Psychology Program team has been meeting on a monthly meeting in order to make explicit the connections between the courses we are teaching. This has been extremely helpful in making clear "who should be teaching what parts of the curriculum and when." One comment from a 10 year veteran of the program after one of these meetings underscores what has been accomplished at these meetings: "After all these years, I feel like I finally understand the program!"
- Creating coherence in and understanding about "program flow"
- Creating student assessment checkpoints at important moments in the program
    Toward both these goals, we have created forms that ensure students have, for example, met with an advisor and put together a program plan before they begin classes. These have been very helpful, not only in tracking students through the program, but in giving the students a clearer understanding of what needs to be accomplished in order to move on to the next phase of the program.
- Implementing a first year practicum
    Starting in the fall of 2008, we will implement requirements for a "first year practicum" which include volunteer and observation time in local schools, working with a school psychologist. This first year practicum will allow us to take certain program requirements and expectation out of our second year practicum and third year internship which will thereby create more necessary prioritization in those experiences.

Goals that remain for next year.
- Creating coherence between and among coursework
    Specifically, we will create a handbook online which will give the students easy access to all the documents that structure and guide the program.

• Aligning student assessments in practicum and internship with NASP/TSPC standards
   We will accomplish by creating student evaluation from both the site supervisor and the campus supervisor that will be directly referencing the NASP/TSPC standards in both practicum and internship.
• Linking coursework syllabi directly to the NASP/TSPC standards
   We will accomplish this by sharing at program meetings this coming year a new document we have created that shows which NASP/TSPC standards are being addressed in which classes. We will, in this way, be able to more closely align specific course syllabi with these standards.

The Director of Research & Assessment conducted exit focus group sessions with all of the 2007-08 graduates in the School Psychology program. The aim of these sessions was to gather students' perceptions of their experiences and sense of preparation upon completion of all program coursework and field work.

In addition the Program Director and Director of Research & Assessment devised a new assessment tool to examine students' perceptions of the role of a school psychologist, the core competencies of a school psychologist, and Lewis & Clark's effectiveness in providing quality preparation in the core competencies. We will conduct this assessment at three time points during the students' program: upon entry, after completing all coursework (i.e., at the end of the second year), and after completing their internship (i.e., at the end of the program). This longitudinal data will allow us to examine change in students' perceptions of the roles and core competencies of school psychologists over the 3-year program. To date, we have gathered these data from 2007-08 program completers, and students completing their second year.

Several key findings emerged from the focus group sessions and surveys. Like last year, program completers expressed feeling prepared to enter the profession. While they recognized they still have much more to learn as they enter the profession, they indicated feeling "competent" and stated that they know where to seek out resources when they have questions. One student commented that Lewis & Clark "gives you a confidence"; even though you may not know an answer, "you know how to find it and you're not afraid to seek it out."

The majority of completers reported program strengths in areas of consultation and counseling theory and practice. Students also noted that the internship experience had the most significant impact on developing their skills in the field, because they could practice what they had learned in action.

Students were also invited to provide feedback regarding areas in which the program could provide additional preparation. The most often mentioned recommendation was the need to integrate more learning theory, general education curriculum, and effective instructional practices into the program.

(b) Reflecting on the degree of accomplishments in meeting the goals through follow-up of recent graduates; and

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program

> The Office of Research & Assessment sent an online survey to more than 300 teacher education alumni (both preservice and inservice) in June 2007. The survey was designed to assess alumni's perceptions of the preparation they received from the Graduate School and to learn about their current classroom beliefs and practices. Pre-service alumni (n=93) reported feeling particularly well-prepared to promote students' learning and social development and to remain committed to differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all learners in the classroom. They recommended that pre-service programs include additional preparation in working with ELL's and Special Education populations. These recommendations were addressed in the department's implementation of an ESOL strategies class at the end of the pre-service year (implemented in the 2007-08 school year).

Advanced Preparation Programs

> Over the 2007-08 academic year, alumni data collection for advanced preparation programs focused most intensively on the ESOL and School Counseling programs. Faculty in the ESOL program collaborated with the Office of Research & Assessment to design a survey to examine Lewis & Clark ESOL program completers': (1) motivation for gaining ESOL preparation, (2) perceptions of effectiveness of training, (3) perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of obtaining an ESOL endorsement, and (4) recommendations for supporting English Language Learners in K-12 settings. We gathered data from 44 ESOL alumni. Findings from this study were presented at the Oregon Association of Latino Educators in February 2008.

> In School Counseling, Lewis & Clark collaborated with OSCA to design a survey to identify the most pressing professional development needs of practicing Oregon School Counselors and to assess counselors' perceptions of how effectively their post-baccalaureate education prepared them for the profession. This was a statewide survey. However, approximately 50 of the total responses received were from Lewis & Clark School Counseling program graduates. The Office of Research & Assessment, along with faculty in the School Counseling program, are currently reviewing and analyzing data from these graduates to inform the program.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program

> As described in 3a above, one of the most significant domains from the NASP/TSPC standards relates to programs having a comprehensive system in place to assess the performance of students in our program as well as the program itself. Below, we outline the goals we had in place last year towards constructing and implementing this comprehensive assessment system with specific regard to follow up of recent graduates, the steps we made toward accomplishing these goals over the past year, as well as what goals remain for next year.

Goals from 2007/2008 towards constructing/implementing our comprehensive assessment system
• Collect and utilize data from "program completers" just finishing the program, graduates who are one year out of the program, and graduates who are five years out of the program
• Collect and maintain a database of recent graduate addresses and contact info

Steps we made toward accomplishing these goals over the past year
• Exit interviews and focus groups
The Director of Research & Assessment conducted exit focus group sessions with all of the 2007-08 graduates in the School Psychology program. The aim of these sessions was to gather students' perceptions of their experiences and sense of preparation upon completion of all program coursework and field work and to use student comments and evaluations to build on strengths and address weaknesses in the program.

Several key findings emerged from the focus group sessions and surveys. Like last year, program completers expressed feeling prepared to enter the profession. While they recognized they still have much more to learn as they enter the profession, they indicated feeling "competent" and stated that they know where to seek out resources when they have questions. One student commented that Lewis & Clark "gives you a confidence"; even though you may not know an answer, "you know how to find it and you're not afraid to seek it out."

The majority of completers reported program strengths in areas of consultation and counseling theory and practice. Students also noted that the internship experience had the most significant impact on developing their skills in the field, because they could practice what they had learned in action.

Students were also invited to provide feedback regarding areas in which the program could provide additional preparation. The most often mentioned recommendation was the need to integrate more learning theory, general education curriculum, and effective instructional practices into the program.

• Student Assessments of Program
In addition the School Psychology Program Coordinator and the Director of Research & Assessment devised a new assessment tool to examine students' perceptions regarding the following three areas:

1. The role of a school psychologist
2. The core competencies of a school psychologist
3. Lewis & Clark's effectiveness in providing quality preparation in the core competencies

We will conduct the assessment regarding these three areas at three time points during the students' program: upon entry, after completing all coursework (i.e., at the end of the second year), and after completing their internship (i.e., at the end of the program). This longitudinal data will allow us to examine change in students' perceptions of the roles and core competencies of school psychologists over the 3-year program. To date, we have gathered these data from 2007-08 program completers, and students completing their second year.

Goals that remain for next year.
In September 2008, the Office of Research & Assessment will send additional alumni surveys to recent graduates. Drawing on the survey template from previous years, this survey will assess students' perceptions of the program's effectiveness in preparing students in core NASP competencies.

(c) Statement of future goals for next academic year with the indicators to be used for measurement of accomplishment.

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
> The faculty in Teacher Education will review the secondary literacy course to determine the course content and goals balance between reading and assistance to second language learners. In both the elementary and secondary licensure programs, the faculty will review the type and amount of content and goals related to candidate's knowledge and skills in assisting students identified as having special needs.

Advanced Preparation Programs
> These programs are in high demand, have all had recent revisions that appear to be meeting the needs of students and school districts, and thus few if any changes are anticipated for next year. The Educational Leadership faculty is currently reviewing the number of electives in the Continuing Administrator License to determine whether the program can be streamlined somewhat and focus offerings on issues central to the work of practicing administrators. The Educational Leadership program conducted an unsuccessful search to replace Dr. Dick Sagor, Director of the Ed.D. program, and is currently searching for a one-year replacement for this position while we prepare for a continued national search for his replacement.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program
> Last year, we identified the following three goals that we focused on in during the past year to collect data on to improve our program. We will continue to focus on these three goals as we move into the next year. Under each of the three following goals, we describe what we have accomplished this year and what we plan on attending to in the following year:

> 1) Transition periods and items
> Accomplished last year:
> We identified and delineated the Transition periods and items, communicated these items to faculty and students, and we began collecting data on how our students are doing at demonstrating skills in the content areas they represent.

> Still to do:
> This data has begun to help us to identify areas of improvement and strength in the program. One particular area we found we needed to focus on was having clear standards in place in order for students to transition from the first to the second to the third year in the program. We therefore created forms that our students must have signed in a meeting

with their advisor in order to advance in the program for the following three areas: Pre-Practicum Registration From; Practicum Registration Approval Form; and Internship Registration Approval Form. By the end of the next academic year, we will be able to assess the effective of these forms and their ability to assess the competencies they reflect.

2) Mid-term course evaluations:
Accomplished last year:
In order to insure quality instruction throughout our program, each course offered in the School Psychology program this year included a mid-term evaluation. The data collected by the program coordinator will include instructors addressing the following two questions: What has worked well in your teaching this term? What changes/improvements were made to the course based on the data gathered in the mid-term evaluation?

Still to do:
We have found these mid-term evaluation to be very effective and making sure that necessary corrections to courses are made midway through the term instead of waiting until the term is over for the students to voice concerns. We have not been collecting the data of the midterm evaluations, but instead have allowed instructors to consult with the Program Coordinator on an as needed basis. We have not been 100% effective in getting each class within the program to use the midterm evaluations and our goal next year is to achieve that.

3) Graduate surveys:
Accomplished this year:
We have taken steps to improve the response rate to our graduate surveys in order to collect the best evaluation data of our program possible from our graduates. The hiring of Mollie Galloway as the Director of Research and Assessment for the Graduate School has been a big step in this direction. This year, Mollie took on the challenge of interviewing each of our graduating students in order to collect data on their experience in the program. A preliminary analysis of her findings was presented above. Throughout the year, the Program Coordinator will continue to work with Mollie to understand the findings of her Exit Interviews and make appropriate changes to our program.

Still to do:
Mollie plans to send a second alumni survey to our graduates, with particular attention to their perceptions of the preparation they received at Lewis & Clark. In addition, the program coordinator, the internship coordinator and Mollie will collaborate to ensure the data we currently gather from students (e.g., their evaluations of their internship site) is entered and analyzed to help better support students in their professional training.

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
>   No deviation from our approved program.

Advanced Preparation Programs
>   No deviation from our approved programs.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program
>   No deviation from our approved program.

(b) Modifications of programs not subject to OAR 584-010-0045;

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
>   No modification of our approved program.

Advanced Preparation Programs
>   No modifications of our approved programs.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program
>   As described in 3a above, this year we undertook a revision of the School Psychology Program
>   Assessment sequence in order to keep it up to date with changes in the field and to better
>   integrate it into the flow and sequence of our curriculum goals as articulated by the NASP/TSPC
>   standards. We have taken a "narrative" framework in the revision of the sequence in that what
>   used to be discrete classes based on topics (e.g. Social emotional assessment, cognitive
>   assessment, etc) is now a set of classes that contain on interconnected focus on the natural
>   progression of assessing children in schools for particular needs (e.g. the first class now
>   addresses RTI and early intervention issues, the second class now focuses on assessment
>   batteries that are used once a child is referred, and the third class now focuses on compiling,
>   integrating and reporting our the data from this assessment process to important stakeholders.
>   Below we give the basic catalogue language that is now used to describe this three class
>   sequence.
>
>   CPSY 541: Assessment and Intervention I
>   This course is the first of a three-part assessment sequence that addresses psycho-educational,
>   social, emotional, and behavioral assessment of children and adolescents from birth through age
>   twenty-one. In this course, the focus is on gaining competency with the skills and tools needed to

collect, interpret and present data using observation, interviews, behavior rating scales, functional behavioral assessments, and response to intervention.

CPSY 542: Assessment and Intervention II
This course is the second of a three-part assessment sequence that addresses psycho-educational, social, emotional, and behavioral assessment of children and adolescents from birth through age twenty-one. In this course, the focus is on gaining competency with the skills and tools needed to collect, interpret and present data using psycho-educational assessments involving cognitive, academic, and adaptive measures.

CPSY 543: Assessment and Intervention III
This course is the third of a three-part assessment sequence that addresses psycho-educational, social, emotional, and behavioral assessment of children and adolescents from birth through age twenty-one. In this course, the focus is on gaining competency with the skills and tools required to interpret and integrate multiple assessment measures, including reporting and consulting on such assessment data in written and verbal formats.

(c) Any change in the liaison officer;

There are no changes. Sharon Chinn will continue as our liaison officer.

(d) Addition of off-campus courses, including but not limited [to] the addition of online or distance delivery of courses within an approved program;

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
No initial teaching license programs are offered off campus

Advanced Preparation Programs
No changes were made to programs offered off campus. During the 2007/08 fiscal year, the ESOL program began coursework offerings in Forest Grove, The Dalles and Tigard-Tualatin School District. The Reading Endorsement program began coursework for endorsement programs at Marshall High School, Atkinson Elementary School, and the David Douglas School District.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program
None.

(e) Evidence that the consortium meets regularly and has reviewed evaluation results and made recommendations for improvement of program design and operation;

Please see the attached Winter 2008 and Spring 2008 Educational Consortium meeting minutes.

(f) Evidence that the unit has provided written response to consortium recommendations; and

Institutional Response to Educational Consortium Recommendations
NB: this chart is shared with Consortium members

RECOMMENDATION FROM CONSORTIUM	INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE
Action: The consortium would like to explore setting up a sub-committee on technology. Sharon Chinn will follow up with the group later this summer to set up the committee. (24 January 2008)	Sharon Chinn has been collecting resources for the subcommittee throughout the spring and will contact consortium members regarding establishing the subcommittee in late July. (Summer 2008)
Motion: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Lewis & Clark College's Initial I School Counseling License program not need to go through a full review process with TSPC because the program already adheres to the national standards. The matrices demonstrating that all standards are met both in the old and the new rules should be submitted to TSPC at the next available opportunity. (24 January 2008)	Laura Pedersen submitted the proposal to TSPC at their February meeting. The proposal was accepted. (Spring 2008)
Action: The consortium requests that the Graduate School continue to pursue funding for financial aid and report back to the consortium annually. (17 April 2008)	The graduate dean will report back to the consortium during each academic year. (2008-'09)
Action: The consortium requests that the Graduate School explore whether there should be a language requirement for students participating in international courses. (17 April 2008)	Sharon Chinn will request of Lisa Pogue that a language requirement be considered. Sharon will report back to the consortium. (Fall 2008)
Action: The consortium requests that, when appropriate, members be informed of the context behind graduate school actions and decisions. (17 April 2008)	Sharon Chinn will ensure that attendees speaking to agenda items present the context behind those items. (2008-'09)
Action: The consortium requests that, when updated by the new dean, a new organizational chart be provided. (17 April 2008)	Once developed, the updated organizational chart of the graduate school will be provided to consortium members. (2008-'09)

2007-2008 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

(g) Data indicating number of students enrolled in approved programs by content and authorization levels and how this compares to the previous five years.

*Pre-service M.A.T. with Initial Teaching License Historical Enrollment

	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05	2003-04	2002-03
Art, ML/HS	4	7	7	8	3	4
Language Arts, ML/HS	18	19	22	20	24	20
Foreign Language, Spanish and French, ML/HS	4	1	0	0	0	4
Mathematics, Basic and Advanced, ML/HS	7	4	2	4	4	5
Multiple Subjects, EC/EL	60	62	61	47	42	50
Music, ML/HS	2	0	0	0	1	0
Biology, ML/HS	8	6	8	9	8	4
Chemistry, ML/HS	1	0	0	2	0	1
Physics, ML/HS	0	2	0	0	1	1
Integrated Science, ML/HS	4	3	2	1	0	1
Social Studies, ML/HS	18	23	18	19	24	24

*In-service and Advanced Program Historical Enrollment
The following licenses and endorsements are offered at all authorization levels.

	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05	2003-04	2002-03
School Psychology Ed.S. and Initial License	44	44	46	46	41	47
School Psychology Initial License Only	5	7	8	12	8	6
School Counseling Initial Track I	10	17	15	21	24	18
School Counseling Initial Track II	48	53	53	58	58	59
Educational Administration Initial License Only	110	101	83	47	54	64
Educational Administration Continuing License Only	156	109	109	92	71	78
Educational Administration Basic Superintendent	1	1	0	0	1	1
Educational Administration Continuing Superintendent	1	0	1	1	0	0
Educational Administration Superintendent Bridge, SAL to CAL	4	5	5	6	4	2
ESOL	103	85	77	35	29	30
ESOL/Bilingual	13	12	13	8	8	14
Reading	93	36	41	17	15	13
Special Education	40	27	27	8	15	24
Exceptional/Handicapped Learner I, Basic/Standard	6	6	10	2	0	1
Continuing Teaching License	93	61	69	56	41	61

*Please note that, due to recent coding changes in the student database, the data represented above is accurate for 2007-'08 and represents a best estimate for prior years.

2007-2008 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Educational Consortium Meeting Minutes
Winter 2008—pages 17-20
Spring 2008—pages 21-23

<div align="center">

Educational Consortium
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College
Winter Meeting Minutes
24 January 2008
Room 114, South Campus Conference Center

</div>

Members in Attendance
Vanessa Bunker, Sharon Klin, Maria Drennen, Dana Re, Kimberly Campbell, Mike Howser
Non-voting Members in Attendance
Jane Atkinson, Nancy Nagel, Sharon Chinn
Special Guests
Marla McGhee, Becky Haas, Laura Pedersen, Mollie Galloway

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at approximately 4.35 PM by **Sharon Chinn**. Consortium members introduced themselves and then Sharon gave an overview of the charge to the Educational Consortium. Members had previously been sent copies of the consortium's *Operating Guidelines* to review.

Update from the Dean's Office
Nancy Nagel began the update by explaining to consortium members that the Dean's office, on conjunction with the Dean's Advisory Council, had been reviewing the organizational structure of the graduate school. The review has included the administrative responsibilities of faculty members (including program coordinators and department chairs).

A working group in the school had also been meeting to select a list of peer institutions. Once the list is finalized, data like student to faculty rations, organizational structures, and faculty salaries can be compared.

Acting Dean **Jane Atkinson** next spoke of the search for a new dean for the Graduate School. She stated what a resilient community we have and that, even with the previous dean's departure, a negative impact has not been seen in regard to fundraising (via the annual phone-a-thon). She said that the dean's position has been posted in a number of publications and that the president has hired a search firm to manage the search. Skills-wise, the school will be looking for a new dean with skills in planning, budgeting, fundraising, administration, and advocacy (as they will need to be an advocate for the school). The dean will also be charged with building a more diverse community. To date, 15 candidates had applied for the position. "Airport interviews" would happen in March with 10 – 12 candidates; campus interviews in April; and a dean will hopefully be hired and starting their new position by mid-summer.

Jane went on to comment that the review of the Graduate School's organizational structure has provided interesting insights into the community. She said that the development of a peer group of institutions will provide a basis for comparing finances, recruitment, et cetera.

<div align="center">

17
2007-2008 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

</div>

In a general summary of college and graduate school activities, Jane commented on:

- The NWCCU's visit to campus in April for a 10-year review of the college. A team of 10 – 11 peer reviewers will be on campus from around the nation. The self-study for the review has been completed and all three schools are part of this process.
- The Graduate School's Diversity Committee has just been made a "standing committee" (vs an "ad hoc" committee) in a vote by the school's faculty.
- The Dean's Advisory Council met earlier in the day with Greg Volk, the college's new Director of Advancement. Greg joins the institution with a focus on fundraising and advancement and with a decentralized, college-wide focus on institutional advancement.
- The new dean of the Law School has begun reaching out to both the Graduate School and to the College of Arts and Sciences. Cross-campus collaboration in a variety of areas is being spearheaded by the president.
- Marla McGhee is a new faculty hire in the Educational Administration program.

Sharon Klin asked Jane what other roles she serves on campus. Jane responded that she currently also serves as the Vice-President and Provost of the college and, 5 years ago, served as acting dean in the graduate school. Nancy added that the community appreciates all that Jane has done to provide recognition of the graduate school at an institutional level.

New Faculty Hires, 2007-'08

Nancy reminded the consortium members that Marla McGhee is a new faculty hire and that she is stepping into a leadership role in the school. She said that Marla brings with her a career as both an administrator and in higher education. **Marla McGhee** elaborated that she has 21 years working in public schools in Texas and 9 years at the University of Texas—San Marcos (30,000 students). At the university, she was a faculty member in the Educational Leadership program where she taught and worked with practicum students (helping her keep in touch with the field). She also worked in the doctoral program.

NCATE Annual Report (PEDS) and TSPC Annual Report

Sharon Chinn, as the graduate school's liaison to TSPC, provided an introduction to annual reports, in general. **Mollie Galloway**, the Graduate School's Director of Research and Assessment, said that the primary question that her office asks is, "Are we meeting our goals in training educators?" She then talked with the consortium members about the NCATE Annual Report or the PEDS. From the report, she shared that the office has established new types of assessments, including updating our transition points, to measure how and that candidates are meeting the goals that we have for them. A sixth transition point, "post graduate," has been added and the office is currently conducting surveys on this point.

The voices from graduates have been heard in recent survey results received and evaluated by the Research and Assessment office. In a recent survey of graduates, 116 of 350 responded (a 40 – 50% response rate). The survey was sent to graduates from the past 4 years. Key questions asked included:

How prepared did you feel in [x] core areas?
Would you come here again?
How well prepared were you compared with your colleagues in the field?

Feedback from preservice teachers indicated that they would have liked additional preparation during the program in special education.

Mollie then shared quotes from some of the surveys. She went on to say that a school counseling survey would be next (this will be a state-wide survey of all recently prepared school counselors in the state asking them to identity their needs for Continuing License programs). An ESOL survey is also underway and will include questions such as why candidates complete programs yet do not apply to TSPC for the endorsement. **Vanessa Bunker** commented that, as a principal, she does see that teachers sometimes complete the ESOL endorsement program but do not add the endorsement because they do not want to teach only in that area.

Sharon Chinn shared that the TSPC annual report is very similar to the NCATE report, although it also includes information on student teaching placements and the consortium minutes and institutional responses to consortium requests.

Sharon Chinn asked for consortium members to provide feedback regarding other information that they would like to see in the annual reports and to feel free to ask questions about the reports. Sharon Klin asked about literacy in technology. **Kimberly Campbell** answered that this is an area of national focus.

> **Action**: The consortium would like to explore setting up a sub-committee on technology. Sharon Chinn will follow up with the group later this summer to set up the committee.

Graduate School Admissions Data and Operations

Becky Haas, Director of the Graduate Admissions office, began her comments by explaining that the Admissions office serves as the first door to the Graduate School. The Admissions office, through the web and printed materials and through personal interactions with prospective students, provides information regarding all of the school's programs. With the arrival of technology, the application process has changed over the years. One constant—the Graduate Admissions Committee continues to review applications monthly and to make admissions decisions.

Data-wise, one challenge faced by the office and by the Graduate School as a whole, is that we have multiple programs in which students can be enrolled at any one time. This means that, when it comes to data input and pulling reports (such as enrollment reports), special care needs to be taken to ensure that the counts are accurate. (The graduate programs serve multiple accreditation organizations.)

Sharon Klin asked how many faculty members review applications. Becky explained that files go through both a departmental and a committee review process. Kimberly added that the review process by the departmental faculty is quite detailed.

Becky concluded her remarks by stating that admission numbers are up this year.

School Counseling Program Modifications

Laura Pedersen, faculty coordinator of the School Counseling program, handed out to consortium members matrices showing how the courses in the program aligned with the old and the new standards for school counselors in the *Oregon Administrative Rules*. She explained that key stakeholders in the state had spent the past two years adopting the revised standards and that the were approved by TSPC last year.

She went on to say that, because the new Oregon standards aligned with national standards and because our program has always aligned with national standards, the program did not need to change to meet the newly adopted standards. In fact, three of the five school counseling programs in the state did not have to make any changes to their programs to be in compliance with the new standards. Because of this, school counseling programs in the state are hoping that a full program approval process will not be required of the programs by TSPC.

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Lewis & Clark College's Initial I School Counseling License program not need to go through a full review process with TSPC because the program already adheres to the national standards. The matrices demonstrating that all standards are met both in the old and the new rules should be submitted to TSPC at the next available opportunity.

Laura went on to remind the group that, with Mollie's assistance, a statewide survey of licensed school counselors is being conducted to determine their needs for a Continuing School Counseling License program. Vanessa asked about the connections between the ODE framework and TSPC. Laura answered that the two are aligned philosophically.

New Business

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Spring 2007 Educational Consortium minutes be accepted, as written.

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Sharon Klin serve as the Educational Consortium chair for the 2007-'08 and 2008-'09 academic years.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 6 P.M. by Sharon Klin.
Notes taken and submitted by Educational Consortium Executive Secretary, Sharon Chinn.

<div align="center">

Educational Consortium
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College
Spring Meeting Minutes
17 April 2008
Room 114, South Campus Conference Center

</div>

Members in Attendance
Vanessa Bunker, Kristen Winn, Sharon Klin, Dana Re, Kimberly Campbell
Non-voting Members in Attendance
Nancy Nagel, Sharon Chinn
Special Guests
Lisa Pogue

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at approximately 4.35 PM by **Sharon Klin**.

Graduate School Budget
Lisa Pogue, the Graduate School's Director of Administrative Services, began by distributing copies of the board-approved budget. She explained that the budget for the entire college is tuition-driven and is built on projected enrollments. Lisa highlighted several sections of the budget including annual gifts, scholarships, and revenue. Finally, she explained that the payment by the Graduate School to the college for "common services" (library, campus safety, and so on) are assessed at a rate of 25% of total revenue.

Vanessa Bunker asked the timeline for preparation for the 2009-2010 budget. Lisa explained that the budgets are prepared 18 months in advance by the Graduate School's Budget Committee. The Board of Trustees reviews and approves the college budget each February. June 1st starts the budget year.

Sharon Klin asked whether the Graduate School had plans to increase sources of financial aid for students. Lisa reported that the school is working to increase available options. For instance, with the assistance of the interim dean, Jane Atkinson, the office of Institutional Advancement for the college is beginning to focus more attention on the needs of the Graduate School in raising funds for scholarships and the endowment. Through Institutional Advancement, a staff member has now been assigned specifically to work on development and on increasing financial aid options for graduate students.

> **Action**: The consortium requests that the Graduate School continue to pursue funding for financial aid and report back to the consortium annually.

Sharon Klin reminded the members of the need for the college to continue to devote additional resources to finding sources of financial aid for graduate students.

Update from the Dean's Office
Nancy Nagel, Associate Dean, told consortium members that the graduate school is in the midst of the search for the new dean and that the three finalists would be coming to campus next week. She said that the candidates have offered very unique skills. The hope is to have the new dean hired and in place by mid-summer.

<div align="center">

21
2007-2008 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

</div>

Faculty searches have led to the hire of a new faculty member in the ESOL/Bilingual endorsement program—Sara Exposito. An offer has been made to the finalist in the search for a faculty member in the Marriage, Couple, and Family Therapy program and the search for a coordinator of the doctoral program is in its second phase with a second round of candidates.

The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) accreditation site visit team just completed their visit on campus. The written report should be available for factual corrections by late April and the status of the final approval will be known in July.

Nancy announced that she has resigned from the role of Associate Dean and that she will be returning to her role as a faculty member in the Education Department.

Dean's Advisory Council and Curriculum Committee Action on International Courses

Lisa Pogue introduced the agenda item by reminding members that Lewis & Clark has extensive overseas programs in the College of Arts and Sciences and that the Graduate School faculty has shown increased interest in expanding graduate program options for international study. The Dean's Advisory Council has asked that policies and procedures be established for developing international courses and appointed a subcommittee to carry out the work (Lisa, Sharon Chinn, and Janet Bixby). The subcommittee gathered together to draft the policy and procedure document using data and existing "p-and-ps" from the undergraduate overseas studies program. The draft document was reviewed and approved by the college's counsel as well as by the registrar's and cashier's offices. The final document was approved by the Dean's Advisory Council. With faculty approval, all future international course offerings in the Graduate School will follow the new policies and procedures.

In explaining some of the highlights of the new document, Lisa said that it now includes a revamped release form which addresses minute and key details (such as a medical release). Students must also now apply to take part in international courses and faculty will interview students interested in attending.

The next step for the approved policies and procedures is to be approved by the graduate school's faculty at one of their fall meetings.

Sharon Chinn mentioned that the request that policies be developed came from the graduate school's Curriculum Committee (to which she is the consortium's representative). **Kimberly Campbell** shared that, as a faculty member and knowing that the graduate school faces certain budget limitations, she has questions as to why we are sending students overseas to study. Vanessa Bunker asked what, historically, students used to pay for these classes. Lisa responded that the new recommendation is that a course fee be charged to cover travel and associated costs above and beyond those for tuition. Sharon Klin asked how international courses support the mission of the graduate school. Kimberly replied that there must be a clear link between the mission and international courses. **Dana Re** asked whether there was a language requirement in order to attend particular international courses.

> **Action**: The consortium requests that the Graduate School explore whether there should be a language requirement for students participating in international courses.

Vanessa remarked that, throughout the course of this particular agenda item, it has been helpful to hear the various perspectives on the issue, as well as to have the issues set in context.

Action: The consortium requests that, when appropriate, members be informed of the context behind graduate school actions and decisions.

Accreditation Update (including NWCCU, NCATE, CACREP, and TSPC)

Sharon Chinn read to consortium members the list of findings delivered to the college community by the NWCCU visiting accreditation team (the site visit concluded the day prior). **Kristen Winn** asked how similar the NWCCU standards were to the NCATE standards; Sharon explained that the NWCCU standards have more of an institutional focus. Vanessa Bunker asked whether future financial campaigns that may come as a result of the findings would be for the entire college. Kimberly Campbell replied that we think and hope that would be the case but that clarification is necessary.

Sharon Chinn informed members of the following accreditation site visit dates:

- Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE)
    - tentatively Spring 2009
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP)
    - tentatively Spring 2009
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), and the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC)
    - Spring 2010

New Business

Vanessa Bunker asked what the future of the Associate Dean role will be with Nancy Nagel's return to faculty. Kimberly Campbell responded that it is typical practice for the dean to select their own associate dean. Sharon Klin asked after Marla McGhee (Director of Educational Administration; attended winter consortium meeting as a guest). Kimberly said that she has been in a challenging position with the pending retirement of the coordinator of the doctoral program (Dick Sagor). Sharon Chinn added that Marla might be bringing forward to the consortium for their review and approval modifications to the Continuing Administrator License program during the 2008-'09 academic year. With all of the changes in key administrative and faculty roles and personnel, Vanessa asked for a description of the graduate school's organizational chart which Kimberly provided.

Action: The consortium requests that, when updated by the new dean, a new organizational chart be provided.

Finally, Vanessa asked for feedback on the candidates for the position of dean (as she had served on the search committee). Kimberly shared her own personal feedback.

Motion: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Winter 2008 Educational Consortium minutes be accepted, as written.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 6 P.M. by Sharon Klin.
Notes taken and submitted by Educational Consortium Executive Secretary, Sharon Chinn.

Annual Report to TSPC 2008-'09

Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College

❖

E. Scott Fletcher, Dean

Victoria Chamberlain, Executive Director
Teacher Standards and Practices Commission
465 Commercial Street
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Ms. Chamberlain,   9 July 2009

I am pleased to submit the 2008-09 Annual Report for the Graduate School of Education and Counseling at Lewis & Clark College.

As I complete my first year as dean of the Graduate School, I can say with confidence that the work presented in this document reflects extraordinary effort on the part of a wonderful group of professionals. The faculty and staff of the Graduate School are deeply committed to the success of our students and their efforts are worthy of the highest praise. The work presented here reflects careful and sustained attention to providing the best education we can offer in the classroom and the field. It also represents our determination that we can always find ways to improve and to learn from others.

I look forward to the commission's review of this material and would be happy to answer any questions you might have about the material included here. On behalf of the Graduate School of Education and Counseling, I also offer my gratitude for the support and guidance provided by you and the commission.

Sincerely,

E. Scott Fletcher, Dean

2008-2009
Annual Report to the Teacher Standards & Practices Commission
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College

OAR 584-010-0050 Annual Report from the Unit

(1) Annual reports will be submitted to the Commission by July 31 of each year...
(2) The unit shall identify:
(a) Changes to the mission statement and how it relates to the mission of the college or university;

No changes to report.

(b) Long and short term strategic plans; and

Short-term strategic planning
- Participate in search for new college president
- Launch new Center for Community Engagement
- Complete restructuring with addition of Educational Leadership Department
- Implement strategic planning recommendations for Ed.D. program
- Complete development of new annual program report process
- Complete revisions of new website
- Implement revised promotion and tenure process
- Initiate searches for new tenure-track faculty

Long-term
- Create new strategic planning process in the Graduate School
- Collaborate with Dean of Students on diversity programming
- Revise faculty evaluation processes
- Expand instructional technology planning
- Expand collaborations in Center for Community Engagement
- Make transition to on-line degree audit process
- Expand collaborations with College of Arts and Sciences
- Launch on-line version of Democracy and Education journal
- Continue and expand participation in local/state educational leadership activities

---

(3) The unit will show evidence of continual review of programs by:
(a) Reflecting on the degree of accomplishment in meeting the goals through student performance in course work, field studies, and work samples;

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program

> Students' accomplishments in field placements are determined by the Intern Teaching Profile (ITP) completed by the mentor teacher and college supervisor. In a manner similar to feedback from graduates, each year the ITP data are analyzed to determine specific areas of strength and

areas in which program completers have scored less well. A similar analysis is undertaken for work samples submitted and approved by program completers. Beginning this year, it was decided to review this data in September when all program completers had completed their programs and the data could be tabulated. In the past, this data has provided data surprisingly similar to that presented by the student surveys, e.g., need for additional work in methods for supporting second language learners and students identified as having special needs. As additional coursework has been, and continues to be added in these areas, it will be interesting to see how program completers, supervisors, and mentors evaluate candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions in these areas.

Advanced Preparation Programs

The School Counseling Program and the Educational Leadership licensure programs are solidly based on standards which must be demonstrated through coursework, portfolios, and assessments of field experiences. This data is reviewed each year by faculty to determine areas for program modification. This year student performance did not indicate any areas to be addressed by program modification. However, the School Counseling faculty will meet in the fall to discuss an observation made by one adjunct faculty based on student coursework performance: the skills candidates possess in understanding special education law and best practices in behavioral interventions for students with emotional and behavior problems.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program

As mentioned in last year's TSPC report, the School Psychology Program produced a report for TSPC in which we demonstrated how our present configuration of courses aligns with the standards by TSPC for programs in school psychology. These TSPC standards are, in fact, the same standards as those from the National Association of School Psychology (NASP) that our program has been aligned with since receiving NASP program approval in 2005. Our program recently received re-approval from TSPC based on the data provided in these tables.

One of the most significant domains from the NASP/TSPC standards relates to programs having a comprehensive system in place to assess the performance of students in our program as well as the program itself as articulated in the language from the NASP domain IV listed below:

NASP Domain IV: Performance-based program assessment and accountability: School psychology training programs employ systematic, valid evaluation of candidates, coursework, practica, internship, faculty, supervisors, and resources and use the resulting information to monitor and improve program quality. A key aspect of program accountability is the assessment of the knowledge and capabilities of school psychology candidates and of the positive impact that interns and graduates have on services to children, youth, families, and other consumers.

At Lewis and Clark, we see the questions listed in this TSPC document as congruent with this NASP domain. Therefore, we outline the goals we determined last year towards constructing and implementing this comprehensive assessment system regarding student performance, the steps we made toward accomplishing these goals over the past year, as well as what goals remain for next year.

Goals from 2008/2009 towards constructing/implementing our comprehensive assessment system
- Creating coherence between and among coursework.
    Specifically, we will create a handbook online which will give the students easy access to all the documents that structure and guide the program.

- Aligning student assessments in practicum and internship with NASP/TSPC standards.
    We will accomplish by creating student evaluation from both the site supervisor and the campus supervisor that will be directly referencing the NASP/TSPC standards in both practicum and internship.

- Linking coursework syllabi directly to the NASP/TSPC standards.
    We will accomplish this by sharing at program meetings this coming year a new document we have created that shows which NASP/TSPC standards are being addressed in which classes. We will, in this way, be able to more closely align specific course syllabi with these standards.

Steps we made toward accomplishing these goals over the past year
- Creating coherence between and among coursework
    We have developed a series of Handbooks for use by students during the first year, the Practica year, and the Internship year. Each handbook describes the goals and extra-curricular activities of the year and includes forms that students will use as they move throughout the years. These handbooks are online and have been particularly popular with students.

    We have initiated and run the first series of Assessment and Intervention courses, designed to take students from prereferral interventions through development of goals, modifications, and interventions for students with individualized educational programs. One student commented, "I thought (the series of courses) worked well together. Especially the way they each stepped up in complexity and ended with a complete integration of information." We continue to meet on a monthly basis to ensure the integration of information through this series.

- Aligning student assessments in practicum and internship with NASP/TSPC standards
    We accomplished this goal for the internship year, bringing NASP standards and ease of reporting on a 7-point Likert scale to the document. Also included are a series of questions designed to take students into the next steps for professional practice. Next year, we will use the same standard with Practica students.

- Linking coursework syllabi directly to the NASP/TSPC standards

    The series of forms that are found in our online handbooks help shepherd students throughout the complex needs of curricular and extracurricular requirements to plan for TSPC and NASP licensure/certification. For example, before first year students can register for their Introduction to School Psychology course (CPSY 507), they must first meet with an advisor who reviews the NASP/TSPC standards, the program's Professional Development standards, the list of courses themselves, etc. Through the

implementing of School Psychology Forms #1-4, we have effectively increased the students' understanding of the program flow, how coursework is linked, and how NASP/TSPC standards underlie all content in the program. These forms have helped students move more efficiently and competently from initial registration into the program until they have become program completers.

We have continued to meet monthly with other professors in the Counseling Psychology program to determine needs of school psychology students in courses that are taught in common throughout the department. We have integrated TSPC and NASP program requirements into syllabi of all coursework that is required for school psychology students.

<u>Goals to be continued for next year</u>
• Creating coherence between and among coursework
• Aligning student assessments in practicum and internship with NASP/TSPC standards.

<u>New goal for next year</u>
• Refining student evaluation forms based on the NASP standards as well as professional standards to be used in first year, practicum year, and internship year.

This form is based on NASP supervision guidelines and will include brief self-report paragraphs on the following questions:
    1. The role of a school psychologist
    2. The core competencies of a school psychologist
    3. Lewis & Clark's effectiveness in providing quality preparation in the core competencies described by NASP.

(b) Reflecting on the degree of accomplishments in meeting the goals through follow-up of recent graduates; and

---

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
    Each year, students in the preservice program are invited to participate in a program-specific exit survey, designed to gather data on perceptions of preparation in core areas including: curriculum development, classroom management, differentiated instruction, assessment, reflection, subject matter knowledge, and collaboration with colleagues. Students rate their preparation on a scale from 1 (not at all prepared) to 5 (very well prepared). The majority of the 2007-08 students completed the survey in their last class (n=50 Early Childhood/Elementary students and n=59 Middle Level / High School students). Both the Early Childhood / Elementary (EC/EL) and the Middle Level / High School (ML/HS) students gave average ratings of 3.5 or above for preparation in each area. The highest mean ratings for the EC/EL students were for preparation in the areas of: reflection, collaborative work, classroom management, curriculum development, and subject matter knowledge. Means for each of these areas were above 4.0. The highest mean ratings for the ML/HS students were for preparation in the areas of: reflection, collaborative work, and development of a repertoire of teaching strategies. When examining these data, faculty

in the ML/HS programs also receive their subject areas mean scores, so that they can assess their effectiveness in preparing students in their particular area.

Preservice students were also invited to share comments and/or recommendations regarding their preparation in each of the area described above. Students in EC/EL noted that the addition of an ESOL class was quite helpful in providing them with theory, tools, and strategies for English Language Learners. They did, however, recommend that the course come earlier in the year so that they could implement these strategies during their student teaching. Overall, both the EC/EL and ML/HS groups recommended more training in the area of Special Education and more specific discussion and strategies throughout the coursework on working with diverse learners.

In addition to the program-specific surveys, all 2007-08 program completers were invited to participate in an online survey designed to assess: (1) students' overall experience at the Graduate School (including perceptions of quality of faculty, program content, field experiences, and advising), (2) perceptions of program strengths and weaknesses (including areas in which students felt particularly well-prepared and areas in which they perceive a need for more preparation), (3) experience with student services (e.g., admissions, registration, career and licensing, library and computer services, etc.), and (4) current employment plans. Forty-seven pre-service students completed this additional survey. Participants indicated several specific strengths of the preservice program including: their field experiences and their experiences with mentors and supervisors, the cohort model at Lewis & Clark (where students move through the program with the same group of peers), and the quality of the faculty (more than 40% of students rated these areas as strengths). Areas most often suggested for improvement included: financial support, racial and cultural diversity at the college, and opportunity to work with diverse P-12 students (more than 40% of students rated each of these areas as a weakness).

The large majority (75%) of preservice program completers indicated that, if they were choosing a graduate program again, they would probably or definitely select Lewis & Clark for their preservice training. At the time their degree posted, 60% of the completers had employment or were being considered for a position in the field.

These results, along with survey data for the 2008-09 Preservice program completers will be reviewed by the faculty in September 2009. In addition, an alumni survey will be distributed in the summer and fall of 2009 to recent MAT Preservice graduates. Similar to previous years, this survey will assess alumni's perceptions of the preparation they received from Lewis & Clark in relation to best practices in the field. We will also gather data on current employment.

Advanced Preparation Programs
Inservice Teacher Education
A small group of completers in one or more of our inservice programs (Special Education, Reading, and/or ESOL) completed the Graduate School Exit survey administered by the Office of Research and Assessment. These students, on average, rated their program experience and the quality of the faculty as more than adequate to exceptional. Sixty percent or more highlighted curriculum and degree content, faculty quality, and faculty expertise as strengths in the program. Financial support was the one weaknesses highlighted by a significant number of completers (44% suggested need for improvement in this area). More than 80% reported that they would probably or likely select Lewis & Clark for their graduate studies, if they had to do it over again.

School Counseling

Thirteen of our 2007-08 school counseling graduates responded to the Graduate School exit survey. The ratings and comments of this group regarding program quality, content, and advising, and field experiences where overwhelmingly positive, with mean ratings of over 4.0 (indicating that the experience was more than adequate to exceptional). When asked about program strengths, more than 60% of these participants reported that the curriculum, quality of the faculty, field experiences and field supervisors, cohort model, and career development opportunities were specific strengths. Three weaknesses were noted by more than 1/3 of the respondents. These included: CORE coursework (which is required cross-disciplinary and mission-centered course work for degree-seekers at Lewis & Clark), financial support, and racial and cultural diversity at the college. All (100%) of the respondents noted that they would probably or likely choose Lewis & Clark again for their graduate studies if they had to do it over again, and 55% were already employed in their area of study or being considered for a position at the time their degree posted.

Educational Leadership

Students completing our initial and continuing administrator also had the opportunity to provide us with feedback through the Graduate School exit survey. Fifteen program completers responded to our request. These individuals, on average, reported that their experiences, including content and field experiences, the quality of faculty and other graduate students and quality of faculty advising was more than adequate to exceptional. Several specific strengths were highlighted including: faculty quality (80% rated this as a strength), faculty expertise and internship supervision (>60% rated these areas as strengths), and program flexibility and the cohort model (>45% rated these areas as strengths). Scheduling was the one area rated as a weakness by more than two completers (27% rated this as a weakness). All of the participants who completed the Educational Administration programs stated that they would probably or definitely attend Lewis & Clark again for their graduate studies if they had to do it over again.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program

As described in 3a above, one of the most significant domains from the NASP/TSPC standards relates to programs having a comprehensive system in place to assess the performance of students in our program as well as the program itself. Below, we outline the goals we had in place last year towards constructing and implementing this comprehensive assessment system with specific regard to follow up of recent graduates, the steps we made toward accomplishing these goals over the past year, as well as what goals remain for next year.

Goals from 2008/2009 towards constructing/implementing our comprehensive assessment system
• Collecting and utilizing data from program completers just finishing the program, graduates who are one year out of the program, and graduates who are five years out of the program.
• Collecting and maintaining a database of recent graduate addresses and contact information.

Steps we made toward accomplishing these goals over the past year
 • Collecting and utilizing data from program completers and graduates
The Lewis and Clark Office of Research & Assessment sent alumni surveys to recent graduates. Drawing on the survey template from previous years, this survey assessed

2008-2009 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

graduates' perceptions of the program's effectiveness in preparing students in core NASP competencies.

The Director of Research & Assessment conducted exit focus group sessions with all of the 2008-09 graduates in the School Psychology program. The aim of these sessions was to gather students' perceptions of their experiences and sense of preparation upon completion of all program coursework and field work and to use student comments and evaluations to build on strengths and address weaknesses in the program.

Focus Group Results
Similar to previous years, all of the completers indicated that they feel very well prepared to enter the field. This confidence stems from a combination of effective coursework and field experiences, and a belief that they have the knowledge and resources to find answers to professional questions that arise during their early years in the field.

Students consistently reported that their practicum and internship experiences provided them with the hands-on preparation they needed to develop, implement and solidify the knowledge and skills they have gained in their coursework. This extensive time spent doing "the work" was consistently highlighted as the most critical to their development and preparation.

Program Strengths. Program completers also highlighted several specific strengths. They noted clarity in program planning and curriculum. They understood the requirements of the program and felt these were well-communicated and well sequenced. Completers also highlighted their preparation in report writing. They felt capable of preparing high quality reports and several specifically indicated that site supervisors wanted to use their reports as examples. They were well prepared in general counseling skills and felt confident in their ability to work with diverse learners and families. They described the latter as a consistent focus throughout the curriculum, although they also noted that a diversity class solely for school psychologists could have provided even more specific tools and strategies for working with diverse populations in schools. Students also mentioned strong preparation in: cognitive assessment, ethical and legal issues, human development, and prevention. Finally, students remarked about the importance of the cohort model and being able to move through the program with the same group of peers.

Areas for Improvement. Several recommendations emerged from the focus group sessions. The majority of these recommendations centered on having more opportunities to learn practical skills and have conversations with colleagues and faculty around their practice. Specifically, they recommended:
- Increased flexibility in assignments, such that their work could consistently meet requirements for both courses and their field work. These kinds of assignments allow students to take full advantage of merging what they learn in their coursework with what they do in their practice.
- More opportunity to discuss internship experiences in small groups so they could learn from each other.
- More opportunity to problem solve on real cases and real scenarios. This occurred in some but not all classes, and when used, this technique was highly effective for students' learning.

Students also noted that they could have been better prepared in the areas of academic interventions and academic assessments, both for general education and special education. This

9

includes more practice with current assessments being used in the field, and when and how to use them, and opportunities to study and discuss what is needed for each category of special education or eligibility.

Exit Survey Results
In addition to focus group sessions, the Research & Assessment Office also conducts exit surveys with all graduates. Responses from the 2008-09 graduates are still being analyzed. Below, we present survey results from the 2007-08 graduates.

All 2007-08 grads were invited to complete an online survey regarding their quality of their experiences at the Graduate School and in the School Psychology program. Five school psychology grads completed the survey. The majority of the participants highlighted the following as program strengths: the cohort model, their field experiences, the supervisors at the sites, the expertise and reputation of the program faculty, and the knowledge of program staff. Two areas were highlighted as areas for improvement: financial support and the CORE coursework (degree-seeking students are required to take two CORE courses, which are cross-disciplinary courses focused on the Graduate School's core values of creativity, commitment, and compassion). Students felt that they would be better served by taking electives in an area directly related to their profession.

All of the participants said they would either probably or definitely select Lewis & Clark for their training, if they had to do it again. All also reported having employment in the field at the time of the survey (completed on their last day of class). An exit survey also went out to 2008-09 completers and is currently being analyzed.

• Collecting and maintaining a database of recent graduate addresses and contact information. This information was refined and exists in the Department database.

Goal for next year.
• Continuing to collect and utilize information from graduates. The Office of Research and Assessment will send refined surveys to alumni in July, 2009.

(c) Statement of future goals for next academic year with the indicators to be used for measurement of accomplishment.

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
We will carefully evaluate students' responses to their coursework in working with students identified as having special needs. We will also monitor student-teacher placement to insure the maximum possible placement in settings with diverse student populations.

Advanced Preparation Programs
Graduates evaluations of these programs were extremely positive. We have no major goals in this area other than to continually monitor feedback from students.

<u>**Counseling Psychology Department**</u>

School Psychology Program
  Last year, we identified five goals. We will continue to focus on three of these goals as we move into the next year, as shown in #1-3 below. Goals #4-8 are new goals for 2009-2010.

    1. Creating coherence between and among coursework
    We will edit and further refine our three School Psychology Handbooks, for the general program, for the practicum students, and for interns. Currently, the School Psychology Forms in each of these Handbooks correspond with each other and are a clear delineation of how each student moves through the steps in completing the program and in applying for licensure/certification from TSPC and NASP.

    2. Aligning student assessments in practicum and internship with NASP/TSPC standards
    We accomplished this goal for the internship year, bringing NASP standards and ease of reporting on a 7-point Likert scale to the document. Also included are a series of questions designed to take students into the next steps for professional practice. Next year, we will use the same standard with practica students.

    3. Collecting and utilizing data from program completers just finishing the school psychology program, graduates who are one year out of the program, and graduates who finished five years ago. Alumni surveys will assess graduates' perceptions of the program's efficacy in preparing students in core NASP competencies. In July 2009, the Office of Research & Assessment will send additional alumni surveys to recent graduates. Drawing on the survey template from previous years, this survey will assess students' perceptions of the program's effectiveness in preparing students in core NASP competencies.

    4. Refining a student evaluation form based on the NASP standards as well as program professional standards to be used in first year, practicum year, and internship year.
    This form will included brief self-report paragraphs on the following questions:
        1. The role of a school psychologist
        2. The core competencies of a school psychologist
        3. Lewis & Clark's effectiveness in providing quality preparation in the
         core competencies (for students completing the final year only).

    5. Considering results of evaluation data to develop goals for the future of our program.
    Data will be collected from students currently in the program (course evaluations developed by the college, mid-term course evaluations, self-evaluations of performance at the end of each year, site evaluations, and portfolios), faculty (monthly course evaluations, professional standards evaluations completed biannually for each student), and off-site supervisors (biannual evaluations of each student's performance during the practica and internship years).

    6. Continuing to expand on the opportunities for students to participate in life at the public schools linking our group counseling class to a high needs district in which students will participate in counseling elementary students in an after-school program in the schools for our required course:

CPSY 514: Group Counseling for Children and Adolescents.

7. Extending student experiences in public schools by requiring increased time in observation, interviews, and volunteering.

8. Reviewing the efficacy of the license-only program and the need for that program in order to serve children in Oregon.

---

(4) The unit shall report:
(a) Any deviation from approved programs;

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
No deviations from the approved programs.

Advanced Preparation Programs
No deviation from our approved programs with the exception of School Counseling where TSPC has approved the elimination of approval for our Continuing School Counseling License program. With the elimination of this program, faculty will better be able to focus their efforts on creating professional development courses that best meet the needs of school counselors in the state.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program
As approved by TSPC at their April 30, 2009, meeting, we no longer offer a continuing license program. Our students graduate and complete our program ready to apply for the National Certificate in School Psychology (NCSP) and therefore do not need a continuing license program. In addition, we have offered the program since 1996 and not a single student has applied for the program or taken a course in the program.

We are developing continuing education credit courses for our graduates and other school psychologists in Oregon and Washington to help them comply with credentialing requirements. To maintain a NCSP, school psychologists must take 75 hours of continuing professional development. For those people renewing their NCSP in 2009, a three-hour class from an approved institution in Ethics and Professional Practice is required. For people renewing their NCSP in 2010 and further, 25 hours from an approved institution are required. The School Psychology Program at Lewis and Clark is one of only two programs in the state that are approved by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) to offer those hours. We have increased our working relationship with the National Association of School Psychologists and the Oregon School Psychologists' Association in order to make this training most readily available and meaningful to school psychologists.

(b) Modifications of programs not subject to OAR 584-010-0045;

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
>   The only course added this year was a one semester hour special education course for candidates in the Early Childhood/Elementary program. No course was removed. The program simply reduced the amount of credit for which students paid for their student teaching field work. In a sense, students will be getting more and paying the same amount.

Advanced Preparation Programs
>   No modifications of our approved programs.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program
>   No modifications of our approved programs.

(c) Any change in the liaison officer;

Sharon Chinn will continue to service as Lewis & Clark College's institutional liaison officer.

(d) Addition of off-campus courses, including but not limited [to] the addition of online or distance delivery of courses within an approved program;

Education Department

Initial Teacher Preparation Program
>   No off-campus courses are offered as a part of this program.

Advanced Preparation Programs
>   The advanced programs continue to be offered in off-site settings as requested by school district personnel. No new courses were added to these programs. However, we are in the process of developing one on-line course within the ESOL endorsement program.

Counseling Psychology Department

School Psychology Program
>   No off-campus courses are offered as a part of this program.

(e) Evidence that the consortium meets regularly and has reviewed evaluation results and made recommendations for improvement of program design and operation;

Please see the attached Winter 2009 and Spring 2009 Educational Consortium meeting minutes.

(f) Evidence that the unit has provided written response to consortium recommendations; and

Institutional Response to Educational Consortium Recommendations
NB: this chart is shared with Consortium members

RECOMMENDATION FROM CONSORTIUM	INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE
Action: The consortium would like to explore setting up a sub-committee on technology. Sharon Chinn will follow up with the group later this summer to set up the committee. (24 January 2008) **SEE MOTION BELOW (01/29/09)**	*Sharon Chinn has been collecting resources for the subcommittee throughout the spring and will contact consortium members regarding establishing the subcommittee in late July. (Summer 2008)*
Motion: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the consortium defer the request to start a sub-committee on technology. (29 January 2009)	No further action required. (29 January 2009)
Action: A representative from the graduate school's technology committee will be invited to the consortium's April meeting to update the consortium on the work of the committee. (29 January 2009)	Sharon Chinn worked with Damian Miller, Kimberly Campbell, Melanie Quinn, and Martha Gross in arranging for a presentation to the consortium's April meeting. (Spring 2009)
Motion: That the Graduate School request of TSPC that approval for the Continuing School Counseling and Continuing School Psychology License programs be eliminated from Lewis & Clark College's list of TSPC-approved programs, effective immediately, and that plans will be made for the one student currently enrolled in the Continuing School Counseling License program to complete the program no later than August 2009. (25 March 2009)	Sharon Chinn will ensure that this proposal and request is moved forward to TSPC for consideration at the next possible meeting. (Spring 2009)
Action: A "technology" agenda item will be added to the 2009-10 Educational Consortium meeting agenda for updates on this topic. (16 April 2009)	Sharon Chinn will add a "technology" agenda item to one of the 2009-10 Educational Consortium meetings and will arrange for people to speak to the topic. (2009-10)

2008-2009 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

(g) Data indicating number of students enrolled in approved programs by content and authorization levels and how this compares to the previous five years.

*Pre-service M.A.T. with Initial Teaching License Historical Enrollment

	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05	2003-04
Art, ML/HS	10	4	7	7	8	3
Language Arts ML/HS	17	18	19	22	20	24
Foreign Language, Spanish and French, ML/HS	6	4	1	0	0	0
Mathematics, Basic and Advanced, ML/HS	7	7	4	2	4	4
Multiple Subjects, EC/EL	66	60	62	61	47	42
Music, ML/HS	1	2	0	0	0	1
Biology, ML/HS	5	8	6	8	9	8
Chemistry, ML/HS	0	1	0	0	2	0
Physics, ML/HS	0	0	2	0	0	1
Integrated Science, ML/HS	4	4	3	2	1	0
Social Studies, ML/HS	16	18	23	18	19	24

In-service and Advanced Program Historical Enrollment

	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05	2003-04
School Psychology Ed.S. and Initial License	49	44	44	46	46	41
School Psychology Initial License-Only	9	5	7	8	12	8
School Counseling Initial Track I	11	10	17	15	21	24
School Counseling Initial Track II	49	48	53	53	58	58
Educational Administration Initial License	83	110	101	83	47	54
Educational Administration Continuing License Only	138	156	109	109	92	71
Educational Administration Basic Superintendent	1	1	1	0	0	1
Educational Administration Continuing Superintendent	0	1	0	1	1	0
Educational Administration Superintendent Bridge, SAL to CAL	2	4	5	5	6	4
ESOL	50	103	85	77	35	29
ESOL/Bilingual	11	13	12	13	8	8
Reading	70	93	36	41	17	15
Special Education Endorsement	57	40	27	27	8	15
Exceptional/Handicapped Learner I, Basic/Standard Endorsement	9	6	6	10	2	0
Continuing Teaching License	80	93	61	69	56	41

*Please note that, due to recent coding changes in the student database, the data represented above is accurate for 2007-'08 forward and represents a best estimate for prior years.

Educational Consortium Meeting Minutes
Winter 2009—pages 17-22
Spring 2009—pages 23-26

Educational Consortium
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College
Winter Meeting Minutes
29 January 2009
Rogers Hall, Room 201

Members in Attendance
Kristen Winn, Martha Gross, Sarah Ott, Jodi Relyea, Kimberly Campbell, and Mike Howser
Non-voting Members in Attendance
Scott Fletcher and Sharon Chinn
Special Guests
Vern Jones

Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions, and Charge
The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:30 p.m. by **Sharon Chinn**. Consortium members and guests introduced themselves and Sharon reminded members of their charge.

Update from the Dean's Office (Including Faculty Searches, Budget, and Accreditation)
Scott Fletcher, Dean of the Graduate School, began his remarks by updating consortium members on the status of current faculty searches. In regard to the position of the director of the doctoral program, two finalists for the position have visited campus and the college is prepared to make an offer to one of the candidates. Both Scott and **Mike Howser** commented on the strength of the applicant pool.

In regard to the search for a new faculty program coordinator for the preservice early childhood/elementary program, Scott told members that the timeline had been extended in order to strengthen the pool of candidates. Phone interviews are currently underway. **Kimberly Campbell** commented on the number of highly qualified candidates for the position. **Martha Gross**, a member of the search committee, added that the committee has met and has reviewed candidate applications in order to narrow the pool.

Two faculty searches are also underway in the Counseling Psychology Department. The search committee is reviewing candidate files for the position in community counseling and applications are still being received for the 0.5 FTE position in the Marriage, Couple, and Family Therapy program.

Martha asked who determines which faculty positions are considered "tenure-track." Scott responded that these decisions are made through conversations between the departments and the dean's office. Under consideration when these decisions are made are factors such as the needs of the department and departmental budgets. More often than not, these positions are made "tenure-track" because they are either a replacement for an existing position or are a conversion of an existing contract position (as are this year's faculty positions).

Regarding the budget, Scott told consortium members that the budgeting process has just been completed. At their February meeting, the college's Board of Trustees will vote to approve the budget. The good news is that, over the past two weeks, changes in the calculations for "common services" costs have allowed the graduate school's tuition increase to be lower for 2009-'10 than expected (3.25% instead of the anticipated 4% with the proposed tuition for 2009-'10 being $699 per semester hour). Scott continued saying that the salary pool increase will be proposed at 3% instead of 4%.

Martha remembered having heard in previous meetings that the "common services" cost was fixed at 25%. Scott responded that the budget for the college is actually calculated first based on actual costs and then a percentage for the "common services" charge is calculated.

In regard to the salary pool, the board will be asked to examine college enrollments in October 2009. Faculty and exempt staff will receive no raises between now and then (raises typically are added to September paycheques). Should enrollments be at an adequate level, faculty and exempt staff raises will go into effect in November. If enrollments are not adequate, a salary freeze will be implemented. **Sharon Chinn** asked about the impact on non-exempt staff. Scott replied that they will receive raises as negotiated through their respective unions.

Kimberly asked about the impact on the graduate school's budget should we exceed enrollment projections. Scott answered that if we generate additional income, then we will have more income available to spend. Martha asked about off-campus class revenues. Scott reminded members that this would include students in both our endorsement and continuing education programs, enrollment numbers for which are currently down. He added that a 0.5 FTE position for alumni relations is budgeted for the graduate school, as well. Martha asked whether fundraising was included in the budget. Fundraising is included in the budget, Scott remarked, but, this year, it has been added at a realistic level (as opposed to budgets developed under previous leadership in the graduate school).

Accreditation-wise, Scott reported that NCATE gave institutions the go-ahead to request postponement of accreditation site visits. The graduate school has requested of TSPC a two-year postponement (which, if approved by both TSPC and by NCATE, would put both on the same approval cycle).

Martha asked whether the graduate school is considering TEAC as another option for national accreditation for our education programs. Scott replied that the conversation is always open, but that we have no immediate reason to switch at this time.

Scott concluded his comments by updating consortium members on accreditations requested by the Counseling Psychology Department. The Marriage, Couple, and Family Therapy program is pursuing COAMFTE accreditation. They submitted the required documentation and had a successful site visit in November. A rejoinder to the site visit report has been written and submitted and the program is now waiting for board approval. The Community Counseling program has submitted documentation to CACREP, has received some feedback, and is awaiting word on scheduling a site visit.

2008 Annual Report to TSPC
Sharon Chinn provided members with a brief explanation of the purpose of the annual report and of the sections required by TSPC. **Vern Jones** then walked members through highlights of the report (which had been distributed prior to the meeting for members to read and review). He mentioned that changes to the "guiding principles and standards" of the graduate school's conceptual framework had been approved by the graduate faculty. Scott Fletcher had been hired as the dean of the graduate school and Janet Bixby had been appointed as the new associate dean. Some changes and additions were made to various programs based on the reports of focus groups and on feedback collected during exit interviews of students. An ESOL course was added to the preservice curriculum based on feedback from past program graduates. The preservice early childhood/elementary program will also be adding a special education course based on graduate feedback.

In regard to the changes to the preservice early childhood/elementary program, **Sarah Ott** asked whether the timing of course work in the program will change. As a student in the program, she reported her experience on being at her placement site only one day per week during the early part of spring term and how this has caused her a sense of losing connection with her students. Vern replied that, based on similar feedback from other cohort members, the faculty are working on revising the schedule for the program for 2009-'10.

Martha asked whether a counseling component had been added to the preservice programs. Vern commented that this has been included in the classroom management course for both the early childhood/elementary and the middle level/high school programs. Current feedback from program graduates seems to indicate that this model is working.

Other future planning for the education programs includes filling the faculty positions in the doctoral program and the early childhood/elementary program (as mentioned in detail by Scott). Also in conversation is a possible change in the preservice early childhood/elementary program as faculty consider incorporating the health and physical education components into other existing courses, thus freeing up room to add a literacy course.

Martha commented to the way that the graduate school appears to listen to the feedback from program graduates and to respond thoughtfully to that feedback. Sarah added that she appreciated that feedback from the preservice cohorts is be listened to and addressed.

TSPC Fast-Track Student File Audit
Sharon Chinn told consortium members about TSPC's recent addition of a "fast-track" license recommendation process for initial teaching license program completers in Oregon. For institutions recommending preservice students for licenses using the fast-track method, an annual audit of student files is required by TSPC.

On Thursday, January 15, 2009, a team of three from TSPC arrived to audit 15 student files (the files were selected by TSPC as a sample of those recommended for initial licenses during the previous year). The 15 files had been carefully reviewed by both faculty and by staff prior to the audit.

The team of auditors found only three errors in the files reviewed (all involving test scores or dates); a small number of errors considering the large amount of data entered for each of the 15 fast-track candidates. Mollie Galloway, Director of the Research and Assessment office, was on hand during the audit and was able to pull additional testing reports required by the auditors (test data stored in Colleague, but not reportable in a readable, accurate format).

Team members were highly complimentary of the information included in the files and the level of organization. They made a few suggestions for future reviews including:

Items Required by TSPC	Description (from TSPC)	Feedback from Audit Team
PA-1 form submitted	Evidence of submission of PA-1 and acknowledgement that it was received by TSPC.	Add to each student file a copy of their completed PA-1 form.
Fingerprint clearance	Evidence of submission of fingerprints and acknowledgement that background clearance was completed.	Add to each student file a copy of the TSPC "License Inquiry" page showing that background check has been cleared.
Degrees	If program requires a degree for entrance or final degree is awarded as part of the program, then transcripts are used as the official record of the degree.	Continue to make clear to audit and accreditation teams that students are admitted into an initial license program AND an MAT program (degree not required for license).
Course-work Completion *Defined previously by Keith Menk as the date of program completion (course work + tests + student teaching).*	The final date of program course-work (end of term).	Our evidence was sufficient. Following Keith's definition, we reported the "program" rather than the "course-work" completion date.
Test Scores	Evidence of test scores reported as related to completed program.	Add to the FileMaker "program completion" sheets or elsewhere in the file the test names, dates, and scores. Make sure that data in Colleague matches print-out.
Civil Rights	Evidence of completion of Civil Rights knowledge requirement.	Add to the FileMaker "program completion" sheets or elsewhere in the file the class number, title, and date in which this information was covered. *Will become a moot point once ORELA: Civil Rights test is required.*
Recommendation	Indication of what was recommended by the institution as the completed program.	Our evidence was sufficient. The team appreciated the copies of the fast-track C-2 forms in the files.
Level Program Documentation	Evidence of proper field experience for program recommendation.	Add to the FileMaker "program completion" sheets or elsewhere in the file the locations of and grade levels in which the two placements were completed. (Subject areas taught should be added, as well.)
Miscellaneous Notes	General notes.	Our evidence was sufficient.

Kimberly Campbell remarked at the great work of the staff in preparing for the audit.

Continuing [School Counseling] and School Psychology License Program
Sharon Chinn informed consortium members of how the commission (TSPC) has acted to make the Continuing School Counseling License optional (now offering the option of an "Initial II School Counseling License" which mirrors the license structure and requirements for teachers) and to make the Initial School Psychology License continuously renewable (with no requirement for school psychologists to complete an "Initial II" or "Continuing" license).

Sharon went on to say that, in response to TSPC's actions and after careful consideration (including surveying of professionals in the field), both programs have decided to request that TSPC eliminate the approval for both continuing license programs. Faculty in both the school counseling and the school psychology program are working with Sherri Carreker, the director of the graduate school's center for continuing studies, to develop course offerings that will meet educator's needs for course work to pursue the Initial II School Counseling License or to renew the school psychology licenses. There is currently one student completing their Continuing School Counseling License course work and they are aware of this change (a plan is in place, developed by the faculty coordinator, for the student to complete the program requirements this summer). The Continuing School Psychology License program has never admitted any students.

The plan to eliminate the Continuing School Counseling and Continuing School Psychology License programs will move forward to the Graduate School's Curriculum Committee at their February or March meeting and has the full support of both the Education Department and the Dean's office. The next step will be to request approval by the Educational Consortium. Because of timing issues (with TSPC's spring meeting being moved several weeks earlier than originally planned), Sharon asked the consortium members to consider acting on this item via e-mail. She suggested the following wording for a motion:

> **PROPOSED MOTION:** That the Graduate School request of TSPC that approval for the Continuing School Counseling and Continuing School Psychology License programs be eliminated from Lewis & Clark College's list of TSPC-approved programs, effective immediately, and that plans will be made for the one student currently enrolled in the Continuing School Counseling License program to complete the program no later than August 2009.

Consortium members approved the proposal to bring this motion forward to them at the appropriate time and to call for an e-vote.

New Business

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Spring 2008 Educational Consortium minutes be accepted, as written.

Sharon Chinn reminded consortium members of the following action item approved at their January 24, 2008, meeting:

> *Action: The consortium would like to explore setting up a sub-committee on technology. Sharon Chinn will follow up with the group later this summer to set up the committee. (24 January 2008)*

Sharon asked members whether they would still like her to pursue the establishment of this sub-committee. Kimberly Campbell said that the main question from the 2008 discussion had been, "How

are we addressing the issues of technology in our programs?" Jodi Relyea commented that a conversation on how to teach when faced with limited availability of technology in the schools would be interesting. Kimberly said that the use of technology in classrooms is addressed in preservice courses. Sarah Ott commented that she would be very interested in the conversation about how to teach in a school with limited technology.

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the consortium defer the request to start a sub-committee on technology.

> **Action**: A representative from the graduate school's technology committee will be invited to the consortium's April meeting to update the consortium on the work of the committee.

Kimberly offered that she and Melanie Quinn would check in with preservice students about technology needs and would share that information with the technology committee representative prior to the April consortium meeting. Martha Gross also offered to check in with and report back to the consortium on the work of Portland Public Schools' technology committee. (Kimberly added that Associate Dean Janet Bixby and Graduate School IT Consultant, Damian Miller, would be the technology committee representatives.)

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 6 p.m. by Sharon Chinn.
Notes taken and submitted by Educational Consortium Executive Secretary, Sharon Chinn.

<div align="center">

Educational Consortium
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College
Spring Meeting Minutes
16 April 2009
Rogers Hall, Room 201

</div>

Members in Attendance
Kristen Winn, Sharon Klin, Jodi Relyea, Kimberly Campbell, and Mike Howser
Non-voting Members in Attendance
Scott Fletcher, Janet Bixby, and Sharon Chinn
Special Guests
Damian Miller and Becky Haas

Call to Order and Welcome
The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:30 p.m. by **Sharon Klin**. Consortium members and guests introduced themselves.

Update from the Dean's Office (Including Faculty and Associate Dean Searches, Announcement from President Hochstettler, and Accreditation)
With regard to searches, **Scott Fletcher** began by announcing to consortium members that President Hochstettler announced his resignation in March, effective June 2011. A search committee has been appointed, to be chaired by trustee Jay Waldron. Faculty member Kasi Allen will serve as the graduate school's representative to the committee. The committee's primary task is to select a presidential search firm, a task that they hope to have completed by June. Applications will be accepted between June and August; from September to October, the list of finalists will be narrowed to approximately 25 from which 3 finalists will be chosen. The search will remain confidential until the point that the three finalists are announced.

At the graduate school, two tenure-track faculty searches have met with success. Carolyn Carr has been hired as the chair of the newly formed Educational Leadership Department (encompassing both educational administration and school psychology). Carol Doyle has been hired to fill the tenure-track position in counseling psychology. Rounding out the graduate school's faculty searches, the early childhood/elementary literacy search was not successful; the 0.5 FTE position in the marriage, couple, and family therapy program has been filled; and the search is underway for the associate dean position (a three-year appointement).

Accreditation-wise, the graduate school has requested and been granted a two-year postponement for an accreditation site visit by NCATE. This postponement will align the NCATE and TSPC accreditation timelines. The extension will also provide the graduate school with the opportunity to best respond to significant changes being made in the NCATE accreditation review process.

Finally, strategic-planning-wise, the graduate school's Center for Continuing Education will launch in June in its new format as the Center for Community Engagement. The center will be led by Janet Bixby with Sherri Carreker serving as its director. Even with the change underway, the existing center has provided faculty, over the course of the year, with the opportunity to apply for mini-grants. According to **Janet Bixby**, approximately 20 proposals were received and 16 received funding. The grants funded all take faculty out into their respective communities.

<div align="center">

23
2008-2009 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

</div>

Beyond her work with the center, Janet also reported that her past and present work in the graduate school includes work on providing clarity to policies and procedures, work on publications, and assistance in the development of the college's new website.

Another initiative underway is the re-envisioning of the graduate school's doctoral program. Scott reported that this project has spanned that past year and has included members from throughout the graduate school's community. The project will end with a series of recommendations being given to Carolyn Carr (who is also serving on the project's committee).

Organizationally, Scott shared with and reminded members that a third department, encompassing educational administration and school counseling will launch at the end of the summer. The graduate school's three departments will then be: Educational Leadership, Teacher Education, and Counseling Psychology. With the change in departments, a new organizational chart will also follow.

In summary, Scott told consortium members that the year had been a great one in terms of growth and challenge. He offered his appreciation to the consortium for their input and feedback. In general, he said that the graduate school is a wonderful place.

Sharon Klin asked what next steps would be taken with the early childhood/elementary literacy search. Scott answered that the teacher education department would decide in the fall whether to re-open the search (as part of the regular search process). Scott, as the dean, would then determine which searches to authorize based on recommendations from the faculty's Personnel Committee and from the department. Sharon asked why the search was unsuccessful. Scott answered that it was the dean's decision—that one candidate had been offered the position and had declined. Scott concluded his remarks saying that all have learned more about faculty searches in the process.

Technology in the Graduate School
As requested by the consortium at their winter meeting, **Damian Miller**, representing the graduate school's technology committee attended the meeting to update members on uses of technology in the school.

Damian began his comments by stating that he had worked with Kimberly Campbell, Melanie Quinn, and Martha Gross in collecting information for both the project and his presentation to the consortium. One of the first challenges that has been defined by both education graduate students and faculty members in the field are the wide range of hardware and software that students will encounter in their school placements (and, in the future, in their classrooms, schools, and district offices). Damian commented that, as Martha did, it would be helpful to survey current students and alumni about what types of technology they are encountering in the districts.

Damian went on to say that the teaching of foundational technological skills and providing students with an understanding of the commonalities between technologies is key. He went on to say that students also need to be taught about free open-source software available to them as future and practicing educators (but that they also need to learn to be aware of privacy and ethics issues). Damian concluded that there are many possible topic areas suitable for training. As a final example, he shared that the Oregon Educational Technology Consortium is offering free Moodle-hosting for all schools in Oregon.

Sharon Klin commented what wonderful summer classes Damian's suggestions would make (for instance, as continuing professional development for practicing educators). **Jodi Relyea** echoed that the topics were great. She also suggested adding to courses creative ways to deal with **not** having adequate (or any) hardware or software available in classrooms. Sharon suggested as a topic strategies on how to use, for instance, text-messaging as a part of classroom instruction (as cell phones are pervasive in her classrooms). **Kimberly Campbell** pointed out that students are often ahead of teachers in their knowledge and use of many forms of technology.

> **Action**: A "technology" agenda item will be added to the 2009-10 Educational Consortium meeting agenda for updates on this topic.

Kristen Winn suggested surveying student teachers as they return from their various placements on what they found, technology-wise, in their schools.

Report from the Office of Graduate Admissions

Becky Haas, Graduate Admissions Director, provided consortium members with a handout of the "gross" number of applications by program from 2007-09. She remarked how the level of interest and number of applications have grown in both school counseling and in school psychology. Becky noted that these are two areas in which she actively recruited over the past couple of years (and in school counseling, in particular).

Sharon Chinn asked whether the admissions office was noticing any trends that they could relate to the economy. Becky answered that, while the number of applications, in general, are up, applicants are taking longer in deciding whether to attend (with greater concern about borrowing money in order to attend). Kimberly Campbell commented that the preservice programs do have wait-lists. Sharon Klin asked for the capacity of the preservice programs. Kimberly responded that, due to limitations on classroom sizes, preservice cohorts cannot get much larger than 22-23 students. Kimberly also commented that there were a number of recent applicants to the preservice program with Lewis & Clark connections; in fact, at least 28 applicants were connected to the college in some way and of those, the majority have taken undergraduate education courses taught by graduate school faculty. Kimberly concluded by acknowledging the fine and hard work of the graduate admissions office.

Update from the Curriculum Committee (Including New M.Ed. Degree)

Sharon Chinn provided consortium members with a brief overview of the charge of and to the graduate school's Curriculum Committee. She also shared how the work of the committee and the work of the consortium flow, particularly as new programs and programs being modified go through the review and approval process on campus before being moved forward to TSPC for consideration.

Sharon shared with members the work that the committee had done most recently in approving new course additions and modifications in preparation for publication of the new graduate school catalogue. As a part of this process, the Teacher Education program recommended and had approved by the Curriculum Committee the renaming of their existing Master of Arts in Teaching: Liberal Studies program to both a Master of Education in Liberal Studies (as a "teach out" for the preservice program) and a Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction (geared toward practicing or inservice teachers). Sharon concluded her comments with a reminder to members that their (and the Curriculum Committee's) approval of the request of the school counseling and school psychology program's requests that TSPC eliminate approval of their continuing license programs was scheduled for the commission's April 30th meeting.

In an oblique segue, Sharon Klin and other members of the consortium took time away from the meeting's agenda to comment on the work that Sharon Chinn has done in all areas of her role, including licensing, support to the consortium, et cetera.

New Business

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Winter 2009 Educational Consortium minutes be accepted, as written.

Sharon Chinn expressed deep gratitude for the past decade of service to the consortium provided by retiring member, Kristen Winn. Sharon Klin was thanked for her term-of-service as the consortium's chair the past two years. Members also celebrated the pending graduation of student members Sarah Ott and Jodi Relyea.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 6 p.m. by Sharon Klin.

Notes taken and submitted by Educational Consortium Executive Secretary, Sharon Chinn.

Annual Report to TSPC 2009-'10

Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College

❖

E. Scott Fletcher, Dean

Victoria Chamberlain, Executive Director
Teacher Standards and Practices Commission
465 Commercial Street
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Ms. Chamberlain,

I am pleased to submit the 2009-10 Annual Report for the Graduate School of Education and Counseling at Lewis & Clark College.

Especially given the difficult economic conditions that we face in the state and nation, I am pleased to provide this account of a thriving and growing educational institution. At the college level, we have completed a successful search for a new president and will enter 2010-11 with an extraordinary leadership team in place.

In the Graduate School, we have sustained record on-campus enrollments, we have hired four new tenure-track faculty, and we will complete a major renovation of a newly expanded classroom building by the end of the summer. The work of the faculty and staff of the Graduate School remains an inspiration to me and I am very pleased to have the opportunity to share their work in this document.

I look forward to the Commission's review of this material and would be happy to answer any questions you might have about it. On behalf of the Graduate School of Education and Counseling, I also offer my gratitude for the support and guidance provided by you and the Commission.

Sincerely,

E. Scott Fletcher, Dean

2009-2010
Annual Report to the Teacher Standards & Practices Commission
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College

OAR 584-010-0050 Annual Report from the Unit

(1) Annual reports will be submitted to the Commission by July 31 of each year...

(2) The unit shall identify:
(a) Changes to the mission statement and how it relates to the mission of the college or university;

No changes have been made to the mission statement.

(b) Long and short term strategic plans; and

Long-term strategic plans
- Build staffing and resources in Research and Assessment Office
- Build instructional technology capacity
- Integrate accreditation, program evaluation, and faculty assessment procedures
- Expand community collaborations in Center for Community Engagement
- Build capacity for seeking external funding for projects
- Add to staffing in academic departments
- Expand available classroom, office, and meeting facilities on the Graduate campus

Short-term strategic plans
- Welcome new president
- Provide support and orientation for new Graduate School faculty
- Review/revise draft of five year strategic plan and produce final document
- Implement annual program report policy
- Implement new faculty performance assessment policy
- Continue preparation for NCATE/TSPC accreditation review
- Launch new online version of Democracy and Education Journal

(3) The unit will show evidence of continual review of programs by:
(a) Reflecting on the degree of accomplishment in meeting the goals through student performance in course work, field studies, and work samples;

Initial I Teaching License,
Early Childhood/Elementary and Middle Level/High School

Each year the Teacher Education faculty schedules a day to meet with the Director of Research and Assessment to review all data related to program goals. The discussions from this meeting provide the

impetus for faculty in each program to consider program modifications. The modifications stemming from this data analysis are described in 4b of this report.

This year we initiated several new assessment methods. First, as found in another section of this document, we significantly updated the assessment design. Second, we now review scoring rubrics on all work samples and analyze the data to determine if areas exist where additional instruction may have been needed. This is used to alter syllabi and instruction in coursework in which skills needed for a successful work sample are developed. Third, this year we obtained candidates' feedback regarding their mentor and supervisor earlier in the year so we could use this data in making placements for the following year. Fourth, we have been entering and reviewing data from our Intern Teaching Profile (ITP--the instrument on which mentors and supervisors rate candidates' skill levels) to assess whether patterns exist regarding strengths or weaknesses. As always, no candidate is recommended for licensure if all ratings are not proficient or above, and candidates who receive one score lower than proficient are either provided an opportunity for a terminal degree or an additional student teaching placement in the fall following their year-long placement. This year only one student was required to select one of these options. Finally, supervisors and mentors rate and provide comments regarding students' levels of preparation in a variety of categories similar to the ITP. While the ITP focuses on candidates' proficiency, this assessment provides information on the quality of instruction being provided to the candidates.

Advanced Teacher Preparation Programs
(ESOL/Bilingual, Reading, and Special Educator Endorsement Programs)

ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
The ESOL faculty meets once-a-month formally, and throughout the year informally to review adjunct faculty, faculty evaluations and syllabi for the ESOL endorsement. The evaluations and syllabi provide feedback regarding how courses are progressing and also help "trouble shoot" any issues that may arise. In these meetings questions about schedules, adjunct faculty, materials and events are discussed. Changes and addition to existing courses and specific student issues are also addressed. Adjuncts are selected on the basis of their qualifications and course feedback. ESOL faculty write annual self evaluations based on course feedback and makes adjustments as needed. Courses are frequently adjusted based on student feedback.

One of the main tools used to monitor program and student quality is the ESOL/Bilingual Portfolio. Each ESOL course requires that students complete two key assignments that become part of their portfolio. The ESOL portfolio is designed to be a professional demonstration of the required skills, knowledge and dispositions required by TSPC and NCATE. Assignments have been specifically selected to highlight the various domains. Specific student work assignments are used as an assessment method to evaluate students' program efficacy and calibrate faculty student products. The ESOL portfolio requests that students keep two assignments from each of the four courses in the ESOL endorsement and that these be collected and reviewed when students exit the program.

Portfolio assessment of students in the pre-service and in-service ESOL Endorsement have been strong since the instructors have evaluated assignments in their courses the quality of these assignments

tends to be high. Each instructor has standards they set for students for key assignments in the portfolio and these are spelled out in the syllabus.

Student evaluation reviews have assisted us in determining which courses need extra focus. For example as we have added the ESOL Endorsement to the pre-service Teacher Education Program we made changes in faculty and content based on some of the course evaluations. The evaluations for the new on-line courses have been quite high and as a result we feel confident that this new addition to the program has been successful. There is a constant monitoring of the student evaluations in the program.

The faculty meets with adjunct faculty regularly to assist in updating course syllabi and in supporting new and more experience adjuncts with courses.

As part of their portfolios, candidates also include a copy of their final observation forms to demonstrate competency in applying ESOL methods and strategies after completing their practicum. This form and course assignments provide validation of the candidate's proficiencies that are aligned with professional, state and national standards. The portfolio is evidence of program completion and may also be used to apply for the Continuing Teaching License (CTL).

Alumni and program completion surveys are also used to make program adjustments. A steady pattern observed in GSEC exit survey starting with data collected in 2006 onward indicated that alumni felt they had not been adequately prepared to work with ELL and Special Education students in the Pre-service program. As a result of these survey results, ESOL 535 coursework was added to the elementary MAT program.

This year there have been additions to the program including the infusion of part of the ESOL endorsement into the Initial I Teaching License + MAT programs and the addition of several on-line courses. (See 4a and 4b). A portfolio for pre-service students has been created and modified since courses are slightly different for subset. The evaluation and collection of these portfolios is done by faculty in the ESOL Endorsement and follows the same procedures mentioned above. (This option, unlike the inservice endorsement, does not include the Continuing Teaching License requirements.)

Students in the on-line course use the same portfolio as the one mentioned above.

Special Education Endorsement
The faculty who teach in the Special Education endorsement meet three times a year to review student work and discuss the curriculum. One time a year this involves reviewing student portfolios to determine whether gaps exist in student competencies. In addition, interviews with students and observation data from students' practica are used to further assess areas where curriculum adjustments might be warranted.

Initial and Continuing Administrator License

During the 2009-2010 academic year the educational administration program faculty have engaged in a variety of activities and strategies that enabled careful and consistent monitoring of student performance in the leadership preparation programs. Several are highlighted in the section below.

- Regularly scheduled program meetings
Frequent meetings, ample face-to-face time, and close communication allows program faculty to regularly examine and discuss student performance. Likewise it offers a forum in which faculty can share successes and student accomplishments and communicate unique needs or circumstances that may require faculty attention.

- Use of common assessments
Common scoring guides and rubrics closely tied to course objectives and state standards allow program faculty to gauge student performance, identify strengths, and to note potential challenges. Moreover, these assessment tools and processes promote consistently high expectations for student performance across the programs.

- Collaborative teaching and instructional facilitation
Three members of the program faculty worked jointly to plan and conduct practicum seminar sessions held in conjunction with field requirements and experiences. Not only did this allow instructors to capitalize on their areas of expertise, it modeled the effectiveness of collaborative teaching and provided a setting in which faculty could assess student performance using a team approach.

Initial School Psychology License

As mentioned in last year's TSPC report, the School Psychology Program produced a report for TSPC in which we demonstrated how our present configuration of courses aligns with the standards by TSPC for programs in school psychology. These TSPC standards are, in fact, the same standards as those from the National Association of School Psychology (NASP) that our program has been aligned with since receiving NASP program approval in 2005. Our program recently received re-approval from TSPC based on the data provided in these tables.

One of the most significant domains from the NASP/TSPC standards relates to programs having a comprehensive system in place to assess the performance of students in our program as well as the program itself as articulated in the language from the NASP domain IV listed below:

> NASP Domain IV: Performance-based program assessment and accountability: School psychology training programs employ systematic, valid evaluation of candidates, coursework, practica, internship, faculty, supervisors, and resources and use the resulting information to monitor and improve program quality. A key aspect of program accountability is the assessment of the knowledge and capabilities of school psychology candidates and of the

positive impact that interns and graduates have on services to children, youth, families, and other consumers.

At Lewis and Clark, we see the questions listed in this TSPC document as congruent with this NASP domain. Therefore, we outline the goals we determined last year towards constructing and implementing this comprehensive assessment system regarding student performance, the steps we made toward accomplishing these goals over the past year, as well as what goals remain for next year.

Goals for 2009-2010 and progress toward those goals

In last year's TSPC report, we set out the following 8 goals for our program to address during the 2009-2010 academic year. In this section, we address progress we have made within each of the eight goals using bullet points:

1. Creating coherence between and among coursework
We will edit and further refine our three School Psychology Handbooks, for the general program, for the practicum students, and for interns. Currently, the School Psychology Forms in each of these Handbooks correspond with each other and are a clear delineation of how each student moves through the steps in completing the program and in applying for licensure/certification from TSPC and NASP.

• We continued to refine each of the three handbooks that existed last year. In addition we have added a fourth handbook entitled First Year Handbook for first year students in the program.

2. Aligning student assessments in practicum and internship with NASP/TSPC standards
We accomplished this goal for the internship year, bringing NASP standards and ease of reporting on a 7-point Likert scale to the document. Also included are a series of questions designed to take students into the next steps for professional practice. Next year, we will use the same standard with practica students.

• We significantly revised the Student Evaluation Forms for students in each of the three years of the program to reflect NASP domains. We also revised the Professional Standards Evaluation Form for each handbook as well. Work remains in this area to refine the Practicum Handbook, specifically regarding aligning practicum assignments with NASP domains of practice.

3. Collecting and utilizing data from program completers just finishing the school psychology program, graduates who are one year out of the program, and graduates who finished five years ago. Alumni surveys will assess graduates' perceptions of the program's efficacy in preparing students in core NASP competencies. In July 2009, the Office of Research & Assessment will send additional alumni surveys to recent graduates. Drawing on the survey template from previous years, this survey will assess students' perceptions of the program's effectiveness in preparing students in core NASP competencies.

- This information has been collected and analyzed. Goals for 2010-2011 will be based on these results.

4. Refining a student evaluation form based on the NASP standards as well as program professional standards to be used in first year, practicum year, and internship year. This form will included brief self-report paragraphs on the following questions:

    1. The role of a school psychologist
    2. The core competencies of a school psychologist
    3. Lewis & Clark's effectiveness in providing quality preparation in the core competencies (for students completing the final year only).

• As mentioned in Goal #2 above, we did revise the Student Evaluation Forms to include NASP domains and Professional Standards. Additionally, students are now asked to address questions 1, 2, and 3 above five times throughout the program. This enables us to track their progress in terms of their conceptualization and understanding of the roles of the school psychologist as they move through the program.

5. Considering results of evaluation data to develop goals for the future of our program. Data will be collected from students currently in the program (course evaluations developed by the college, mid-term course evaluations, self-evaluations of performance at the end of each year, site evaluations, and portfolios), faculty (monthly course evaluations, professional standards evaluations completed biannually for each student), and off-site supervisors (biannual evaluations of each student's performance during the practica and internship years).

• Based on student input both within the program and as recent graduates in the exit surveys, we significantly altered the Introduction to School Psychology course CPSY 507 and 508 by adding a semester credit to each. This enables us to address issues related to behavioral, academic, social and emotional interventions for school based practices early in the program.

6. Continuing to expand on the opportunities for students to participate in life at the public schools linking our group counseling class to a high needs district in which students will participate in counseling elementary students in an after-school program in the schools for our required course: CPSY 514: Group Counseling for Children and Adolescents.

• This goal was accomplished. It is timely to note that exit interview data (below) from this year's graduating cohort mentioned needing more school based counseling opportunities within the program. This class is also now required in large part by each of the additional programs in the Counseling Psychology Department.

7. Extending student experiences in public schools by requiring increased time in observation, interviews, and volunteering.

• This year within CPSY 507 and 508 (Introduction to School Psychology) as well as CPSY 514 (Group Counseling with Children) we required students to participate in 20 to 30 more hours of observation, interviews, and interventions as well as counseling in public school settings. This goal has been accomplished.

8. Reviewing the efficacy of the license-only program and the need for that program in order to serve children in Oregon.

• Under review of the LO program this year, the school psychology program team decided to leave the program "on hold" and this coming year will decide along with a larger team of stakeholders (i.e. Chair and Dean) the viability of this program.

Initial I School Counseling License

Goals from 2009-2010 towards continual review of School Counseling Program:
- Faculty meet on a regular basis to review student performance, curricular goals, and program principles.

- Continue work sample and project-based work as an integral component of course requirements. Develop new ideas to allow for new forums and exchange of expertise among students and faculty. Ensure that the organization and expectations of work samples is clearly communicated and executed by students.

Steps made toward accomplishing these goals over the past year:
- The School Counseling Program continues to review areas of student performance that require improvement. In 2009-10, the faculty held a fall retreat in September and a spring retreat in May to discuss the previous year and develop goals for the upcoming school year. The focus of retreats is on evaluations of curriculum scope and sequence, particularly in regard to infused principles of social justice, data-based decision making, and consultation, all of which are integral to the program's identity and mission.

- Work samples are required for successful completion of SCED 517 Practicum in Classroom Instruction. In addition, an action research milestone project is required in both SCED 508 Educational Research, Assessment and Technology and SCED 516 School Counseling Internship. The faculty agrees that the quality of work of these written and oral presentation projects for the 2009-10 school year was stellar.

- In a new effort this year, a Research Fair was held in the spring term to allow students to share their project-based work. The fair was held in April 2010 and was a successful venue for students to demonstrate their mastery of their projects and as an opportunity for students to exchange their expertise with one another.

New goals for next year:
- Review the organization and structure of the Student Academic Performance Portfolio, to ensure that the current structure meets our goals for student demonstration of growth and skills; and that students find the process to be understandable and meaningful.

- Begin a five-year plan to developing a Spanish Immersion Program, which would be offered to both entry level professionals and Initial II professionals.

(b) Reflecting on the degree of accomplishments in meeting the goals through follow-up of recent graduates; and

Exit Surveys

Each year, the Office of Research and Assessment at the Graduate School invites completers of our Education programs to participate in an online exit survey at the end of their program. This survey assesses: (1) completers' overall experience at the Graduate School (including perceptions of quality of faculty, program content, field experiences, and advising), (2) perceptions of program strengths and weaknesses (including areas in which students felt particularly well-prepared and areas in which they perceive a need for more preparation), (3) the link between program completers' experiences and the Lewis & Clark Graduate School mission, (4) completers' experience with student services (e.g., admissions, registration, career and licensing, library and computer services, etc.), and (5) completers' employment plans. Several of our programs have also incorporated program-specific questions, designed to measure students' perception of their preparation in key competencies areas within their specific domain of study. In 2008-09, 156 of those completing a licensure or endorsement program participated in the survey.

Many of the items on the survey are Likert-type, where students are ask to rate items on a scale from 1 to 5. Additional open-ended items are included to gather broader perspectives on program quality, strengths, and weaknesses. The Office of Research and Assessment generates a report of the data for each program. Data from the completers is used as one indicator of program and unit strengths and weaknesses to guide program and unit planning. Highlights of results by program are presented below:

Initial I Teaching License,
Early Childhood/Elementary and Middle Level/High School

We had an excellent response rate from our Early Childhood/Elementary (EC/EL) and Middle Level/High School Programs (ML/HS) in 2008-09. In total, 60 EC/EL completers and 59 ML/HS completers participated in the survey. As in past years, students in both programs rated the quality of their overall experience as more than adequate (a rating of 4) to exceptional (a rating of 5) on a 1 to 5 scale. For EC/EL the mean rating was 4.52; for ML/HS the mean rating was 4.64.

Both EC/EL and ML/HS completers reported that field work, the curriculum and content of the program, applicability of course content to their practice, and the cohort model were particular strengths of the program and reported being quite to very well prepared to develop and plan curriculum (lessons/units), develop a repertoire of teaching strategies, assess student learning,

recognize and respond to individual/cultural differences in the classroom, work collaboratively with colleagues, engage in professional development/reflection, and extend and refine the knowledge and application in their subject area(s). On a 1 to 5 rating scale, means for all of these items were above 4.0.

On open-ended questions regarding their preparation, ML/HS students consistently highlighted feeling well-prepared in their content area, pedagogical content knowledge, and lesson planning (noting, in addition, the benefit of a year-long school placement). Some also explicitly highlighted teaching for social justice as an area in which they felt particularly well-prepared.

In terms of areas for improvement, EC/EL completers specifically reported wanting to learn additional strategies for teaching English Language Learners, teaching the basics of reading (although many highlighted feeling well-prepared in literacy instruction), and working with special needs students. Many of the ML/HS completers also noted wanting more preparation around English Language Learners and Special Education. On ratings of their preparation, preparation to work with these two populations were the only two mean ratings that fell below 3.0 (or below a rating of being "somewhat prepared").

Advanced Teacher Preparation Programs
(ESOL/Bilingual, Reading, and Special Educator Endorsement Programs)

Eight of our 2008-09 completers from our advanced teacher preparations programs participated in the exit survey (Four completing the ESOL program, 1 completing the Reading program, 1 completing the Special Education program, and 2 completing both the Reading and Special Education programs). Because number of respondents was quite small both within and across advanced programs, we present a few highlights at the aggregate level. As with our Preservice program, participants in the advanced programs reported their overall experience as more than adequate (rating of 4) to exceptional (rating of 5). The overall mean was 4.50. Faculty quality and expertise, the curriculum and content of the program, and the collaborative nature of the environment were highlighted as program strengths by 5 or more of the participants. In part because of the small sample size, no one area was called out by participants as a particular weakness. In future years, we are seeking ways to gather more robust data from our advanced teacher education completers and alumni.

Initial and Continuing Administrator License

Fourteen completers of our educational administration programs responded to our exit survey in 2008-09. Overall, they indicated that their experience in the program was more than adequate (rating of 4) to exceptional (rating of 5), on a 5 point scale. The mean was 4.43 for the group. Participants reported strong alignment between their experience and the Graduate School mission (Mean of 4.57 out of 5.00) and several specifically noted how the program modeled open dialogue and allowed for "rich conversations" based upon multiple perspectives. When invited to select program strengths, the collaborative nature of the environment, faculty quality and expertise, and applicability of course content to professional practice were highlighted by the majority (>70%). There were no consistent areas noted for improvement.

Initial School Psychology License

Exit surveys from 2008-09 were analyzed for the School Psychology program. The 2009-10 completers also recently finished their exit survey. Data from last year, along with preliminary results from this year are included here. A total of 10 completers from 2008-09 and 14 completers from 2009-10 participated in the survey. Participating completers for both years reported having a more than adequate (rating of 4) to exceptional (rating of 5) experience in the program [for 2008-09 the mean was 4.10; for 2009-10 the mean was 4.64].

In 2008-09, field experience, cohort model, and having the opportunity to work with diverse P-12 students were noted by 50% of the completers as program strengths. In addition, completers were asked to rate how well prepared they were in the various NASP domains. Completers felt quite to exceptionally well prepared in the following domains:

- Knowing different models and methods of assessment used to identify students' strengths and needs, understand problems, and measure student progress and accomplishments
- Knowing student learning processes, techniques to assess these processes, and services applicable to the development of cognitive and academic skills.
- Knowing individual differences, abilities, and disabilities and the potential influence of biological, social, cultural, ethnic, experiential, socioeconomic, gender-related, and linguistic factors in development
- Working with individuals of diverse characteristics
- Knowing human development and psychopathology and associated biological, cultural, and social influences on human behavior
- Providing or contributing to prevention and intervention programs that promote the mental health and physical well-being of students
- Knowing ethical, professional, and legal standards

There were no domains in which completers reported feeling less than somewhat well prepared (in fact, the lowest mean score was 3.33 (still between somewhat and quite well prepared)). This mean was for the following item: Preparation to develop, implement, and evaluate appropriate behavioral, affective, adaptive, and social goals and interventions for students of varying abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs. In analyses to date, the same is true of the 2009-10 data, with the lowest mean at 3.21 on the same item.

Focus Group Sessions (School Psychology)

Each year, the School Psychology program invites the Director of Research and Assessment to conduct focus group sessions with completers in order to gather more depth around their experiences in the program. This year (2009-10), several key strengths and recommendations emerged from these sessions.

Strengths:
Completers highlighted several program strengths including the cohort model, training and preparation on the comprehensive nature of the profession, coursework that was rooted in research but maintained clear connection to practice, and field experience:

2009-2010 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Cohort model: The completers indicated that being part of a cohort, where students move through the program together, developed a critical sense of community and support. Through engaging together and with faculty over the course of the program, they felt they knew each other deeply enough to be open and reflective about both high points/successes and challenges they faced in coursework and field experiences.

Comprehensive nature of the profession: Completers described feeling well-trained in broad range of models and theories, offering them a range of lenses and strategies from which to draw upon in their practice. Similarly, they felt the program developed their understanding and skills related to collaboration. They viewed this as critical to forging positive connections between (and collaborations among) parents, students, teachers, other school staff, etc.

Coursework connecting research and practice: The coursework completers found most effective was "rooted in research" and also consistently connected or applied to practice. This allowed students to understand the underpinnings of a certain theory, model or strategy, while simultaneously learning how to utilize it. While not every class provided this opportunity, this was a strength of several key courses within the program.

Field experience: Completers consistently report that field experience is a highlight of their training. Again this year, those finishing the program indicated that having the opportunity to apply their learning in coursework to practice in the field was central to their development as professionals. In particular, several students noted that their field experience took them "out of their comfort zone" and pushed them to realize and further develop their capacity, skills, and knowledge. They expressed that internship allowed them to recognize how much their coursework had taught them.

Areas for improvement:

Two primary areas were noted for improvement: (1) ensuring counseling-related coursework provided application to work in schools, and (2) providing more coursework and/or preparation around learning theory and curriculum development.

Counseling-related coursework: As part of their curriculum, students take courses in the Counseling Psychology program. While many find these courses useful for developing their counseling skills, they recommend that these courses give more attention to school issues and school-based practices.

Learning theory and curriculum development: Completers reported wanting additional training on how students learn, what it means to be "at grade level" in a certain area, and how teachers develop and/or utilize curriculum and develop and conduct assessment. One consistent recommendation was to collaborate more with the Teacher Education department to gain this body of knowledge.

All of the findings from the focus group sessions will be reported back to the program and used, along with data from the exit and alumni surveys, as the program conducts its review and planning.

2009-2010 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Alumni Surveys (School Psychology and Preservice Teacher Education)

Two alumni surveys were completed during the 2009-10 academic year, one for our School Psychology program and one for our Teacher Education Preservice program.

School Psychology Survey. A small sample of recent school psychology alumni participated in an alumni survey in the summer of 2009. The sample included 5 females and 1 male (with 3 who did not report their gender); self-reported race or ethnicity included 5 White, 1 White and Asian and 3 who did not report their race/ethnicity. Table 2 includes descriptive data on alumni perceptions of how well the program prepared them. The rating scale was as follows: 1=not at all, 2=a little, 3=somewhat, 4=quite, 5=very. Questions were modeled after the key NASP domains.

Table 2. School Psychology Alumni Perceptions of Lewis & Clark Program Preparation

NASP Area	Mean	SD
1. Know different models and methods of assessment used to identify students' strengths and needs, understand problems, and measure student progress and accomplishments?	3.89	0.60
2. Know behavioral, mental health, collaborative, and/or other consultation models and methods and their application?	3.89	0.60
3. Collaborate with others in planning and decision-making processes at the individual, group, and system levels?	3.89	0.33
4. Know student learning processes, techniques to assess these processes, and services applicable to the development of cognitive and academic skills?	2.75	1.49
5. Develop, implement, and evaluate appropriate cognitive and academic goals and interventions for student with different abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs?	3.00	1.20
6. Know developmental processes, techniques to assess these processes, and services applicable to the development of behavioral, affective, adaptive, and social skills?	3.50	0.53
7. Develop, implement, and evaluate appropriate behavioral, affective, adaptive, and social goals and interventions for students of varying abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs?	3.13	0.83
8. Know individual differences, abilities, and disabilities and the potential influence of biological, social, cultural, ethnic, experiential, socioeconomic, gender-related, and linguistic factors in development?	4.00	0.53
9. Work with individuals of diverse characteristics?	4.25	0.46
10. Implement strategies selected and/or adapted based on individual characteristics, strengths, and needs?	3.50	0.93
11. Know general education, special education, and other educational and related services?	3.63	1.06
12. Work with individuals and groups to facilitate policies and practices that create and maintain safe, supportive, and effective learning environments for children and others?	3.75	0.89
13. Know human development and psychopathology and associated	3.43	0.79

2009-2010 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

biological, cultural, and social influences on human behavior?		
14. Provide or contribute to prevention and intervention programs that promote the mental health and physical well-being of students?	3.43	0.79
15. Know family systems such as family strengths and influences on student development, learning and behavior?	3.86	1.07
16. Know methods to involve families in education and service delivery?	3.14	1.07
17. Work effectively with families, educators, and others in the community to promote and provide comprehensive services to children and families?	3.43	0.98
18. Know research, statistics, and evaluation methods?	4.43	0.79
19. Evaluate research, translate research into practice, and understand research design and statistics in sufficient depth to plan and conduct investigations and program evaluations for improvement of services?	3.86	1.07
20. Know the history and foundations of the profession?	4.29	0.49
21. Know public policy development applicable to services to children and families?	4.00	0.58
22. Know ethical, professional, and legal standards?	4.57	0.53

Teacher Education Survey. Fifty-five of our recent Preservice teacher education graduates participated in the alumni survey (25 Early Childhood/ Elementary Alumni and 30 Middle Level / High School Alumni from 2003, 2004, 2007 and 2008). The survey included both likert-type and open-ended questions, designed to assess how well alumni felt Lewis & Clark prepared them to: plan, design, and implement curriculum and instruction; assess student learning; meet the needs of diverse learners (including questions specifically about meeting the needs of ELLs and Special Needs students); use technology, and create a supportive classroom climate. For the majority of items, we asked students to indicate the level of preparation provided by their program on a set of items (see Table 1). The rating scale was as follows: 1=not prepared, 2=a little prepared, 3=somewhat prepared, 4=quite prepared, 5=exceptionally prepared. Overall means and standard deviations are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Teacher Education Alumni Perceptions of Lewis & Clark Program Preparation*

How well prepared were you to…	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Evaluate and reflect on your practice to improve instruction?	4.06	0.84
2. Understand how students' social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development influences their learning?	3.92	0.76
3. Understand how factors in the students' environment outside of school may influence their learning?	3.91	0.90
4. Create a classroom community where students are supportive of each other's learning?	3.85	0.97
5. Use knowledge of learning, subject matter, and curriculum to plan instruction?	3.79	0.91
6. Use instructional strategies that promote active student learning?	3.75	0.98
7. Engage students in cooperative group work as well as independent learning?	3.74	0.96

8. Develop curriculum that builds on students' experiences, interests, and abilities?	3.70	0.89
9. Teach subject matter concepts, knowledge, and skills in ways that enable students to learn?	3.68	0.94
10. Relate classroom learning to the real world?	3.68	0.92
11. Teach students from a multicultural vantage point?	3.58	0.95
12. Understand how different students in your classroom are learning?	3.57	0.91
13. Set challenging and appropriate expectations of learning and performance for students?	3.55	0.80
14. Use a variety of assessments (e.g., observation, portfolios, tests, performance tasks, anecdotal records) to determine student strengths and needs?	3.55	1.05
15. Encourage students to see, question, and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives?	3.55	0.85
16. Develop students' questioning and discussion skills?	3.53	0.87
17. Adjust instructional approaches (e.g., planning, pacing, etc.) to account for students' different learning styles?	3.51	0.87
18. Evaluate curriculum materials for their usefulness and appropriateness for your students?	3.47	1.07
19. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning?	3.37	0.97
20. Choose teaching strategies to meet different student needs?	3.32	0.85
21. Maintain discipline and an orderly, purposeful learning environment?	3.30	1.05
22. Help all students achieve high academic standards?	3.23	0.75
23. Help students learn how to assess their own learning?	3.09	1.06
24. Work with diverse families and communities?	3.09	0.79
25. Work with parents and families to better understand students and to support their learning?	3.08	0.96
26. Use technology to increase student learning?	3.04	0.98
27. Apply English Language proficiency standards?	2.87	1.04
28. Identify and address special learning needs and/or difficulties?	2.75	1.02
29. Teach in ways that support new English language learners?	2.75	0.92
30. Build individual plans for students who have special behavioral, social, and/or academic needs?	2.72	1.13
31. Refer students for special assistance when appropriate?	2.70	0.95
32. Develop teaching strategies to use with English Learners at different levels of language acquisition?	2.60	1.04
33. Use technology to assess and track student learning?	2.53	0.93

*Items were modeled after a survey tool by Darling-Hammond, with permission of the author: Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Assessing teacher education: The usefulness of multiple measures for assessing program outcomes. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57,* 120-138.

We looked more specifically at alumni's perception of their preparation in curriculum and instruction (a scale including items 5, 6, 8, 9, 16 and 18), and their work in meeting needs of ELLs and Special Needs students (a scale including items 27-32). Overall, candidates felt somewhat to quite well

prepared in curriculum and instruction (Mean on the six items was 3.62, SD=.82), but less well prepared to meet the needs of special populations (Mean on the six items was 2.73, SD=.77). There were no significant differences in alumni's mean scores on these scales by either level or year graduated.

In open-ended comments, one area in which numerous participants reported feeling either skilled and/or well-prepared was creating a supportive classroom community. For example, alumni reported strengths in: "getting to know students' individual interests", "building a community of respect", "developing relationships with students", creating "open", "positive" and "comfortable" learning environments, "forming personal connections with students", and establishing "good rapport". In connection with this, several alumni mentioned feeling well-prepared and skilled in classroom management (although a few also indicated wanting more training in this area). On the rating items, creating a community where students are supportive of each other was also reported as a relative strength of the program 3.85 (SD=.97). Mean ratings did differ by graduation year on this item, with those who had been teaching for more than 1 year feeling significantly better prepared (p<.05) to created a classroom community where students are supportive of each other than those who had only been teaching for a year [M=4.12, SD=.88 for those out more than one year, while M=3.37, SD=.96 for those out one year]

In terms of areas for improvement, several alumni reported on the open ended items that they would like more on specific strategies for teaching, whether with special populations, like ELLs or Special Needs students, strategies for teaching reading, or "more practical strategies on how to differentiate instruction". This theme was more common in the comments from the Early Childhood/ Elementary Alumni than the Middle Level / High School Alumni.

Initial I School Counseling License

In 2008-09 we had a relatively low participation rate from our school counseling graduates (5 participated), in part because the request for participation went out several weeks after students had completed the program. We recently completed the survey for the 2009-10 graduates, sending the survey just after program completion. This method resulted in greater success in garnering graduates' responses (13 participated, representing over half of our completers). Participating completers for both years reported having a more than adequate (rating of 4) to exceptional (rating of 5) experience in the program [for 2008-09 the mean was 4.40; for 2009-10 the mean was 4.62]. Faculty quality and expertise and field experience were rated as particular strengths both years, and several completers specifically pointed to their strong preparation in the ASCA national model. For 2009-10 completers, additional strengths included curricular content and the applicability of course content to professional practice.

2009-2010 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

(c) Statement of future goals for next academic year with the indicators to be used for measurement of accomplishment.

Initial I Teaching License,
Early Childhood/Elementary and Middle Level/High School

The faculty in the Early Childhood/Elementary program continue to monitor the degree to which candidates receive adequate professional knowledge and skills in the area of working with students identified as having special needs. Feedback from the students graduating this summer as well as from their supervisors and mentors will be combined with an analysis of their work samples to determine whether another semester hour of special education needs to be added to the curriculum.

This year each program and department in the Graduate School wrote a five-year Strategic Plan. The Teacher Education plan included the goals of developing much closer partnerships with local schools and creating a system for tracking achievement outcomes for students of our graduates.

Advanced Teacher Preparation Programs
(ESOL/Bilingual, Reading, and Special Educator Endorsement Programs)

ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
The faculty in the ESOL Endorsement continues to monitor the degree to which candidates receive adequate professional knowledge and skills in preparing teachers to work with English Language Learners and their families. Feedback from the students' course evaluations, and adjunct and faculty feedback is combined with an analysis of work samples in portfolios to determine changes and adjustments in the ESOL Endorsement.

This year the ESOL Endorsement wrote a Strategic Plan and established goals for the next five years. This coming year goals include:
- Strengthen the existing ESOL Endorsement design through the processes and assessments mentioned in section 3a.
- Add two high quality on-line courses (ESOL 500-Historical and Legal Foundations and ESOL 501 Strategies and Materials for Teaching Literacy and Content to ESOL/Bilingual Students) to existing on-line offerings. The indicator of quality will be assessed through processes and tools mentioned in 3a.
- Strengthen the content and delivery of courses that have been infused in the Teacher Education Pre-Service Program (See 4a). The indicators of quality include the assessment tools mentioned in 3a.
- Review of syllabus to determine alignment in evaluation of assignments.
- Conduct two interviews a year with District ESL Directors to ask them how teachers who have gone through the ESOL Endorsement are doing and if they have any curriculum additions that would be beneficial to district programs.
- Meet once a year to read to evaluate random portfolios in order to see how assignments can be improved.

In addition to the ESOL Endorsement evaluation, each year the Teacher Education faculty schedules a day to meet with the Director of Research and Assessment in order to review all data related to the ESOL program goals. The discussion from this meeting provides the impetus for the ESOL faculty to consider program modifications.

Special Education Endorsement
The Special Education Endorsement faculty has been busy making small adjustments in the program to insure it meets the new special education standards. At this point we anticipate presenting our program at the November, 2010 TSPC meeting.

Initial and Continuing Administrator License

As a program that teaches *and* practices continuous improvement, Lewis & Clark's educational administration program faculty collaborated to determine the following goals and outcome measures for the coming year in our quest to consistently improve our work. Some of these goals, given their complexity and importance, will be extended past the 2010-11 academic year, as they may take longer to accomplish. These goal areas focus on themes such as maintaining our rigorous, research-centered and practitioner-focused philosophy of leadership preparation, continuing our robust work related to diversity and culturally responsive practice, sustaining a commitment to improved uses of instructional and administrative technologies, and increasing our collaboration across programs with our colleagues in school counseling, school psychology, and teaching and learning. The table below provides additional information on these targeted improvement areas.

New Goals for 2010-2011:

General Program Goal:
      Maintain practitioner-focused, student-centered, research-grounded, and rigorous philosophies and practices

    Outcome measures
- End-of-course feedback
- Exit surveys,
- Interviews with those hiring Lewis & Clark College IAL and CAL completers will provide evidence of a practitioner-focused, student-centered, and research-grounded preparation program experience

 Diversity Goals:
     1) Increase number of students of color/potential school leaders of color;
     2) Increase number of instructors/faculty of color, from diverse backgrounds, and improve gender equity;
     3) Continue to strive for improved cultural awareness/ competence in all facets of the program (faculty, curriculum, pedagogy, assessments, etc.);

4) Create program culture that nurtures and sustains colleagues of color and from diverse backgrounds (long term).

Outcome measures:
- More students and potential leaders of color will enroll in and complete IAL and CAL in the Lewis & Clark program
- The number of scholars and practitioners of color serving in full time teaching and adjuncts positions will increase
- Faculty and adjuncts of color will remain in their posts for extended periods of time tenure-track faculty will be tenured and promoted
- Syllabi, reading materials, activities, and assessments will reflect culturally responsive themes and practices

Technology-related Goals:
1) Maintain an effective web presence for a variety of audiences;
2) Students will be able users and champions for effective instructional, informational and administrative technologies.

Outcome measures:
- End-of-course feedback
- Exit surveys
- Interviews with Lewis & Clark College IAL and CAL completers to provide evidence of an engaging, vibrant, and information-rich website
- End-of-course feedback
- Periodic focus groups will provide evidence of students' commitment to and successful usage of a variety of instructional and administrative technologies

Program Development Goal:
Collaborate across programs and departments (school counseling, school psychology, teaching and learning)

Outcome measures:
- Units of study integrating school counseling, school psychology, and teaching and learning themes and information will be developed and delivered
- End-of-course feedback
- Exit surveys
- Interviews or focus groups with Lewis & Clark College IAL and CAL completers to provide evidence of increased collaboration and integration of subjects as appropriate

Initial School Psychology License

1) Revise Practicum Handbook to include NASP domain/assignment linkages.
2) Determine future of License Only program with administrative consultation.
3) Send out Alumni Surveys in July of 2010 and use the data for next year's program review.

4) Curriculum Revision

     • Develop syllabi and collect student feedback on the progress of CPSY 507, 508, and 541.

     Based on student input both within the program and as recent graduates in the exit surveys, we significantly altered the Introduction to School Psychology courses (CPSY 507 and 508) by adding a semester credit to each for the start of the 2010-2011 school year. . We also added one semester credit hour to the first of the Assessment and Intervention courses (CPSY 541.) This enables us to more thoroughly address issues related to behavioral, academic, social and emotional interventions for school-based practices early in the program.

     • Revise Consultation course sequence and develop syllabi to address the concerns below from the exit interviews:

     Learning theory and curriculum development: Completers reported wanting additional training on how students learn, what it means to be "at grade level" in a certain area, and how teachers develop and/or utilize curriculum and develop and conduct assessment. One consistent recommendation was to collaborate more with the Teacher Education department to gain this body of knowledge.

     Counseling-related coursework: As part of their curriculum, students take courses in the Counseling Psychology program. While many find these courses useful for developing their counseling skills, they recommend that these courses give more attention to school issues and school-based practices.

5) Develop and submit program evaluation for NASP reapproval in March of 2011.

Initial I School Counseling License

Goals for 2010-11 include:

1. Responding efficiently and satisfactorily to the increased number of enrolled students.
   Indicators of measurement: The School Counseling program has seen an increase in enrollment of approximately 50% from 2009 to 2010 admissions. The growth in the program has created implications for course offerings, placement coordination, and hiring instructors, in particular. The faculty plans to discuss observations and feedback from faculty and students to monitor the impact of higher enrollment on the program. Course evaluations, final course enrollment numbers, student advising information will also inform future decisions and goals.

2. Providing additional support and guidance to hired adjunct faculty members.
   Indicators of measurement: Adjunct instructors have been hired to teach additional course sections. Current faculty members have committed to mentoring adjuncts instructors in order to provide the most seamless instruction and transition possible for students and instructors. New hires will receive mentoring in the areas of course development, policies and procedures,

program requirements, and instructional strategies. Adjunct instructors will be contacted via phone, email and in-person during the 2010-11 year and interviewed at the end of the year to discuss the impact and success of these efforts. Course evaluations will also provide information about instructor performance.

3. Providing additional support services to enrolled students of color.
   Indicators of measurement: The School Counseling faculty is committed to responding to the needs of enrolled students of color. A faculty-advised student group will meet on a regular basis during the school year. The group is aimed at retention, support, and professional development for students of color. At the conclusion of the 2010-11 school year, participating students of color will be interviewed about their experience and perceived success of efforts and future directions. Advising information will be gathered, and retention data of students of color will be collected by the Program Director in collaboration with the Registrar.

---

(4) The unit shall report:
(a) Any deviation from approved programs;

Initial I Teaching License,
Early Childhood/Elementary and Middle Level/High School

Early Childhood/Elementary: No deviation from the previously approved program.
Middle Level/High School: No deviation from the previously approved program.

Advanced Teacher Preparation Programs
(ESOL/Bilingual, Reading, and Special Educator Endorsement Programs)

ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
There are two changes to the ESOL Endorsement that have been on-going. The first is the partial infusion of the ESOL Endorsement into the Pre-service Teacher Education Program. For Pre-service teachers the course ESOL 535-Effective Practice in Teaching English Language Learners will take the place of ESOL 501/601 Strategies and Materials. This course has become part of the requirement for all teachers in the Teacher Education Program.

Pre-service students who wish to continue to pursue the ESOL Endorsement can also take one of two CORE Courses, CORE 501-31 Immigrants in the US: Challenges and Opportunities or ESOL 501-51 Supporting Minority Populations: Strategies for Teachers and Counselors. One of these courses can take the place of ESOL 502/602 Focus on Culture and Community in Teaching ESOL/Bilingual Students.

The second change has been the addition of on-line two ESOL courses:
ESOL 602 Focus on Culture and Community in teaching ESOL/Bilingual Students
ESOL 607 Language Acquisition and Development

Reading Endorsement
No deviation from the previously approved program.

Special Education Endorsement
No deviation from the previously approved program.

Initial and Continuing Administrator License

The Initial Administrative License (IAL) program was significantly revised during the 2006-2007 academic year. Since the fall of 2007, when the new program was fully implemented, program faculty have closely monitored IAL classes and the program. In consultation with instructors who regularly teach each of the courses, Lewis & Clark's educational administration faculty determined that adjustments in course hours were necessary. Our assessment revealed that several courses and objectives required less instructional time to accomplish while others required more. The IAL program still totals 18 semester credit hours, as approved by TSPC. However, the distribution of these hours was slightly modified. There was no fiscal impact to the overall program—either for the college or for our participating students. This minor modification was fully vetted and approved by the Graduate School of Education and Counseling Curriculum Committee. The table below outlines the refinements that were fully implemented during the summer 2010 semester.

IAL Course Number	Previous credit per course	New credit per course
EDAD 501	3	2.5
EDAD 502	3	2.5
EDAD 504A	2	2.5
EDAD 504B	2	2.5
EDAD 507	1	1.5
EDAD 560	3	2.5
EDAD 568	2.5	2
EDAD 569	1.5	2

Initial School Psychology License

No deviation from the previously approved program.

Initial I School Counseling License

No deviation from the previously approved program.

(b) Modifications of programs not subject to OAR 584-010-0045;

Initial I Teaching License,
Early Childhood/Elementary and Middle Level/High School

The Teacher Education Department hired three new tenure-line faculty: one in social studies education, a second in early childhood/elementary literacy and the third in early childhood/elementary mathematics.

In the Early Childhood/Elementary Pre-service Program, the faculty modified the course: ED 598: Practicum: Second Level of Authorization to be a permanent number: ED 517: Practicum: Second Level Authorization to include structured work in sites selected by our faculty for implementing "best practices" in serving second language learners, literacy, and mathematics education and where our faculty will facilitate observations and seminars with our candidates and, in exchange for the support from the building faculty will offer free in-service education opportunities.

Advanced Teacher Preparation Programs
(ESOL/Bilingual, Reading, and Special Educator Endorsement Programs)

ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
Modifications in the ESOL Endorsement include the infusion of ESOL 535 and CORE 501 into the Pre-service Teacher Education Program. We have created a planning work sheet for the Pre-Service ESOL Endorsement (See attachment) that reflects the addition of these courses. We are currently in conversations with TSPC to discuss the ESOL practicum settings.

Reading Endorsement
There were no content changes to the program. We made minor changes to the course titles of our two Practicum courses to make it clear that that these courses are where the practicum components are embedded, and to reflect the early childhood content already in our capstone class. We changed ED 532 Assessing Reading Strategies to "Practicum I: Assessing Reading Strategies" and we changed LA502 Innovations in Reading K-12 to "Practicum II: Innovations in Reading Pre-K through Grade 12."

Special Educator Endorsement
In the Special Education Endorsement, one semester hour was shifted from the introductory course, SPED 510 to the summative course, SPED 535. This was due to the fact many entering students have some special education background and the flexibility of the summative course to meet unique learning needs of a cohort allows for greater flexibility.

Initial and Continuing Administrator License

Beginning in the fall semester of 2009 under the facilitative leadership of Dr. Betty Flad, a committee of administrators, including local practicing principals and superintendents, along with Lewis & Clark's educational leadership faculty spent over 4 months refining and clarifying the Continuing Administrator

License (CAL) program courses and reviewing their correlation to the Oregon Standards for School Administrators. As part of the assessment, the team reviewed written feedback from students over time and conducted a face-to-face input session with current CAL students regarding the overall program. Moreover, they reviewed course offerings and class syllabi. A similar recalibration took place during the 2006-2007 academic year for the Lewis & Clark IAL program.

The work of this team targeted the following primary areas related to the CAL:
- Program strengths
- Program weaknesses or challenges
- Unnecessary course duplications or redundancies
- Alignment with TSPC standards

As a result of this focused work, a number of CAL classes were eliminated and will no longer be offered. The 18 CAL courses that will be offered are clustered under 4 unifying strands, Visionary Leadership and Ethical Practice; Instructional Improvement; Effective Management; and Socio-Political Contexts and Inclusive Practices. Students will select and take classes in each of the four strands then complete their program with the required Professional Mentorship and Seminar course. Each CAL class is 2 semester credit hours. The table below outlines the refinements that will be fully implemented during the fall 2010 semester.

STRAND ONE	Visionary Leadership and Ethical Practice
EDAD 523	Communication Skills & Conflict Resolution
EDAD 540	Organizational Change for Action
EDAD 553	Priority Leadership: Leading Systemic Change
EDAD 547	Ethical Leadership and Decision-making
EDAD 559	Collaborative Leadership & Team Building
STRAND TWO	Instructional Improvement
EDAD 548	Leadership for Learning & School Culture
EDAD 533	Professional Development for Instructional Leaders
EDAD 536	Leading Schools through Instructional Technologies
EDAD 537	Educational Research and Assessment
EDAD 532	Leading Difficult & Underperforming People to Excellence
STRAND THREE	Effective Management
EDAD 535	Managing Facilities and Resources
EDAD 546	Negotiation & Collective Bargaining
EDAD 531	Colloquium for New Administrators
EDAD 556	School Finance & District Budgeting
STRAND FOUR	Socio-Political Contexts and Inclusive Practices
EDAD 577	Advanced Colloquium for Practicing Administrators
EDAD 578	Leader as Ethnographer: Exploring and Engaging the School-Community

2009-2010 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

EDAD 542	Culturally Responsive Practices for School Leaders
EDAD 567	Developing Leadership Intelligences
Final Required Course	
EDAD 549	Professional Mentorship & Seminar

Initial School Psychology License

Removed CPSY 512 (Counseling Theories) from program curriculum because of student feedback and faculty deliberation toward adding more school-based theories of counseling and interventions. Added one semester credit to CPSY 507, 508 and 541 in order to address such concerns.

Initial I School Counseling License

The School Counseling Program has made no modifications from the approved program during the 2009-10 year. There have been no changes to program planning worksheets.

(c) Any change in the liaison officer;

Sharon Chinn will continue to serve as Lewis & Clark's liaison officer to TSPC.

(d) Addition of off-campus courses, including but not limited [to] the addition of online or distance delivery of courses within an approved program;

Initial I Teaching License,
Early Childhood/Elementary and Middle Level/High School

Early Childhood/Elementary: No off-campus nor online courses have been added.
Middle Level/High School: No off-campus nor online courses have been added.

Advanced Teacher Preparation Programs
(ESOL/Bilingual, Reading, and Special Educator Endorsement Programs)

ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
We have added two on-line courses- ESOL 602 Focus on Culture and Community in teaching ESOL/Bilingual Students and ESOL 607 Language Acquisition and Development

We have added three courses that have taken the place of existing courses in the ESOL Endorsement for Pre-Service teachers in the Teacher Education Program.

Reading Endorsement

The Reading endorsement program is currently offered at the following sites: Rainier SD; St. Helens SD; Molalla River SD; David Douglas SD; east Portland (combined districts). The program is offered in a cohort-model with all courses being delivered at the school district site.

Special Education Endorsement

Due to lack of enrollment, for the first time in 12 years, the Special Education Endorsement was not offered in central Oregon. The endorsement will be offered again during the 2010/11 academic year.

Initial and Continuing Administrator License

There have been no major changes in the regional IAL and CAL programs in Central, Eastern, and the Southern Coastal areas of the state except to align classes with the refinements noted above.

Initial School Psychology License

No off-campus nor online courses have been added.

Initial I School Counseling License

The School Counseling Program created several courses as a partnership between the Lewis & Clark Center for Community Engagement and the Beaverton School District (BSD) for practicing school counselors working toward their Initial II School Counseling license. In collaboration with the BSD Central District Coordinator for School Counseling, the School Counseling Program offered several Independent Study courses including *"SCED 689 Facilitating Courageous Conversations"* (9 enrolled); *"SCED 689 Using Data to Increase Student Success"* (26 enrolled); and *"SCED 689 Increasing Data Skills"* (23 enrolled) . The requirements of the courses align with the ASCA National Model and Oregon Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling Framework guidelines specifically for school counselors to show leadership and in the areas of cultural competency and data-based decision making and action research skills.

In addition, the School Counseling Program provided access to two summer courses for practicing school counseling seeking graduate degree credit toward their Initial II School Counseling License. The two courses, SCED 550 Clinical Issues for School Counselors and SCED 598 College Planning, were well received by practicing counselors, as indicated by the instructors.

In the future, the course evaluations of these particular courses will be reviewed by faculty, and a discussion between faculty, school counselors, and district administrators will be held to determine the future course offering and potential expansion of courses to meet the needs of Initial II Licensure requirements.

(e) Evidence that the consortium meets regularly and has reviewed evaluation results and made recommendations for improvement of program design and operation;

Please see attached Winter 2010 and Spring 2010 Educational Consortium meeting minutes.

(f) Evidence that the unit has provided written response to consortium recommendations; and

RECOMMENDATION FROM CONSORTIUM	INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE
Action: A "technology" agenda item will be added to the 2009-10 Educational Consortium meeting agenda for updates on this topic. (16 April 2009)	Sharon Chinn added a "technology" agenda item to the Spring 2010 Educational Consortium meeting and arranged for Damian Miller to speak to the topic. (6 May 2010)

(g) Data indicating number of students enrolled in approved programs by content and authorization levels and how this compares to the previous five years.

Preservice MAT Plus Initial I Teaching License Historical Enrollment

		2009-10	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05
Art	ML/HS	10	10	4	7	7	8
Language Arts	ML/HS	21	17	18	19	22	20
Foreign Language, Spanish and French	ML/HS	0	6	4	1	0	0
Mathematics, Basic and Advanced	ML/HS	7 advanced, 5 basic	7	7	4	2	4
Multiple Subjects	EC/EL	73	66	60	62	61	47
Music	ML/HS	2	1	2	0	0	0
Biology	ML/HS	10	5	8	6	8	9
Chemistry	ML/HS	1	0	1	0	0	2
Physics	ML/HS	3	0	0	2	0	0
Integrated Science	ML/HS	5	4	4	3	2	1
Social Studies	ML/HS	20	16	18	23	18	19

"Post-Baccalaureate" program as license requirements are completed in advance of degree requirements

Inservice and Advanced Program Historical Enrollment

	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05
ESOL	84	50	103	85	77	35
ESOL/Bilingual	8	11	13	12	13	8
Reading	50	70	93	36	41	17
Special Education	32	57	40	27	27	8
Exceptional Learner I--Basic/Standard Endorsement	7	9	6	6	10	2
Continuing Teaching License	78	80	93	61	69	56
Initial Administrator	89	83	110	101	83	47
Continuing Administrator	128	138	156	109	109	92
Basic Superintendent	1	1	1	1	0	0
Continuing Superintendent	0	0	1	0	1	1
Superintendent Bridge, SAL to CAL	0	2	4	5	5	6
Initial School Psychology	61	58	49	51	54	58
Initial School Counseling--Track I	17	11	10	17	15	21
Initial School Counseling--Track II	68	49	48	53	53	58

2009-2010 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Educational Consortium Meeting Minutes
Winter 2010—pages 31-34
Spring 2010—pages 35-39

Educational Consortium
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College
Winter Meeting Minutes
4 February 2010
Rogers Hall, Room 218

Members in Attendance
Vanessa Bunker, Sharon Klin, Dylan McCann, Jennifer Reeves, and Carolyn Carr
Non-voting Members in Attendance
Scott Fletcher, Janet Bixby, and Sharon Chinn
Special Guests
Becky Haas, Peter Mortola, and Hanna Neuschwander

Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions, and Charge
The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:30 p.m. by **Sharon Chinn**. Consortium members and guests introduced themselves and Sharon C. reminded members of their charge.

Update from the Dean's Office (Including Presidential Search, Faculty Searches, Budget, and Accreditation)
Scott Fletcher, Dean of the Graduate School, first commented on the college's presidential search. He said that an on-campus interview pool has been identified but that, due to high demands for confidentiality amongst the applicants, none of the finalists are willing to have their names made public at this time. Because of issues of confidentiality, final interviews of candidates will also be kept in confidence. Scott said that the pool is strong and that the search is on track for a single final candidate to be presented at the February meeting of Lewis & Clark's Board of Trustees.

Regarding faculty searches, Scott informed consortium members of a search in Educational Leadership and of three searches in Teacher Education (two early childhood/elementary (EC/EL) and one in social studies). The three finalists in the Educational Leadership search are scheduled to be on campus this week and next. Both the EC/EL Literacy, EC/EL Math, and the Social Studies searches are close to finalizing on-campus interview pools.

Budget-wise, the Board of Trustees is scheduled to approve the 2010-11 budget at their February meeting, including a confidential discussion of the budget proposal. Renovation of the South Campus Conference Center (which houses many graduate school classes and activities) is up for board approval. The renovation proposal includes a "green" design with skylights, a passive heating and cooling system, and an intention to reduce the carbon footprint of the entire building.

The graduate school faculty and staff are currently in the midst of preparing for several accreditation visits including CACREP (counseling psychology), NCATE (education), and TSPC (education). Janet Bixby, Associate Dean, and Mollie Galloway, Director of Research and Assessment, have been working on the accreditation program design, particularly in preparation for the NCATE-TSPC joint visit. The graduate school has elected to follow NCATE's "continuous improvement" model which will require a more consistent investment of resources and the identification of one particular NCATE standard in

which the education programs agree to work toward the "target" level. TSPC is in the midst of redesigning their unit and program standards and Lewis & Clark is hoping to pilot those standards at our April 2012 joint NCATE-TSPC site visit.

Finally, the entire graduate school is engaged in a strategic planning process. Individual program and staff reports are due to Scott by May to be compiled into one comprehensive report over the summer and with the goal of a 5-year plan to be presented to the community in the fall.

Dylan McCann asked where the new classrooms will be added to the South Campus Conference Center. Scott replied that the current kitchen area will be converted to classrooms.

2009 Annual Report to TSPC
Sharon Chinn began by providing consortium members with an overview of the contents of the annual report as required by TSPC (through the *Oregon Administrative Rules*). Scott then walked members through the strategic plans, both long- and short-term, as stated in the report. In regard to the plans around the Center for Community Engagement (CCE), **Janet Bixby** reminded consortium members that former member, Sherri Carreker, is leading this newly launched center. The CCE will encompass continuing education plus community engagement, including grants in which the community is invited to participate. The Indigenous Ways of Knowing (IWOK) program will be housed within CCE as will the Center for Equitable Research and the proposed Documentary Studies Certification Program.

Another change was the restructuring of the graduate school's two existing departments into three— we now have the Teacher Education, Counseling Psychology, and Educational Leadership+School Counseling Departments. With the creation of the Educational Leadership+School Counseling Department, Dr. Carolyn Carr was hired to head the new department. **Carolyn Carr** added that one of the major projects underway in the new department, with key input from the professional community, is the restructuring of the doctoral program in educational leadership. Program changes have been approved and will be rolled out starting Summer 2010.

Finally, in regard to strategic planning, Scott commented that quite a bit of work is being done in regard to technology in the graduate school and with the ultimate goal of reforming the school's Technology Committee. Sharon C. added that a technology update will be presented at the consortium's spring meeting.

The annual report then moves on to talk specifically about program changes and modifications. Carolyn spoke to the school counseling and educational leadership programs. She said that exit surveys have been conducted in these two programs but, in the past, they have not garnered a positive response rate. The department is working with Research and Assessment to improve the response rate this year. In past surveys, very few areas have been listed by students as "areas for improvement." Carolyn went on to say that the enrollment for the school counseling program has doubled this year. In Educational Leadership, both the Initial and the Continuing Administrator License programs have been re-assessed and the Continuing program is going through revisions and re-approval.

Next **Peter Mortola**, director of the school psychology program, spoke of this nationally-approved program (approved by NASP). Peter informed members that this is a three-year program and that faculty are currently working on ensuring coherence throughout the program. Changes and modifications are being made based on student feedback.

Scott reported on the Teacher Education Department. This particular department experiences a high percentage of student responses on their exit surveys. Student feedback is regularly reviewed and suggested changes are incorporated into the program design.

Drawing to the end of the report, Sharon C. drew the consortium's attention to the list of recommendations from the consortium to the institution and Lewis & Clark's response over the 2008-09 academic year.

Graduate Admissions Committee Report

Becky Haas, Director of the Graduate Admissions office, began her comments by letting the consortium know that this is the season for recruiting. She said that she and her staff have been recruiting for the graduate school's programs at on-campus information sessions and at colleges and recruiting events throughout the Pacific Northwest.

To enhance communication with prospective students, the college's office of Public Affairs and Communications (PubComm) has recently helped produce a viewbook featuring the graduate school's programs. The school's new website has also made program and admissions information much more accessible to the public.

The office of graduate admissions regularly reviews and updates their application processes, including the addition of new forms, form revisions, and the addition of new admissions requirements (for instance, there is now a math and science requirement for preservice early childhood/elementary candidates and a basic skills test requirement for school psychology candidates). As part of the review of office practices, the application deadline for the preservice program has been moved from January to December. Even with all of these changes, applications, in general, are up from two years ago—although they are slightly down from last year.

Curriculum Committee Report

Sharon Chinn reminded consortium members that, years ago, they elected her as their representative to the graduate school's Curriculum Committee. With that, **Hanna Neuschwander**, Director of Graduate Communications and the person responsible for creating the graduate school's catalogue, provided a brief overview of the Curriculum Committee. She explained that the committee is a faculty body and a representative group that reviews curriculum additions, deletions, and modifications while taking a global view and then making recommendations to the graduate dean's office.

Hanna provided a handout showing the current composition of the committee, the committee's work, and its "work of note" for 2009-10. Specifically, Hanna highlighted new forms that have been created and piloted for course and program approval and modifications. She also mentioned a newly-approved policy for the approval of academic certificate programs (particularly important as the "Documentary Studies" proposal is in the pipeline).

Janet commented that the calendar year cycle for the work of the Curriculum Committee has been formalized and approved by the faculty this year. Sharon C. explained how the consortium fits into the graduate school's program approval model. Using the Continuing Administrator License (CAL) program modifications several years ago as an example, Sharon explained how modifications go through several stages of approval including program, departmental, curriculum committee, dean's office, consortium, board (if required), and TSPC (if required).

Vanessa Bunker asked whether there are academic certificate programs at other institutions. Hanna explained that this will be a first for the graduate school and that, typically, institutions have professional certificate programs rather than academic. (Academic certificate programs are on the same "level" as degree programs and must go through the same level of approval as degree programs whereas professional certificate programs can be offered with minimal pre-approval.) Scott added that all certificate programs must be sustainable and that they usually serve a very specific professional community. **Jennifer Reeves** asked about the admissions process for certificate programs. Scott replied that there will be a process but that it will be streamlined. Dylan inquired as to the number of applicants for these programs. Scott said that these could run as cohorts and that there would most likely be some overlap with students from other graduate programs also taking academic certificate program courses (to meet elective and other requirements). Carolyn added that certificate programs tend to recognize expertise in a very particular area. Dylan asked whether alumni can return to take part in certificate programs; the answer was "yes." **Sharon Klin** suggested surveying graduates of certificate programs for their feedback.

New Business

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Spring 2009 Educational Consortium minutes be accepted, with the following changes—that, on the first page, second paragraph under "Dean's Report," "…(encompassing both educational administration and school psychology)…, "psychology" be changed to "counseling." Also that, in the same paragraph, the spelling of the word "appointment" be corrected.

Sharon Chinn reminded consortium members that a chair for the 2009-10 and 2010-11 academic years needed to be elected. **Sharon Klin** called for nominations and Sharon C. nominated Martha Gross (in absentia, but as approved in an earlier e-conversation with Martha).

> **Action**: The consortium unanimously approved Martha Gross' tenure as chair of the Educational Consortium for a term running for the 2009-10 and 2010-11 academic years.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 6 p.m. by Sharon Chinn.
Notes taken and submitted by Educational Consortium Executive Secretary, Sharon Chinn.

<div align="center">

Educational Consortium
Graduate School of Education and Counseling
Lewis & Clark College
Spring Meeting Minutes
6 May 2010
Rogers Hall, Room 220

</div>

Members in Attendance
Martha Gross, Dylan McCann, Jennifer Reeves, and Vern Jones
Non-voting Members in Attendance
Janet Bixby and Sharon Chinn
Special Guests
Mollie Galloway, Damian Miller, and Sara Violante

Call to Order, Welcome and Introductions
The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:30 p.m. by **Martha Gross**. Consortium members and guests introduced themselves.

Introduction of and Update on Graduate Alumni Office
Sara Violante, Graduate Alumni Director, began her comments by explaining to consortium members that this is a newly resurrected office in the graduate school. In the process of making the office viable once again, it has been discovered that there are currently three data systems tracking graduate alumni. The college is in the process of purchasing a new system to be used by all three campuses which will include an alumni directory function. (The college hopes to have the system up-and-running by the end of the year.) Other activity in the office since its recreation earlier this year include events combining alumni from all three schools, marketing continuing education opportunities, and co-hosting a networking dinner with the graduate school's student union network (SUN).

Vern Jones commented how positive it is to create events in which alumni really are drawn to participate, citing a recent trip to Kenya in which alumni from all three schools were invited. He also suggested keeping a seat or two open for alumni in popular classes such as in Ecoscapes: Costa Rica. Vern advocated for long-time graduate school faculty to be present at alumni events. **Janet Bixby** mentioned that the Ecoscapes: Costa Rica class/trip is currently open for student and alumni registrations through the Center for Community Engagement.

Sara concluded her comments by adding that the new alumni database will include alumni from degree programs as well as completers of license-only and endorsement programs and those students who enroll in graduate continuing education classes/workshops.

Update on K-12 Career and Licensing Services
Sharon Chinn, director of Student Services and Licensing, began by providing consortium members with an overview of the work of the career and licensing office:

<div align="center">

35
2009-2010 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

</div>

- The K-12 Career and Licensing Services office provides education-related career advising and TSPC and out-of-state licensing assistance. The office serves the graduate school's education students, alumni, and faculty.
- Counseling Psychology students are served by the office of Counseling Psychology Career and Professional Resources.
- Sharon visits student teaching and school counseling and school psychology internship classes twice a year—in the fall with a focus on preparing for the job search and in the spring with a licensing focus.
- Students, alumni, and faculty schedule appointments throughout the year for in-person visits regarding job search and licensing advising. Advising also happens by e-mail and phone.
- This year, Sharon hosted our 10th Annual Metro Educator Fair. The fair is held each year prior to the larger Oregon Professional Educator Fair.
  - The MEF is held prior to the OPEF at the request of school districts.
  - School districts from throughout the Willamette Valley and SW Washington are invited to attend.
  - 11 school districts and agencies attended this year's event.
- Although hiring for licensed educators in the Portland area and SW Washington is expected to be about the same or only slightly better this year than least, several of Oregon's largest districts, including Beaverton and Salem-Keizer, began building their applicant pools in January and February.
- While some measures, such as the "Keep Our Educators Working Act" (which is currently being considered in the Senate ($23 billion)), are being considered, the funds are not currently available to help districts fully staff their buildings.
- Oregon has recently pulled out of the "Race to the Top" grant, so funds won't be available from that federal source, either.
- Issues for this year's new teachers, school counselors, and school psychologists include competing against last year's graduates who were unable to find employment in schools. Both sets of graduates are also competing with experienced teachers who are returning to the workforce or who have been laid off from long-time positions.
- The Graduate Dean's office, the K-12 Career and Licensing Services office, and the Center for Community Engagement are currently planning conversations with the graduate school community regarding ways to connect with and offer support to graduates who continue to seek employment or who may be facing potential lay-offs.

Martha Gross asked whether the number of applications to our graduate programs were up or down with the economy. Vern replied that it depended on the program—for example, the preservice program numbers were up with a waitlist while numbers in educational administration continue to be down (due to lack of district funding to support aspiring principals in these programs). Vern said that this year's (2010-11) preservice cohorts will be the biggest yet. Concerns for the future include a predicted retirement boom from 2011-13, issues around teacher retention, and the workforce becoming much younger. Martha asked about the impact on school placements for student teaching as programs increase in size. Vern acknowledged that this has become an issue, particularly as some schools with new administrators will not allow student teachers in their buildings.

Update on Accreditation
Janet Bixby, Associate Dean, explained to consortium members the make-up of the graduate school's NCATE-TSPC accreditation team and the fact that the team meets weekly, year-round. Members of team, Mollie Galloway and Sharon Chinn, in particular, produce annual reports for both organizations (NCATE/AACTE and TSPC). Janet announced that the school's education programs are on track for an April 1-4, 2012, NCATE-TSPC site visit and that graduate school will be piloting a "Continuous Improvement" model for the NCATE portion of the visit.

In preparation for the 2012 visit, all of the data for the education programs must be collected by Fall 2010. Moodle, the college's online course delivery system, is being used as the storage-place for the electronic exhibits that are being gathered and all programs are submitting exhibits and data. The NCATE-TSPC team and, in particular, Mollie and Damian Miller (representing the graduate school's Research and Assessment office), are working closely with faculty on collecting, analyzing, and using data for program improvement.

Sharon Chinn reminded consortium members that they are involved in the accreditation process through the annual reports to TSPC and interviews during the site visit. Janet added that the TSPC rules for programs are currently in the process of being redesigned and that Lewis & Clark will be piloting the new rules during the April 2012 site visit. **Mollie Galloway** reminded members that she submits annual reports to NCATE/AACTE and that Sharon does the same for TSPC, both in collaboration with the dean's office, department chairs, and program faculty.

Janet announced that the national search for a new director of research and assessment was drawing to a close with an offer about to be made. **Vern Jones** commented that, accreditation-wise, faculty must always be reminded to document everything (minutes from every meeting, changes to programs).

Data Summit
Mollie Galloway, the graduate school's director of Research and Assessment, provided consortium members with detailed information regarding the school's assessment design (via a PowerPoint presentation). Using the preservice middle level/high school program as an example, she told members that the guiding question was, "What are the key indicators that we're meeting our standards?" As an example, in graduate admissions, faculty review content courses on the undergraduate transcripts and look at applicant's resumes and letters to document experience working with children. Faculty also developed standards for student teaching placements at the second level of authorization, via evaluative portfolios. Once in student teaching, faculty then use the "Intern Teaching Profiles" for both student teachers and interns to show how preservice students have grown in their teaching practice over their year in the program. At the conclusion of the program, program-specific exit surveys are administered to all students.

Mollie provided an example of the data from the 2008-09 online exit survey looking at student satisfaction in a variety of areas. She pointed out that the feedback, in MEANS, is usually quite high—above 4 on a 1-5 scale. Mollie shared with members that curriculum and course applicability both rated at about 60% across all programs (this is the percentage of graduates who rated these areas as a strength). On the other hand, "diversity," at 42%, rated as an area of weakness.

2009-2010 Annual Report to TSPC
Submitted by Lewis & Clark College

Expanding on "diversity" as an area of weakness, Mollie shared that the Research and Assessment office has worked with the graduate school's Diversity Committee to develop specific question to draw out from students and graduates specific areas for improvement and areas of strength.

Dylan McCann asked how self-reflections from student teacher work-samples are assessed and how that data is evaluated and used. **Janet Bixby** replied that the feedback on self-reflections, at least in the middle level/high school program, is reviewed by faculty, supervisors, and mentors. Dylan replied that, in his experience in the early childhood/elementary program, supervisors and mentors review the self-reflections but not faculty. **Vern Jones** answered that there was a misunderstanding by the all-new faculty in the program in the current year and that there will be a meeting in Fall 2010 by all preservice faculty regarding work-sample evaluations.

Dylan then asked how student evaluations of mentors in the preservice program are used. Mollie replied that the data from mentor evaluations goes back to the early childhood/elementary and middle level/high school program cohort coordinators in time for them to review and use in making decisions for the next year's student teaching placements.

Mollie concluded her remarks by stating that Data Summits in the graduate school will continue, including presentations to the consortium.

Technology Report
As requested of the graduate school by the consortium, **Damian Miller**, representing the college's IT office, attended the meeting to present an update on technology in the graduate school. Damian began his comments by informing consortium members that the budget for instructional technology has been expanded. One direct impact of this increase in funding has been the encouragement to faculty to pursue online instruction.

In support of technology in the graduate school, last spring, the first SMARTBOARD was installed in Rogers Hall (in the graduate school). This installation has led to the question about how does the graduate school community best use this resource both on-campus and in training educators and counselors to use similar technology out in the field. While some training has already occurred, additional training opportunities on the use of the SMARTBOARD will be provided, hopefully including a faculty panel and a student showcase of instructional applications.

Another key area that has seen improvements is in the use of student video. All student videos have now gone digital. This changeover has provided both challenges and opportunities, equipment-wise with the good news being that the new equipment is much easier to use than the old. Damian reported being in the process of developing a "Digital Video Literacy" training course.

Videoconferencing is another area of technology whose use in on the rise in the graduate school. While quite a bit of set-up work is required at the front-end, training is available for faculty and staff. (Faculty are currently beginning to use videoconferencing for activities such as sharing speakers with students in remote locations, conducting remote site visits, and providing advising to students who

reside off-campus.) Similarly, video-streaming and recording may be available in the new South Campus Conference Center classrooms which are scheduled to come online this Fall 2010.

Damian continued his comments saying that the graduate school now offers classes on-campus, online, in hybrid (or online+on-campus) form, and off-site. Both the ESOL and educational leadership programs are using this mix of instruction. Moodle, the college's "learning management system," has become a positive tool for encouraging student input—thus demonstrating one of the strengths of online teaching. There have also been similar positive "discoveries" by faculty about student participation through the use of videoconferencing. Finally, educational leadership faculty have also begun experimenting with "public web-writing" or blogging assignments for students.

Dylan McCann commented that he loves that Lewis & Clark is being so pro-active when it comes to technology. **Vern Jones** added that Damian has been absolutely key to bringing this advanced technology to the graduate school and for making the technology accessible to the entire graduate school community. **Martha Gross** said that she really appreciates the pushing faculty toward the use of technology.

Damian concluded his remarks by say that this and similar conversations serve to enrich the process for all learners.

New Business

> **Motion**: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Winter 2010 Educational Consortium minutes be accepted, as written.

Sharon Chinn thanked Dylan McCann and Jennifer Reeves for their time serving as student representatives to the consortium and provided each with a "thank you" box of chocolate. **Vern Jones** added that the student voice and feedback is critical to the programs and added his thanks to Dylan and Jennifer. Vern also invited continued conversation and further feedback. **Dylan McCann** and **Jennifer Reeves** thanked the graduate school for the opportunity to serve on the consortium.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 6 p.m. by Martha Gross.
Notes taken and submitted by Educational Consortium Executive Secretary, Sharon Chinn.

10. Syllabi for Courses

This section contains syllabi for courses on-campus and off-campus. Each syllabus is accompanied by the special education standards table indicating which standards (including benchmarks) are met in the course. Syllabi are presented to candidates with the accompanying standards at the start of each course each semester. Beginning in May 2011, syllabi will have a cover sheet which documents which reading, project, or assessment or assignment covers which benchmark/standard.

Course: SPED 510 Educating Students with Special Needs
Semester: Summer, Term II- June, 2010
Instructor: Christine Moore Office: Office: Rogers Hall, 405
Appointments can be made for before and after class.

Text: <u>Exceptional Children: An Introduction to Special Education</u>
8th or 9th Ed.
Dates/Time: M-Fri., 6/21-6/30 12:30-4:30 Location: Howard Hall, Rm.203

Course Description: Content: Analysis of child/adolescent development and the cognitive, linguistic, motor, behavioral, and learning characteristics of individuals with special needs. With the focus on progress monitoring and accountability ,topics include history, current policies and procedures, the practice of special education based on scientific research, incorporation of technology, and legal issues. Students develop and refine a research-based foundation in the education of students with special needs, including the impact of linguistic and cultural variability on special education eligibility and practice.
Prerequisites: None.
Credits: 2 semester hours.

Class Description: Successful practice as a special educator is determined by student learning, which in turn is built on a foundation of validated techniques specific to individuals with disabilities. Though similar in many areas to the foundations of general education, special education policies, procedures and practices are drawn from a variety of information including child/adolescent development, curriculum & instruction, disability research and the requirements of legislation and litigation. This course focuses on the confluence of these different sources of information and the school based programs, services, roles, requirements, and responsibilities which are the result.

Course Objectives:	Demonstration/Outcome:
Students will increase their knowledge of high/low incidence disabilities and instructional practices with demonstrated student outcomes .	Special Education Answer Book
Students will demonstrate understanding of special education processes / procedures (Prereferral (RTI), Referral, Eligibility, IEP, Placement, Reevaluation) as applied to	Answer Book Case Presentation

**educational practice in elementary, middle
and secondary schools.**

Students will demonstrate understanding	**Case Presentation**
of the learning strengths & needs of students	
With disabilities in terms of the Oregon	
State Standards as evidenced through	
Instructional practices.	

Students will demonstrate their understanding of	**Case Presentation**
The legal framework of special education	
(IDEA '04, Section 504, ADA and relevant	
litigation, as applied to the practice of educating	
students with disabilities.	

<u>**Special Education Endorsement Standards**</u>
**The newly adopted special education standards are listed below. Though to the
degree relevant, each standard is present in each of the endorsement courses,
the specific standards which are the focus of this course are indicated.**

Standard	SPED 510
Standard 1: Foundations	**X**
Standard 2; Development and Characteristics of Learners	**X**
Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences	**X**
Standard 4 Instructional Strategies	**X**
Standard 5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions.	
Standard 6: Language	
Standard 7: Instructional Planning	**X**
Standard 8: Assessment	
Standard 9 Professional and Ethical Practice	**X**
Standard 10: Collaboration	**X**

Course Requirements

I. <u>**Special Education Answer Book**</u>   **Due: - June,30th**
**A series of questions focused on many of the most relevant issues regarding
educating students with disabilities and the practice of special education is provided**

with this syllabus. Information covered will include IDEA '04/'06, the special education process etc.

You are asked to compile & edit a <u>Special Education Answer Book</u>. Each section of the "book" should contain the question and the information which answers that question. (It should not contain other information that requires the reader to sift through to get the answer to the question. Answers need to be read and edited prior to being included. Remember you will be the eventual reader.)

You do not have to make the answers to the questions original work. You are asked instead to compile accurate and succinct answers from what is already available from websites, (ode.state.or.us), (http: idea/ed.gov/), text(s), your district and relevant materials.

II. Case Study: Specially Designed Instruction   Due: June 30th

As a special education teacher, knowledge of accommodations which assist a special education eligible student in benefiting from the general education curriculum is essential. Accommodations must be a bridge between the student and the learning task.

Prepare presentation (8-10 minutes) on the instruction sequence (How you would teach X.) for a student with a disability in reading or math. You can use any grade level appropriate lesson.

Describe the student briefly, then describe the lesson and the accommodations you would make to facilitate the student's learning.   Use the following as the outline for your brief written outline & <u>presentation:</u>

A.   Describe the student: strengths/weaknesses, skills in the academic area, learning issues, and behavior concerns. What is the student's disability?
B. Describe the "lesson". What is the learning or goal of the lesson for the student? What do you do? What do the student(s) do?
C. Describe the 'adaptations' (differentiated instruction, universal design, accommodations &/or modifications) you would use to support student learning.
D. Describe how you will know whether the student has "learned" what was presented?

 Topic Outline/ Text Reading

June 21st : I**. Review syllabus/assignments**.
> 1. What's special about Special Education? History of Special Education Models/Theories/Practices
> 2. CEC Content Standards for Special Ed. Tchrs/New OARs
> 3. What are "evidence based instructional practices" and why are they important?
> 4. The Special education Process (Response-to-Intervention, RTI)
> **READ: First three introductory chapters. (Read the Summary & fill in as needed)**

June 22rd & June23rd.   Special education law in review (PL-94-142 to IDEA '04 & beyond)

      I.   Group Review: Key elements in the readings
      II. **'**NCLB', Litigation, Lau Decision; Section 504 –OCR; FERPA, HIPP**A**

     Issues in special education:
          mainstreaming/inclusion; LRE/most appropriate placement;
          procedure/substance content; reauthorization changes
          accountability
     Law & special education
       *What is specially designed instruction
       *accountability and state standards
       *general and special education: who's responsible for what?
       *parents' rights, student's right, school responsibilities
       READ: *Chp. 5*

June 24th Disability areas to include: Definition/ Characteristics/Eligibility criteria; Assessment/ Review of Instructional Practices

Learning Disabilities	[p..]436-440
	Chp. *8*
ADD/ADHD	Chp. *6*
	Chp. 4
June 25th	
Communication Disorders; Speech /Language,	
Emotional Disturbance	Chp. 12
Mental Retardation-EMR, TMR	Chp. 7
June 28th	
Severe & Multiple Disabilities	
Autism Spectrum Disorders	Chp. 11
Other Health Impairment –OHI	p.477-481
June 29th	
Orthopedically Impaired- OI	
Traumatic Brain Injury – TBI	Chp. 9
Hearing Impaired/Deaf	Chp.10
Visually Impaired/Blind	
EI/ECSE	Chp.13
Gifted & Talented	Chp.14 & 15
June 30 Teaching Presentation	
June 30 Summary	

Grading Criteria

The,Answer Book, Case Study & class participation are intended to be of practical use to the student. If you do not believe a project is appropriate for you as outlined, please discuss this with me so adaptations/changes can be made.

A = completion of all projects demonstrating mastery of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by presentation and exam.

B = completion of all projects demonstrating a good understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project.

C = completion of all projects demonstrating an emerging understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project.

D = all projects not completed or some projects only partially complete.

Special Education Answer Book

The information requested here is an outcome of the primary elements of special education practice. It is intended to cover the topics not represented in the Case Study. Sources should be used for materials. [The issue is knowing how to find the answers rather than memorizing information. This should be a document you will use to answer your own questions in these areas.

Each item number should be on a separate page(s) and tabbed for easy location. Amount of detail required is "enough" so you know what you were talking about.

1. Oregon State Standards Assessment Process - OAKS

   A. List and/or describe ways a special educator ensures a student with disabilities' access to and progress in the general education curriculum with emphasis on state standards and state assessment.

   B. Who takes the Extended exams?.

   C.   Include the most current list of state assessment accommodations

   D.   Include the most current list of modifications

2.   Define: LRE. Least Restrictive Environment

   Define: …most appropriate placement.

   a. How does LRE relate to "most appropriate placement"?

   b. What are the criteria, issues and concerns (educational and legal) that influence decisions about least restrictive environment vs. most appropriate placement?

3. Include information that lists and describes the activities/procedures and outcomes of the special education process". (**Pre-referral (RTI), Evaluation, Eligibility, IEP, Placement, Reevaluation/reeligiblity**.)
   (Include relevantstate or district forms.)

4. Eligibility Criteria
   a. All Oregon eligibility criteria by disability.(www.ode.state.or.us.)
   b. List at least two implications of the classification system for the individual classified.

5. What is a learning disability?
   a. Include state definition, criteria & describe how the definition has been operationalized in your district.
   b. What is the process for determining LD eligibility in your district?)
   c. Contrast discrepancy formulae and RTI in terms of student outcomes.

6. Continuum of services
   a. Describe the role(s) of a special ed teacher, **elementary, middle and high school** (Your authorization area determines which area.)
   b. Describe the role of a self-contained teacher. (Consider GE requirements, "pull-out, "inclusion".)

7. List the steps in the discipline process for special education students include manifestation determination and when it is necessary.

8. a. What is a functional behavioral assessment?
   b. What is a behavior support plan?
   c. When are they needed and by whom?

9. What is the significance of the legal phrase **'educational impact'** as applied to deciding if a student has a disability?

10. Compare and contrast IDEA '04 and Section 504 eligibility requirements. in terms of Referral, Evaluation, Eligibility, Plans and Placement.

11. List and describe the key issues/considerations in eligibility and ongoing special education services for minority students and linguistically/culturally diverse students.

12. What is F.A.P.E?

13. What is the "Rowley Standard" See Rowley v. Bd. of Educ. Hendrick Hudson Central School District, 458 U.S. 176 (1982).

14. What is mainstreaming?

15. What is inclusion? What do these ideas have to do with educating students with disabilities?

BEHAVIOR CHANGE INTERVENTIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH SERIOUS EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIORAL DISORDER.

SPED 511:   Summer 2010
July 12-16
8:00 AM – 2:30 PM

INSTRUCTOR: Skip Greenwood Ph.D.
503-299-0142
E-Mail: 2sgreenwood @ Comcast.net

TEXT: Functional Assessment: Strategies to Prevent and Remediate Challenging Behavior in School Settings 3rd ed.; Lynette Chandler, Carol Dahlquist

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Content: Study of developmental backgrounds of students with significant emotional/behavioral problems, and practices to help these students develop more productive behaviors. Emphasis on procedures for completing a functional behavior analysis (FBA) and a behavior intervention plan (BIP), research-based interventions including environmental modifications, positive behavior supports and interventions (PBIS), social-skills training, cognitive-behavioral interventions, self-monitoring, contracting, and the use of outside agencies to support the school in assisting students
COURSE OBJECTIVES:

Students who complete this course will have the opportunity to demonstrate competency in the following areas:

1. A general understanding of behavior characteristics that may play a role in student adjustment difficulties including externalizing/internalizing patterns, personality variables and various clinical disorders.
2. Understanding the role of Functional Assessment and applying this procedure in the development of Behavior Support Plans.
3. Developing, implementing and monitoring a comprehensive Behavior Support Plan
4. Developing a general understanding of self management techniques and utilizing them in the implementation of a Behavior Support Plan.
5. Developing a general understanding of cognitive cue systems and utilizing them in the implementation of a Behavior Support Plan.
6. Using skill building of positive social behaviors in a Behavior Support Plan.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Students will be asked to complete or participate in the following:

1. Attend all classes and complete required reading
2. Research one intervention method and match that method with a problem behavior identified by the class. Generate a written document and present to the class. The following outline can be used as a guide for the presentation and written document:
   a. Brief narrative description of the given method. Use some examples.
   b. Identify several ways in which the method could be used to address your particular problem behavior. Consider interventions inside and outside the classroom.
   c. Provide your own interpretation and perspective on the chosen topic as it relates to impact in the classroom and what educators need to be aware of.
   d. Present to the class.
3. Perform and write up a Functional Assessment for a behavior problem.
4. Develop a Behavior Support plan incorporating a new social behavior.
5. Develop a Behavior Support plan that uses self-monitoring.
6. Participate with other students in developing and reviewing a series of Behavior Support Plans.

GRADING:

Written and Oral Presentation of Chosen Topic	15%
Written Functional Assessment Exercises	10%
Written Behavior Support Plan Exercises	15%
Final Exercise	50%
Class Participation	10%

Grade of A: 93% / Grade of B: 83% / Grade of C: 73%

CLASS SCHEDULE / READING

July 12, 2010:

Am Session   Orientation and Business
Characteristics of Emotional and Behavior Disorders
Syndromes and Disorders
Diagnosis / mental health and its relevance to the school setting
Personality roles / Factors contributing to behavior
The Process of Assessment / EBD Eligibility

Reading: Chandler and Dahlquist: Chapters 1, 2,

PM Session   EBD Eligibility / Behavior Support Planning
                    Challenging Behaviors / General Education and Special Education,
                    Sequence of Behavioral Supports
                    IDEA and best practice considerations
                    Core assumptions in FBA/ BSP thinking
                    Paradigm Shifts
                    Pinpointing behaviors

                              Reading: Chandler and Dahlquist: Chapters 3, 4, 5
                              Functional Assessment worksheet
                              Article

July 13, 2010:

AM Session   Behavior Support Planning
                    Functional Behavior Assessment / FBA worksheet
                    Behavior Support Plans / Behavior Intervention Plans / PENT
                    Selecting Intervention Strategies / Replacement Behaviors
                    Developing models for intervention

                              Reading: Chandler and Dahlquist: Chapters 6, 7
                              Behavior Support Plan Worksheet

PM Session   Data Collection / Implementation Planning
                    Baselines / Goal Setting
                    Reactive Strategy Planning
                    Environmental Change / Accommodations / 504
                              Handout
                              Reading: Catch Up

July 14, 2010:

AM Session   Behavior Support Planning
                    Developing a Behavior Support Plan
                    Exercise: FBA / BSP Worksheet

PM Session   Skill Building / Contingency Management
                    IDEA and best practice implications
                    Lagging Skills
                    Positive Social Behavior and Social Skill Building
                    Social Skills and Inclusion
                    Reinforcers and Contingencies
                              Exercise: Groups for Social Skills and Problem Solving
                              Reading: Chandler and Dahlquist: Chapter 8
                              Handout
                              FBA / BSP worksheet

July 15, 2010:

AM Session   Personal Awareness / Self -Assessment and Self Control
                             Monitoring Procedures
                             Emotional and Behavioral Self Regulation
                             Helping Students Change
                                      Reading: Chandler and Dahlquist: Chapter 9, 10
                                      Exercise: Groups for Self Monitoring, Goal Setting and Self
                                      Regulation
                                      FBA / BSP worksheet

PM Session   Facilitating the FBA / BSP Process
                             Student / Teacher Interviews
                             Getting student and teachers involved
                             Conducting a successful FBA/BSP meeting

July 16, 2010

AM Session   Behavior Methods and Intervention/ Measurement and Tracking
                             Data Collection Procedures
                             Evidence Based Methods
                             When a plan doesn't work / BSP checklist
                             Catch Up
                                      Reading: Chandler and Dahlquist: Chapter 11, 12
                                      Exercise: FBA / BSP

PM Session   Final Exercise

LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
SPED 513
ASSESSMENT AND DIAGNOSIS FOR STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS
Fall Semester, 2010

_____

Credit   3 Semester hours

Classroom: Rogers 105

Day/Time: Thursdays, 5:15 – 8:15 p.m.
Dates: September 09 - December 16, 2010. Class meets on 11/11 (Veteran's Day); No
                    class 11/25/2010 (Thanksgiving Holiday)

Instructor: Lee Ann Sharman, M.S.
                    Coordinator, Child Evaluation and Service Center, Clackamas ESD
                    13455 SE 97th Avenue
                    Clackamas, Oregon 97015

Phone: (503) 675-4177 (office)
                    (503) 577-0003 (home)
                    E-mail: lsharman@lclark.edu

Text & Materials:	**Assessing Students with Special Needs - 7th Edition,** _James McLoughlin and Rena Lewis, Prentice-Hall, 2008_ Oregon Administrative Rules - (eligibility sections) Oregon State Assessment; Sample tests Reading/Lit/Math (Ode.state.or.us) Additional readings as assigned on assessment, legal, and procedural issues.

Course Description: This course explores educational assessment as it relates to decision-making in special education. Selection, administration, scoring, and interpretation of a variety of measures are taught through demonstrations, practice, and case studies. Relationships between assessment, eligibility decision-making, instructional planning and accountability issues are examined, including monitoring student performance using curriculum-based and related measurements and summative evaluation using the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS). Students will be introduced to issues regarding assessment of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Functional, practical assessments are emphasized, within the context of the IDEA's conceptual and procedural requirements.

Course Objectives:

1.   Discuss the different kinds of decisions required for special education (screening, eligibility, classification, etc.) and methods of assessment relevant to each type of decision (CEC Standards 1, 2, 8).

2.   Use basic measurement terminology and descriptive statistics to clearly and objectively describe student performance to others (CEC Standard 8).

3.   Be able to critique the reliability, validity, norms, and standardization of commonly used academic assessments, including state assessments (CEC Standard 8)

4. Identify best practice procedures designed to protect the student and assessment process from discriminatory practices (CEC Standards 1, 3, 6, 8, 9).

5. Delineate the steps involved in an evaluation of each of the disabilities included under IDEA, and analyze eligibility criteria for all disabilities (CEC Standards 1, 2, 3, 8, 10).

6. Demonstrate understanding of the major issues and decisions faced by teachers/special education team members to determine eligibility under the major IDEA categories. Explain the basic components of Response-to-Intervention (RTI) (CEC Standards 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10).

7. Use a variety of observation methods to assess student performance, and utilize this data as a part of the assessment process (CEC Standard 8).

8. Select and appropriately administer a variety of measurement tools (norm and criterion-referenced tests, checklists, observations, and state assessment results) to gather information on student performance for purposes of eligibility and instructional decision-making (CEC Standards 3, 7, 8).

9. Ability to generate an evaluation report based on data collected, with assessment findings linked to academic interventions and recommended accommodations (if needed) for classroom and state testing (CEC Standards 7, 8).

10. Develop working knowledge in Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), including practice with graphing, trend analysis, and making basic instructional changes (CEC Standards 5, 7, 8, 10).

Course Requirements:

Students will complete or participate in the following projects and activities:

1. **Complete and submit a log of testing hours,** Due by last class (12/16/2010). At least 15 hours of practice with tests, direct assessment, observation, and report writing are required.

2. **Assessment Instrument Critique**
   Given criteria, evaluate one of several tests available in class for technical adequacy. This will be an in-class, collaborative activity; pairs will present and discuss findings with the larger group, using a format that will be provided.

3. **Quiz on basic informational statistics**
   In class quiz on descriptive statistics to demonstrate basic knowledge of statistical concepts and terms needed for test data interpretation.

4. **ELL assessment Exploration paper**
   Talk to someone in your district (or another) about how ELL students are identified for special education. After hearing Dr. Bender's lecture, what recommendations you would make to your district to align current practices with best practice? Write a short (1-3 page) paper describing 1) what current practices are in the district; and 2) your recommendations for improved practice.

5. **Special education teacher (or administrator) interview**
   Conduct a brief interview with a special education teacher (or administrator, if you are the building special education teacher) and report findings to class members. Format provided will include questions on district eligibility procedures, assessments used, team process, difficult issues, etc.

6. **Special education eligibility meeting attendance**
   Attend an eligibility meeting at which test results are discussed with parents and school staff. Observe and take notes using instructor-provided format, prepare brief written summary.

7.   **Assessment - informal, criterion-referenced, or observational**
   a.)   *Observation*
   Conduct one observation (minimum 30 minutes) of a selected student in various classroom and non-classroom settings using an observation protocol. You will be asked to write up your observational data, interpret your findings, and present to the group.

   2.   *CBM Progress Monitoring*
   Using the materials and guidelines for Curriculum Based Measurement (provided in class), as well as data provided in class, graph an elementary student's progress in reading, analyze trends, and identify proposed instructional changes.

9.   **Assessment - standardized, norm-referenced**
   a.)   Students will be required to administer and score the WJ-III Achievement Test (all standard plus 4 extended battery subtests) a total of 3 times: once for practice, once for a grade, and again as part of the graded Case Study.

   Students will use the Compuscore computer scoring program for all 3 tests, submit the protocol and student record form, and a compuscore data sheet. Compuscore programs are available in the Lewis and Clark School of Education computer lab. They may also be available in your district.

   b.)   For the *Case Study*, select a *different* school-aged student and administer and/or provide and interpret each of the following:
   WJ-III Achievement (entire standard battery plus 4 extended subtests)
   One criterion or curriculum-based test (Running Record, Dibels, Brigance, etc.)
   One classroom observation
   Records review and background information (if available)
   OAKS data

   Students will score tests and write up evaluation data and interpretation in an approved report writing format, with a focus on instructional recommendations and recommended accommodations or modifications for state tests. Students will present their case study to a mock IEP team comprised of class members. Evaluation reports due and presentations conducted during Sessions 13 and 14. *Students must obtain written, informed parental consent prior to testing, and attach a copy to the report.*

   Testing a family member, or a friend or relative's child is strongly discouraged.

10. **Final Exam - December 16 (Session 14)**

Class Schedule and Reading Assignments

Sept 09 - Session 1
Introduction and course overview
Pre-Test
Making Sense of Test Results (Ppt)

Readings for Next Week: Text Ch.1 - 3
Assignment: Prepare notebook for handouts

Sept. 16 - Session 2
Statistics and SPED: Guest Lecturer, Dr. Chris Ryder
Pre-test review
In-class activity: Evaluating test technical adequacy

Readings for Next Week: Text Chapter 4; Handout on
"Understanding Tests and Measurements"
Due at end of class: Test reviews – in-class "one-pager"
on test technical adequacy

Sept. 23 - Session 3
Quiz on concepts of measurement
Standardized test administration
Film: *Misunderstood Minds*

Readings for Next Week: Text: Ch 6
Assignment: Review WJ-III Protocols

Sept. 30 - Session 4
Quiz Review
Overview of Woodcock-Johnson-III
Review WJ-III scoring guide/handouts
In-class practice

Readings for Next Week: Chapters 10, 11, 12
   (Skip technical material on specific tests if desired)
Assignments: 1. Interview special education teacher or
   administrator with format provided by instructor In-class
                       2. Begin practicing with tests at home

Oct. 7 - Session 5
Share results of interviews
Continue WJ-III Training
In-class practice

Due*: Interview write-up (option through 11/11)

Assignment: Continue practicing with tests at home
Readings for Next Week: Chapter 5, 9

Oct. 14 - Session 6
Meet in Computer LAB for WJ-III Scoring
Review WIAT-III/Other tests in class
Observation strategies and protocols

Readings for Next Week: Text Chapters 7 and 8

Oct. 21 - Session 7
Overview of cognitive assessment theory
Response to Intervention, theory and practice

Due: No assignments due
Readings for Next Week: Text, Chapter 5;
Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM)/RtI handouts

Oct. 28 - Session 8
Discuss eligibility meeting attendance
Curriculum Based Assessment/In-Class practice
Discuss case studies

Readings for Next Week: Review ODE Eligibility
                       Forms

Nov. 4 - Session 9
Special Ed eligibility categories and
related evaluation procedures/team roles

Due: eligibility meeting write-ups
Readings for Next Week: Text, Chapter 13;
ODE technical assistance paper on ELL Assessment

Nov. 11- Session 10
SPED/ELL assessment and best practices

Due: WJ-III Practice Tests due with write-up
Readings for Next Week: Text, Chapter 16

Nov. 18 - Session 11
Translating assessment results to instruction
Presenting test data to parents/school staff
Transition Assessment overview

Due: ELL papers
      Handouts: Transition Assessment

```
┌──────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│        NOVEMBER 26 - NO CLASS - THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY          │
│                                                              │
└──────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Dec. 2 - Session 12   **Due**: Observation protocols and summaries
Observations - discussion/presentations   **Readings for Next Week**: TBD
Eligibility decision-making presentations and/or simulations
Report critique (in class activity)

Dec. 09 - Session 13
Case study presentations

Dec. 16 - Session 14
Continue case study presentations
Turn in Testing Logs
Wrap up; discussion/questions
Course evaluations
Final Exam

Point Distribution/Grading

1.	Short Write-Ups/Brief Papers:	20

        SPED teacher/administrator interview (5)
        Eligibility meeting attendance (5)
        ELL Exploration paper (10)

2.   Tests/Quizzes:
        Statistics Quiz   20
        Final Exam   30

3.   Individual Academic Assessments/Observation
        WJ-III   25
        Individual student observation   15

4.   Case Studies
        Full evaluation report   50
        CBM Summary   20

5.   Class participation and attendance   20

                        _____
                        200

A = 95%; B = 85%; C = 75%, etc.

STUDENTS MISSING TWO CLASSES DURING THE TERM MAY BE DROPPED.

Resources

Mercer, C.D., & Mercer, A.R. (2001). *Teaching students with learning problems* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.

Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J.E. (2007.) *Assessment* (10th ed.) Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Turnbull, R. &Turnbull, A. et al (2005). *Exceptional Lives* (4th ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice-Hall.

www.LDonline.org

Course Syllabus

Course: **SPED 514 Curriculum & Instruction for Special Needs Students**
Term: Winter/Spring, 2011
Day/Time: Thursdays (1/6/10-4//28/10) 5:30- 8:30
Location: Rogers 220
Office: Rogers Hall Rm. 405. Office hours can be scheduled by appointment with me. I can be reached at cmoore@lclark.edu. We can arrange a time to fit your schedule. 503 768-6128

Text: Mastropieri, Margo and Thomas E. Scruggs. The Inclusive Classroom: Strategies for Effective Instruction. (3rd Ed.). Pearson, 2007)

www.ODE.state.or.us/teach/learn/real/standards/sbd.aspx : Standards by Design
www.ODE.state.or.us Teaching & Learning Assessment section for Sample Tests…
www.ODE.state.or.us/search /page/?id=2047 Oregon Diploma, Modified Diploma,
Extended Diploma, Alternative Certificate

www.ODE.state.or.us Standard IEP & Guidelines (both age levels)
PowerPoint presentations sent to you by email….

Course Description: Content: Research-validated curriculum and specially designed instruction (SDI) for students with disabilities. Based on state standards/state assessment(OAKS),participants review and adapt general education curricula appropriate to their authorization level to create specially designed instruction (SDI) that emphasizes and supports progress across academic areas,learning strategies and appropriate accommodations. This course uses curriculum-based assessment/measurement data to craft effective, substantively and procedurally correct individual education plans(IEPs);and specially designed instruction(SDI)based on student achievement data. Candidates will demonstrate all skills necessary to facilitate an IEP meeting including group dynamics and conflict resolution strategies.
Prerequisites: SPED 513/SPED 632 or consent of advisor.
Corequisites: SPED 546/646.
Credits: 3 semester hours.

Course Objectives/Demonstration Criteria: Based on the demonstration criteria specified, students in this course will achieve the following outcomes:

1. A comprehensive understanding of the relationship between general education curricula at different grade levels, across content and process skills, within the framework of mild/moderate disabilities, emphasizing and increased learning, academic & educational outcomes for students who are eligible for special education. Demonstration Criteria: Curriculum Analysis Paper

2. Demonstrated understanding and the ability to complete all aspects of an Individualized Education Plan (IEP)and a Facilitated IEP meeting, both of which cover all necessary/appropriate procedural and substantive aspects of the process based on the skills and needs of a specific student. Demonstration Criteria: Completed accurate IEP Project and completed Facilitated IEP meeting.

3. Demonstrated knowledge of curricular accommodations and modifications (including the differences between them) across curricula, instructional methodology, disabilities, academic/subject areas, and linguistically/culturally diverse students. Consider the principles of Universal Design for Learning

(UDL) as applied to the creation of specially designed instruction and adaptation.
of the general education curriculum as represented by state common curriculum
goals, standards, benchmarks and monitored through CBA and Sate Assessment
Demonstrations Criteria: Curriculum Analysis Paper, IEP Project, Accommodations &
Modifications Notebook

Course Requirements:
 I. Each of you will be asked to facilitate the discussion of course readings (with partners) once during the class. Facilitation focus questions follow in the outline. You may add others. Your opinions and experience will also be relevant. The first 15 minutes of class will be devoted to a group review of the assigned text Chapters or web Materials. Two or three people will be assigned to facilitate the discussion for the rest of the group. Each person will take a chapter. Grading will be credit no credit for this facilitation.

II. Individual Education Plan Project
An IEP is a blueprint for the specially designed instruction for an eligible special education student. It contains all essential aspects of the students skills and needs adaptations and a progress monitoring (data) system to support student progress.
We will work on each aspect of the IEP during class, you will be asked to create both portions of IEPs (details to follow) and a complete IEP for a specific student. You must be able to obtain *assessment, eligibility and instructionally* relevant information for the student including any information about second language acquisition and/or cultural diversity essential for the IEP.
It is expected that your IEP will be procedurally, and substantively correct for the student you describe. IEPs can be "practiced" and completed on ODE forms. You may use your district forms, if you prefer and we discuss how your district's forms differ from the ODE examples.
As background for this project, you will be provided with information about all procedural and substantive aspects of the IEP, current legal requirements, "IEP best practices" and relevant information regarding ELL students/families.

The objective is to write the most effective and efficient IEP possible. This includes determining the data necessary to accomplish this goal.

Part 1:   **Present level of educational and functional performance + goals in reading and math (academic goals) and SDI.** Write on IEP forms for your district or state forms. If possible use your districts IEP system and print. If you use an actual IEP you have written, redact all identifiable information. Each part of the IEP must include the underlined information and be accompanied by : Student Name: (created), Age: actual,   Grade: actual, & Eligibility: LD or?
Due Date: **February 3rd**

Part 2: Present level of educational and functional performance + goals in academics, behavior learning strategies & SDI
Due Date: February 17th

Part 3   Present level of educational and functional performance + goals: academic, behavior and learning strategies; Supplementary aides and services (accommodations/modifications)
Due Date: **February 24th**
 Part 4: First complete draft IEP due for March 3rd.
Part 5: **First complete IEP Due: March 10th**
 Part 6: Final IEP Due Date: Facilitation Date

III. Facilitated IEP Meeting Project
An IEP meeting is more than a parent conference. The ability to properly facilitate an IEP meeting includes presentation skills, group process skills, problem solving skills and conflict resolution skills. Following class sessions which discuss group process and conflict resolution skills, communication strategies and differing needs of culturally/linguistically diverse parents, as well as completion of the IEP Project (see above) you will be asked to present your IEP to an IEP Team made up of others in class. This will be a role-playing situation for the IEP you created for the IEP Project. Class members not part of the IEP team will be expected to provide feedback which is designed to assist the individual presenting the IEP in being more efficient and more effective at presenting the IEP. **Due Date: March 31ˢᵗ, April 7ᵗʰ, 14ᵗʰ ᵒʳ , 21ˢᵗ to be scheduled.**

IV. SDI Curriculum Analysis Work Sample
Each student will be asked to examine and briefly, but comprehensively describe the interaction between the general education curriculum, a student's disability, student learning and student progress. Use one of your current or past special education students. *****The content should follow this outline**:
1 **From the IEP**: Eligibility code, Present Level of Performance, IEP Goals/Objectives & Supplementary Aides/Services.
2. **Outline**: Focusing on **reading or math**, outline a unit of instruction for this student, i.e. **lesson plans** for a one-week period (5 "sessions").
Please specify **the length of each session**, so I know the time period you have to work with. This is a simple curriculum map for these five individual lessons showing the focus , order and sequence of what is taught and what is to be learned.
3. **Standards**: What are the State Standards that this lesson is based on ?
4. **Goals/Objectives**: What are the goals/objectives in reading or math that are based on state standards?
   (If you are using another special ed teachers IEP and the Goals/Objectives are not based on state standards, rewrite the goals/objectives so they are based on state standards.)
5 . **Lesson Plans**: These lesson plan must be detailed enough to explain what the teacher does in each lesson and what the student's responses should (could) be…Your lesson plans should answer the following questions:
         - what is the goal of the unit in terms of what the student will know/do when
          it is completed?
         - how does this goal support meeting the "target" goal on the student's IEP?
         - what are the 'steps' in the lesson (specify techniques, materials,)?
         - what will the student learn from **each of these lessons**?
         - **how do the 5 lessons "fit together" to accomplish the goal?**
6. **Research**: What are the research validated practices you will use to support student learning during these lessons? List them please, with the source.
7. **Progress Monitoring**: What will you observe and record about the students' performance to determine progress in learning,or **how will you know if the student has learned what you're teaching**?
Due Date: 4//28/10   (Please have a copy of this material to turn in and a 10 minute presentation for class.)

III. Accommodations & Modifications Research Notebook Project
Based on information provided through lecture, class discussion, readings and review of special education books, journals and literature and/or second language, immigrant and minority learner experiences and needs, you are asked to gather **research validated** information which will be useful to you in creating and adapting (accommodations and/or modifications) the general education curriculum at the grade level(s) you are teaching.

The requirement is 5 specific articles with brief analysis. Information will be evaluated based on usefulness. Materials should focus on how to assist the general education classroom teacher in making the necessary changes to the general education curriculum (including state standards/benchmarks) so that students with varied disabilities can be successful in the regular education classroom.

This small ' notebook' should be organized by disability (LD, ADD/HD, ED, Speech/Language and subdivided into sections which provide accommodations and modifications. You can include copies of articles which describe "how to …" , kinds of changes, samples you write up of specific techniques which you have used or observed etc.

The goal is to find information about : 1) differentiating instruction, 2)accommodations and modifications, how they are different, how you decide which students need what kinds of changes, 3) how the accommodation or modification is implemented and, 4) how *you* explain all of this to the general education teacher.

Due Date : 3/3110

Grading Criteria

All projects are intended to be of clinical use. If you do not believe a project will support your learning as outlined, or you need accommodations, please discuss this with me so appropriate changes can be made before the project is due.

A = completion of all projects demonstrating **mastery** of all substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by each project outlined above.

B = completion of all projects demonstrating **proficiency** in each of the substantive and procedural elements of each project.

C = completion of all projects demonstrating an **emerging** understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project.

D = project(s) partially completed; project(s) not appropriate, not accurate, demonstrating little understanding

F = project(s) not completed; competencies not demonstrated

Content Topics Outline

This outline is to provide a general organization of the information to be discussed during class. The outline is subject to "adaptations" based on the needs of the class. The topic listed is not necessarily the only topic that will be presented on the date specified. Readings will be assigned from the text and discussed. Reviews will mean discussing in small group and then for the class the key ideas in each Chp. as they apply to the practice of special education.

1/6   Review Syllabus
         SDI, substantive and procedural aspects of the special education process
         Accountability: OAKS, NCLB, & high school diplomas
         How students learn…How we teach …Analysis
         Learning theories with practical applications
         Defining Curriculum: General Ed & Sped
         What is Specially Designed Instruction (SDI)?
         Special Education Process & the relationship between "general" and special education curricula
                  (**Reading for NEXT week   Text: Chps: 1-3 & 12**

1/13   **Practicum Review & Scheduling: Please be prepared with at least two dates when a supervisor
         can visit and observe you working with special education students and consider IEP
         relationships. (SPED 546: Practicum II)**
         Review; Key elements of reading Chps. 1-3 & 12
                           Are there common characteristics among high incidence disabilities?
                           What is the role of language in learning?
                           Metacognition?   Metalinguistics? What is learned helplessness?
                           Issues: LRE v. most appropriate placement;
                           Review the different types of assessment for the group.

          Lecture/Discussion:
         Procedural and Substantive error on IEPs
         Current brain research: are there any practical learning applications? - Mindfulness
         What is appropriate curriculum & instruction for students with high incidence disabilities? Reading, Math,
         Learning Strategies, Behavior
         Strategies: key elements of research based practice.
         Adaptations: Accommodations & Modifications

(**Reading for NEXT week**: **Text: Chps. 4-5-6**

1/20   **Review: Key elements o Chp. 4, 5, 6,:** What are the differences between
                     instruction for high incidence and low incidence disabilities?
                     Where does ASD disorder fit? What is the curriculum for ASD?
                     What is effective instruction for all students?
          Lecture/Discussion:
           Accommodations continued
           Research validated special education practices;
           Role of assessment in curriculum and instruction;
           Monitoring progress and relevant DATA
          Reading: Text Chps. 9 , 10
          Bring a copy of the state IEP Form + Guidelines ODE.state.or.us or your districts on 2/4

1/27   **Review: Key elements of Chps. 9 & 10**. Why is a supportive atmosphere important
           in learning? How do you decide if tasks are meaningful?
           Lecture/Discussion:
           The IEP: What do you know? Team exercise
           Regulations, Insights & practical suggestions: Meeting Notice, Who must attend an IEP meeting,, who
           can be absent and how, FORMS, Relationship between the IEP & Placement.
                     Writing Present levels :
                          Reading: Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension
                          Writing: Writing Process (Peabody: Write Minded Strategies
                          Math: Calculations/ Estimations ,Statistics/Probability ,
                          Algebraic reationships ,Measurement Geometry, math problem solving

                     Writing IEP goals ---- Creating Consensus Powerpoint
                     Linking Present Levels, Goals (objectives), Creating Consensus Powerpoint

2/3   **The IEP: Due Part 1 IEP**
          Review in class. Review present levels & goals in class in academic areas
                          Discuss examples and hand in.
                           Introduce behavior goals
                          Introduce learning strategies.
2/10   Discussion Session to be determined due to TSPC presentation
2/17   **The IEP**: **Due Part 2 IEP**
          Review in class Academic & Behavioral Goals
           Present Accommodations Ppoint
           IEP Accommodations & Modifications

2/24   **The IEP: Due Part 3 IEP**
          **Review present levels, academic/behavior/learning strategies goals, accommodations &
          modifications**
          Line by line through the IEP: Issues with 'drop down menus'
          Facilitation Skills: Group process dynamics, problem-solving approaches, conflict resolutions strategies,
          Reading for Next week: **Chps. 7 & 8**

3/3   **The IEP Due: Part 4 Draft IEP Review: Key elements of Chps. 7 & 8**
           What is classroom management and why is it important to students? Differentiate classroom management
           and FBA, BIP strategies.
           What is peer assistance? Peer tutoring?
           What is important about Cooperative learning, i.e. What are the dos and don'ts?
          Lecture/Discussion
           (IEP   Q & A : Conclusions)

The key elements of instruction
1. Activate Background Knowledge;
2. Engage student participation
3. Demonstrate/ Model
4. Provide Guided Practice
5. Independent Practice
Differentiating Instruction: SDI
Individualized "scaffolding" of instruction to minimize the effects of
the student's disability.
Creating a responsive, interactive and appropriate classroom.
******Reading for Next week: Chp. 11 & 12**

3/10   **Due IEP**: Review : **Key Elements of Chp. 11 & 12**
How does your organizational style affect your teaching organizational skills? Is there a specific kind of organization that is necessary? What is the role of strategy instruction?
Lecture/Discussion
The role of language in reading
Differentiated Instruction vs. Differentiated Curriculum
Learning Strategies: Text structure analysis/ Summarizing/Retell/   Comprehension Monitoring
National Read Panel: recommendations for reading instruction
Word Attach/Word Recognition/Language
Reading: Chp: 13 & 15, 14, 16

3/17   **Review: Chps. 13. ,15,14,16**
What are the issues in literacy?
What are the issues regarding special education and linguistic &/cultural diversity?
Writing instruction: What are the steps in the writing process? When/how is
Instruction provided around "spam"?
Lecture/Discussion
SDI in reading
How should reading be taught in special education?
Grade level differences in reading instruction
What to do about high school issues/potential solutions? The role of language in reading
What is integrated curriculum and why is it important
SDI in Math
What did NCTM changing in current standards? What are
the factors which make math difficult for high incidence &
low incidence disabilities? What is the relationship between
the categories of state standards, math teaching & math curricula?
What is the role of the arts (music, art, theatre) in: special education?
Lecture/Discussion:

3/21   **Spring Break**

3/31   **IEP Facilitation**
Due: Accommodations Notebook

4/7   **IEP Facilitation**

4/14   **IEP Facilitation :IEP Due**

4/21   **IEP Facilitation: IEP Due**
Lecture/Discussion
Transition Issues

4/28 **Curriculum Analysis Project & Class Presentation**
      * Summary Session: Case Management and information about   SPED 535

Special Education Standards for this Course

SPED 516:	**Interventions for Severely Challenged Students** **Summer Session 2010** **Miller Center Room 210**

Instructor: Sheila Magee
Phone: 503-720-6411
Email: sheila.magee@starautismsupport.com

Dates:

Thursday, Friday	7/1,2	10-4
Tues, Wed, Thurs	7/6,7,8	10-4

Required Texts:

1) Arick, J., Nave G., Hoffman T. (2004) <u>FACTER: Functional Assessment and Curriculum for Teaching Everyday Routines: Program Manual</u>. Austin, TX:PRO-ED. 2004)
2) French, Nancy (2003) <u>Managing Paraeducators in Your School</u>. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Course Description: Students learn instructional practices to increase the functional performance and academic success of students with severe disabilities (e.g., autism spectrum disorder, severe mental retardation, or multiple disabilities). Participants learn research-validated strategies with demonstrated effectiveness in increasing communication skills, appropriate behavior, social skills, and life-skill routines for severely disabled students. Emphasis is placed on data-driven instruction in the least restrictive environment, and working with paraprofessionals.

Course Outcomes:

Knowledge of collaborative team processes to involve diverse families, general educators, related services personnel, the student, and other team members in developing and implementing a functional curriculum.

Ability to plan instruction in natural, age-appropriate environments to teach adaptive/life skills (i.e. self-care/daily living, leisure/play, community, and vocational/school routines).

Ability to plan instruction for acquisition, generalization, fluency, and maintenance of functional communication, social, motor, and academic skills.

Ability to use principles of applied behavior analysis to design and implement instructional strategies, including task analysis, prompting, fading prompts, shaping, chaining, reinforcement, and correction procedures.

Ability to design and implement instructional strategies for teaching functional skills, including routines-based teaching, naturalistic teaching strategies, and direct instruction/discrete trial teaching.

Ability to design data collection systems, collect and use data to modify instruction.

Ability to design and implement strategies to provide positive behavioral supports, based upon behavioral assessment and analysis for students with significant and multiple disabilities.

Ability to use professional resources to identify effective strategies and design instructional programs.

Reflection upon instructional goals and strategies in light of current issues in special education, including educational reform and the call for self-determination among individuals with disabilities.

This course meets the following TSPC Special Education Endorsement Standards:

Standard 1:	Foundations (B;C;D)
Standard 2:	Development and Characteristics of Learners (A;B;C)
Standard 3:	Individual Learning Differences (A;B;C)
Standard 4:	Instructional Strategies (A;B;C)
Standard 5:	Learning Environments and Social Interactions (A;B;C;D;F)
Standard 6:	Language (A;B;C)
Standard 7:	Instructional Planning (A;B;C;D;E;F;G;H)

Standard 8:   Assessment (A;B;D;E;F;G)
Standard 9:   Professional and Ethical Practice (D;H)
Standard 10:   Collaboration (A;D;E)

Session	Topic	Assignments:
7/1 Thursday		
10:00-12:00	-Introductions -Course overview and requirements -Overview of significant disabilities/ principles of functional curriculum -Self determination: video	
12:00-12:30	-Lunch	
12:30-2:00	-Basic Behavioral Principles	
2:00-2:30	-Video: "playing a game"/lesson plan development	Video: Pretest: Instructional plan for student based on video (in-class)
2:30-4:00	-Introduction to FACTER Curriculum	Complete baseline rating on student(in class)
7/2 Friday		
10:00-12:00	-FACTER Assessment and Instructional Planning	***Due:*** ***Read Chapters 1,2,3,4,5: FACTER Manual (prior to class)***
12:00-12:30	Lunch	
12:30-2:00	-FACTER lesson plan development -FACTER scoring routines	Develop lesson plan (in class) Score routines secondary (in class)
2:00-3:30	-Functional Routines-Preschool and Elementary -Environmental Supports	Score routines elementary (in class) Routine lesson plan (in class)
7/6 Tuesday		
10:00-12:00	-Instructional Strategies: Discrete Trial Training (DT) Guest lecturer: Joel Arick PhD	Demonstrate competency in discrete trial training technique (in class)
12:00-12:30	-Lunch	
12:30-3:00	-Instructional Strategies: DT continued	
3:00-4:00	-Instructional Strategies: Naturalistic Language Instruction	
7/7 Wednesday		
10:00-11:00	-Instructional Strategies: Functional Communication: PECS/aug com. systems /Functional Academic Instruction/Structured Teacch	***Visit the website: www.teacch.com (prior to class)***
11:00-12:00	-Parent Training	
12:00-12:30	-Lunch	
12:30-1:00	-Special Health Needs -Motor Disabilities	
1:00-4:00	-Group Presentations	
7/8 Thursday		
10:00-12:00	-Working with Paraprofessionals	***Due:*** *** Read chapters 1,2,3,6*** ***Skim chapters 6,7,8,9,10: Managing Paraeducators/answer discussion questions (prior to class)***
12:00-12:30	-Lunch	
12:30-4:00	-Group Presentations	***Due:*** ***Research Summary***

Prior to August 1, 2010		*Due:* *Instructional Lesson Plan for student* *"Playing a Game"*

Course Requirements/Assignments

Requirement	Scoring Guide
1. ***In – class participation***: Participate in all in-class practice and demonstrations of instructional strategies and data collection techniques.	***In class practice and participation (30 points)*** a) Practice and demonstrate instructional strategies presented/discussed throughout the class.

2. ***Research Project***:
 a) Group Presentation (oral presentation 45 minutes in length)
 • Find a minimum of 3 research articles on your topic (sign up for topics)
 • Use the research articles, as well as other sources, to:
   ➢ Define the issues surrounding the topic
   ➢ Discuss current research on the topic
   ➢ Discuss the impact the research has on current special education practice
   ➢ Using the above information, provide suggestions to the class how best to address the issue as a teacher in a special education classroom.
 	
 b)Individual Research Paper (written document)
   ➢ Summarize the three research articles and the findings
   ➢ Write a short reflection analyzing the findings from the research.
	Research Project :
	
	 Group Presentation (10 points)
	
	 a) Presentation of information engaged others in critical thinking about the issue (2 points)
	 b) Information presented will be useful to educators in making informed decisions about services to students with cognitive disabilities. (2 points)
	 c) Relevant information used to address topic (internet, current educators, etc) (3 points)
	 d) Key findings and analysis of research stated clearly and concisely (3 points)
	
	 Individual Written Summary (30 points total)
	
	 Written summary should be typed and 3-4 pages in length.
	
	 Summary should include:
	 a) A minimum of 3 research articles (provide references). You do not need to turn in the articles
	 b) Summarize the research as it relates to students with significant disabilities. (10 points)
	 c) Your analysis of the research and reflection on the impact this research has (or should have) on special education practices for students with significant disabilities (20 points)

3. ***Lesson Plan***
 	
 Develop an instructional lesson plan for a student with significant cognitive disabilities . Use the template provided.
 	
 This lesson plan is your portfolio assignment for this class and will be placed in your "Portfolio of Evidence"
	Lesson Plan (30 points)
	
	 a) Lesson plan includes all components (20 points)
	   1. Baseline assessment (2 points)
	   2. Goals and objectives (2 points)
	   3. Identify routine steps and related skills to teach (2 points)
	   4. Lesson Plan: Pre-teaching, during routine teaching, environmental supports (12 points)
	   5. On-going assessment to evaluate progress towards goals/objectives (2 points)
	 b) Lesson plan is well written, typed and organized in an easily understandable format. (10 points)

Grading: A- = 91 — 93%   A = 94 — 100%

B- = 81 - 83%   B = 84 — 87%   B+ = 88 — 90 %

C- = 71 — 73%   C = 74 — 77%   C+ = 78 — 80

D = 61 — 70%   F = less than 61%

Class attendance is imperative as much of the content for this class is delivered through lecture, video and in-class practice. Your grade will drop by one grade for each class session missed after the first. A class session is considered either AM or PM. So missing two class sessions will result in a grade of "B". Three class sessions missed will result in a grade of "C".

SPED 517: Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs

Summer 2010
Class time: 9:00-1:00 Dates: 6/212010-6/25/, 6/28-6/30/2010   **Location**: Howard Hall, Rm. 217
Instructor: Jen Burkart
Office Hours: Meeting times/days may be scheduled with the Instructor before or after class.
Contact Information: Email: jen.burkart@gmail.com
Required Texts & Materials:

  Allington, R., What *Really Matters for Struggling Readers.*
  Beers, K., *When Kids Can't Read*.

  Materials & Resources: Information contained on these websites will be cited and used in class. You can access these materials through the ODE website under The Oregon Literacy Framework. [Downloading these materials can be completed at the Computer Center. South Campus.]

  Big Ideas in Beginning Reading website http://reading.uoregon.edu
• Doing What Works: Research-based Education Practices Online, US Department of Education,
 http://dww.ed.gov/topic/?T_ID=23
• *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy*
. http://www.all4ed.org/files/ReadingNext.pdf
. http://Whatworksclearinghouse.org
. http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/results/?id=40

Optional Text:

  Rhodes, L., Literacy Assessment: A Handbook of Instruments.

> "...*Thus is reading similar to a conversation-with the author;
> with the past, the present, or the future; with an aspect of
> ourselves that is called into existence through the words we read.
> Reading is a physical as well as intellectual experience, one
> that becomes more complex as technology spawns new, more
> interactive types of texts. To these experiences, these textual
> encounters, we each bring our own set of talents, strategies,
> cultures, and perspectives, all of which inevitable color our
> reading of any text."*
>
>   Burke, J. Reading Reminders. 2000.

Catalog Description

Content: Curriculum and instructional practices based on validated research for teaching reading and writing to students with disabilities. Topics include the causes and correlates of reading difficulties, research validated reading curricula, programs, models of reading instruction(K-12)emphasizing reading comprehension outcomes, basic reading skills, learning strategy acquisition, and progress monitoring with SDI in reading based on the general education curricula.

Course Description

The most common aspect of any special education student's eligibility is reading disability. With schools implementing RtI practices, the population of students made eligible for special education will have persistent reading difficulties compounded by their disability. This course considers reading from beginning literacy into adulthood. According to national reading assessments...

  ... Seen in the context of NAEP, 35% of Oregon grade 4 students read **below grade level**. In other words, more than 1 out of 3 students in grade 4 does not have the reading skills necessary to meet Basic (grade-level expectations) on the NAEP. Nearly 24% of grade 8 students read below grade level. This means that nearly 1 out of 4 grade 8 students does not have the reading skills necessary to read grade-level material.

At high school level:
  … on the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS) for Reading/Literature.

…, about 34% of students read below grade level (from the three combined categories, Nearly Meets, Low, and Very Low). This means that 34% of grade 10 students do not have the fundamental reading skills necessary to read grade-level textbooks with proficiency.

Students eligible for special education often have more reading difficulty than their age/grade level peers. This course reviews and considers specially designed instruction to improve the reading performance, particularly the comprehension of eligible students.

Course Goals

Students develop understanding and ability to set formative reading goals in grades K-3 & track students' progress on the essential elements of reading.

Students develop teaching strategies, programs and materials to help K-12 students read texts with understanding across the instructional areas for a variety of purposes including reading for enjoyment.

Topic Outline & Reading Assignments

Monday, June 21: Introductions, Reading Assessment

Introductions, Agenda, Syllabus
The Oregon Literacy Framework: Moving Reading Forward: DVD
 . Review & Analyze key elements presented in the DVD.
What We Know / What We Want to Know – Carousel
 Video: Reid Lyon Review & Analyze
National Reading Panel Report
 'Big Five' National Reading Panel Report
 Early Literacy
Reading Assessment
 1.RtI 2. DIBELS. 3. Reading Recovery
 Reading: Oregon Literacy Framework, Chp.2 pdf. Allington, Chapters 1, 2 & 3; Beers, Chapters 1 & 14 **+ Reflection/Review**

Tuesday, June 22: Reading Engagement

Review Readings
Quick Write: The Book that was the Turning Point
Introduce assignment #1: Due Tomorrow
Silent Sustained Reading R5 Method
Assessment Continued:
 OAKS/Special Ed Assessment; Early Literacy Assessment
Reading: Allington, Chapter 4; Beers, Chapters 10, 11 & 12 ,
OLF materials as specified in class
Complete Reflection/Review

Wednesday, June 23: Fluency and Accuracy

Accuracy & Fluency
Fix-up Strategies
Phonics in Context
Review/Create Case Studies
Reading: Allington, Chapter 5; Beers, Chapters 4 & 5
Complete Reflection/Review

Thursday, June 24: Comprehension

Discuss Reading
Adolescent Literacy
 1.Comprehension Strategies, 2. Vocabulary Instruction, 3. Text Structure Analysis
 4. Intensive Intervention: Monitoring & Data Analysis
Video-Tovani
Introduce Assignment #2: Due June 28th
Model Lesson – Preparation, Choose Book, Work in Groups
Reading: ODE materials, Beers, Chapters 6, 7 & 8, Review/Reflection

Friday, June 25: Comprehension (Before, During and After)
Discuss assigned readings
Before, During and After Activity
Video: Cris Tovani
Reading: ODE materials, Beers, Chapters 9 & 12, Handout **+** Reflection/Review

Monday, June 28: Vocabulary and Spelling
Discuss assigned readings
Vocabulary Strategies: Pre-school-12thgrade: Different strategies?
Assignment #2 Share
Vocabulary Activity: Teach the Class
Reading: Whatworksclearinghouse.org(selections specified in class) Allington, Chapter 6 **+** Reflection/Review

Tuesday, June 29: District Reading Programs
Discuss assigned readings.
District Reading Programs Analysis Group Work/Discussion
          Data on validity, reliability, prediction of reading success and peer-reviewed research
Tonight's reading: Handouts + Reflection/Review

Wednesday, June 30: Special Education Eligible Students: The issues are the same
Discuss assigned readings
Reading for students with low incidence disabilities
Assignment #3 Share
Self-evaluation paper due, to be done in class

Assignments:
   I. Readings/Discussions
         Students will need to complete all readings assigned before class and have materials available and 'highlighted' for class discussion. Discussions will focus on clarifying any information that is not clear, and specifying the most essential elements in the reading for creating specially designed instruction for students (at your practicum grade level).
   II. Reflections/Reviews
         Summarizing is a reading strategy you will be teaching students. You are asked to apply that strategy here. You will be reading expository text. Your **summary is to provide a text structure analysis** appropriate for what you are reading. Summaries are to be no longer than one page. [The essential piece of this assignment is to actually think about what you do as a reader to be able to comprehend the text, review and report the focus.]

III. Application Assignments
1. Review a variety of assessment materials using the book <u>Literacy Assessment</u>,the OLP materials, an internet search and materials used in your district.
         1a. Develop an assessment that can/will be used with the special education population in your school (Inclusion, Res. Program or self-contained, select the population appropriate for you.)

 2. After selecting a grade level that you have, or are presently working with, choose a comprehension strategy and text for a group of readers (groups may contain more than one grade level student as in your school). Using your knowledge of explicit comprehension instruction, provide a series of lessons (1 week) appropriate for the population you specify.
 Include: * eligibility code,
                        * number of students for these lessons,
                        * goal of each lesson
                        * data monitoring system you will use.
We will be sharing these in class and a paper copy is to be turned in.

  3. Using your Sample Case Study description, find **three** appropriate texts for a reader. You must have at least one narrative and one expository text. Start with the texts available in your

practicum site. High school special education teachers should consider texts across subject areas, particularly science and history/ social studies.

    3a. Describe your selection criteria for each text,

    3b. Describe features could become 'teachable moments'.

    3c. Describe how you would use these texts with your student. Include progress monitoring.

    3d. List goal(s) on the IEP that are addressed by the use of SDI with this text.

Evaluation Criteria

Teaching special education gives you the unique opportunity to stretch yourself as a teacher and determine successful ways to teach students who have not been successful with methods used in the general education classes in the district. It requires you to search for instructional strategies and materials that work with each individual student at any grade level pre-school through 12. Class discussions and participation are essential for providing opportunities to review successful programs and strategies and those that failed with special education students.

    A = completion of all projects demonstrating **mastery** of the substantive (content) and procedural (process) elements required by each project.

    B = completion of all projects demonstrating a **good** understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project.

    C = completion of all projects demonstrating an **emerging** understanding of the substantive and procedural aspects of each project.

    D = project(s) partially completed; project(s) not appropriate, not accurate, demonstrating little understanding

    F = project(s) not completed; competencies not demonstrated

Numerical criteria:

40% - Class participation – This includes completing all assignments on time, participating in class discussions, and completing assigned readings.

30% - Quality: Completeness & Accuracy of Reading Reflections/Reviews

30% - Application Assignments

SPED 535:   **Part I Current Issues in Special Education**
Instructors: Lee Ann Sharman, Christine Moore
Location: Rogers Hall, Rm. 105
Dates: Part I : June 14,15,16,17 5:30-8:30, Saturday, June 19 10:00- 5:00
                 Part II: June 21,22,23,24, 5:30-8:30
Office: Christine Moore, Rogers Hall, Rm. 105   Office hours can be arranged
                before class or after class at student's convenience. Please schedule
                with faculty. Lee Ann Sharman can be contacted at
                lsharman.clackesd.k12.or.us

Catalog Description

Content: Provides an integrated summary of current content, pedagogy, learning and special education legal issues that have direct impact on the practice of special education in k-12 public schools. The faculty,in conjunction with endorsement candidates, jointly select topics for additional emphasis based on participants' backgrounds and cumulative experiences in the Special Educator Endorsement Program. Focus is on application of all components of special education standards in Oregon.
Prerequisites: Completion of all coursework for the Special Education

Course Description

Current Issues is a summative experience in the special education endorsement at the Graduate School of Education & Counseling, Lewis & Clark. As a course it has been designed to emphasize elements of the endorsement that require additional emphasis either because of recent changes in the legal framework or research based practices in special education, as well as educational concerns or questions posed by the students. The current course will be provided as two sections.

Part I, as addressed in this syllabus, will be concerned with a variety of procedural and educational issues. Endorsement candidates will be asked to work with others in the course to solve the problems or answer the questions posed in a simulation of what would occur in local school districts.

<u>Course Objectives/Competencies</u>	<u>Demonstration/Outcome</u>
Students will demonstrate their knowledge of all aspects of the special education processes / procedures (Pre-referral (RTI), Referral, Eligibility, IEP, Placement, Reevaluation) as applied to educational practice in elementary, middle and secondary schools.	Forms Project
Students will demonstrate the application of the legal framework of special education, specifically FERPA, HIPPA, IDEA '04-'06, Section 504 and relevant technology issues.	Class group work Forms project

Students will demonstrate their competence in   Class simulation
 conflict management.

Special Education Endorsement Standards
The newly adopted special education standards are listed below. Aspects of each standard are represented in each course to the degree relevant. The specific standards which are the focus of this course are indicated below.

Standard		SPED 535
Standard 1:	Foundations	
Standard 2;	Development and Characteristics of Learners	X
Standard 3:	Individual Learning Differences	X
Standard 4	Instructional Strategies	X
Standard 5:	Learning Environments and Social Interactions.	X
Standard 6:	Language	X
Standard 7:	Instructional Planning	X
Standard 8:	Assessment	X
Standard 9	Professional and Ethical Practice	X
Standard 10:	Collaboration	X

Course Requirements

In this section of the course, students will be provided with the most current information available regarding, FERPA, HIPPA, Accommodations, Transition, Conflict Resolution, Lesson Planning, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Special Education Forms. Working individually and in groups, you will be asked to synthesize the information provided and apply it at elementary or secondary level.   As the work for this class is completed in class, it is essential that you be present and participating to complete the projects with others in the class. This course is graded CR/NCR.

Topic Outline
June 14th
 I. Final program requirements review
  A. Review requirements for the Portfolio
  B. Review the Career & License website info

C. Sped HQT PPoint
D. Legal updates and reviews

> **Transition law**
> (Whole group determines key issues & describes solutions)
> **FERPA Handout**   Group 1: Elementary
> **Accommodations Manual** Group 2: Secondary
> Review individually. Discuss in group. Present key points.

E. **Section 504: Forms for 504 Plan**   Group 1 & 2 Whole Group & Report
> 1. Similarities & differences with IDEA

F. Planning & Teaching "What you need to do to….focus on Instruction." Ppoint

June 15th I . Reading, Writing, Math, Strategies Ppoint Review
> Group 1 & Group 2 A Reading --a Writing, & a Math 'lesson '

II. **UDL**---design curriculum w/UDL
> The Journal…technology trends in 2010
> Group 1 & Group 2 Summarize—1. describe the use of computers, Ipods,etc.
> 2. Adapt the lessons in I above.

IV. Conflict Resolution
> Group 1 & Group 2 1) What is the conflict? 2) What is the parent's goal
> and how do you know? 3)What do you say/do?

June 16th : Forms
> Manifestation Determination
> Summary of Performance,
> Referral,
> Prior Notice of Evaluation/ Consent for Evaluation,
> Eligibility Forms

June 17th: Forms
> Eligibility continued…
> IEP (Notice of team meeting, Placement,
> Prior Notice of Consent for Initial Provision of Sped
> Prior Notice of Special Education Action
> Agreement between parent /district,
> Revocation of permission for special education
> Med. Statement

June 19th I Forms project Special Ed (3 Scenarios)
> With data provided, complete all forms individually.
> Group review
> Group presentation

SPED 535:   Part II: Understanding and Responding to Behavior that Disrupts the
                Learning Environment
Instructors: Dr. Skip Greenwood & Dr. Vern Jones
Location: Rogers Hall, Rm. 105
Dates: Part II: June 19 1-4 p.m. and June ,21,22,23, 24, 5:30-8:30
Office: Vern Jones, Rogers Hall, Rm. 403   Office hours can be arranged
                at student's convenience. Please schedule with faculty.

Catalog Description

Content: Provides an integrated summary of current content, pedagogy, learning and
special education legal issues that have direct impact on the practice of special education
in k-12 public schools. The faculty,in conjunction with endorsement candidates, jointly
select topics for additional emphasis based on participants' backgrounds and cumulative
experiences in the Special Educator Endorsement Program. Focus is on application of all
components of special education standards in Oregon.
Prerequisites: Completion of all coursework for the Special Education

Course Description

Current Issues is a summative experience in the special education endorsement at the
Graduate School of Education & Counseling, Lewis & Clark. As a course it has been
designed to emphasize elements of the endorsement that require additional emphasis
either because of recent changes in the legal framework or research based practices in
special education, as well as educational concerns or questions posed by the students.
The current course will be provided as two sections.

Part II, as addressed in this syllabus, emphasizes the development of knowledge and
skills related to classroom management and the development of behavior change plans
for students whose behavior disrupts the learning environment despite the establishment
of high quality classroom management.

<u>Course Objectives/Competencies</u>	<u>Demonstration/Outcome</u>
Students will demonstrate their knowledge of effective, research-based classroom management methods.	Summative Project
Students will demonstrate their knowledge and skills in conducting a functional behavior assessment and using this to create a behavior change plan. This plan will incorporate the use of effective, research based classroom management as well as student self-management and social skill training techniques	Summative Project

<u>Special Education Endorsement Standards</u>

The newly adopted special education standards are listed below. Aspects of each standard are represented in each course to the degree relevant. The specific standards which are the focus of this course are indicated below.

Standard		SPED 535
Standard 1:	Foundations	
Standard 2;	Development and Characteristics of Learners	X
Standard 3:	Individual Learning Differences	X
Standard 4	Instructional Strategies	X
Standard 5:	Learning Environments and Social Interactions.	X
Standard 6:	Language	X
Standard 7:	Instructional Planning	X
Standard 8:	Assessment	X
Standard 9	Professional and Ethical Practice	X
Standard 10:	Collaboration	X

Course Requirements

As the work for this class is completed in class, it is essential that you be present and participating to complete the projects with others in the class. This course is graded CR/NCR. Your major assignment will be the development of a Functional Behavior Assessment and an accompanying Behavior Intervention Plan. The FBA must incorporate classroom environmental modifications indicating a strong understanding of best-accepted, research-based practices in preventive classroom management.

Topic Outline

June 19 and 21   Reading: Handout workbook provided by professor

Topic: Understanding the behavior of students with Emotional-Behavioral Disorders and Developing Pathways for Appropriate Educational Interventions:
Current Paradigms for understanding student behavior
Major characteristics of EBD students
Major Characteristics of externalizing and internalizing disorders

Outline: See below

I.   Current paradigms of understanding student behavior
    a. Traditional clinical disorders model
    b. FBA / BSP model

        c. Skill deficit model

II.   Major characteristics of EBD students
        a. Problems with heterogeneity
        b. Adverse impact
        c. Need for specialized instruction

III.   Major characteristics of Externalizing Disorders
        a. Conduct problems
        b. Hyperactive-impulsive behaviors
        c. Anti-social behaviors

IV.   Major characteristics of Internalizing Disorders
        a. Depression
        b. Anxiety
        c. Social withdrawal
        d. Somatic problems

V.   Collaborative Problem Solving and skill deficits
        a. Thinking Skills Inventory
        b. Blending clinical and skill deficit paradigms

VI.   FBA / BSP process
        a. Review of critical components of FBA / BSP
        b. FBA as a sequential process
        c. FBA / BSP checklist

VII.   Helping students change
        a. What do all kids need?
        b. Accepted methods and skills involved in change
        c. Getting students involved in their behavior and change
        d. Individual behavior plans / IEP goals and objectives

Key Questions:

- *Are clinical diagnoses and identification of disorders useful in working with EBD students? Are they necessary?*
- *What are some common features shared by all students with internalizing problems?*
- *Why should we use systematic procedures for assessing behavior and for behavior intervention?*
- *What are the challenges in implementing the FBA / BSP process in general education?*

June 22th I . Readings:
 and 23

        Handouts provided by instructor

        Special Education Preparation in Classroom Management:
        Implications for Students With Emotional and Behavioral Disorders
        Oliver and Reschly (2010) Behavior Disorders

        Practical Classroom Management Techniques to Close the Accessibility
        Gap for Students Who Are Culturally and Linguistically Diverse,
        Cartledge, et al. (2008). Preventing School Failure
        Reconsidering Behavior Management for Students with Autism Spectrum
        Disorders, Marks and Hudson (2006). Beyond Behavior

        Behavior Intervention Plans: Legal and Practical Considerations for
        Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, Maag, (2006),
        Behavioral Disorders

        Functional Behavior Assessment: Principles, Procedures, and Future
        Directions. Gresham, Watson, & Skinner, (2001). School Psychology
        Review.

        Making Choices – Improving Behavior – Engaging in Learning. Jolivette,
        Stichter & McCormick, 2002, Teaching Exceptional Children.

        Facilitating Effective Team-Based Functional Behavior Assessments in
        Typical School. Park, (2002). Beyond Behavior.

        Class outline

Creating a Community of Support and Solving Problems in an EBD Classroom

A substantial body of research indicates that the manner in which teachers organize the class during the first several weeks of school is a critical factor influencing student motivation and behavior during the entire school year. Today we will examine and work with best practices for creating classrooms as communities of support where students learn language and skills associated with accepting and displaying acceptable school behavior.

    I. Overview
        A. Circle of Classroom Management (Handout #1)
        B. Hill Walker's levels of intervention model (Handout #2)
        C. Beginning the school year (Handout #3)

    II. Teacher-student relationships
        A. People abuse roles not people
        B. Positive relationship bank account

C. Natural vs. arbitrary authority
D. Review key concepts from text (Handouts #s 4-7)
E. **key question/Activity**: What do you do to create a "positive relationship bank account" with your students? What methods do you employ to help you become acquainted with your students and visa versa?

IIII. Peer relationships
A. Acquaintance activities
B. Peer collaboration activities
C. **key question/Activity**: What activities did you implement to acquaint students with one another and help the group become cohesive?

IV. Instructional Interventions: Defining and Demystifying Learning
A. Brophy's motivation theory (Handout #8)
B. Defining a successful learner (Handout #9)
C. Students' academic needs (Handout #10)
D. Lesson overview (Handout #11)
E. Helping students understand special abilities (Handout # 12)
F. Cultural mismatch cycle (Handout #13)
G. Homework plan (Handout #14)
H. Success contract (Handouts #s 15, & 16)
I. Place-based education/real world problem solving as a method for motivating students
K. **Key question/Activity**: What do you do to help students believe they can all succeed academically and to enhance students' academic motivation for the upcoming school year?

V. Creating Behavioral Standards
A. Historical perspective (Kounin through Freiberg)
B. Rules: general guidelines concerning how individuals in the classroom will treat each other (Handout #17)
    1. Judicious Discipline (Handout #18)
    2. concept of "work place behavior"
    3. concept of "Time, Place, and Manner"
    4. quiz on classroom behavior expectations (Handouts #s 19 & 20)
C. Procedures: specific behaviors for accomplishing important activities in the Classroom (Handout # 21)
D . **Key question/Activity**: How were behavioral norms established in your classroom? What are the key procedures in your classroom and how were they developed and taught?

VI. Responding to classroom disruptions
A. being smarter than a trout
B. Key factors in effective responses (Handout #22)
C. Effective response sequence (Handout #23)
D. Analyzing a classroom for best practice (Handout #24)

339

E.   Initial response to behavior that disrupts the learning environment (Handout #25)

F. A "discipline" sequence in an EBD classroom (Handout #26)

1. the questions are: "What needs to be done here?" and "What needs to be learned here?"

G. Problem solving as a component of a discipline system (Handouts #s27& 28).

H. Social skill training as a component of a discipline system (Handout #29)

I.   Using a "level system"

J. Moving a student into a more restrictive setting (Handout #30)

K. Incorporating a therapeutic approach into responding to student behavior issues Handouts 31-35)

L. **key question/Activity**: (1) What is the procedure for adults responding to rule violations in your classroom? How was this taught to students? (2) In responding to student behavior that detracts from their learning or that of others, how do you incorporate feedback that helps them deal with personal issues that may be preventing them from being successful in school?

VII. Summary Activities

A. Reviewing and discussing feedback to a teacher of students with EBD

B. Reviewing and discussing feedback to a program serving students with EBD

Key Learning Goals:

- *Be prepared to create an outline for beginning the school year in a classroom in a manner that will facilitate the social/emotional and academic skill development for students identified with special needs*

- *Be prepared to develop a classroom management system that will facilitate the social/emotional and academic skill development for students identified with special needs*

- *Be prepared to assess effective teaching and classroom management by a teacher working with students with special needs.*

- *Be prepared to assess program components for students identified with social/emotional skills deficits.*

June 24th: Classroom Group Project: In groups of four, using data provided by one group member, complete a functional behavior assessment, including a focus on current classroom management methods being implemented. Next, develop a behavior intervention plan, including changes that could be made to strengthen the classroom management methods used in the classroom as well as behavior change interventions incorporating self-management and social skill training.

Course: SPED 545/645: Special Education Practicum I
Location: Special education job site or volunteer practicum position
Supervisors: On campus: SPED 545: Christine Moore   Central Oregon SPED 645:
       cmoore@lclark.edu   Diane Hensley
       dhensley@bendboradband.net
       Cynthia Aumann   Phone: 541 749-0879
       caumann@gmail.com

Phone: Christine Moore 503 768-6128   **Office:** Rogers Hall, Rm. 405
Meetings for Practicum observations or aspects relevant to the observations are by appointment, and will take place at the public school practicum site. Meetings/Observations are to be scheduled directly with the Supervisor.

Central Oregon: Diane Hensley (dhensley@bendbroadband.com) Ms. Hensley will schedule directly with each candidate

This information is intended as general background. Additional information will be provided during the first practicum meeting of the semester.

Catalog Description: SPED 545/645 - Practicum I
Designed to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning essential skills associated with the Special Education Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License. Observations are collaboratively scheduled by the participant and practicum supervisor with pre- and post-observation analysis as part of each site visit. Participants document time spent providing specially designed instruction for students with individual education plans (IEPs).
Corequisite: SPED 513/632 (3 credits)
Prerequisite: SPED 510/621
Credit: 1 semester hour (fall), CR/NC

Practicum Description
       The Lewis and Clark GSEC Special Education Program practicum courses are **SPED 545/645 Practicum I** and SPED 546/646 Practicum II. Two credits of practicum are required to complete the endorsement. Each credit is a minimum of 125 hours of school-based experience covering **all aspects of the special education process, [Referral, Evaluation, Eligibility, IEP, Placement, Reevaluation].**
Please emphasize curriculum and instruction to improve student outcomes. Work in the area of curriculum and instruction must be linked to the IEP of the student(s). You must be able to describe and demonstrate that linkage.
    Practicum I (SPED 545/645) is taken during the Fall semester in conjunction with **SPED 513, Assessment & Diagnosis**. The second credit of practicum (SPED 546: Practicum II) is taken during the winter/spring semester in conjunction with SPED 514, Curriculum & Instruction.
   Practicum Hours
       Candidates will record practicum hours on the **Practicum Log** (attached) and Lewis & Clark Supervisors will observe practica to support candidate's skill development in special education. Candidates who are not currently employed as the special education teacher-of- record, but have an Oregon teaching license, can determine their practicum site by discussing requirements with the LC supervisor, contacting the district, and **following the district process and requirements for working as an unpaid volunteer** with special education eligible students in the district. Please be sure that you contact the district's Human Resources department to find out the expectations and requirements for working at a district site.
       All candidates will benefit by having a mentor at their work site who can provide a model of effective special education practices. The most appropriate sites for this purpose are those where the candi-

date is able to observe and participate in all aspects of the special education process. Supervisors are available by email or by phone to answer questions, provide suggestions, problem solve etc.

Candidates must complete a **minimum** of 90 hrs. of special education practice. These hours must be in a site which requires that the teacher- of- record hold a special education endorsement. If you have any questions about the suitability of your site to meet practicum requirements, (e.g. an ' inclusion district' where all special education eligible students are in the general education classroom for the entire day), please discuss your site with a practicum supervisor.

SPED 545/645 Requirements: Practicum I Observations

Scheduling:

You will need to schedule a minimum of two observations.   Observations are scheduled directly with the Practicum supervisor.. **Please provide the name of the school, street address, location in the building and a phone number where you can be reached**.   If you are working with another special educator, please provide that individual's name.

The best method for scheduling is through email. On campus: (cmoore@lclark.edu) or (cindyaumann@gmail.com) Central Oregon: Diane Hensley: dhensley@bendbroadband.net.

If you need to make a change in a scheduled observation, please let the supervisor know by email and leave a phone mail message at (503 768-6128). Please leave an email and phone number where you can receive a message, if a change is needed. Central Oregon candidates can reach Diane Hensley : 541 749-0879.

Practicum observations will be at least an hour in length (approximately). Observations are preceded by a 5-10 minute **Pre-conference** during which you are asked to explain the activity to be observed, where you are in the special education process, questions/concerns you have with this group and support you believe could be helpful. Observations are concluded with a 15-30 minute **Post conference**. If the pre-conference and post-conference will not fit your schedule, please discuss this with the supervisor before the observation, so that appropriate arrangements can be made to facilitate the conferences. If the supervisor will be observing a special education meeting, please be prepared to demonstrate that appropriate Notice has been provided to the parent and district.

Practicum Log
Please log a minimum of 90 hours of work in special education. Please log hours on the form provided. Please do not use "hash marks" to indicate 'same activity-different day'. Describe the students and activity, even if you are in a special education self-contained classroom.

 You may log any hours which are direct work with one or more special education students.   Any special education work (meetings, paperwork etc) maybe used as appropriate practicum documentation.

The Practicum Log must contain the age/grade level of the student(s),(e.g. ECE/Elementary or Middle/High School , the disability (LD, ED etc.) and the severity level of the disability (mild, moderate, severe).

It is important that candidates observe clinical practice from the beginning to the end of the school year. Your practicum should continue until the end of the school year. The semester ends before the school year ends. Credit will generally be deferred until the end of the school year.

The Practicum II Log is due   . It can be turned in to the Education Office 4th Floor Rogers Hall or brought to class.

The Practicum Log for Central Oregon is mailed to: Diane Hensley.
                                                          3810 NW Summerfield
                                                          Bend, Oregon

Grading

Grading for SPED 545 is CR/NCR. To receive credit a student must demonstrate, at minimum, an emerging level of competence in most sections of the Practicum Standards/Competency Form and at minimum 90hrs of practicum in a special education setting. (See attached Forms.)

Course: **SPED 546/646: Special Education Practicum II**
Location: **Special education job site or volunteer practicum position**
Supervisors: On campus: SPED 545: Christine Moore   Central Oregon SPED 645:
                                       cmoore@lclark.edu   **Diane Hensley**
                                                                                    dhensley@bendboradband.net
                                       Cynthia Aumann   **Phone: 541 749-0879**
                                       caumann@gmail.com

Phone: **Christine Moore 503 768-6128   Office: Rogers Hall, Rm. 405**
Meetings for Practicum observations or aspects relevant to the observations are by appointment, and will take place at the public school practicum site. Meetings/Observations are to be scheduled directly with the Supervisor.

Central Oregon Program: Supervisor   Diane Hensley dhensley@bendbroadband.com

This information is intended as general background. Additional information will be provided during the first practicum meeting of the semester.

Catalog Description: SPED 546/646 - Practicum II
Designed to provide each participant with observation and feedback concerning essential skills associated with the Special Education Endorsement and the Continuing Teaching License. Observations are collaboratively scheduled by the participant and practicum supervisor with pre- and post-observation analysis as part of each site visit. Participants document time spent providing specially designed instruction for students with individual education plans (IEPs).
Corequisite: SPED 514/633 (3 credits)
Prerequisite: SPED 510/621
Credit: 1 semester hour (spring), CR/NC

Practicum Description
        The Lewis and Clark GSEC Special Education Program practicum courses are **SPED 545/645 Practicum I** and SPED 546/646 Practicum II. Two credits of practicum are required to complete the endorsement.   Each credit is a minimum of 90 hours of school-based experience covering **all aspects of the special education process, [Referral, Evaluation, Eligibility, IEP, Placement, Reevaluation].**
 Please emphasize curriculum and instruction to improve student outcomes. Work in the area of curriculum and instruction must be linked to the IEP of the student(s). You must be able to describe and demonstrate that linkage.
    Practicum I (SPED 545/645) is taken during the Fall semester in conjunction with SPED 513, Assessment & Diagnosis. **The second credit of practicum (SPED 546: Practicum II) is taken during the winter/spring semester in conjunction with SPED 514/633, Curriculum & Instruction.**
 Practicum Hours
         Candidates will record practicum hours on the **Practicum Log** (attached) and Lewis & Clark Supervisors will observe practica to support candidate's skill development in special education. Candidates who are not currently employed as the special education teacher-of- record, but have an Oregon teaching license, can determine their practicum site by discussing requirements with the LC supervisor, contacting the district, and **following the district process and requirements for working as an unpaid volunteer** with special education eligible students in the district. Please be sure that you contact the district's Human Resources department to find out the expectations and requirements for working at a district site.
        All candidates will benefit by having a mentor at their work site who can provide a model of effective special education practices. The most appropriate sites for this purpose are those where the candidate is able to observe and participate in all aspects of the special education process. Supervisors are available by email or by phone to answer questions, provide suggestions, problem solve etc.

Candidates must complete a **minimum** of 125 hrs. of special education practice. These hours must be in a site which requires that the teacher- of- record hold a special education endorsement. If you have any questions about the suitability of your site to meet practicum requirements, (e.g. an ' inclusion district' where all special education eligible students are in the general education classroom for the entire day), please discuss your site with a practicum supervisor.

SPED 546/646 Requirements: Practicum I Observations

Scheduling:

You will need to schedule a minimum of two observations. Observations are scheduled directly with the Practicum supervisor.. **Please provide the name of the school, street address, location in the building and a phone number where you can be reached**. If you are working with another special educator, please provide that individual's name.
The best method for scheduling is through email (cmoore@lclark.edu) or (cindyaumann@gmail.com) or Diane Hensley: (dhensley@bendbroadband.com.)

If you need to make a change in a scheduled observation, please let the supervisor know by email and leave a phone mail message at (503 768-6128). Please leave an email and phone number where you can receive a message, if a change is needed. Central Oregon candidates can reach Diane Hensley: 541 749-0879.

Practicum observations will be at least an hour in length (approximately). Observations are preceded by a 5-10 minute **Pre-conference** during which you are asked to explain the activity to be observed, where you are in the special education process, questions/concerns you have with this group and support you believe could be helpful. Observations are concluded with a 15-30 minute **Post conference**. If the pre-conference and post-conference will not fit your schedule, please discuss this with the supervisor before the observation, so that appropriate arrangements can be made to facilitate the conferences. If the supervisor will be observing a special education meeting, please be prepared to demonstrate that appropriate Notice has been provided to the parent and district.

Practicum Log
Please log a minimum of 90 hours of work in special education. Please log hours on the form provided. Please do not use "hash marks" to indicate 'same activity-different day'. Describe the students and activity, even if you are in a special education self-contained classroom.

You may log any hours which are direct work with one or more special education students. Any special education work (meetings, paperwork etc) maybe used as appropriate practicum documentation.

The Practicum Log must contain the age/grade level of the student(s),(e.g. ECE/Elementary or Middle/High School , the disability (LD, ED etc.) and the severity level of the disability (mild, moderate, severe).

It is important that candidates observe clinical practice from the beginning to the end of the school year. Your practicum should continue until the end of the school year. The semester ends before the school year ends. Credit will generally be deferred until the end of the school year.

The Practicum II Log is due   . It can be turned in to the Education Office 4th Floor Rogers Hall or brought to class.

The Practicum Log for Central Oregon is mailed to: Diane Hensley.
                                                                                                    3810 NW Summerfield
                                                                                                     Bend, Oregon

                                                                                                    dhensley@bendbroadband.com

Grading

Grading for SPED 545 is CR/NCR. To receive credit a student must demonstrate, at minimum, an emerging level of competence in most sections of the Practicum Standards/Competency Form and at minimum 90hrs of practicum in a special education setting. (See attached Forms.)

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education
SPED (a)1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society.	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A,1B,1C,1D	**1B,1C,1D**	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D,	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D
SPED (b) 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners: Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C,	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	**2A, 2B, 2C**	2A. 2B, 2C	x	2A, 2B, 2C	2A
SPED (c) 3: Individual Learning Differences: Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B , 3C	**3C**	3C	3C	3C	3C
SPED (d) 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	4, 4A, 4B,4C	4, 4A, 4B, 4C		**4, 4A, 4B, 4C**	4, 4B, 4C	4A, 4B, 4C	4	4, 4A, 4B, 4C
SPED (e)5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	5B,5E	5B, 5E		**5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F**	5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F	5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F		5E, 5F

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education
SPED (f) 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	6C	6A, 6B,6C,	6	**6D**	6,6A, 6B, 6C,	6D	6A, 6B,6C, 6D	6
SPED (g) 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.		7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G,7H		**7,7A,7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G 7H**	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	7, 7A,7B,7C,7D, 7E,7F	7E, 7F, 7G, 7H
SPED (h) 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	8A,8D, 8E,8F	8A,8B,8D,8E, 8F	ALL 8 -8I	**ALL 8-8I**	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	8F,8G, 8H, 8I
SPED (i) 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	9D,9H	9D,	9B,9F,9H	**9A, 9E, 9F,9H**	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F, 9H	9B,9H	9A,9E,9F, 9H
SPED (j) 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	10A, 10C, 10D,10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E	10,10A,10C,1 0D	**10B,10C, 10D, 10E**	10A,10C, 10D, 10E	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10D, 10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E
CTL (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			CTL 1	CTL 1	**CTL 1**	CTL 1	CTL1	CTL 1	CTL 1

348

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		**CTL 2**	CTL2	CTL 2	CTL 2	CTL 2
CTL (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		**CTL 3**		CTL 3		CTL 3
CTL (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		**CTL 4**	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4
CTL (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		**CTL 5**	CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5
CTL (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.			CTL 6	CTL6	**CTL 6**	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6
CTL (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	**CTL 7**	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8
CTL (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					CTL 9	CTL 9			CTL 9
CTL (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					CTL 10	CTL 10			CTL 10

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	**SPED 513/632** *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (a)1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society.	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	**1A,1B,1C,1D**	1B,1C,1D	**1B, 1C, 1D**	1B, 1C, 1D,	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D
SPED (b) 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners: Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C,	2A, 2B, 2C	**2A, 2B, 2C**	2A, 2B, 2C	**2A. 2B, 2C**	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A
SPED (c) 3: Individual Learning Differences: Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B, 3C	**3A, 3B , 3C**	3C	**3C**	3C	3C	3C
SPED (d) 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	4, 4A, 4B,4C	4, 4A, 4B, 4C		4, 4A, 4B, 4C	**4, 4B, 4C**	4A, 4B, 4C	4	4, 4A, 4B, 4C
SPED (e)5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	5B,5E	5B, 5E		5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F	**5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F**	5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F		5E, 5F

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (f) 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	6C	6A, 6B,6C,	**6**	6D	**6,6A, 6B, 6C,**	6D	6A, 6B,6C, 6D	6
SPED (g) 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.		7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G,7H		7,7A,7B,7C,7D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	**7,7A7B,7C,7D,7E,7F,7G, 7H**	7,7A7B,7C,7D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	7, 7A,7B,7C,7D, 7E,7F	7E, 7F, 7G, 7H
SPED (h) 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	8A,8D, 8E,8F	8A,8B,8D,8E, 8F	**ALL 8 -8I**	ALL 8-8I	**ALL 8-8I**	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	8F,8G, 8H, 8I
SPED (i) 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	9D,9H	9D,	**9B,9F,9H**	9A, 9E, 9F,9H	**9B,9F,9H**	9A, 9E, 9F, 9H	9B,9H	9A,9E,9F, 9H
SPED (j) 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	10A, 10C, 10D,10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E	**10,10A,10C,10D**	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	**10A,10C, 10D, 10E**	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10D, 10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E
CTL (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			CTL 1	**CTL 1**	CTL 1	**CTL 1**	CTL1	CTL 1	CTL 1

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 Practicum I	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 Practicum II	SPED 517/627 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education
CTL (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		CTL 2	**CTL2**	CTL 2	CTL 2	CTL 2
CTL (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3
CTL (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		CTL 4	**CTL 4**	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4
CTL (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5	**CTL 5**	CTL 5		CTL 5
CTL (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.			CTL 6	**CTL6**	CTL 6	**CTL 6**	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6
CTL (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	**CTL 7**	CTL 7	**CTL 7**	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7

353

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	**SPED 513/632** *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					CTL 8	**CTL 8**	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8
CTL (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					CTL 9		CTL 9		CTL 9
CTL (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					CTL 10		CTL 10		CTL 10

354

SPED Courses & Standards

	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (a)1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society.	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A,1B,1C,1D	1B,1C,1D	**1B, 1C, 1D**	1B, 1C, 1D,	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D
SPED (b) 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners: Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C,	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	**2A. 2B, 2C**	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A
SPED (c) 3: Individual Learning Differences: Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B , 3C	3C	**3C**	3C	3C	3C
SPED (d) 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	4, 4A, 4B,4C	4, 4A, 4B, 4C		4, 4A, 4B, 4C	**4, 4B, 4C**	4A, 4B, 4C	4	4, 4A, 4B, 4C
SPED (e)5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	5B,5E	5B, 5E		5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F	**5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F**	5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F		5E, 5F

355

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (f) 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	6C	6A, 6B,6C,	6	6D	**6,6A, 6B, 6C,**	6D	6A, 6B,6C, 6D	6
SPED (g) 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.		7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G,7H		7,7A,7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	**7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H**	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	7, 7A,7B,7C,7D, 7E,7F	7E, 7F, 7G, 7H
SPED (h) 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	8A,8D, 8E,8F	8A,8B,8D,8E, 8F	ALL 8 -8I	ALL 8-8I	**ALL 8-8I**	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	8F,8G, 8H, 8I
SPED (i) 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	9D,9H	9D,	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F,9H	**9B,9F,9H**	9A, 9E, 9F, 9H	9B,9H	9A,9E,9F, 9H
SPED (j) 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	10A, 10C, 10D,10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E	10,10A,10C,1 0D	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	**10A,10C, 10D, 10E**	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10D, 10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E
CTL (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	**CTL 1**	CTL1	CTL 1	CTL 1

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 Practicum I	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 Practicum II	SPED 517/627 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education
CTL (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		CTL 2	CTL2	CTL 2	CTL 2	CTL 2
CTL (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3
CTL (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4
CTL (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5	CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5
CTL (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.			CTL 6	CTL6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6
CTL (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7

357

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8
CTL (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					CTL 9		CTL 9		CTL 9
CTL (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					CTL 10		CTL 10		CTL 10

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (a)1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society.	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A,1B,1C,1D	1B,1C,1D	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D,	1B, 1C, 1D	**1B, 1C, 1D**
SPED (b) 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners: Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C,	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A. 2B, 2C	x	2A, 2B, 2C	**2A**
SPED (c) 3: Individual Learning Differences: Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B , 3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	**3C**
SPED (d) 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	4, 4A, 4B,4C	4, 4A, 4B, 4C		4, 4A, 4B, 4C	4, 4B, 4C	4A, 4B, 4C	4	**4, 4A, 4B, 4C**
SPED (e)5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	5B,5E	5B, 5E		5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F	5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F	5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F		**5E, 5F**

359

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (f) 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	6C	6A, 6B,6C,	6	6D	6,6A, 6B, 6C,	6D	6A, 6B,6C, 6D	**6**
SPED (g) 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.		7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G,7H		7,7A,7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G7 H	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	7, 7A,7B,7C,7D, 7E,7F	**7E, 7F, 7G, 7H**
SPED (h) 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	8A,8D, 8E,8F	8A,8B,8D,8E, 8F	ALL 8 -8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	**8F,8G, 8H, 8I**
SPED (i) 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	9D,9H	9D,	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F,9H	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F, 9H	9B,9H	**9A,9E,9F, 9H**
SPED (j) 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	10A, 10C, 10D,10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E	10,10A,10C,1 0D	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10A,10C, 10D, 10E	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10D, 10E	**10A,10C,10D ,10E**
CTL (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL1	CTL 1	**CTL 1**

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		CTL 2	CTL2	CTL 2	CTL 2	**CTL 2**
CTL (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		CTL 3	CTL 3			**CTL 3**
CTL (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	**CTL 4**
CTL (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5	CTL 5	CTL 5		**CTL 5**
CTL (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.			CTL 6	CTL6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	**CTL 6**
CTL (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	**CTL 7**

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	**CTL 8**
CTL (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					CTL 9	CTL 9			**CTL 9**
CTL (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					CTL 10	CTL 10			**CTL 10**

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (a)1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society.	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A,1B,1C,1D	**1B,1C,1D**	1B, 1C, 1D	**1B, 1C, 1D,**	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D
SPED (b) 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners: Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C,	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	**2A, 2B, 2C**	2A. 2B, 2C	**2A,2B,2C**	2A, 2B, 2C	2A
SPED (c) 3: Individual Learning Differences: Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B , 3C	**3C**	3C	**3C**	3C	3C
SPED (d) 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	4, 4A, 4B,4C	4, 4A, 4B, 4C		**4, 4A, 4B, 4C**	4, 4B, 4C	**4A, 4B, 4C**	4	4, 4A, 4B, 4C
SPED (e)5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	5B,5E	5B, 5E		**5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F**	5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F	**5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F**		5E, 5F

363

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 Practicum I	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 Practicum II	SPED 517/627 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education
SPED (f) 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	6C	6A, 6B,6C,	6	**6D**	6,6A, 6B, 6C,	**6D**	6A, 6B,6C, 6D	6
SPED (g) 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.		7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G,7H		**7,7A,7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G 7H**	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	**7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H**	7, 7A,7B,7C,7D, 7E,7F	7E, 7F, 7G, 7H
SPED (h) 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	8A,8D, 8E,8F	8A,8B,8D,8E, 8F	ALL 8 -8I	**ALL 8-8I**	ALL 8-8I	**ALL 8-8I**	ALL 8-8I	8F,8G, 8H, 8I
SPED (i) 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	9D,9H	9D,	9B,9F,9H	**9A, 9E, 9F,9H**	9B,9F,9H	**9A, 9E, 9F, 9H**	9B,9H	9A,9E,9F, 9H
SPED (j) 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	10A, 10C, 10D,10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E	10,10A,10C,1 0D	**10B,10C, 10D, 10E**	10A,10C, 10D, 10E	**10B,10C, 10D, 10E**	10D, 10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E
CTL (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			CTL 1	CTL 1	**CTL 1**	CTL 1	**CTL1**	CTL 1	CTL 1

364

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 Practicum I	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 Practicum II	SPED 517/627 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education
CTL (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		CTL 2	CTL2	CTL 2	CTL 2	CTL 2
CTL (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3
CTL (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4
CTL (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5	CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5
CTL (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.			CTL 6	CTL6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6
CTL (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7

365

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8
CTL (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					CTL 9		CTL 9		CTL 9
CTL (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					CTL 10		CTL 10		CTL 10

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (a)1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society.	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	**1A, 1B, 1C, 1D**	1A,1B,1C,1D	1B,1C,1D	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D,	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D
SPED (b) 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners: Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C,	**2A, 2B, 2C**	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A. 2B, 2C	x	2A, 2B, 2C	2A
SPED (c) 3: Individual Learning Differences: Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	3A, 3B, 3C	**3A, 3B, 3C**	3A, 3B , 3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	3C
SPED (d) 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	4, 4A, 4B,4C	**4, 4A, 4B, 4C**		4, 4A, 4B, 4C	4, 4B, 4C	4A, 4B, 4C	4	4, 4A, 4B, 4C
SPED (e)5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	5B,5E	**5B, 5E**		5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F	5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F	5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F		5E, 5F

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (f) 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	6C	**6A, 6B,6C,**	6	6D	6,6A, 6B, 6C,	6D	6A, 6B,6C, 6D	6
SPED (g) 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.		7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	**7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G,7H**		7,7A,7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G7 H	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G,7 H	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G,7 H	7, 7A,7B,7C,7D, 7E,7F	7E, 7F, 7G, 7H
SPED (h) 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	8A,8D, 8E,8F	**8A,8B,8D,8E, 8F**	ALL 8 -8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	8F,8G, 8H, 8I
SPED (i) 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	9D,9H	**9D,**	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F,9H	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F, 9H	9B,9H	9A,9E,9F, 9H
SPED (j) 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	10A, 10C, 10D,10E	**10A,10C,10D ,10E**	10,10A,10C,1 0D	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10A,10C, 10D, 10E	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10D, 10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E
CTL (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			**CTL 1**	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL1	CTL 1	CTL 1

368

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 Practicum I	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 Practicum II	SPED 517/627 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education
CTL (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		CTL 2	CTL2	CTL 2	CTL 2	CTL 2
CTL (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		CTL 3	CTL 3			CTL 3
CTL (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4
CTL (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5	CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5
CTL (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.			CTL 6	CTL6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6
CTL (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7

369

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	**SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students***	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8
CTL (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					CTL 9	CTL 9			CTL 9
CTL (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					CTL 10	CTL 10			CTL 10

SPED Courses & Standards

	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (a)1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society.	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A,1B,1C,1D	1B,1C,1D	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D,	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D
SPED (b) 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners: Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C,	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A. 2B, 2C	2A,2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A
SPED (c) 3: Individual Learning Differences: Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B , 3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	3C
SPED (d) 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	4, 4A, 4B,4C	4, 4A, 4B, 4C		4, 4A, 4B, 4C	4, 4B, 4C	4A, 4B, 4C	4	4, 4A, 4B, 4C
SPED (e)5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	5B,5E	5B, 5E		5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F	5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F	5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F		5E, 5F

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (f) 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	6C	6A, 6B,6C,	6	6D	6,6A, 6B, 6C,	6D	6A, 6B,6C, 6D	6
SPED (g) 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.	7	7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G,7H		7,7A,7B,7C,7D,7E,7F,7G7H	7,7A7B,7C,7D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	7,7A7B,7C,7D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	7, 7A,7B,7C,7D, 7E,7F	7E, 7F, 7G, 7H
SPED (h) 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	8A,8D, 8E,8F	8A,8B,8D,8E, 8F	ALL 8 -8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	8F,8G, 8H, 8I
SPED (i) 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	9D,9H	9D,	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F,9H	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F, 9H	9B,9H	9A,9E,9F, 9H
SPED (j) 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	10A, 10C, 10D,10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E	10,10A,10C,10D	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10A,10C, 10D, 10E	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10D, 10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E
CTL (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL1	CTL 1	CTL 1

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 Practicum I	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 Practicum II	SPED 517/627 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education
CTL (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		CTL 2	CTL2	CTL 2	CTL 2	CTL 2
CTL (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3
CTL (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4
CTL (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5	CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5
CTL (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.			CTL 6	CTL6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6
CTL (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8
CTL (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					CTL 9	CTL 9			CTL 9
CTL (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					CTL 10	CTL 10			CTL 10

374

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (a)1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society.	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	**1A, 1B, 1C, 1D**	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A,1B,1C,1D	1B,1C,1D	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D,	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D
SPED (b) 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners: Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	**2A, 2B, 2C,**	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A. 2B, 2C	x	2A, 2B, 2C	2A
SPED (c) 3: Individual Learning Differences: Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	**3A, 3B, 3C**	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B , 3C	3C	3C	3C	3C	3C
SPED (d) 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	**4, 4A, 4B,4C**	4, 4A, 4B, 4C		4, 4A, 4B, 4C	4, 4B, 4C	4A, 4B, 4C	4	4, 4A, 4B, 4C
SPED (e)5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	**5B,5E**	5B, 5E		5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F	5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F	5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F		5E, 5F

375

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 **Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders**	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (f) 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	**6C**	6A, 6B,6C,	6	6D	6,6A, 6B, 6C,	6D	6A, 6B,6C, 6D	6
SPED (g) 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.		**7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H**	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G,7H		7,7A,7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G7 H	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G,7 H	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G,7 H	7, 7A,7B,7C,7D, 7E,7F	7E, 7F, 7G, 7H
SPED (h) 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	**8A,8D, 8E,8F**	8A,8B,8D,8E, 8F	ALL 8 -8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	8F,8G, 8H, 8I
SPED (i) 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	**9D,9H**	9D,	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F,9H	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F, 9H	9B,9H	9A,9E,9F, 9H
SPED (j) 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	**10A, 10C, 10D,10E**	10A,10C,10D ,10E	10,10A,10C,1 0D	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10A,10C, 10D, 10E	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10D, 10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E
CTL (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL1	CTL 1	CTL 1

376

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		CTL 2	CTL2	CTL 2	CTL 2	CTL 2
CTL (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3		CTL 3
CTL (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4
CTL (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5	CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5
CTL (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.			CTL 6	CTL6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6
CTL (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7

377

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8
CTL (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					CTL 9	CTL 9			CTL 9
CTL (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					CTL 10	CTL 10			CTL 10

378

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (a)1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society.	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A,1B,1C,1D	1B,1C,1D	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D,	**1B, 1C, 1D**	1B, 1C, 1D
SPED (b) 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners: Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C,	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	2A. 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	**2A, 2B, 2C**	2A
SPED (c) 3: Individual Learning Differences: Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B , 3C	3C	3C	3C	**3C**	3C
SPED (d) 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	4, 4A, 4B,4C	4, 4A, 4B, 4C		4, 4A, 4B, 4C	4, 4B, 4C	4A, 4B, 4C	**4**	4, 4A, 4B, 4C
SPED (e)5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	5B,5E	5B, 5E		5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F	5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F	5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F		5E, 5F

379

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (f) 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	6C	6A, 6B,6C,	6	6D	6,6A, 6B, 6C,	6D	**6A, 6B,6C, 6D**	6
SPED (g) 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.		7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G,7H		7,7A,7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G7 H	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	7,7A7B,7C,7 D,7E,7F,7G, 7H	**7, 7A,7B,7C,7D, 7E,7F**	7E, 7F, 7G, 7H
SPED (h) 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	8A,8D, 8E,8F	8A,8B,8D,8E, 8F	ALL 8 -8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	**ALL 8-8I**	8F,8G, 8H, 8I
SPED (i) 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	9D,9H	9D,	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F,9H	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F, 9H	**9B,9H**	9A,9E,9F, 9H
SPED (j) 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	10A, 10C, 10D,10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E	10,10A,10C,1 0D	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10A,10C, 10D, 10E	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	**10D, 10E**	10A,10C,10D ,10E
CTL (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL 1	CTL1	**CTL 1**	CTL 1

380

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 Practicum I	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 Practicum II	SPED 517/627 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education
CTL (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		CTL 2	CTL2	CTL 2	**CTL 2**	CTL 2
CTL (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		CTL 3	CTL 3			CTL 3
CTL (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	**CTL 4**	CTL 4
CTL (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5	CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5
CTL (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.			CTL 6	CTL6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	**CTL 6**	CTL 6
CTL (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	**CTL 7**	CTL 7

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 545/645 *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	**CTL 8**	CTL 8
CTL (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					CTL 9	CTL 9			CTL 9
CTL (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					CTL 10	CTL 10			CTL 10

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	**SPED 545/645 *Practicum I***	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
SPED (a)1: Foundations: Candidates understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society.	1A ,1B,1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A, 1B, 1C, 1D	1A,1B,1C,1D	**1B,1C,1D**	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D,	1B, 1C, 1D	1B, 1C, 1D
SPED (b) 2: Development and Characteristics of Learners: Candidates know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings.	2A,2B,2C	2A, 2B, 2C,	2A, 2B, 2C	2A, 2B, 2C	**2A, 2B, 2C**	2A. 2B, 2C	x	2A, 2B, 2C	2A
SPED (c) 3: Individual Learning Differences: Candidates understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual's learning in school and throughout life.	3A,3B,3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B, 3C	3A, 3B , 3C	**3C**	3C	3C	3C	3C
SPED (d) 4: Instructional Strategies. Candidates posses a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs.	4	4, 4A, 4B,4C	4, 4A, 4B, 4C		**4, 4A, 4B, 4C**	4, 4B, 4C	4A, 4B, 4C	4	4, 4A, 4B, 4C
SPED (e)5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Candidates actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs.	5	5B,5E	5B, 5E		**5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E,5F**	5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F	5 , 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F		5E, 5F

383

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues	SPED 511/629 Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	SPED 516/628 Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	SPED 513/632 Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs	SPED 545/645 Practicum I	SPED 514/633 Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs	SPED 546/646 Practicum II	SPED 517/627 Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs	SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education
SPED (f) 6: Language. Candidates understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language.	6	6C	6A, 6B,6C,	6	**6D**	6,6A, 6B, 6C,	6D	6A, 6B,6C, 6D	6
SPED (g) 7: Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.		7D,7E, 7F, 7G, 7H	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D,7E,7F, 7G,7H		**7,7A,7B,7C,7D,7E,7F,7G7H**	7,7A7B,7C,7D,7E,7F,7G,7H	7,7A7B,7C,7D,7E,7F,7G,7H	7, 7A,7B,7C,7D, 7E,7F	7E, 7F, 7G, 7H
SPED (h) 8: Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and candidates use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions.	8C	8A,8D, 8E,8F	8A,8B,8D,8E, 8F	ALL 8 -8I	**ALL 8-8I**	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	ALL 8-8I	8F,8G, 8H, 8I
SPED (i) 9: Professional and Ethical Practice. Candidates are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards.	9B,9C,9F,9G	9D,9H	9D,	9B,9F,9H	**9A, 9E, 9F,9H**	9B,9F,9H	9A, 9E, 9F, 9H	9B,9H	9A,9E,9F, 9H
SPED (j) 10: Collaboration. Candidates routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling.	10, 10E	10A, 10C, 10D,10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E	10,10A,10C,10D	**10B,10C, 10D, 10E**	10A,10C, 10D, 10E	10B,10C, 10D, 10E	10D, 10E	10A,10C,10D ,10E
CTL (1) Candidates assess knowledge and skills of students in relation to long-term content goals and district standards, and determine the knowledge and skills each student needs to accomplish them.			CTL 1	CTL 1	**CTL 1**	CTL 1	CTL1	CTL 1	CTL 1

384

SPED Courses & Standards

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	**SPED 545/645** *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (2) Candidates design instructional plans that incorporate knowledge of students' developmental levels, interests, abilities, and learning accomplishments consistent with content goals and district standards.			CTL 2		**CTL 2**	CTL2	CTL 2	CTL 2	CTL 2
CTL (3) Candidates establish a classroom climate conducive to learning, e.g., positive classroom management, a safe and developmentally appropriate environment, efficient organization of time and materials, and effective transitions.		CTL 3	CTL 3		**CTL 3**		CTL 3		CTL 3
CTL (4) Candidates implement instructional plans that employ knowledge of subject matter and use research-based educational practices that reflect how students learn, are sensitive to individual differences and diverse cultures, and encourage parent participation.		CTL 4	CTL 4		**CTL 4**	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4	CTL 4
CTL (5) Candidates collaborate with parents, colleagues, and members of the community to provide internal and external assistance to students and to their families, if needed, to promote student learning.		CTL 5	CTL 5		**CTL 5**	CTL 5	CTL 5		CTL 5
CTL (6) Candidates evaluate student progress in learning, refine plans for instruction, and establish alternative goals or environments for learning when necessary.			CTL 6	CTL6	**CTL 6**	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6	CTL 6
CTL (7) Candidates document and report the progress of students in achieving content goals and district standards.		CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	**CTL 7**	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7	CTL 7

SPED Courses & Standards	SPED 510/626 *Educating Students With Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues*	SPED 511/629 *Behavior Change Interventions for Students With Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*	SPED 516/628 *Interventions for Severely Challenged Students*	SPED 513/632 *Assessment and Diagnosis for Students With Special Needs*	**SPED 545/645** *Practicum I*	SPED 514/633 *Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Special Needs*	SPED 546/646 *Practicum II*	SPED 517/627 *Teaching Reading to Students With Special Needs*	SPED 535/635 *Current Issues in Special Education*
CTL (8) Candidates use emerging research on teaching, learning and school improvement to enhance practices.					**CTL 8**	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8	CTL 8
CTL (9) Candidates participate in designing, evaluating and improving opportunities for teaching and learning in an educational institution.					**CTL 9**	CTL 9			CTL 9
CTL (10) Candidates collaborate with colleagues to enhance job performance and advance teaching as a profession.					**CTL 10**	CTL 10			CTL 10

COURSE SYLLABUS
Lewis & Clark College Graduate School of Education and Counseling

Course Name Educating Students with Special Needs: Learning and Legal Issues Course Number
Special Education 626
Term Summer 2010
Textbooks/Materials Special Education Law, 2ⁿᵈ Edition
Faculty Name: Barbara Garland Faculty
Phone/E-mail: 541-325-5456   bgarland@509j.net
Faculty Office Jefferson County Education Service District
Catalogue Description:

Introduction to the learning and behavioral characteristics of children with special needs, and how educators attempt to meet these needs. Topics include history, current issues, contemporary practice of special education as a professional discipline, incorporation of technology, and legal issues. Students develop sensitivity and a basic foundation in the education of students with special needs and examine issues of cultural variability in student special education eligibility.

Course Goals and Objectives:

1. **To gain a historical perspective regarding special education law**
2. **To identify the process for special education from child find through development of the Individual Education Plan**
3. **To explain the procedural safeguards and parent rights for special education**
4. **To discern 504 vs IDEA issues**
5. **To investigate discipline issues, functional behavior assessments and behavior intervention plans**
6. **To discuss current legal issues surrounding special education**
7. **To explain the components of the Response to Intervention model of identifying special needs**
8. **To gain a historical perspective of special education practice**
9. **To identify English Language Learner issues surrounding the special education identification process**
10. **To research the learning and behavioral characteristics of children with special needs**
11. **To identify appropriate intervention/instruction strategies appropriate for children identified as having special needs**

Course Calendar:

Class will meet the following dates: TBD at first class meeting. Check WebAdvisor at lclark.edu for first course meeting date.
Course will meet at Jefferson County ESD Administrative Offices

Course Requirements:

1. **Class Participation – Class members will attend and engage in meaningful contributions to each class meeting.**
2. **Class Assignments – Participate and dialogue with peers.**
3. **Final Project- Develop a defensible Individual Education Plan (IEP) and revise after constructive feedback.**
4. **Final Project – Each class member will select one disability category and develop reference materials for peers.**
5. **Class Presentation – Final project will be shared with peers.**

Evaluation and Assessment:

1   **Class Participation 25%**
2   **Class Assignments 25%**
3   **Final Project - IEP 20%**
4   **Final Project – Disability 20%**
5   **Class Presentation 10%**

Bibliography: Selected readings from various sources. To be provided at first class meeting

SPED 627: Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs
Summer 2010
Instructor: Gail Ochsner

Course Description:

Examines the five key components of reading instruction across K-12 curriculum as described in the National Reading Panel and the Oregon State English/Language Arts Framework. This course will overview effective primary level instructional programs and equip participants with the skills necessary to assess student performance and develop K-12 intervention action plans for students with reading disabilities. Students will have the opportunity to explore a variety of research-based programs and supplements` designed to meet the needs of students struggling with reading skill acquisition, including English Language Learners.

Course Objectives:

- Understand why learning to read is difficult for many students.
- Develop awareness of what the mind does when it reads-how good readers read.
- Recognize tasks that are typical of each component of comprehensive reading instruction.
- Understand the biological, genetic, cognitive, environmental, and instructional causes that interact to influence reading development.
- Review characteristics of dyslexia.

- Respond to a range of phonological tasks.
- Understand the relationship between phoneme awareness, phonological processing, and phonics.
- Define, identify, and segment important linguistic units including vowels, consonants, syllables, and onset-rime.
- Develop skills for producing, counting, blending, segmenting, and manipulating phonemes in one-syllable words.
- Recognize phonological influences on children's inventive spelling.
- Review the phonemes of Spanish and the way they differ from English, and understand dialectical differences.

- Review methods for accommodating ELL students within multicultural reading groups.
- Learn English orthography

- Role of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension.
- Identify the ways in which word meanings are learned, in oral and written language.
- Role of context in word learning.
- Develop a rationale for choosing specific words for direct instruction.
- How to teach vocabulary.

- Understand the concepts of automaticity and reading fluency and why it is important.
- Identify causes for dysfluency.
- Understand poor reader subtypes; single and double deficits.
- How to measure and chart fluency.
- Practice strategies for fluency-building.
- Discuss less effective strategies to minimize or avoid.

- Understand the major factors that influence comprehension.
- Differentiate among the instructional strategies most useful before a text is read, during text reading, and after text reading.
- Summarize important research findings on comprehension strategy instructions.
- Learn techniques to develop visualization skills to improve listening and reading comprehension.

- Components of a comprehensive lesson framework in beginning reading instruction and the proportion of time allocated to each.
- Learn and practice techniques for teaching letter recognition, letter matching, letter naming, and letter formation.
- Learn and practice techniques for teaching phonological awareness.
- Learn and practice techniques for teaching phoneme-grapheme association.
- Using controlled texts with beginner readers.
- Strategies for building language comprehension during the reading of controlled text.

- Understand the uses and different types of assessments.
- Review and practice assessments for varying grade levels and how to interpret data to make instructional decisions.

- Understand why writing is an essential component of a comprehensive literacy program.
- Develop techniques for teaching applications of phonemic awareness and phonics principles to spelling tasks.
- Practice analyzing written language samples to determine targets for spelling instruction.

- Review and match research-based programs to different learner needs.

Conceptual Framework:

Special Education teachers must have a sound foundation in teaching, assessing and providing interventions for reading. There must be an understanding between assessment data, strategies and student achievement. Based on the extensive research compiled and analyzed by the National Reading Panel on how students learn to read, the following components are identified as being essential in an effective reading program and will enable the Special Education teacher to create effective reading programs:

- Phonemic Awareness Instruction must be taught directly and at an early age.
- Phonics Instruction must be taught using a systematic, explicit and direct approach.
- Fluency instruction must be direct and purposeful.
- Vocabulary must be taught directly and indirectly with repetition and exposure to rich literature.
- Comprehension Instruction must include a variety of strategies

Assignments:

Prior to the start of class, students will read the text "Unlocking Literacy" and generate five questions that they will later respond to as material is presented and discussed in class.

Students will participate daily in exercises based on the objectives for the course to develop knowledge and skills they will later apply when teaching struggling readers.

As a final project, students will be required to organize the information provided in class and through websites and texts, in any way they choose, ending up with a document and system that they can easily access when assessing, teaching, and problem solving roadblocks for students, and which can be expanded as they participate in future continuing education activities.

Students will create a short comprehension lesson based on one of the "7 Keys" from their text.

Students will choose one "Perspectives" article to read, and write a short summary (one page) to share with classmates at the end of the course.

Readings:

Unlocking Literacy: Effective Decoding and Spelling Instruction by Marcia Henry

7 Keys to Comprehension by Susan Zimmermann and Chryse Hutchins

Just the Facts-Dyslexia Basics by International Dyslexia Association

Perspectives-Theme Summary: Overview of Dyslexia Over the Lifespan by International Dyslexia Association

Evaluation Criteria:

The class will be most effective in facilitating the accomplishment of the course objectives if students are present and participate in class as one who shares and/or as an active listener. Active and appropriate participation is required as is attendance. Absences can adversely impact your grade.

For an "A":

- You have participated in class discussions and exercises, supporting and encouraging others in their learning, and show willingness to explore methods that may be new to you.
- You have raised questions and/or shared student profiles that enhance learning for our group.

- You have completed a final project which shows in depth understanding of course material.
- You have completed a Perspectives summary and shared with classmates.
- You have come to class prepared and on time.

For a "B":

- You have participated in class discussions and exercises and raised questions to further your own learning.
- You have come to class willing to explore methods that may be new to you.
- You have completed a final project which shows understanding of course material.
- You have completed a Perspectives summary and shared with classmates.
- You have come to class prepared and on time.

**BEHAVIOR CHANGE INTERVENTIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH SERIOUS
EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIORAL DISORDER.**

SPED 629:   Summer 2010
                     July 9-12
                     8:30 AM – 4:30 PM

INSTRUCTOR: Skip Greenwood Ph.D.
                     503-635-5747
                     E-Mail: 2sgreenwood @ Comcast.net

TEXT: Strategies For Addressing Behavior Problems In The Classroom
                     5th Ed. M. Kerr and C. Nelson. Merrill Prentice Hall 2006

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

        The study of developmental backgrounds of students with serious emotional and
behavioral problems, and practices to help these students develop more productive behaviors.
Topics include the use of a functional analysis to determine the necessary interventions,
environmental modifications, social skills training, cognitive behavioral interventions, self
monitoring, contracting and the use of outside agencies to support the school in assisting
students.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

                     Students who complete this course will have the opportunity to
                     demonstrate competency in the following areas:

    1. A general understanding of behavior characteristics that may play a
        role in student adjustment difficulties including
        externalizing/internalizing patterns, personality variables and various
        clinical disorders.
    2. Developing, implementing and monitoring a comprehensive Behavior
        Intervention Plan
    3. Understanding the role of Functional Analysis and applying this
        procedure in the development of Behavior Intervention Plans.
    4. Developing a general understanding of self management techniques
        and utilizing them in the implementation of a Behavior Intervention
        Plan.
    5. Developing a general understanding of cognitive cue systems and
        utilizing them in the implementation of a Behavior Intervention Plan.

6. Using skill building of positive social behaviors in a Behavior Intervention Plan.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Students will be asked to complete or participate in the following:

1. Attend all classes and complete required reading
2. Collaborate with a small group to present a synopsis of a chosen reading and help lead a classroom discussion.
3. Perform a Functional Analysis on a behavior problem.
4. Develop and write up a Behavior Intervention Plan for a student with aggressive or disruptive behavior.
5. Develop a Behavior Intervention plan using positive social behavior.
6. Develop a Behavior intervention plan that uses self-monitoring.
7. Participate with other students in developing and reviewing a series of Behavior Intervention Plans.

GRADING:

Oral Facilitation of Chosen Topic	10%
Written Functional Analysis Exercise	20%
Written Behavior Intervention Plan Exercise	20%
Final Exercise	40%
Class Participation	10%

Grade of A: 93% / Grade of B: 83% / Grade of C: 73%

CLASS SCHEDULE / READING

July 31, 2007:   Orientation and Business
AM Session

Characteristics of Emotional and Behavior Disorders
Determining Disorders
Diagnosis / mental health and its relevance to the school setting
Personality roles / Factors contributing to behavior

Reading: Kerr and Nelson: Chapters 1 & 11

July 31, 2007:   Behavior Support Planning
PM Session   IDEA and best practice considerations
Behavior Support Plans / Functional Analysis
Pinpointing behaviors
Functional analysis worksheet
Reading: Kerr and Nelson: Chapters 2, 3 & 4

August 1, 2007: Behavior Support Planning
AM Session   Chapter 3 and 5 Discussion
Behavior Intervention Plans
Developing models for intervention
Data Collection Procedures
Clinical Cases
Exercise:
Reading: Kerr and Nelson: Chapters 5 & 6

August 1, 2007: Preparing for the BSP meeting
PM Session   Chapter 4 Discussion
Assessing and determining reinforcers
Obtaining student information
Exercise: Behavior Support Plan
Reading: Kerr and Nelson: Chapter 7 & 8

August 2, 2007: Social Skill Building
AM Session   Chapter 8 Discussion
Assessing and determining strengths and deficits
Positive Social Behavior and Social Skill Building
Social Skills and School Performance
Exercise: Behavior Support Plan
Reading: Kerr and Nelson: Chapter 9

August 2, 2007: Self -Assessment and Self Control
PM Session   Chapter 9 Discussion
Monitoring Procedures
Emotional and Behavioral Self Control
Developing interventions for aggressive /Disruptive behavior
Reading: Kerr and Nelson: Chapter 10 & 12
Handout

August 3, 2007: Review and Final Exercise
AM Session   Data Collection revisited
Facilitation of the BSP Meeting

August 3, 2007 Review
PM Session   Final Exercise

COURSE SYLLABUS
Lewis & Clark College
Graduate School of Education and Counseling

Please attach completed Course Syllabus Cover Sheet to course syllabus.

Course Name	**Assessment and Diagnosis**
Course Number	**Special Education 623-01**
Term	**Fall 2010**
Department	**Department of Teacher Education**
Textbooks/Materials	**Selected Documents**
Faculty Name	**Barbara Garland**
Faculty Phone/E-mail	**541-325-5456 bgarland@509j.net**
Faculty Office	**Jefferson County Education Service District**

Catalogue Description:

This course explores educational assessment as it relates to decision-making in special education. Current Oregon standards, district identified priority standards and common formative assessment will be discussed in relation each plays in the assessment process for special education eligibility/ineligibility. Administration, scoring, and interpretation of most common individual achievement measures are taught through demonstrations, practice, and case studies. A variety of curriculum based measurements are examined. Relationships between assessment, eligibility decision-making, instructional planning and accountability issues are examined, including monitoring student performance using curriculum-based and related measurements and summative evaluation using the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS). Students will be introduced to issues regarding assessment of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Functional, practical assessments are emphasized, within the context of the IDEA conceptual and procedural requirements.

Course Goals and Objectives:

   Upon completion of the course, the student will demonstrate the ability to:
   Discuss the different kinds of decisions required for special education (screening, eligibility, classification, etc.) and methods of assessment relevant to each type of decision.
   Use basic measurement terminology and descriptive statistics to clearly and objectively describe student performance to others.
   Critique the reliability, validity, norms, and standardization of commonly used academic assessments, including state assessments.
   Identify best practice procedures designed to protect the student and assessment process from discriminatory practices.
   Demonstrate understanding of the major issues and decisions faced by teachers/special education team members to determine eligibility under the major disability categories.
   Explain the basic components of a "response-to-intervention" (RTI) eligibility process.
   Select and appropriately administer most commonly utilized measurement tools (norm and criterion referenced tests, checklists, observations, and curriculum based assessments) to gather information on student performance.
   Ability to generate an evaluation report based on data collected, with assessment findings linked to academic interventions and recommended accommodations for the classroom and state assessments.

Course Calendar:

   Class will meet the following dates: TBD

Course Requirements:

1. **Class Participation – Class members will attend and engage in meaningful contributions to each class meeting.**
2. **Class Assignments – Participate and dialogue with peers.**
3. **Attend a special education eligibility determination meeting.**
4. **Administer and interpret standardized, norm referenced assessment instruments.**
5. **Administer and interpret standardized curriculum based assessment instruments.**

Evaluation and Assessment:

1. Class Participation   **20%**
2. Class Assignments   **20%**
3. Attend a special education eligibility determination meeting   **20%**
4. Administer and interpret standardized, norm referenced assessment instruments   **20%**
5. Administer and interpret standardized curriculum based assessment instruments   **20%**

Bibliography: Selected readings from various sources.

<div align="center">

Lewis and Clark College
SPED 633
Course Syllabus

</div>

Course: Curriculum and Instruction for Special Needs Students
Term: Spring 2009
Dates: 1/17/09, 2/21, 3/14, 4/11, plus 2 more dates TBD
Times: **8:30 to 4:00 Saturdays**
Location: Bend-La Pine School District Education Administration Center

Instructor Contact Information:

>   Patti Craveiro, Executive Director of Special Education
>   Bend-La Pine School District, Bend, Oregon
>   patti.craveiro@bend.k12.or.us
>   541 383-6051 work
>   541 280-1085 cell
>
>   Pam Palmer, Assistant Director of Special Education
>   Bend-La Pine School District, Bend, Oregon
>   pam.palmer@bend.k12.or.us
>   541 383-6051 work
>   541 390-1143

Text: **The Inclusive Classroom: Strategies for Effective Instruction,**
        Margo A. Mastropieri, Thomas E. Scruggs, Third Edition 2007,
        Pearson for Merrill Prentice Hall, Columbus, Ohio

Course Description: Study of curriculum and instructional practices that promote success in learning for all students, development of a curriculum unit that includes modifications for students with special needs and reflects learning modes, overview of assessment practices and procedures that provide feedback on student learning, in depth IEP development that aligns with the State Standards and general education curriculum and assessment that are essential course skills.

Course Objectives/Demonstration Criteria: Based on the demonstration criteria specified, students in the course will achieve the following outcomes:

1. A comprehensive understanding of the relationship between general education curricula, at different grade levels, across content and process skills and disabilities, with an emphasis on facilitating student learning.
    Demonstration Criteria: Curriculum and Practice Reflection Journal and lesson plan.
2. Comprehensive understanding and demonstrated ability to complete all aspects of an Individualized Education Plan and Facilitated IEP meeting, which are both procedurally and substantively appropriate based on identified student needs.
    Demonstration Criteria: Completed IEP project and completed IEP meeting.

3. Demonstrated knowledge of curricular adaptations and modifications across grade levels, disabilities, and subject areas.
   Demonstration Criteria: Notebook including collected data on a specific student's response to accommodations tried.

Course Requirements:
I. Curriculum and Instruction Reflection Journal: Each student will be asked to keep a daily journal that will be a comprehensive reflection of their daily practice in education. They will be asked to include reflections of the relationship between the regular education curriculum, a student's disability and student learning. They will include collected data on a specific student, the student's responses to accommodations/modifications, and instruction both in regular education and in special education settings. This data and information will be used to create IEPs. They will also reflect upon presented information and materials throughout the class. **Due Date: Last class, 2009**

2. IEP Project: After collecting information and data on a specific student, you will be asked to create an IEP. This will be a student that you are familiar with and for whom you are able to obtain assessment and other relevant information on. It is expected that your IEP will be procedurally, and substantively correct for the student you select. IEPs will be completed on state forms. You will be provided with information about the IEP process, the legal requirements of an IEP with opportunities to "practice" writing IEPs in class. **Due Date: Last class, 2009**

3. Facilitated IEP Meeting Project: The ability to properly "run" an IEP meeting including solving problems and dealing with conflict is a critical skill for any special education teacher. Following class discussions on group process and skill building information on conflict resolution, you will be asked to be the Case Coordinator (lead special education teacher) in a simulated IEP meeting.
   Due Date: Last class, 2009

4. Resource Notebook: You will collect materials from class and from outside resources and will organize a notebook for your use in your practice. You will be looking for articles and materials that will provide information regarding your practice, including accommodations, techniques, methodology, curriculum, and other resources that you might find helpful to you in your practice in the future.
   Due Date: Last class, 2009

Content Topics Outline:
1/17/09
   Introductions
   Course Expectations
   Disability Criteria
   IDEA and LRE overview
   State Content Curriculum Standards and Benchmarks

02/07/09
   The IEP requirements
   Aligning the IEP with curriculum
   Specially Designed Instruction
   State Assessment Standards and Assessment Decisions
02/21/09
   Curriculum alignment
   Miscellaneous IEP components
   Effective IEP meetings
03/14/09
   Curriculum Based Measures/Formative Assessment
   Effective Teaching Strategies/Methodologies
   Components of Effective Intervention Strategies
04/11/09
   Conflict resolution
   Student led IEPs
   Service Delivery Models
   Curriculum Fair
04/25/09
   IEP Facilitation
   All Assignments are due

Grading Policy: All attendance is required. Arrangements must be made in advance for any missed class time due to emergencies.

Journal:
15 points: Journal is written on a consistent basis, writing has occurred 75% of the days. Journal is reflective of teaching practices, observations, intervention reflections, may include life's little lessons that may impact your teaching in an indirect manner. Journal would be useful as a resource in the future.

10 points: Journal is not consistent, writing has occurred less than 75% but more than 50% of the days. Some thought and reflection on educational practice however lacks insight that might be useful in the future.

5 points: Little attempt to keep a journal has been made, writing is not reflective of teaching practice or little detail and thought is given to reflections, journal is of little use to the person in the future.

Lesson Plan:
20 points: Lesson plan clearly identifies: objectives of lesson, instructional plan and assessment to monitor successful acquisition of targeted skills. Use of CBM is preferable.

10 points: Lesson plan lacks clarity in; identification of objectives, instructional plan, and assessment used to monitor skill acquisition.

IEP:
25 points: IEP meets all legal requirements according to the State's guidelines. IEP has been conferred for benefit for the student and could be implemented as written.

15 points: IEP meets most of the legal requirements, only minor corrections are necessary and it is designed to confer educational benefit for the student, may not be able to be implemented as written.

10 points: IEP has substantial legal problems; no educational benefit has been designed and is not able to be implemented as written.

IEP Project:
25 points: IEP meeting is held in a professional manner; all components of the IEP were explained well enough for the participants to follow along understand the meaning and fully participate as equal members of the team.

15 points: IEP meeting is held in a professional manner; most of the components of the IEP were explained, some confusion was expressed by the participants, however problems were resolved by the end of the IEP meeting and participants felt as though they were equal members of the team.

10 points: IEP was not held in professional manner; major parts of the IEP were missing or not handled correctly. Members of the team did not feel they were equal members and expressed concerns with the manner in which the IEP was facilitated.

Resource Book:
15 points: Book is thoughtfully organized by categories that make sense. Materials are gathered both from class and from outside resources. Book will be of great use in the future.

10 points: Book is somewhat organized by categories, materials come only from class and book will be some use in the future.

5 points: Book is not organized, materials come only from class and you this book will only collect dust.

Please rate yourself in each of these areas, write any comments or concerns that you might have and turn this into me at the end of the class on March 15th.

SELF RATING:
Journal:
Comments:

Lesson Plan:
Comments:

IEP:
Comments:

IEP Facilitation:
Comments:

Resource Notebook:
Comments:

Cynthia Aumann

9854 NW Nottage Drive   Portland, Oregon 97229
Home: (503) 297-2603

Education

Administrative Certificate, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, OR   1998
Standard Teacher Certificate, **Severely Handicapped** Oregon   1979
Master of Science, Portland State University, Portland, OR   1979
Bachelor of Science, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR   1970

Experience

Lewis and Clark College, Portland, OR

Practicum Supervisor, Graduate School of Education   Current
Responsibilities: Observe, assess and recommend graduate level practicum students for certification in Special Education.

Northwest Regional Education Service District, Hillsboro, OR

Director of Special Education   2003-2005
Responsibilities: Design, develop and administer contracted programs for eligible Special Education students for 20 school districts throughout a four county-wide area including budget development and the recruitment, hiring and supervision of personnel.

Program Director, Special Programs   2000-2003
Responsibilities: Administer contracted programs for students K-12 with severe emotional disturbance; participate in agency-wide recruitment and hiring.

Beaverton School District, Beaverton, OR

District Facilitator, Special Education   1995-2000
Responsibilities: Interpret current legislation and laws regarding Special Education; collaborate with district-wide administrators; provide support and technical assistance to all certified Special Education staff including the design, presentation and evaluation of staff development activities; develop and implement department budget (approximately 14 million dollars); recruit and participate in hiring of certified and classified staff.

Program Specialist, Intervention Program   1986-1995
Responsibilities: Coordinate and direct Intervention Program for K-12 students with severe emotional disturbance including the provision of staff support, curriculum development, ongoing program evaluation, budget

design and supervision and review and coordination of the out of district placement of students.

Teacher, Intervention Program   1982-1986

Responsibilities: In addition to classroom teaching position established and coordinated a school-wide peer tutoring program, supervised high school health careers students, college level practicum students and student teachers, and participated in various curriculum development and program evaluation projects.

Other

Consulting Teacher, Project SIGN	1981-1982
Teacher, Independent Skills Program	1980-1981
Teacher, Project SHAPE	1979-1980
Teacher, Waverly Day Treatment Program, Portland, OR	1979
Teacher, Milwaukie High School, Milwaukie, OR	1979
Executive Secretary, Arthur Andersen & Company, Belgium	1974-1976
English Language Teacher, Institute of Modern Languages and Communication, Belgium	1972-1974
YWCA Assistant Youth Director, San Francisco**,** CA	1968
VISTA Volunteer, New York City, NY	1966

Organizations and Memberships

Confederation of Oregon School Administrators
Southern Poverty Law Center
Portland Art Museum
Japanese Garden Society

2667 SW 41st
Redmond, OR 97756
(541) 548-5722
work – (541) 923-4868
email -(sandy.bishop@redmond.k12.or.us)

LEADERSHIP PROFILE

A professional that is dedicated and committed to education with proven ability in group facilitation and team processes, utilizing research and "best practices" to enhance instruction, promoting safe and positive learning environments for children, and demonstrating continuous learning and professional growth.

EDUCATION:
Initial Administrator License – Lewis and Clark - 2003
Masters in Special Education – Eastern Montana College – 1985
Bachelor of Science, Elementary Education – Montana State University – 1978

ENDORSEMENTS:
Administrator ALL LVL (valid to serve as school administrator, principal or superintendent at all grade levels).
Standard Handicapped Learner
Basic Elementary

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCES:

High Desert Education Service District (HDESD) - Administrator of Special Programs - 2008-present

1. **Program Supervisor** *of Behavioral Intervention Center (BIC) - serving students regionally in grades K - 8th. Responsible for referrals, program implementation, monitoring and evaluation.*

2. **Program Supervisor** *of Options - Redmond School District Behavioral Program - grades K-8th. Responsible for referrals, program implementation, monitoring and evaluation.*

3. **Program Supervisor** *of Cascade Child Center - responsible for the coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the educational program at two sites for students in K- 8th grades.*

4. **Facilitator** *of Community Partner Operations Team - facilitate monthly meetings to coordinate community services for at-risk students.*

4. **Program Supervisor** *of the Assistive Technology Department at the HDESD - responsible for supervising the program that provides for the assistive technology*

needs of students.

5. **Program Supervisor** *of Orthopedic Services at the HDESD - responsible for coordinating services to students to be provided by occupational and physical therapists.*

High Desert Education Service District (HDESD) - Program Administrator of Behavioral Programs – 2004-2007

1. **Program Supervisor** *of Trillium Residential Program – responsible for the coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the educational program – students ages 8-17.*
2. **Program Supervisor** *of Cascade Child Center – responsible for the coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the educational program – students grades K – 6.*
3. **Program Supervisor** *of the Behavioral Intervention Center (BIC) – responsible for the coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the educational program – students grades K – 8.*
4. **Regional representative** *on Trillium Family Services of Central Oregon – membership on the Operations and Review Teams.*
5. **Regional representative** *for Systems of Care Meetings – Mental Health Initiative*
6. **Student Support Services Administrative Team (SSSALT) –** *participant in administrative leadership team with focus on program coordination, monitoring and evaluation.*

Redmond School District, District Behavior Specialist, Redmond, Oregon – 1999-present

1. *Provide behavioral* **consultation** *to district staff.*
2. **Facilitates** *District Student Effectiveness Team (D-SET) – problem- solving forum.*
3. *Provide* **Functional Behavioral Assessment** *to determine behavioral intervention.*
4. **Co-authored** *Student Support Team process and manual.*
5. **Provided professional development** *training opportunities in Student Support Teams, Non-Violent Crisis Intervention (CPI), Effective Behavior Support (EBS) and effective behavioral interventions.*
6. *Developed and implemented the* **Paraeducator Steps to Success** *training program.*
7. **District support** *in IEP development, discipline of special education students, and manifestation determination reviews.*

Redmond School District, Special Education Teacher, District Elementary Behavior Program, Redmond, Oregon – 1990 – 1999

1. *Developed and implemented the first elementary district behavior program.*
2. *Implemented a* **Supportive Education** *service delivery model.*
3. **Supervised paraeducators** *in providing service to children with special needs.*
4. *Provided in-service training to paraeducators.*
5. **Modified and adapted curriculum** *to meet individual needs of students.*
6. **Collaborated with teachers** *in meeting individual student needs.*
7. *Provided instruction in* **social skill groups.**
8. *Developed and implemented individual* **behavior support plans.**

Education Service District (ESD), Alyce Hatch Center, Preschool Special Education Teacher,

Bend, Oregon – 1988-1989
1. _Developed and implemented a Preschool behavior program._
2. **_Developed and implemented individual behavior support plans._**
3. _Supervised paraeducators in providing service to children with special needs._

Powell School District, Special Education Teacher, Educational Resource Center (ERC) Powell, Wyoming – 1986-1987
1. _Developed Individual Education Plans for Students in Special Education._
2. **_Provided academic instruction utilizing differentiated instruction._**

Special Touch Preschool , Classroom Teacher, Early Intervention Center, Powell, Wyoming – 1983-1985
1. _Provided educational programs for students, ages 3-5, with mild to severe disabilities._
2. _Collaborated with educational specialists._
3. **_Developed individual education plans._**
4. **_Collaborated with parents_** _in the development of educational programs._

Buena Head Start, Preschool Teacher, Buena, Washington – 1980-1981
1. _Provided **developmentally appropriate instruction** for children, ages 4 – 5._
2. _Developed programs to meet individual needs._

Van Norman School, Elementary Teacher, Jordan, Montana – 1979- 1980
1. _Provided **multi-age instruction** to students in first – fifth grade._

PROFESSIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS:
1. **_Co-authored_** _the development of a regional program – Behavior Intervention Center_
2. **_Presentations_** _to local school boards, ESD boards and Special Education Directors on both the Behavior Intervention Center and the Paraeducator Steps to Success program._
3. **_Co-authored and awarded two grants_** _– Effective Behavior Support and Nurturing Parent Education Program – awarded $412,000_
4. **_Co-authored the Paraeducator Steps to Success_** _– a comprehensive training program that incorporates competencies/standards, training, evaluation and professional advancement of Paraeducators_
5. _Provided **research data** for the Behavior Intervention Center to determine program effectiveness_
6. _Provided **professional development** opportunities for teachers and paraeducators._
7. _Participated in the **state standard setting** for the Paraeducator Praxis._
8. **_Presented_** _at the National Paraeducator Conference in Los Angeles (2003)._

Jennifer J. Burkart

2756 SE 33rd Ave, Portland, OR 97202 • 503.810.2230 • jen.burkart@gmail.com

Endorsements

Currently I am endorsed as a K-12 Reading Specialist and Elementary Educator in the State of Oregon.

Education

Lewis and Clark College
Master of Education, K-12 Reading Endorsement, 2005

Michigan State University
Bachelor Degree in Elementary Education, 1999

Work Experience

Beaverton Public School District, Beaverton, OR   2006 - Present
Instructional Coach
- Coach teachers in all subject areas and aspects of instruction
- Construct and deliver staff development presentations
- Develop school-wide instructional improvement plans
- Create and implement Title 1 school improvement plan
- Instruct small groups of struggling readers
- Plan and facilitate professional learning communities

Lewis and Clark College, Portland, OR   2008-Present
Adjunct Professor
- Classes Taught
  ◦ Reading Comprehension
  ◦ Innovations for Literacy Leaders
  ◦ Reading Instructions for Special Education

Beaverton Public School District, Beaverton, OR   2001-2005
6th Grade Teacher
- Taught multiple subjects in a self-contained classroom
- Collaborated with colleagues a school-wide Literacy Team
- Presented staff development

Clarkston Public School District, Clarkston, MI   1999-2000
4th Grade Teacher

References

Available upon request

PATRICIA RANKIN CRAVEIRO

61045 River Bluff Trail
Bend, OR 97702

(541) 389-1894 (phone)
(541) 318-0569 (fax)

EDUCATION:

M.A. Special Education
California State University — Fresno, California
B.A. Psychology
University of California at Berkeley — Berkeley, California

CREDENTIALS:

Oregon Pupil Personnel Services (School Psychologist)
Oregon State Basic Administrative
Oregon State Learning Handicapped
Oregon State Severely Handicapped
Oregon State Regular Elementary
California State Regular Elementary
California State Learning Handicapped/Severely Handicapped
California Community College Teaching Credential

WORK EXPERIENCE:

<u>Bend-LaPine School District</u> - Bend, Oregon   1990 - Present
School Psychologist and Special Education Site Facilitator (1998 - Present)
    Provide psychological services such as site-based consultation to teachers and staff, diagnostic student psycho-educational evaluations, and direct therapeutic interventions for at-risk and special education students (K-12). Administer special education interventions and the implementation of student programs.
School Psychologist Intern and Special Education Site Facilitator (1997 - 1998)
    Performed the same duties as listed above.
Counselor, ADHD/ADD and At-Risk Adolescents (1995 - 1998)
    Provide case management, therapeutic intervention and counseling, and site-based consultation with staff and parents. Direct student skill groups centered around issues involving ADHD/ADD students with aggression, learning problems, depression, and/or low self-esteem.
Special Education Evaluator and Site Facilitator (1996 - 1997)
    Performed the same duties as listed for first two positions.
Coordinator for Social Service Integration Project (1994 - 1996)
    Developed and implemented medical, mental, social-emotional, behavioral and recreational child and family site-based intervention services at various westside Bend schools in collaboration with public and private community agencies. Duties included grant writing, implementation, and documentation for state and federal funding sources. Also provided direct parent education and student skill development opportunities in the areas of prevention of child abuse, domestic violence, juvenile crime, and drug/alcohol abuse.

Bend-LaPine School District (continued)
Inclusion Specialist for Special Education Students (1994 - 1996)
Implemented special education inclusion model for all students, including those with severe learning and behavior problems. Taught skill groups for social-emotional, self-esteem, anger control, and friendship skills.
Assessment Specialist (1990 - 1996)
Responsible for diagnostic testing and psycho-educational evaluations for at-risk and special education students (K-12). Worked for both the Bend-LaPine School District and Deschutes County Educational Service District (ESD).
Learning Disabilities Specialist, IEP Case Manager (K-3) (1990 - 1994)
Served as Learning Disabled Special Education Teacher, Team Leader, and Coordinator for at-risk and special education students with learning and behavior problems. IEP Case Manager duties included the implementation of inclusion model pilot project.

Granite School District - Salt Lake City, Utah   1986 - 1988
Principal: Administrative Intern: Hartvigsen School for Severely Handicapped Children
In addition to daily supervision of students (K-12), staff and building, duties included writing and revision of policy and procedures manual, fiscal planning, grant procurement and writing, implementation of school-wide discipline and behavior management system, interviewing and hiring teachers, staff morale-building techniques, curriculum development, and annual calendar planning.
Special Education Resource Teacher: Elementary, Junior/Senior High
Planned and wrote individualized educational programs and instructional objectives for learning handicapped and behaviorally disordered students, conducted testing and diagnostic work-ups, coordinated special Service Team's weekly meetings and agendas, directed instruction and remediation as well as student discipline and management systems, and consulted with/assisted regular classroom teachers.

Columbia Community College - Sonora, California   1981
Learning Disabilities Specialist and Program Supervisor
Planned and implemented a learning disability program at community college level for handicapped adults and high school transfers, coordinated and evaluated articulation of LD program with regular class requirements and teacher goals, trained aides, worked with LD students (in the areas of diagnosing, qualifying, remediating, teaching, and evaluating progress), organized and procured all evaluative materials as well as diagnostic tests, designed remedial curriculum and provided faculty consultation.

Toulumne County Superintendent of Schools - Sonora, California   1978 - 1981
Teacher Substitute for Regular Class and Special Education
Served as long-term and daily substitute for various ages and classes in Toulumne County.

Ventura Unified School District - Ventura, California   1977 - 1978
Special Education Project Coordinator and Teacher
Supervised and planned inter-agency Crisis Intervention Team for expelled handicapped students who were at high risk for dropping out of school, coordinated activities (social, psychiatric, educational and occupational), and monitored case progress as well as re-entry into public school programs.

411

University of Southern California School of Education, Bureau of Education for the Western Los Angeles Direction Service Project (for parents of handicapped children in need of service providers) - Los Angeles, California   1976 - 1977
Consultant
> Provided expertise and in-service information on handicapped children for the professional staff. Developed resources for a parent orientated library, designed a handicapped child-centered playroom, and conducted/documented a public relations outreach campaign with pre-school providers and processionals in the community.

Direction Counselor in Special Education
> Interviewed parents of handicapped children, assessed each child's needs, researched community resources, helped parents select appropriate services, held conferences with school personnel, monitored children's progress, and coordinated efforts of involved professionals and family to ensure best possible program for each child.

Santa Monica School District - Santa Monica, California   1975 - 1976
State Master Pilot Project for Special Education
Special Day Class Teacher
> In teaching special class for EH, LDG, and EMR students: assessed students' needs, designed remedial instructional plans for each student, and determined and met goals/objectives within the guidelines specified under the Master Plan. Additional duties included serving as Demonstration and Master Teacher for UCLA and USC Graduate School students as well as Master Plan observers.

Lennox School District - Lennox, California   1974 - 1975
Special Education Learning Resource Center Teacher
> Planned and operated a new learning center for special education students, provided in-services and demonstrations for professional staff on special education, shared materials and behavior management techniques with regular teachers, designed effective education program and classroom management techniques, and served as Team Teacher.

Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools - Los Angeles, California   1974
Special Education Teacher for Severely Handicapped
> Designed summer program for psychotic and delinquent adolescents, taught academics, created units on body awareness and relaxation skills, and provided program evaluation.

Fresno County Department of Mental Health   1972 - 1973
Adolescent Day Treatment Center - Fresno, California
Mental Health Worker
> Served as Co-therapist for group therapy sessions, handled case management of patients, served as Occupational and Recreational Therapy Assistant, taught sensory-relaxation and movement therapy units, and provided crisis counseling and intervention.

— References Available Upon Request —

Dr. Barbara L. Garland
324 S.E. Barber Road
Madras, Oregon 97741
(541) 312-3831
Email: bgarland@509j.net

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

Doctor of Philosophy, 1993
University of Tennessee, Knoxville TN
Major: Educational Psychology

Master of Arts, 1988
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City TN
Major: Psychology

Master of Education, 1984
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City TN
Major: Special Education

Bachelor of Arts, 1979
Tusculum College, Greeneville TN
Major: Education with concentrations in Elementary, Special & Early Childhood

LICENSURE & CERTIFICATION:

State of Oregon
Certification in the following areas:
Initial Administrator License- Administrator, Principal, Superintendent (All Levels)
Personnel Service License - School Psychologist
Basic Teacher License-Standard Handicapped Learner II

State of Tennessee
Certification in the following areas:
School Psychologist
Special Education
Elementary Education
Early Childhood Education

Tennessee Department of Health
Psychologist
Designation as Health Service Provider (post-doctoral status)

EXPERIENCE:

Special Programs Director   Jefferson County School District
Madras, OR   Jefferson County Education Service District
2005-Present

Administrative-Provide leadership in developing and maintaining special education services within the Jefferson County School District and Jefferson County Education Service District; Interpret federal, state and local requirements and design programs for compliance and implementation; Provide technical support for special education programs; Recruit, train, and supervise specialists for component districts; Coordinate special education programs and school improvement opportunities for districts within the education service district including services for home schooling alternatives; Represent the district and education service district at selected regional, state, and national events; Responsible for the program development, implementation, and evaluation of Title 1A (No Child Left Behind) programs; Represent school districts on State Special Education Directors' Advisory Committee.

School Psychologist   Redmond School District 2J
Redmond, OR
1999-2005

Administrative- Responsible for program development, administrative services, and research components of the Behavior Intervention Center, a regional school-based mental health treatment program for children emphasizing a cognitive behavioral approach in addressing challenging behaviors; Monitor state and federal policy and update special services department and school board policy and procedures; Fiscal Management of the Behavior Intervention Center and Redmond School District funds allocated through the High Desert Educational Service District; Participate in the Consolidated Planning Committee for Title I (No Child Left Behind Act); Responsible for the program development, implementation, and evaluation of the paraeducators participating in the NCLB training program for Title I and Special Education programs; Identify and actively seek funding sources including grant writing and monitoring/evaluating funded programs.

Personnel Service-Provide psychoeducational services including assessment of cognitive/social/emotional/behavioral functioning; development of behavioral intervention plans and crisis intervention plans; participate in pre-referral teams, Individual Education Plan (IEP) teams; Conduct staff development training including Crisis Prevention Intervention, Effective Behavior Support, (University of Oregon Behavior Intervention Program Trainer), Social Skills Curriculum (including Second Steps, First Step); Consultation services for parents, teachers, and administrators; Participating member of the regional Traumatic Brain Injury consultation team.

EXPERIENCE (continued):

School Psychologist   Union County Schools Maynardville, TN
1996-1999

Psychoeducational Services-Responsible for providing counseling services for individual students in kindergarten through twelfth grade; Assessment of cognitive/social/emotional/behavioral functioning; Participate in pre-referral teams, Individual Education Plan (IEP) teams; Conduct staff development training; Disaggregate, interpret, and analyze school-wide and system-wide assessment data; Develop school improvement plans; Participating member of Character Education steering committee; Participating member of the Southern Association Accreditation Committee for program evaluation.

School Psychologist   Private Practice   Knoxville, TN
1989-1996

Psychoeducational Services-Responsible for providing counseling services for individual students in kindergarten through twelfth grade; Assessment of cognitive/social/emotional/behavioral functioning; Participation in pre-referral teams, Individual Education Plan (IEP) teams; Conduct staff development training; Consultation services to parents, teachers, and administrators; Supervision of school psychologists; Contract with school systems for grant writing services.

Adjunct Professor   Lewis & Clark College Portland, OR
2007-Present
Graduate level instruction for special education endorsement.

Adjunct Professor   Eastern Oregon University Bend OR
2001
Graduate level instruction on Exceptionalities in Special Education.

Adjunct Professor   University of Tennessee Knoxville TN
1996
Graduate level instruction - Educational and Psychological Implications of Traumatic Brain Injury.

Adjunct Professor   Walters State College Morristown TN
1993
Undergraduate level instruction - Psychological/Emotional Development of Children.

Graduate Assistant   University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN
Knoxville TN
1989-1990
Developed course and provided instruction - Behavioral Management and Interventions.

EXPERIENCE (continued):

Special Education Teacher   Hamblen County Schools   Morristown TN
1979-1988

Special Services Teacher – Provide specialized instruction for middle school students (all disabilities including Talented and Gifted); Responsible for program development, implementation, and evaluation; Coordinate services with middle level teachers; Supervise educational assistants; Participate in multidisciplinary teams; Supervise special education intern teachers; Provide staff development training; Participate in grant writing opportunities.

PUBLICATIONS:

Garland, B.L. (1994). *Diagnostic Validity of Neuropsychological and Discrepancy Analysis Methods for Identification of Learning Disabled Children.* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55, 511A.

Garland, B.L. & Lewis, R.D. (1993). Assessment Instruments. *Tennessee Special Education Manual.*

Lewis, R.D., Hutchens, T.A., & Garland, B.L. (1993). Cross validation of the Luria-Nebraska Neuropsychological Battery for learning disabled adolescents. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 8, 437-447.

Lewis, R.D., Garland, B.L., & Hutchens, T.A. (1991). Identification of learning Disabilities; Accuracy of aptitude-achievement criteria vs the Luria-Nebraska Neuropsychological Battery. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 9, 130-139.*

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS:

Garland, B.L. & Bishop, S.K. (2003). *Paraeducator Steps to Success (A professional Development training program for paraeducators).* Presentation at the 22nd Annual Conference for Paraprofessionals & 6th Annual California Paraeducator Conference, Los Angeles, CA.

Garland, B.L. & Hutchens, T.A. (1999). *The Luria-Nebraska Children's Revision in the Identification of Learning Disabilities.* Paper presentation National Conference of the National Association of School Psychologists, Las Vegas, NV.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Albert W. Greenwood
2740 Arbor Drive
West Linn, Oregon 97068

EXPERIENCE

8/85 to present: Private practice - Child/family evaluation, treatment, consultation.

1/87 to 9/88: Lake Oswego Medical Center - Psychology and evaluation service.

8/79 to 8/85: Children's Program, Good Samaritan Hospital & Medical Center, Portland, Oregon.
Position: Staff Psychologist. Responsible for Clinical Services for children 6 to 12. Supervise staff, diagnostic assessments, program and school consultation.

9/77 to 8/79: Child Neurology Clinic, Good Samaritan Hospital & Medical Center, Portland, Oregon.
Position: Psychology Staff, Psychological Resident. Out-patient services oriented clinic using transdisciplinary team approach. Primarily responsible for diagnosis and evaluation of school-age children (6-18). Supervisor: Richard D. Charlton, Ph.D., Licensed Psychologist.

9/76 to 6/77: Cedar Hills Psychiatric Clinic, Portland, Oregon. Beaverton School District #48, Beaverton, Oregon.
Position: Intern. Diagnostic evaluations, consultation, staffing, individual therapy: Age 6-24. Development of prescriptive academic programs with special educators.

1/77 to 8/77: Student Counseling Center, U.S. International University, San Diego, California.
Position: Counselor, Coordinator. Counseling with college-age men and women. Vocational and psychological testing when necessary. Administrative organization at graduate student field experience.

9/75 to 1/76: San Diego City Schools, San Diego, California.
Position: Teacher's Aide-Field Experience. Worked with kindergarten children in public school in low academic area.

8/74 to 6/75:   Cedar Hills Psychiatric Center, Portland, Oregon.
Position: Psychology Examiner. Worked under the supervision of a psychiatrist and clinical psychologist administering psychological tests to adolescents in residential setting for emotionally disturbed children.

1/74 to 1/75:   Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.
Position: Research Assistant, Research Grant. Examining effects of stimulants and depressors on the parasympathetic nervous system of rats.

3/73 to 3/74:   Cedar Hills Psychiatric Hospital, Portland, Oregon.
Position: Psychiatric Aide.

CERTIFICATION

3/80   Oregon License Clinical Psychology - State Board of Psychologist Examiners; Oregon License #429.

9/78   Psychological Residency - State Board of Psychologist Examiners.

EDUCATION

Ph.D.   Professional Psychology, United States International University, San Diego, California, June 1978.

Psychology Dissertation: <u>Similarity of Needs Between Mother and Child in Relation to Social and Emotional Adjustment of the Adolescent</u>.

M.S.   Portland State University, Portland, Oregon, August 1975.

Psychology Thesis: <u>Exteroceptive Effects on a Marijuana Induced Conditioned Food Aversion</u>.

B.S.   University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, June 1972.

TEACHING

Adjunct Staff, Lewis & Clark Graduate Psychology Department
　　　"Personality Assessment of Children"
　　　"Intelligence Testing"

Division of Continuing Education, Portland State University, Spring, 1979
　　　"Assessment of School-Age Children"

Lewis & Clark College Continuing Professional Education
　　　"Brief Therapy I & II"
　　　"Introduction to Brief Therapies"

CONSULTING CONTRACTS

1/89 to present:　　　Estacada School District

9/87 to present:　　　Clackamas Education Service District / Child Evaluation Center

4/89 to 9/90:　　　Meridian Park Outpatient Adolescent Drug and Alcohol Program
　　　　　　　　　Program

9/92 to present:　　　North Plains School District

9/91 to present:　　　Cotrell School District

9/94 to present:　　　Tillamook Education Service District

ADDITIONAL EDUCATION

Reitan Neuropsychological Assessment Training; Ralph Reitan
Advanced Training in Neuropsychological Assessment; Ralph Reitan

20 Hours Certified Class A Continuing Education in Neuropsychological
Assessment; Richard Cox, Ph.D.

8 Hours School Psychology Practicum, University of Oregon
Herbert Severson, Ph.D.

36 Hours Biofeedback Training, Biofeedback Center of Berkeley,
Berkeley, California.

30 Hours Brief Therapy Training, Don F. Pagano, Ph.D. and Richard D. Charlton, Ph.D.

88 Hours Brief Therapy Training; Mental Research Institute,
Palo Alto, California.

AFFILIATIONS

American Psychological Association
Oregon Psychological Association
Medical Staff; Good Samaritan Hospital & Medical Center / Legacy Hospital Systems

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

Principal Investigator: A Model Classroom for the Diagnosis and Remedication of
Neurologically Impaired Children, 1986-1988, Grant # G007903066.

PUBLICATIONS

Greenwood, Albert W. Maximizing Evaluation of Handicapped Children By Integrating the
Efforts of Parents, Child and School. Building an Alliance for Children: Parents and
Professionals. Marie Peters, Ed. PDAS publication, 1987.

ADVISORY BOARDS

Beaverton School District Special Education Advisory Board
Cedar Oak Park / West Linn School District Site Council

My vision: To create a culture of trust where teachers, students, and families are able to communicate safely and as a result become stronger teachers and lifelong learners.
-Sue Hayes

Leadership Experience:

Facilitating Speech Pathologists and SLPA's:
Speech/Language Pathologist and Team Facilitator (1986-2005)
Bend School District
- ❖ Organize agendas for monthly team meetings and facilitate meetings
- ❖ Research and gather information at the state level to support our staff
- ❖ Generate a work load analysis in order to make data driven decisions about budget, caseload and job descriptions
- ❖ Problem solve with therapists
- ❖ Share best practice and research
- ❖ Listen to what our Speech Pathologist need to get the job done
- ❖ Interview job candidates

Creating Statewide Visions
Committee member on OAR committee on Communication Disorders (1992)
Committee member on Recruitment and Retention of Speech Pathologists (2006-2008)
Committee member on Traumatic Brain Injury Team to determine model for statewide TBI services (2007-2009)

Facilitating Staff Development
Contact teacher for Special Education Department at Bend High School (2001-2005)
Team Leader for Special Education Department at Bend High (2001-2005)
- ❖ Facilitate a process to generate a vision for our department
- ❖ Share evidence based practices with team
- ❖ Assist staff in determining their strengths
- ❖ Organize and run yearly planning retreats
- ❖ Create trusting and transparent culture alongside my colleagues

Enhancing Student Learning
Teacher for Lewis and Clark Special Education Program (2007-)
Trainer of Person Centered Planning Strategies (1999-)
Presenter on the topic of Consultation for Teaching Research (2006, 2008)
Facilitator of Statewide Group on TBI for Teaching Research (Spring 2007)
Speech Pathologist at Bend School District (1986-2005)
- ❖ Teach course on Students with Severe Disabilities for Lewis and Clark University
- ❖ Champion stronger programs for secondary students in our district
- ❖ Train teachers on a variety of topics including TBI and Autism (2005-)
- ❖ Facilitate teams through processes in order to generate a desired outcome
- ❖ Develop a collaborative relationship with teachers in order to create success for students with language disorders in regular education programs; team taught in English
- ❖ Facilitate and Record MAPs and PATHs for students and families in crisis

The best time to plant a tree is twenty years ago.
The second best time is today.
-Chinese Proverb

Resume
Diane E. Hensley

3810 NW Summerfield Road
Bend, Oregon 97701

Home: 541-382-5746
Cell: 541-749-0879

Consultant Experience

September 2004-Present   RiverBend Connections-Bend, Oregon

Consultant: I own a private business that contracts with school districts for
consultation services. I have written handbooks for Redmond and Bend, wrote a
modified diploma plan for Redmond, supervised a special education compliance
plan for Redmond, acted as special education director for Culver and Seven
Peaks private school, did a district wide special education program review for
Lakeview, facilitated district wide strategic plan in Sisters, was a practicum
supervision in Crook Co. and served as a school evaluator for Sisters, Redmond,
Culver, Jefferson Co, and Bend LaPine.

September 1996-Present   Lewis and Clark College-Portland, Oregon

Adjunct Professor and Cohort Coordinator: Teach graduate level courses for
teachers seeking their special education endorsement and/or Masters in special
education. Supervised and observed practicum students in the program. I
coordinate the program for the Central and Eastern Oregon region.

September 2000-2002   University of Oregon-Eugene, Oregon

Adjunct Professor: Taught Special Education and the Law to teachers seeking
their administrative license.

Administrative Experience

August 1986-June 2004   Bend LaPine School District, Bend, Oregon

Executive Director of Special Programs: Insured compliance of State and
Federal guidelines in Special Education and 504 programs for the 2000 district's
special needs students. Implemented and supervised the teen mom program,
the ESL program, the off campus alternative education program, Family Access
Center. I was the District Representative for Central Oregon Regional Programs
for several years until they transferred to the ESD.

Hired and managed a staff of 250 teachers and assistants, evaluating first year
teachers, and oversaw a million dollar budget.

March 1979-August 1986   Roseburg SD-Roseburg, Oregon

Program Supervisor for Special Education: Hired, supervised and evaluated special education staff. I was the district representative for regional programs. I was an elementary summer school principal for two years and coordinated the district wide program.

Teaching Experience

September 1978-March 1979   Roseburg SD-Roseburg, Oregon

Title I Teacher at Green Elementary School: I was responsible for 70 Title I students. I supervised four assistants. In March I was asked to apply and was hired for a district supervisor position.

September 1977-June 1978   Orange SD-Orange, California

Early Childhood Education Coordinator: Responsible for coordinating, implementing and monitoring the Calif. Early Childhood Education Plan. This included writing curriculum to meet the requirements of the various ECE components. I had monthly in-service trainings for teachers, instructional assistants, and parents. The program required parent volunteers in each classroom. I trained the parents and set up an on site daycare center.

September 1973-June 1977   Orange SD, Orange, California

Teacher for Emotionally Disturbed: Taught emotionally disturbed students in grades first through fourth grade. Students were bused in from all the district's schools to my classroom. The program was a pilot program and ran successfully under my direction for my four years with the district.

September 1970-June 1973   Los Nietos SD, Whittier, California

Resource Teacher for Moderately Delayed: Taught a classroom of 18 student's grade 1st-grade 6th who were learning impaired.

Education:

Administrative Certification: University of Oregon 1985
90 units after my Masters degree in administrative and education coursework.

Master of Science in Special Education: Calif State Univer. at Long Beach 1970

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology: Calif State University at Long Beach 1969

District wide Programs I designed and implemented that required district wide training of all regular and spec. ed. teachers and are still in effect

Family Access Center: Each school in Bend LaPine district has a family advocate who connects families to services and agencies. This is a multi agency, community involved service project that was started with grant funds. Our goal is to help build strong healthy families so their children come to school ready to learn.

Nursing services: Started a program where nurses are based in all schools.

Effective Behavior Support: Implemented school wide behavior support programs in all elementary and middle schools.

DIBELS: Early Reading Screening program for all kindergarten through 2nd graders to screen for early indicators of reading problems and intervene.

CRISS: A program that teaches students study skills. At least one teacher per middle and high school was trained to be a trainer at their site.

Kids Belong in School: Drop out prevention program that provide positive support.

Off Campus Behavior Programs: Recognizing that many students need intense behavior intervention, several off campus programs were created: including three programs for emotionally disturbed youth, one at the Juvenile Detention Center for probation students, and Second Chance for suspended and expelled students.

First Steps: This program is based on the idea that kindergarten teachers can immediately identify those students who are likely to have behavior problems throughout school. A program of positive reinforcement is implemented to change their behaviors before they become engrained.

Inclusion Model for special education students: Bend was one of the first districts to integrate special education students into regular education classes. This required re-training of all district staff.

Teen Parent Program with Daycare: Started a high school based teen mom program that included childcare. Services from mental health and health department were contracted and served the students at school. To date this program has served over 750 students. Over 350 girls have graduated.

School and District Student Effectiveness Teams: Pre-referral teams that review the academic, behavior, and social issues of students and make recommendations and placement.

Community Connections Clinic: In cooperation with St. Charles Hospital, local doctors, and Oregon Health Science University, a monthly screening clinic was set up to diagnosis children with complex issues.

Parent Group: I believe it is important schools and parents form a partnership. I had a monthly parent group, we offered evening trainings for parents, and sent out a monthly newsletter.

District wide ADHD/ADD Screening Process: Each school counselor has been trained and given the tools to do an on site screening with the teacher and parent before sending the student to a physician for medication. We worked with the local doctors to set up this process.

Oregon Department of Education:
- ❋ State funding review committee
- ❋ Federal Special Education Cap Committee
- ❋ State Advisory Board to the Superintendent, 6 years. Chair 1 year, Vice Chair 2 years. Was sent to Washington DC to represent Oregon
- ❋ Autism Advisory Board
- ❋ Learning Disabled Advisory Board
- ❋ State Special Education Issues Group-Liaison to ODE
- ❋ Special Education Complaint Processing Committee
- ❋ Standardization Team
- ❋ SPAN Portland State Study

Oregon Department of Human Resources:
- ❋ Interagency Coordination Council
- ❋ Vocational Rehabilitation Council

Oregon Department of Mental Health:
- ❋ Served on the State Early Childhood Program Committee
- ❋ State Transition Team member
- ❋ Family Access Center Steering Committee

Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA)
- ❋ Chair, Central Oregon Region

University of Oregon Education Alumni Association
- ❋ Served for two years and was the Central Regional Chair

Honors
- ❋ USOE Fellowship scholarship that paid for my Master of Science
- ❋ Have been asked to speak at many statewide conferences and two National conferences.
- ❋ University of Oregon Outstanding Alumni 2005
- ❋ State Special Education Director of the Year 1997

References

Many references are available upon request

Martha Hinman
712 NE Quimby Ave, Bend OR 97701
Home: (541)388-8335
Work: (541)923-8260
Martha.hinman@recmond.k12.or.us

EXPERIENCE

Director of Student Services

2007- Current Redmond School District
Supervising Special Education, English Language Learner Program, 504, School
Counselors, School Nurses, TAG Services, 504 Compliance, Positive Behavior
Support Development district-wide, Community Learning Centers grant

Coordinator of Student Services

2005-2007 Redmond School District   Redmond, OR
Assisting in supervision of Special Education and English Language Learner Program
district-wide.

Program Developer

2003-2005   Bend LaPine School District   Bend, OR

IEP Implementation and Consultation, eSIS training and technical support, Teacher
and Educational Assistant Training

Adjunct Professor for Lewis and Clark College

2003-2009   Lewis and Clark College   Portland, OR
Curriculum and Instruction for Special Education

Adjunct Professor for George Fox University

Summer 2009   George Fox University   Newburg, OR
Diversity in the Classroom

Special Education Teacher

2000-2003   Sky View Middle School   Bend, OR
Grades 6-8 teaching Math, Language Arts, Reading and Study Skills
Managed 40 IEP's annually, Student Evaluation Team Coordinator
SITE council representative
District-wide Training for Aligning IEP's with State Standards and Benchmarks Using
Curriculum Based Measures

Special Education Teacher

1994-2000   R.E. Jewell Elementary School   Bend, OR
Grades K-5 teaching Math, Reading, and Social Skills
Managed 30+ IEP's annually
Student Evaluation Team Coordinator, CARE team member

Special Education Teacher

1990-1994   Mt. Blue Middle School   Farmington, ME
Grades 7-9 teaching Social Skills, Reading, Behavioral Teacher
Managed 20+ IEPs annually, SAT Team Member

Special Education Teacher

1983-1985
Ages 6-9 Therapeutic Day Treatment Center for Autistic and Emotionally Disturbed
youth.

EDUCATION

1980-1984   University of Maine Farmington   Farmington, ME
B.S., Special Education for Emotionally Disturbed
2000-2001   Lewis and Clark College   Portland, OR
M.A.T., Masters of Art in Teaching
2004- 2006   University of Oregon   Eugene, OR
Initial Administrators Licensure
2007-current   University of Oregon   Eugene, OR

Vern Jones   Office Phone: (503) 768-6050
21770 SW 109th Terrace   E-Mail jones@lclark.edu
Tualatin, OR 97062   FAX (503) 768-6115

EDUCATION

Ph.D. Educational Psychology - Counseling Psychology; University of Texas at Austin, August, 1971.

B.A. Sociology-Education; Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oregon, June, 1968 (Summa Cum Laude).

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

University/College

Chair, Teacher Education Department, Lewis & Clark College, December 2003 – present

Associate Dean, Graduate School of Education and Counseling, Lewis & Clark College, December 2005 – March, 2007

Professor of Education, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oregon, 1973 to present. Courses taught include: Effective Program Development for Students with Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, Behavior Change Interventions, Individuals in the Classroom: Focus on Students at Risk, Classroom Management, Advanced Teaching Strategies, Behavioral Counseling, Psychology of Childhood, Adolescent Psychology, Educational Psychology, The Exceptional Child, Methods and Curriculum in Secondary Education, Supervision of Elementary and Secondary Student Teaching, Introduction to Education, Positive School and Classroom Climates, Leader, Lewis and Clark College Britain Overseas Study Program, 1978.

Scholar in Resident, Western Michigan State University, Fall, 1988.

Distinguished Scholar, University of California, Riverside, Winter, 1989.

Guest Professor at University of Idaho: Coeur d'Alene summer campus. Summer, 1985, 1986. Course taught: Classroom Management

Guest Professor at Reed College. Portland, Oregon, Summers 1975-77. Course taught: Adolescent Psychology.

Guest Professor at Portland State University. Portland, Oregon, Fall, 1976 and Winter, 1977. Course taught: Behavior Modification.

Guest lectures on Classroom Management presented at Moray House College, Edinburgh, Scotland. May - June, 1978.

Public School Teaching

Director of Title Vl Program for Emotionally Handicapped Junior High School Students. Parkrose School District # 3, Portland, Oregon. August, 1971 to August 1973.

Public School Administration

Junior High School Vice Principal. Beaverton School District # 48, Beaverton, Oregon. July 1980 July, 1981

Coordinator, Programs for Students with Behavior Disorders, Vancouver, School District, Vancouver, Washington, September 1998-June 2000.

PUBLICATIONS

Books

Practical classroom management. Boston: Pearson, 2011.

Comprehensive classroom management: Creating positive learning environments and solving problems. (9th Edition) Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2010 – translated into Taiwanese and Chinese

Creating effective programs for students with emotional and behavior problems: Interdisciplinary approaches for adding meaning and hope to behavior change interventions. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2004. With Beth Dohrn and Cory Dunn.

Responsible classroom discipline: Creating positive learning environments and solving problems. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1981. With Louise Jones.

Adolescents with behavior problems: Strategies for teaching. counseling and parent involvement. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1980.

The identification and treatment of seriously emotionally disturbed students. Technical Assistance Paper prepared for the Western Regional Resource Center and the Oregon State Department of Education. June, 1985. (co-authored with Steve Waksman).

Chapters in Books

"How Do Teachers Learn to Be Effective Classroom Managers?" In Carol Weinstein and Carolyn Evertson (Eds.) The Handbook of Classroom Management: Research, Practice, and Contemporary Issues, 2006

"Classroom management". In John Sikula (ed.) Handbook of research on teacher education: Second edition. New York: Macmillan, 1996.

Classroom management in the United States: Trends and critical issues. In D. Tatum (ed.)

Disruptive pupil behavior in schools. New York: Wiley, 1986.

Major components in a comprehensive program for seriously emotionally disturbed children. In R. Rutherford (ed.) Severe behavior disorders of children and youth. College Hills Press, 1987.

Training teachers to be effective classroom managers. In D. Duke (ed.) Helping teachers manage classrooms. 1982 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Reston, Virginia, ASCD, 1982.

Two articles: "An administrator's guide to developing and evaluating a building discipline program" and "School discipline: Problems and solutions" published in Discipline, Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1985.

Selected Articles

Creating communities of support: The missing link in dealing with student behavior problems and reducing violence in schools. Beyond Behavior, Vol. 11, No. 2, 2002.

In the face of predictable crises: Developing a comprehensive treatment plan for students with emotional or behavioral disorders. Teaching Exceptional Children, Vol. 29, No. 2, Dec. 1996

Developing effective inclusion and "pull-out" programs for students with serious emotional and behavioral disorders. Exceptionality Education Canada. Vol. 5, Nos. 3 & 4, pgs. 1-23, 1996.

Assessing your classroom and school-wide student management plan. Beyond Behavior, Vol. 4, No. 3, pgs. 9-12, Spring, 1993.

Integrating behavioral and insight-oriented treatment into school-based programs for seriously emotionally disturbed students. Journal of Behavioral Disorders, Volume 17, No. 3, pgs. 225-236, May,1992.

Conceptualizing and implementing a comprehensive program for at-risk students. Education, Vol. 111, No. 4, Summer, 1991.

A systematic approach for dealing responsibly with disruptive behavior in school settings. Beyond Behavior, Volume 2, No. 1, Winter, 1991

Experienced teachers' use of classroom management skills presented in a summer course. Journal of Instructional Psychology, Volume 18, No. 2, June, 1991.

A debate on the importance of simple student obedience in the classroom. Invited paper. Debates in Education. Vol. 1 No. 4, 1990.

Classroom management. Clarifying theory and improving practice, Education, 1989, Volume 109, No. 3, 333-339.

What schools can do to foster student responsibility. <u>Theory</u> <u>Into</u> <u>Practice</u>. Volume 24, Autumn, 1985. (co-authored with Daniel L. Duke).

Practical applications of research: Classroom management. Deborah Strother (ed.) <u>Phi</u> <u>Delta</u> <u>Kappan,</u> June, 1985.

An Administrator's guide to developing and evaluating a building-wide discipline program. <u>National</u> <u>Association</u> <u>of</u> <u>Secondary</u> <u>School</u> <u>Principals</u> <u>Bulletin,</u> Volume 68, April, 1984.

Two decades of discipline: Assessing the development of an educational specialization. <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>Research</u> <u>and</u> <u>Development</u> <u>in</u> <u>Education.</u> Volume 17, Summer, 1984. (co-authored with Daniel L. Duke).

Current trends in classroom management: Implications for gifted students. <u>Roeper</u> <u>Review,</u> Volume 6, Number 1, September, 1983.

School-wide discipline: Meeting both students' and teachers' needs. <u>Middle</u> <u>School</u> <u>Journal,</u> Volume 14, Number 4, August, 1983.

School discipline: Problems and solutions. <u>Principal,</u> Volume 61, Number 1, September, 1981 .

Humanistic behaviorism: A tool for creating healthy learning environments. <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>School</u> <u>Psychology,</u> Volume 15, Number 4, September, 1977.

The school counselor as an agent for developing productive learning environments. <u>The</u> <u>School</u> <u>Counselor,</u> Volume 24, Number 3, January, 1977.

An off-campus retreat as an integral part of an elementary teacher preparation program. <u>College</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Journal,</u> Volume 10, Number 2, Summer, 1976. (Co-authored with Bernie Wolff).

The emotionally handicapped child: Altering home and school environments as the key to prevention and cure. <u>Resources</u> <u>in</u> <u>Education</u> 1976, and <u>Exceptional</u> <u>Child</u> <u>Education</u> <u>Abstracts,</u> Volume 8, Nov. 4, 1976.

Assessing recent efforts to reduce student behavior problems. <u>Eric</u> <u>Document</u> ED 233 4401983 55 p. (co-authored with Daniel L. Duke).

A Junior high school program for emotionally disturbed children. Impact 7: <u>Research</u> <u>Reports</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>Title</u> <u>Vl</u> <u>Programs</u> <u>in</u> <u>the</u> <u>State</u> <u>of</u> <u>Oregon,</u> September, 1972 - August, 1973, pp. 181-200.

A junior high school program for emotionally disturbed children. Impact 6: <u>Research</u> <u>Reports</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>Title</u> <u>Vl</u> <u>Programs</u> <u>in</u> <u>the</u> <u>State</u> <u>of</u> <u>Oregon,</u> September, 1971 - August, 1972, pp. 113-124.

Statewide institute for teachers of emotionally handicapped children. <u>Impact</u> 1: Research Reports

of the Title Vl - D Programs in the State of Oregon, August 1, 1975 - May 31, 1976, pp. 49-51.

A symposium on innovations in teaching child and adolescent psychology (A. Rossi, ed.). Catalog of Selected Documents Psychology, August, 1979.

Portland City Club Research Report: The juvenile justice system in Multnomah County. October. 1976. (Committee authorship).

GRANTS RECEIVED

NEI contract (3 years, $64,500) to study research on teacher effectiveness and utilize the findings in making decisions about the Lewis and Clark College Teacher Education Program (1983-1986).

HONORS/AWARDS

Selected by the Association of Teacher Educators to write the chapter on classroom management for the second edition of the Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (1996).

Book, Adolescents with Behavior Problems selected by a panel of writers, researchers and classroom teachers reviewing material for the National Education Association as one of the top seven books published in the last twenty-five years (1960-1985) in the field of school discipline

Scholar in Resident, Western Michigan State University, Fall, 1988.

Distinguished Scholar, University of California, Riverside, Winter, 1989.

Centennial Address Speaker for the School of Education, University of Idaho Centennial Celebration, Moscow, Idaho, July, 1988.

Artist Lecture Series Speaker, Hastings College, Hastings, Nebraska, February 23, 1995. Topic: Violence in the Schools

Selected by the Iowa State Department of Education to chair a committee and write the Iowa Behavioral Initiative Position Paper on effective classroom and schoolwide student management. May-Sept., 1997

Selected 1990/91 Burlington Northern Award for Graduate School Teacher of the Year, Lewis and Clark College, Graduate School of Professional Studies

Selected co-chair of the American Educational Research Association Special Interest Group on Classroom Management. March 1986-March, 1989.

Selected by the Oregon State Department of Education to present a statewide interactive

teleconference on current best practice in delivering services to students experiencing serious emotional and behavioral problems. December, 1992

Selected by the University of Nebraska and the State Department of Nebraska to present a statewide interactive teleconference on current methods for inclusion of students with serious behavior problems into regular education settings. February, 1992

Selected by the University of Nebraska and the State Department of Nebraska to present a statewide interactive teleconference on promising and best accepted practices in classroom management. November, 1997

Selected by the Federal Way School District to serve as their coordinator of training for the inclusion of behavior problem students in regular education classrooms. 1994-1997

Selected by the Executive Council of the National Council for Exceptional Children to present a VIP Address at the 1994 International Conference. Title: Key components to an effective IEP/treatment plan for SEBD students. Denver, Colorado, April, 1994

Asked by both the National Education Institute and the National Institute of Education to present workshops across the country on effective schoolwide and student management. These were presented in Salt Lake City, Albuquerque, Denver, Dallas, and Minneapolis.

After hearing presentations by six national experts on schoolwide discipline, selected by a committee of 33 Omaha School District educators to work for three years with the Omaha, Nebraska schools to improve student behavior in the Omaha schools 1992-1994 – including reducing suspension and expulsion rates for African American male students.

Selected by the State Department of Oregon to write the Technical Assistance Paper on The identification and treatment of seriously emotionally disturbed students (1985)

New York School District requested a position paper and model schoolwide student management plan to be used as a model for all district. (1986)

Selected by the Schaumburg, Ill School District to work with their school violence prevention committee on a long-term project to reduce school suspensions and violence, 1997.

Selected by a national panel as one of the top four writers on classroom management and asked to present a workshop with William Glasser and Thomas Gordon at the National Classroom Management and Discipline Conference in Austin, Texas. (1986)

Invited paper for the National Adolescent Conference. Topic: Components of a comprehensive model program for seriously emotionally disturbed adolescents. Minneapolis, Minn. September, 1986.

Symposium participant at the Eighty-Sixth Annual Convention of the American Psychology

Association. Symposium title: Innovations in teaching adolescent psychology. Toronto, Canada. September, 1978.

Paper presented at the Eighty-Fifth Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. Paper title: Teaching adolescent psychology: A personalized, experiential approach. San Francisco, California. Aug. 1977.

Major address at the Joint Washington School Superintendents and Washington School Administrators Conference. Topic: A systems approach to serving at-risk students in school settings. Spokane, WA. June, 1988.

Invited presentation at the 11th Symposium on Learning and Cognitive Development: Facts, Myths and Implications for Education and Child Development. Topic: Classroom management methods: Their relationship to student learning and personal growth. Western Washington State University, Bellingham, Washington. April, 1985

Two invited workshop sessions presented at the 1982 North Carolina Council for Exceptional Children Conference. Title: The emotionally November, 1982.

Keynote luncheon address presented at the 1982 Wisconsin Association for Children with Behavior Disorders State Convention. Title: Integrating affective and psychodynamic with behavioral approaches in programs for emotionally disturbed children. Madison, Wisconsin. November, 1982.

Two invited workshop sessions presented at the 1982 North Carolina Council for Exceptional Children Conference. Title: The emotionally handicapped adolescents' special needs. Charlotte, North Carolina. November, 1982.

Keynote address and a workshop presented at the 1980 Iowa State Council for Exceptional Children Convention. Topics: A holistic approach to discipline (keynote) and consulting with classroom teachers and staff on discipline problems (workshop). Ames, Iowa. October, 1980.

Workshop presented at the 1977 Kentucky Bureau of Education for Exceptional Children Conference. Topic: Affective education for children with emotional problems. Louisville, Kentucky. October 22, 1977.

1982/83 Portland Public School Districts 33 hour requirement for training in desegregation

PRESENTATIONS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

National

Half-day workshop at the Midwest Behavioral Conference:. Topic: Research-based interventions for students with emotional and behavior problems. Kansas City, MO, 2008

Keynote address, 7th National School Social Work Convention. Title: Creating effective behavior change programs for students with emotional and behavior disorders. April 2004, San Francisco.

VIP Invited Address at the 1994 CEC (Council for Exceptional Children) Conference. Title: Key components to an effective IEP/treatment plan for SEBD students. Denver, Colorado, April, 1994

Invited paper on current trends and issues in classroom management. American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1995

Invited paper presented at the 1987 National Conference on Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth. Title: A systems approach to dealing with disruptive student behavior. Tempe, Arizona. November, 1987.

Invited paper for a special classroom management special interest group presentation at the 1987 American Educational Research Association Meeting. Title: A decision making approach to responding to disruptive student behavior.

Invited paper for the National Adolescent Conference. Topic: Components of a comprehensive model program for seriously emotionally disturbed adolescents. Minneapolis, Minn. Sept., 1986.

Invited paper for the Classroom Management and Discipline Conference. Title: School-wide student discipline plans. Austin, Texas. November, 1986.

Invited symposium paper presented at the 1986 American Education Research Association Convention. Title: A model for pre and inservice training in comprehensive classroom management. SF, Calif. April, 1986.

Invited symposium paper presented at The 1986 American Education Research Association Convention. Paper Title: A comprehensive approach to assessing and responding to unproductive student behavior. San Francisco, CA., April, 1986.

Paper presented at the 1985 National Conference on Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth. Title: Major components in a comprehensive program for students with severe behavior problems. Tempe, Arizona. November, 1985.

Paper presented at the 1983 National Conference on Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Adolescents. Title: incorporating psychodynamic techniques in school based programs for seriously emotionally disturbed adolescents. Tampa, Arizona. November, 1983.

Paper presented with Dan Duke at the National Convention of the American Education Research Association. Title: A decade of discipline - Assessing recent efforts to reduce student behavior problems. Montreal, April, 1983.

Paper presented at the 1983 National Convention of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Title: Training teachers to be effective classroom managers. Detroit, Michigan. February, 1983.

Symposium participant at the Eighty-Sixth Annual Convention of the American Psychology Association. Symposium title: Innovations in teaching adolescent psychology. Toronto, Canada. September, 1978.

Workshop presentation at the 1977 International Council for Exceptional Children Convention. Workshop title: Affective education with behavior-problem students. Atlanta, Georgia. April, 1977.

Paper presented at the Eighty-Fifth Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. Paper title: Teaching adolescent psychology: A personalized, experiential approach. San Francisco, California. August, 1977.

Workshop presentation at the 1976 International Council for Exceptional Children Convention. Workshop title: The emotionally handicapped child: Altering home and school environments as the key to prevention and cure. Chicago, Illinois. April, 1976.

Statewide - Out-of-State

Statewide interactive video presentation to educators in Nebraska. Four-hour presentation presented live to five sites and made available on video to 176 sites throughout Nebraska. November, 1997 Topic: Essential factors in effective classroom and school-wide student management

Two-day statewide workshop on inclusion of behavior disordered students presented for the state of Nebraska. November, 1997.

Consultant to the proactive classroom management drafting committee for the State of Iowa, Iowa Behavioral Initiative project. Des Moines, Iowa, May, 1997 to present.

Presenter at Fall, 1997 IBI meeting with Area Education Agency staff. Topic: Observational methods for assessing student behavior problems.

Keynote address and breakout session at the Idaho State Partnerships in Education Conference. Topics: Classroom Management. Lewiston, Idaho, September, 1997

Keynote address at the Nebraska Summer Institute on Promoting Positive Behavior in Schools. Topics: Creating communities of support and Developing individualized intervention plans for

students with serious behavior problems. Lincoln, Nebraska, June, 1996.

Keynote address at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Nebraska Safe & Drug Free Schools Communities Conference. Lincoln, Neb., Sept., 1995.

Keynote address and five breakout sessions at the Iowa Behavioral Initiative 2nd Annual Symposium. Cedar Rapids, Iowa, September, 1995.
Topic: Inclusion of SBD students in regular school settings.

Keynote presentation at the Nebraska Summer Institute on Promoting Positive Behavior in Schools. Topic: Developing effective schoolwide approaches to assisting students with behavior problems. Omaha, Nebraska, June, 1994.

Presentation at the University of Idaho Middle School Conference. Topic: Schoolwide student management in the middle school. Moscow, ID, June 1993.

Two workshops at the Nebraska Thirteenth Annual Conference on Excellence in Education:
Topic: Implementing Change Through Staff Development. Lincoln, Nebraska, May, 1993.

Keynote address and breakout workshop at the Nebraska Conference on SBD Students. Omaha, Nebraska, August, 1992.

Pre-conference workshop at the Montana Superintendents and Principals Conference. Topic: Motivating and managing students at risk. Billings, Montana, October, 1992.

Workshops on assessing and improving your programs for students with serious behavioral disorders. Association of Washington School Administrators. Seattle, WA. and Spokane, WA., Fall, 1992 - March, 1995.

Day-long workshop at the Montana Vice Principals' Association Conference.
Topic: Effective Student Management in the 90s. Helena, Montana, December, 1992.

Keynote address and workshop at the Idaho Middle School Symposium. Topic: Effective schoolwide student management in middle schools. Moscow, Idaho, June, 1992.

Major address at the Joint Washington School Superintendents and Washington School Administrators Conference. Topic: A systems approach to serving at-risk students in school settings. Spokane, WA. June, 1988.

Keynote address and workshop at the Washington State Assistant Principal's Conference. Topic: Developing effective school-wide student management programs. Kennewick, Washington, 1989.

Pre-conference workshop at the Washington State Elementary Principals Conference. Topic: Meeting the needs of at-risk students. Seattle, Feb. 1989.

Two day workshops for the Association of Washington School Principals. Topic: Effective classroom and schoolwide management for at-risk students. Twice yearly from 1988-1996.

Paper presented at the 1988 Washington State CEC Convention. Title: A Systems approach to working with behavior problem students. Seattle, WA.

Two papers presented at the 1987 Washington State Elementary Principal Conference. Topics: Classroom management and school discipline. Pasco, Washington. November, 1987.

Two workshops presented at the 1986 Washington State Regional Drive-ln Conferences. Topic: Effective instruction in a high tech world. Kennewick, and Tacoma, Washington. November, 1986.

Idaho Conference for Elementary Administrators. Topic: The tough ones. McCall, Idaho. July, 1986.

Invited presentation at the 11th Symposium on Learning and Cognitive Development: Facts, Myths and Implications for Education and Child Development. Topic: Classroom management methods: Their relationship to student learning and personal growth. Western Washington State University, Bellingham, Washington. April, 1985.

All-day workshop presented at the Adolescent Symposium. Topic: The role of the school counselor in preventing and correcting student misbehavior. Dallas, Texas. April, 1984.

Luncheon address and two workshops presented at the Washington State Vice Principal's Conference. Topic: Classroom management research and practice. Tacoma, Washington. March, 1984.

Presentation at the Behind the Classroom Door Conference sponsored by The Vancouver, Washington Educational Service District. Topic: Research in classroom management. Vancouver, Washington. March, 1984.

Two invited workshop sessions presented at the 1982 North Carolina Council for Exceptional Children Conference. Title: The emotionally handicapped adolescents' special needs. Charlotte, North Carolina.

Keynote luncheon address presented at the 1982 Wisconsin Association for Children with Behavior Disorders State Convention. Title: Integrating affective and psychodynamic with behavioral approaches in programs for emotionally disturbed children. Madison, Wisconsin. November, 1982.

Workshops presented for Texas Teacher In-Service day. Topics: Classroom management: Research and practice. School-wide discipline programs: Research and implementation. Grand

Prairie, Texas. October, 1982.

Keynote address and a workshop presented at the 1980 Iowa State Council for Exceptional Children Convention. Topics: A holistic approach to discipline (keynote) and consulting with classroom teachers and staff on discipline problems (workshop). Ames, Iowa. October, 1980.

Workshop presented at the 1977 Kentucky Bureau of Education for Exceptional Children Conference. Topic: Affective education for children with emotional problems. Louisville, Kentucky. October 22, 1977.

Major address speaker and workshop presentation at the Ninth Annual Idaho Conference on Exceptional Children. Twin Falls, Idaho. October, 1974.

Regional

Keynote address at the Our Other Youth Conference. Topic: Demystifying learning. Seattle, WA., January, 1994.

Keynote address at The Oregon Conference: Topic: Meeting the needs of students at risk: Policies and procedures. Eugene, Oregon, February, 1991

Presentation at Our Other Youth Conference: Topic: Developing a systematic school-based program for students at risk. Seattle, WA, February, 1991

Keynote presentation at the joint meeting of the Portland and Mount St. Helen's Chapters of Phi Delta Kappa. Topic: Working with students at risk. Portland, Oregon December, 1989.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory Junior High School/Middle School Network Seminar. Topic: Effective schooling for at-risk young adolescents. Portland, Oregon. October, 1986.

Workshop presented at the Seventh Day Adventist Regional Conference. Topic: Time-on-task research and its implications for classroom practice. Auburn, Washington. August, 1984.

Six workshops presented at the Seventh Day Adventist North Pacific Union Teachers Convention. Topics: Classroom management and teacher effectiveness. Walla Walla, Washington. August, 1983.

Keynote address presented at the Northwest Regional Resource Center Conference on Educating the Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Student. Portland, Oregon. April, 1982.

Address presented at the Eighth Far West Regional International Reading Association Conference. Topic: Establishing a positive middle school learning environment. Portland, Oregon. April, 1982.

440

Major Address at the Music Educator's Northwest Conference. Topic: Eight approaches to discipline. Vancouver, Washington. February, 1981.

Keynote Address at the Northwest Elementary School Principal's Regional Conference. Topic: Discipline in the '80's. Portland, Oregon. Feb., 1980.

Paper presented at the Midwest Association of Behavioral Analysis. Title: A synthesis of behaviorism and humanism. Chicago, Illinois. May, 1976.

Statewide - Oregon

Teleconference for the Oregon Department of Education. Topic: Delivery services to students with serious emotional and behavioral disorders.
December, 1992.

Keynote address at the Oregon Conference. Topic: What we know about working with students at risk. Eugene, Oregon. February, 1992.

Half-day workshop and breakout session at the Oregon Conference for Teachers of Delinquent and Disturbed Youth. Topics: Writing effective IEPs and behavior management plans for SED students. Eugene, Ore. Nov. 1992.

Presentation at the Statewide School Social Work Conference. Portland, Oregon. March, 1991

Co-planner and co-presenter of two training workshops for teachers of seriously emotionally disturbed students, sponsored by the Oregon State Department of Education. Portland, April, 1989; and Salem, July, 1989.

Keynote address at the Joint Conference of Oregon School Counselors and Oregon Mental Health Counselors. Topic: A systems approach to serving at-risk students in school settings. Portland, Oregon. April, 1989.

Two addresses at the Oregon School Psychologist State Convention. Topic: Serving at-risk students in school settings. Newport, Oregon. April, 1989.

Major address at the Oregon Elementary School Administrators State Conference. Topic: Meeting the needs of at-risk students. February, 1989.

Presentation at the Oregon Conference for Teachers of Delinquent and Disturbed Youth. Topic: A systems approach for responding to disruptive student behavior in school settings. Eugene, Oregon. November 1987

Trainer for Oregon Department of Special Education Statewide Workshops for School Personnel Working with SED Students. Nine cities. November 1985 - May 1986.
Presentation at the Oregon Law Related Education Summer Conference. Topic: Student

development as an aspect of involving students in shared decision making. Portland, Oregon. July 1986.

Presentation at the Oregon Conference for Teachers of Delinquent and Disturbed Youth. Topic: Program Components in school-based programs for SED youth. Eugene, Oregon. November, 1985.

Presentation at the 1985 State Council for Exceptional Children Conference. Title: Identification and provision of services to SED students. Portland, Oregon. October, 1985.

Presentation at the 1986 Cooperative Personnel Planning Council Conference on Learning Disabilities. Topic: Programs for behavior disordered students. Salem, Oregon. March, 1986.

Presentation at the Oregon Conference for Teachers of Delinquent and Disturbed Youth. Topic: Effective classroom management: Preventative measures for SED students. Eugene, Oregon. November, 1984.

Workshop at the Oregon Conference for Teachers of Delinquent and Disturbed youth . Eugene, Oregon. November, 1984.

Presentation to the Staff Development and Excellence Conference. Topic: Staff development in classroom management. Portland September, 1984.

Presentation at the 1983 Oregon Educational Research Association Convention. Title: Raising the quality of teachers and perspective teachers. Newport, Oregon. November 1983.

Presentation at the Middle School Workshop (sponsored by the Council for Oregon School Administrators). Title: Classroom management. Portland, Oregon. November, 1983.

Keynote half-day workshop at the Seventh Day Adventist In-Service Teacher Training day. Topic: Classroom management. Salem, Oregon.1983.

Presentation at the 1982 Oregon School Counselors Association Spring Conference. Topic: Counselor leadership in the educational system. Portland, Oregon. April, 1982.

Keynote address presented at the 1981 Oregon School Counselors Association Conference. Topic: The school counselor's role in school discipline. Portland, Oregon. April, 1981.

Paper presented at the 1977 Oregon Psychological Association Convention. Title: An examination and synthesis of a product and process approach to consultation with school personnel. Newport, Oregon. May, 1977.

Workshop presentation at the Oregon CEC Fall Conference. Workshop title: Teaching strategies for improving learning environments. Portland, Oregon. October, 1976.

Three addresses at the Coastal Child Management Conference. Address title: Humanistic behavior management; How to change your teaching behavior; Humanistic classroom environments. Newport, Oregon. Dec., 1975.

Workshop presentation at the Oregon CED-ACLD Fall Conference. Workshop title: Principles and techniques of behavioral management, Port. Oct., 1975.

Presentation at the Oregon Association for Children with learning Disabilities Conference. Topic: Preventing learning disabilities through classroom change. Portland, Oregon. April, 1975.

Speaker at the Oregon School Psychologist Association Workshop. Title of presentation: The role of the school psychologist - creating productive learning environments. Portland, Oregon. October, 1974.

Lecture on student motivation presented to District 11 - Oregon Music Education Association. Portland, Oregon. October, 1974.

Speaker at the Troubled Child Conference. Topic: Developing a program for behavior disordered junior high school students. Eugene, Oregon. Feb., 1973.

SCHOOL CONSULTATION AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Statewide

Consultant to the Iowa State Department of Education Iowa Behavioral Initiative Program Development Plan. April 1996-August, 1997

Statewide interactive video teleconference on current best practices in classroom management. Nebraska, November, 1997

Training workshops for model inclusion sites for the State of Iowa Behavioral Initiative. 1995-1996. Des Moines, Iowa. Topic: Inclusion of students with serious behavior problems.

Statewide Teleconference for the Nebraska State Department of Education. Topic: Delivery of services for BD students. February 1993.

Develop and present inservice training workshops for the Association of Washington School Administrators on the topic of students at risk. October, 1988 through November 1992.

Designer with George Sugai of the State Training Program for Staff Providing Services to Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Students. 1989

Develop the State of Oregon Technical Assistance Paper on The Identification and Delivery of Services to Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Students. 1984

Trainer for Oregon State Department of Education. Provide workshops for administrators and teachers in fifteen counties on the identification, education and treatment of seriously emotionally disturbed students. November,1984-May,1986.

Director of the Oregon Statewide Training Institute for Teachers of Emotionally Handicapped Children. 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975.

Consultant to the State Department of Special Education, State of Idaho. Topic: Developing school-based programs for behavior-problem children. Boise, Idaho. May, 1974.

Local Out-of-State

Consultant to Schaumburg School District program for students with emotional and behavior problems. Schaumburg, Illinois. August, 1977-May 2002.

Inclusion Consultant to Federal Way School District, WA 1992-1997.

Consultant to Iowa Regional Service Districts and local school districts on the implementation of effective classroom and schoolwide management programs, 1995-1998.

Assessment of Vancouver School District programs for students with behavior problems, 1996 and 1997.

Consultant to Schaumburg, Illinois School District committee on schoolwide student management. 1997-1999

Assessment of Fir Grove Therapeutic Day Treatment Program, Vancouver School District, WA. 1996 - 2003.

Inservice workshops on inclusion and classroom management to five Education Service Units in Nebraska and Area Education Agencies in Iowa1995-1997.

Districtwide assessment on student motivation and behavior. Scottbluff School District, Nebraska. 1998

Consultant to Wahoo, Nebraska School district. 1997/98

Consultant to West Chicago Schools. Topic: Inclusion of students with behavior problems. Chicago, Illinois. January 1995.

Consultant to Valley School District, Omaha, Nebraska. Topic: Developing an effective

schoolwide student management plan, 1994-95

Consultant to Enumclaw, WA. School District. Topic: Interventions to facilitate the inclusion of students with behavior problems. April, 1994

Consultant to Lewiston School District. Topic: Middle school student management programs. 1994, 1995

Consultant to Everett, WA School District. Topic: Work with Silver Firs Elementary School on students experiencing serious behavioral difficulties.
Spring, 1994-Spring 1995.

Consultant to Omaha, Nebraska School District. Topic: Elementary schoolwide student management plans. February, 1992 - June, 1993.

Consultant to Shoreline School District. Topic: Motivating and managing students at risk. August, 1992 - January, 1994.

Consultant to Longview School District. Topic: Working with students demonstrating low motivation in high school classroom. April, 1994.

Consultant to South Central School District. Topic: Working effectively with students at risk for school failure. Seattle, WA, 1992-1993

Consultant to the Mead School District. Topic: Working effectively with students at risk for school failure. Mead, WA. February, 1993-August, 1993.

Consultant to the Billings School District. Topic: Working effectively with students at risk for school failure. Billings, MT., November, 1992-1993

Consultant to the Mt. Vernon School District. Topic: Working effectively with students at risk for school failure. Mt. Vernon, WA., April 1993-1994

Consultant to the Target Range School District. Topic: Developing an effective schoolwide student management plan. Missoula, MT., Fall, 1993.

Consultant to the Tenino School District. Topic: Developing an effective schoolwide student management plan. Tenino, WA., 1993/1994.

Consultant to the Olympia School District. Topic: Working effectively with all students. Olympia, WA., Fall, 1993.

Consultant to the Granite Falls School District. Topic: Working effectively with students at risk

for school failure. Great Fall, WA., August, 1993-94.

Consultant to the Bremerton School District. Topic: Working effectively with students at risk for school failure. Bremerton, WA., August, 1993.

Consultant to Wapato, WA School District. Topic: Effective instructional and management programs for students at risk. February, 1991 -1994

Consultant to Lake Washington School District. Topic: Programs for students at risk. April 1990 -1993.

Consultant to Region 10 Service Center, Dallas, Texas. Topic: Programs for seriously behaviorally disturbed students. October 1985-1987.

Consultant to Omak, WA School District. Topic: Developing school-based programs to increase achievement and graduation rates for Native American students. August, 1988 through June, 1990.

Consultant to Tacoma School District. Topic: Schoolwide student management. November 1991- June 1992.

Consultant to Deer Park, Elementary School. Spokane, WA, 1992.

Consultant to Vancouver, WA. School District programs for students at risk. August 1988 through Summer 1991.

Consultant to South Central School District, Seattle, WA. Programs for students at risk. 1991

Consultant to Gig Harbor, WA School District. Programs for students at risk. April 1992.

Consultant to Issaquah, WA School District programs for students at risk. 1988-1990.

Consultant to Lake Washington School District on effective instructional and school-wide management programs for students at risk. 1990 - 1993

Consultant to Tacoma, WA School District. Programs for at risk students. March, 1991 -1993

Consultant to Issaquah, WA School District. Effective instructional and student management programs for students at risk. 1989 - 1991

Consultant to Riverview, WA School District programs for SBD students. 1989-90.

Consultant to Centralia, WA School District on effective middle school programs for students at risk. April, 1989-90

Consultant to South Kitsap, WA. School District programs for students at risk. 1989-90.

Consultant to Kelso, WA School District on programs for students at risk. 1991

Consultant to ESD 189 programs for SBD students. Mt. Vernon, WA., 1991.

Consultant to Mt. Baker, WA School District. Programs for students at risk. August, 1991.

Consultant to Foster High School, Seattle, WA. Effective instructional and student management programs for students at risk. Spring 1991.

Presentation to the Lower Columbia Elementary Principals Association. Topic: School-based programs for students at risk. Vancouver, WA. February, 1989.

Consultant to Mercer Island, WA School District. Topic: Programs for students at risk. August, 1990.

Presentation to the Mid Columbia Elementary Principals Association. Topic: School-based programs for students at risk. Vancouver, WA. May, 1989.

Consultant to ESD 121 (Seattle, WA): Training workshops for educators providing services to seriously emotionally disturbed students. April through June, 1989.

Consultant to Kennewick, WA School District. Topic: Developing school-based programs for at-risk students. February, 1988 through June, 1989.

Consultant to the Everett, WA School District. Topic: Developing school-based programs for at-risk students. August, 1988 through present.

Consultant to Kalama, WA. School District Programs for students at risk. October 1988 through May, 1990.

Consultant to the Evergreen, WA. School District. Topic: Developing Teacher Assistance Teams. Winter, 1989.

Consultant to the Marysville, WA School District. Topic: Developing school-based programs for students at risk. Spring, 1989.

Consultant to Snoqualmie, WA. School District. Topic: Developing school-based programs for students at risk. Spring, 1989.

Consultant to the Longview, WA School District. Topic: Developing school-based programs for at-risk students. August, 1988 through present.

Consultant to the Pasco, WA School District. Topic: Developing school-based programs for at-

risk students. February, 1989.

Consultant to the Ephrata, WA School District. Topic: Developing School based programs for at-risk students. October 1988 through March, 1989.

Consultant to the Eastmont, WA School District. Topic: Developing school-based programs for at-risk students. October 1988 through March, 1989.

Consultant to ESD 112. Topic: Programs for emotionally disturbed children and youth. Vancouver, Washington. 1986-1988.

Consultant to Evergreen Elementary School. Topic: Effective teaching with at-risk students. Seattle, Washington. February, 1988.

Consultant to Education Service Center, Region 10. Topic: Coping with the behavior problems of secondary school emotionally disturbed students. Richardson, Texas. September, 1981, August, 1982, January, 1985.

Keynote presenter at the Leadership Institute for Teachers sponsored by the Kennewick chapter of Phi Delta Kappa. Topic: Classroom management. Kennewick, Washington. March, 1986.

Consultation to school district special education specialists serving SED students within Clark County. Topic: Guidelines for services to SED students. Vancouver, WA. September, 1986.

Presentation to Evergreen School District Administrators. Topic: Effective student management. Vancouver, Washington. March, 1986.

Presentations at the ESD 105 Behavioral Disorders Spring Conference. Topics: Summary of classroom management research and practice: Techniques for mainstreaming and components to an effective SBD program. Yakima, WA. March, 1986.

Keynote speaker at the Behavior Disorders Conference. Sponsored by Clark County ESD. Topic: Program components and considerations. Vancouver, Washington. March, 1986.

In-service workshop for Pacific Junior High School. Topic: Classroom management and school discipline. Vancouver, Washington. October, 1985.

In-service workshop for the Covington Junior High School Staff. Topic: Classroom management. Vancouver, Washington. August, 1985.

In-service workshop for Fort Vancouver High School. Topic: Classroom management. Vancouver, Washington. September, 1984.

In-service workshop for Kelso School District teachers and administrators. Topic: Classroom

management. Kelso, Washington. September, 1984.

Consultant to Jefferson Middle School. Topic: Teacher effectiveness research applied to middle schools. Olympia, Washington. May, 1983.

Presentation to Boise Music Educators. Topic: Classroom management Boise, Idaho. January, 1982.

Consultant to the Northwest Educational Cooperative. Topic: Behavior management. Arlington Heights, Illinois. January, 1979.

Consultant to Schaumberg School District. Topic: Developing programs for behavior problem junior high school students. Schaumberg, Illinois. August, 1977, January, 1978, November, 1978.

Consultant to Olympia School District. Role: Assisting district's special education consultants in development of improved consultation skills. Olympia, Washington. February, 1977.

Consultant to Olympia School District. Role: Presentations to selected teachers on improving teacher skills and learning environments. Olympia, Washington. March, 1976.

Two-day workshop for Boise School District teachers, special educators and administrators. Topic: working with the behavior-problem child. Boise, Idaho. November, 1974.

Consultant to Blaine County, Idaho School District's program for emotionally handicapped and learning-disabled students. Blaine County, Idaho. October, 1974.

Local In-State

Consultant to the Hillsboro School District Special Education Programs, February – April, 2009.

Consultant to St. Helen's School District. Topic: Classroom management. September, 2007-March, 2009.

Consultant to Ed Philips Learning Center for SED students. Washington County ESD. March, 1994 - June, 1995

Consultant to Washington County ESD SED program at Echo Shaw Elementary School. March - June, 1995

Consultant to Swegle Elementary School, Salem. Working with students experiencing serious behavior problems in regular classroom settings, November 1994.

Consultant to Joseph Gale Elementary School, Forest Grove. Working with students experiencing serious behavior problems in regular classroom settings, May, 1994- present.

Consultant to William Knight Elementary School, Canby. Developing an effective schoolwide student management plan. February, 1995.

Consultant to Dayton Elementary School, Dayton. Developing an effective schoolwide student management plan. April, 1995.

Consultant to West Linn High School. Inclusion of behavior problem students. April/May, 1994.

Consultant to North Clackamas School District. Programs for students at risk: Rowe Junior High School, McLaughlin Junior High School and Ardenwald Elementary School. December, 1990 - June, 1994.

Consultant to the Washington County ESD. Programs for SED students at Neil Armstrong Middle School. February, 1993-June, 1993.

Consultant to the Astoria School District. Topic: Effective methods for working with students at risk for school failure. August, 1993.

Consultant to the Marion County ESD. Developing schoolwide student management plans. August, 1992-June, 1993.

Consultant to the Corbett School District. Developing an effective schoolwide student management plan. September, 1992- October, 1993.

Consultant to the Woodburn School District. Topic: Developing methods for successfully working with students at risk for school failure. September, 1992-94

Consultant to Cascade Middle School. Topic: Developing an effective schoolwide student management plan. August, 1992-May, 1993.

Consultation to the Hillsboro, Oregon secondary school programs for seriously emotionally disturbed students and staff development in classroom management and cooperative learning. Hillsboro, Oregon. May, 1983- November, 1992.

Consultant to Children's Farm Home, Corvallis, Oregon. 1992

Consultant to Portland School District: Student management specialist and school program development for students at risk, 1988-1994. Included a focus on reducing suspension and expulsion rates for African American male students.

Consultant to Tigard's alternative school, Project ABLE. March, 1990-1992.

Consultant to the Reedville, Oregon School District. Developing individual prescriptions for

students with serious behavior problems. 1990-92.

Consultant to Linn-Benton ESD on programs for SED and at-risk students. 1988 -1995.

Consultant to Lebanon School District programs for students at risk. 1990-91.

Consultant to Albany School District on programs for students at risk. 1990

Consultant to Washington County ESD on programs for SED students. Forest Grove, Oregon, 1989 - 1996.

Consultant to West Linn School District middle schools on classroom and schoolwide student management. March, 1989 to Fall, 1992.

Presentation to the Jefferson High School Staff: Topic: Motivating and managing students at risk: Fall, 1990.

Presentation to the Milwaukie High School Staff: Topic: Motivating and managing students at risk: Fall, 1990.

Consultant to Estacada School District. Topic: Classroom management. Fall, 1988, Winter, 1989.

Consultant to Umatilla ESD programs for seriously emotionally disturbed children. Pendleton, Oregon. December, 1986.

Consultant to Lebanon School District programs for students at risk. 1986-87

Consultant to Albany School District programs for students at risk. 1989/90

Consultant to Sweethome School District on programs for students at risk. November, 1990.

Consultant to Fern Ridge School District on programs for students at risk. February, 1990.

Consultant to Washington County ESD's programs for seriously emotionally disturbed students. November, 1988 to present.

Consultant to Monroe Middle School. Topic: Meeting the needs of at-risk students. February, 1988 - May, 1988. Eugene, Oregon.

Consultant to Parkrose Middle School. Topic: School organization and instruction that best facilitates learning for young adolescents. Parkrose, Oregon. December, 1987.

Consultant to Beaumont Middle School. Topic: Effective guide groups and advisory programs. Portland, Oregon. November, 1987.

Consultant to Fernwood Middle School. Topic: Effective classroom management and instruction. Portland, Oregon. November, 1987.

Consultant to Morrow County School District. Topic: School-wide student management programs. Boardman, Oregon. October, 1987.

Consultant to Jesuit High School. Topic: Student motivation. October, 1987.

Presentation at the Catholic High School in-service day. Topic: Effective classroom management. Portland, Oregon. October, 1987.

Consultant to Cascade School District. Topic: Effective classroom management. Cascade, Oregon. September, 1987.

Consultant to Fairplay Elementary School. Topic: Effective classroom management. Corvallis, Oregon. September, 1987.

Consultant to Corvallis School District Elementary Principals. Topic: Effective classroom management. Corvallis, Oregon. September, 1987.

Consultant to Riverdale Elementary School. Topic: Cooperative learning. Portland, Oregon. September, 1987. September - October, 1985 -1987.

Consultant to Hillsboro Union High School District. Inservice course on classroom management. Hillsboro, Oregon

Presentations at the Hillsboro Union High School District Fall Inservice. Topic: Strategies for beginning the school year and resolving disruptive behavior. Hillsboro, Oregon. August, 1986

Consultant to Glencoe High School SED staff. Hillsboro, Oregon.1986

Consultant to Gladstone School District. Workshops on classroom management at the high school, middle school and elementary school. Gladstone, Oregon. September, 1986.

Consultant to Yamhill Grade School. Topic: Classroom Management. 1986.

Monitor for programs for emotionally disturbed students. Gresham School District. Gresham, Oregon. April & June, 1986.

Consultant to Centennial School District Special Education Department. Program Assessment and Consultation to the district's programs for seriously emotionally disturbed students. Sept., 1985-June, 1986.

In-service workshop for Roosevelt Middle School. Topic: Follow-up on middle school effectiveness consultation. Eugene, Oregon. January, 1986.

In-service workshop for Kelley Middle School. Topic: Research and practice in middle school teacher effectiveness. Eugene, Oregon. January, 1986.

School assessment and ongoing in-service for Howard Elementary School. Eugene, Oregon. January-March, 1986.

In-service course for Robert Gray Middle School. Topic: Teacher effectiveness and classroom management. Portland, Oregon. 1986.

Staff development course for Hillsboro Union High School District teachers and administrators. Topic: Classroom management. Hillsboro, Oregon. September/October 1984 and 1985.

Consultant to Hillsboro High School District's High School programs for seriously emotionally disturbed students. Hillsboro, Oregon. November 1985 - June 1986.

Consultant to Corvallis School District. Topic: Identification of SED students. Corvallis, Oregon. October, 1985.

In-service training session for the Umatilla ESD child development staff. Topic: Consultation to teachers serving seriously emotionally disturbed students. Pendleton, Oregon. August, 1985.

In-service workshop for Corbett School District. Topic: Classroom management. Corbett, Oregon. August, 1985.

In-service workshop for Groner School District. Topic: Classroom management. Hillsboro, Oregon. August, 1985.

In-service workshop for Silverton School District. Topic: Classroom management. Silverton, Oregon. August, 1985.

In-service workshop for the Gregory Heights Middle School staff. Topic: Classroom management. Portland, Oregon. August, 1985.

Consultation on schoolwide discipline provided to Petersberg School District. The Dalles, Oregon. August, 1985.

Two day workshop for the Portland City Police Community Juvenile Officers staff. Topic: Methods for effective instruction in middle school classrooms. Portland, Oregon. August, 1984, August, 1985.

Workshop for Roosevelt Middle School. Topic: The application of teacher effectiveness research to the middle school. Eugene, Oregon. Dec., 1984.

Presentations at the Lewis and Clark College Beginning Administrators Conference. Topic:

Classroom management. Portland, Oregon. July, 1983, 1984, 1985.

Consultant to Silverton School District School Board and School Administrations. Topic: Using teaching effectiveness research as a basis for a school improvement program. Silverton, Oregon. April, 1985.

In-service workshop for all Hillsboro School District high school and junior high school staff. Topic: Classroom management. Hillsboro, Oregon. September, 1984.

Workshop presented to the Portland School District Student Management Specialists. Topic: Staff development in classroom management. Portland, Oregon. August, 1984.

Staff development consultant to Franklin High School. Topic: Classroom management: Current research and application. Portland, Oregon. March - May, 1984.

Presentation at the Symposium on School Dropout Prevention. Topic: Adolescent behavior: Symptoms of defeat. Portland, Oregon. February, 1984.

Staff development consultant to Marshall High School. Topic: Incorporating teacher effectiveness research into your teaching. Portland, Oregon. October 1983 - January, 1984.

Workshop at West Linn School District inservice training program. Topic: Discipline and school success. West Linn, Oregon. April, 1983.

In-service training workshop for Lincoln High School leadership team. Topic: An overview of teacher effectiveness research. Portland, Aug. 1983.

Consultant to Lincoln Park Elementary School. Topic: Developing a school- wide discipline system. David Douglas School District. Portland, Oregon. September-December 1983.

School assessment of Fernwood Middle School. Portland, Oregon. January - March, 1 983.

School assessment for Woodlawn School. Portland, Oregon. March -June, 1983.

Consultant to Parkrose Middle School. Topic: Developmental needs of early adolescence and its relationship to school climate factors. Portland, May, 1983.

Consultant to Riverdale School. Topic: Developing a program for improving students' transition from sixth to seventh grade. Portland, Oregon. June, 1983, September, 1983.

Consultant to Scappoose High School. Topic: School discipline procedures and school climate. Scappoose, Oregon. May, 1983.

Consultant to Bolton Middle School. Topic: Meeting the educational needs of middle school students. West Linn, Oregon. March - April, 1983.

Consultant to Hillsboro School District - state grant on instruction and individual supervision for improving classroom instruction and management skills. Hillsboro, Oregon. October, 1982 - April, 1983.

Consultant to Binsmead Middle School. Topic: Teacher effectiveness research: Portland, Oregon. March, 1983.

In-service presentation to Lakeridge High School staff. Topic: School effectiveness research: Lake Oswego, Oregon. February, 1983.

Consultant to English Department at Lincoln High School. Topic: Meeting the educational needs of all learners. Portland, Oregon. January, 1983.

Consultant to Ainsworth Elementary School. Topic: In-service course on teaching student responsibility. Portland, Oregon. January- February, 1983.

In-service workshop for North Clackamas School District secondary school counselors. Topic: Consulting with classroom teachers. November, 1982.

In-service presentation to Grant High School staff. Topic: Teacher-student relationships - their impact on student achievement and behavior. Portland, Oregon. November, 1982.

Consultant to Sam Barlow High School Administrators, Department chairpersons and counselors. Topic: Teacher evaluation procedures. Gresham, Oregon. October, 1982.

Keynote speaker for Portland School District's Fall in service program Topic: Responsible discipline strategies promote student achievement. Portland, Oregon. October, 1982.

Consultant to Grant High School leadership team. Topic: The relationship between instructional methods and classroom management. Portland, Oregon. September, 1982.

Assessment of school climate and school discipline system. Ockley Green Middle School. Portland, Oregon. April- November, 1982.

Teacher training consultant. Work with two teachers to assess their instruction and management skills and prescribe new methods. Harriet Tubman Middle School. Portland, Oregon. April - May, 1982.

Director of in-service training course and consultant to the district's steering committee to examine educational programs for early adolescents. Oregon City School District. September, 1981 - April, 1982.

In-service training as part of the Portland School District's 33-Hour Desegregation inservice. Topics: School climate, teacher- student relationships and peer relationships. Rose City Park

School, Peninsula School, Markham Middle School, Portsmouth Middle School and Woodlawn School. Portland, Oregon. January - April, 1982.

Assessment of school climate and discipline system. Ball Elementary School. Portland, Oregon. April, 1982.

In-service training session. Glencoe High School. Topic: Adolescent development: Implications for educational programs. Hillsboro. Oregon. April, 1982.

Consultant to Portsmouth Middle School. Topic: Improving student motivation and reducing discipline problems. Portland, January -April, 1982.

In-service training session for Orient and Estacada School District. Topic: Mainstreaming emotionally handicapped students. March, 1982.

In-service training session for counselors in North Clackamas School District. Topic: Factors influencing acting-out behaviors of junior high school students. Milwaukie, Oregon. February, 1982.

Assessment of school climate and school discipline system. Portsmouth Middle School. Portland, Oregon. November- December, 1981.

In-service training session for Portland School District Area I administrators. Topic: Classroom and school discipline. Portland, Oregon. November, 1981.

In-service workshop for Portland School District. Topic: Teaching methods that produce learning and positive behavior. Portland, Oregon. October, 1981.

In-service mini-course for Portland School District. Topic: A holistic look at classroom management: A practical approach. Portland, Oregon. October, 1981

In-service training session for Portland School District teachers. Topic: Responsible classroom discipline. Portland, Oregon. October, 1981.

In-service training Skillshop for the Dalles and Hood River School Districts. Topic: Classroom management. October, 1981.

In-service training with Robert Gray Middle School. Topic: Classroom management. Portland, Oregon. February - April, 1981.

Workshop presented at the Oregon Instructional Improvement Day meeting. Topic :Responsible school discipline. Lake Oswego, Oregon. October, 1980.

Speech presented at the Portland School District In-Service. Topic: Improving classroom

discipline. Portland, Oregon. October, 1980.

In-service training sessions with the Portsmouth Middle School staff. Topic: Classroom discipline. Portland, Oregon. February- May, 1980.

In-service training with Rose City Park Elementary School. Topic: Classroom management. Portland, Oregon. October, 1979-April, 1980.

Consultant to Portland School District Advisory Committee for Behavior- Problem Children. Portland, Oregon. March, 1980.

In-service workshop for Portland School District Special Education Department. Topic: Classroom discipline. Portland, Oregon. March, 1980.

In-service program for Lutheran High School. Topic: School discipline. Portland, Oregon. February, 1980.

In-service workshop for Portland School District's English as a Second Language Program. Topic: Classroom discipline. Portland, Oregon. Nov.1979.

In-service workshop Kellogg Middle School. Topic: Classroom management. Portland, Oregon. August, 1979.

In-service workshop for Portland School District Area 11. Topic: Positive school discipline. Portland, Oregon. June, 1979.

In-service workshop for the Jewish Education Association. Topic: Classroom management. Portland, Oregon. February, 1979.

In-service workshop: Consultation skills for special education teachers. Parkrose School District. Portland, Oregon. October, 1977.

Consultant to North Clackamas School District, Milwaukie Elementary School. Topic: Developing a uniform school-wide program for classroom management. Milwaukie, Oregon. August, 1977.

Consultant to Lincoln County School District. Role: Assisting counseling staff in improving skills in interpersonal relationships and team membership. Newport, Oregon. March, 1977.

Consultant to Forest Grove School District. Role: Work with high school staff to examine strategies for working with behavior-problem students. 1977

In-service workshop presented to Gladstone School District. Topic: Classroom management. Gladstone, Oregon. April, 1976.

Consultant to Lincoln County School District. Role: Training secondary learning disability specialists and counselors in skills for working with learning disabled students. Newport, Oregon. May, 1976.

Consultant to Lincoln County School District. Role: Work with district counselors to develop techniques for serving as consultants to classroom teachers. Newport, Oregon. March, 1976.

Consultant to Beaverton School District #48 Title Vl Project for Severely learning Disabled Junior High School students. Beaverton, Oregon. September - November, 1975.

Speech made at workshop for Portland School District Area 11 teachers of emotionally handicapped children. Topic: Classroom management and strategies for integrating emotionally handicapped children. May, 1975.

Consultation to Parkrose School District # 3. Topic: Use of school counselors. Portland, Oregon. January, 1975.

Program consultant to Eugene School District 4J. Program for emotionally handicapped junior high school students. Eugene, Oregon. Fall, 1974.

Consultant to Dallas School District. Topic: Student-teacher communication. Dallas, Oregon. October, 1974.

Director, Workshop for training teachers of emotionally handicapped children, Portland School District # 1. Portland, Oregon. Summer, 1974.

Program evaluator and consultant to Title Vl Intervention Program for Emotionally Handicapped Junior High School Students. Department of Special Education, Beaverton School District#48. Beaverton, Oregon, 1974.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Co-Chair, American Educational Research Association Special Interest Group on Classroom management. March, 1986 - March 1989.

Member of the Oregon Department of Special Education's Long Range Planning Committee, 1989/90.

Member of the Governor's Policy and Planning Group on Youth Substance Abuse. 1988/89

Member of the State Committee on Programs for Emotionally Handicapped Students. October, 1986-1989

Chairman, Board of Directors for MAINSTREAM Youth Alcohol Program. March 1982 - June 1984. Member of board, 1979 - 1986.

Member, Board of Directors for Serendipity Academy. 1982 - 1986.

Member of State of Oregon Task Force Committee to develop a State Master Plan for Special Education. 1976.

Member of State Evaluation Team to evaluate and make recommendations regarding the Child and Adolescent Secure Treatment Program in Salem, Oregon. May, 1976.

Chairman of the State of Oregon Title Vl Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, 1975/96

Member of State of Oregon Task Force Committee to develop a State Master Plan for Special Education. 1976.

Member of State Evaluation Team to evaluate and make recommendations regarding the Child and Adolescent Secure Treatment Program in Salem, Oregon. May, 1976.

Member of Portland City Club Research Committee to review and make recommendations concerning the juvenile justice system in Multnomah County. 1975 - 1976.

Member of state-wide committee to identify and rank in-service training needs of teachers of the handicapped. Salem, Oregon. October, 1975.

Chairman of the Oregon State Committee for Emotionally Handicapped Children. 1973/74.

Member of State of Oregon Title Vl Ad Hoc Advisory Committee. 1973/4.

Agency Consultation and In-Service Training

Program Assessment for Fir Grove Day Treatment Program. Vancouver, WA, 1996-2003

Program Assessment for the Ed Phillips Learning Center (Washington County ESDs Program for SED adolescents). March - June, 1994.

Assessment and program planning for Children's Farm Home School.January-June, 1992.

Workshops on working with seriously emotionally disturbed students presented for the Cedar Hills Psychiatric Adolescent Unit. 1991-1992.

Program assessment and recommendations to Student Therapeutic Educational Program Mt. Prospect, Illinois. December 1985.

Program assessment and recommendations to Lifeskills and Educational Alternatives Program. Schaumburg, Illinois. December, 1985.

Program assessment and recommendations for the Jesse Lee Home for Emotionally Disturbed Youth. Anchorage, Alaska. May, 1984.

Consultant to MacLaren School (State boys training school). Topic: Implementing a process-oriented treatment program. Woodburn, Oregon. June, 1983.

Consultant to staff at Mainstream, Inc. (Youth alcohol treatment program). Topic: Adolescent development and its implications for treatment choice and treatment groups for young adolescents. 1980-1987

In-service training (10 hours) for physicians, psychologists, and nurses at Dammasch State Hospital. Topic: Adolescent developmental psychology and its implications for developing therapeutic intervention programs for severely disturbed adolescents. Wilsonville, Oregon. May, 1976.

Program consultant to Albertina Kerr Program for Severely Emotionally Disturbed Pre-adolescent Boys. Portland, Oregon. November, 1973.

Program consultant to Christie Residential Center for Adolescent Girls. Portland, Oregon. September, 1975 - August, 1976.

Resume

Sheila Magee
6291 SW Bancroft St.
Portland, Oregon 97221
Phone: 503-720-6411 FAX: 503-292-4173
EMAIL: sheila@starautismsupport.com

Education

Portland State University
Portland, OR
2002
School Administrator License

Lewis and Clark College
Portland, OR
1993
School Psychologist License

Portland State University
Portland, OR
1975
M.S. Special Education; Reading Specialist Endorsement:
Handicapped Learner/Severely Handicapped Learner

Portland State University
Portland, OR
1974
B.S. Elementary Education: Oregon Basic Elementary Certificate

Professional Experience

Consultant/Workshop Presenter
STAR Autism Support
2007 to Present
Presented at numerous workshops and consultations to school districts throughout the
United States on the STAR Autism Program.

Instructor
Lewis and Clark College
Portland, OR
2007- Present
Developed and instructed course on curriculum for severely handicapped learners

Professional Experience (Continued)

Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Administrator
Northwest Regional Education Service District
Hillsboro, OR
2000 to Present
Administrator in charge of early intervention/early childhood special education services for children in several school districts. Coordinated the Washington County Early Autism Program.

School Psychologist and Special Education Facilitator
Beaverton School District
Beaverton, OR
1990-2000
School Psychologist serving a variety of special needs students in elementary through high school. Special education facilitator responsible for supporting students with autism in elementary and middle school for the school district.

Special Education Teacher
Portland Public Schools
Portland, OR
1978-1990
Designed and implemented curriculum and Individual Educational Programs for students with autism and other developmental delays in self contained and resource classroom programs.

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL DATA

Name: Christine L. Moore
Address: 5205 SW 49th Dr.
             Portland, Or. 97221
Phone: 503 577-1799
Email: cmoore@lclark.edu

ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

Year	Institution	Degree	Emphasis Area
1969	California State University, Los Angeles	B.A	Speech/Communication Theatre
1972	University of Southern California	M.A.	Communication Disorders: Special Education
1976	University of Oregon	No degree	(Course work completed Special Education PhD)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Year	Institution	Position Description
2004-Present	Graduate School of Education Counseling, Education Lewis & Clark College	Coordinator, Special Education Programs, Instructor Education
2001-2005	Clackamas ESD/ Oregon Department of Education	Director, Special Projects/ Personal Services Contract Oregon Department of Education
1980-2004	Lewis & Clark College	Adjunct Professor-Education: M.A.T, M. Ed Special Education, Special Education Endorsement
1980-2001	Beaverton School District	Director of Special Education; Coordinator Special Education; Staff Development Specialist; Specialist Language/Learning Disabilities
1976-1980	Western Oregon State University	Assistant Professor- Psychology & Special Education

Christine L. Moore

1975-1976	Chemeketa Community College	Instructor-Speech Department
1975-1976	Portland Public Schools	Speech Language Pathologist
1974-1975	Los Angeles City U.S.D.	Special Education: Teacher, ED Classroom Special Education: Teacher, Autism Classroom
1972-1974	Los Angeles City U.S.D.	Language Specialist; Special Education School

REPRESENTATIVE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES /MAJOR PRESENTATIONS

Agency	Course/Activity	Year
Lewis & Clark College GSEC	Educating Students with Special Needs Foundations of Literacy Special Education & the Law Assessment/Diagnosis of Reading Strategies Language Acquisition & Development Developing Reading Success Curriculum & Instruction for Special Needs Students Advanced Instructional Design Practicum I &II: Special Education Special Education for the Gen Ed Teacher	1980-Present
PN Institute Special Education & Law	'Special Education Funding' Crafting Measurable IEPs IDEA, NCLB & Learning Disabilities Residential Placement & Special Education Special Ed +Gen Ed= Getting It Right for Students	2003-2010
Oregon Dept. Ed.	"Improving Outcomes for Students with Disabilities" (Staff development presented statewide for teachers ,administrators and parents.)	2001-2005
OrPTI	Accommodating Students with Disabilities IEPs: Contest or Communication Special Ed: What Works……..	2003 - 2010

Oregon Department of Education	Governor's Task Force: Autism Appointment	2000
Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA)	Conference Presentations (Special Education policies, procedures law & educational practices)	1998-2003
Washington Literacy Conference	"Teaching Reading in Special Education" "Literacy & The At Risk Learner"	1994 1990
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory	Summer Institute Keynote Presentation "Connecting Literacy, Language & Learning: The Construction of Meaning"	1993

Christine L. Moore

City University, Washington	"Inclusion & the Future of Special Education"	1992
Claremont Reading Conference, Claremont, Ca.	"Literacy Development and the Culture of Childhood	1991
OSU Corvallis	Guest Professor-Summer "Literacy Learning"	1990
Oregon Conference University of Oregon	Workshop Presentations; "Development of Thinking Skills" "Language in Context: Listening, Speaking, Reading & Writing." "Language & Learning Problems in Special Education"	1982-1986
COSA/ODE	ODE: Special Education Policy & Planning Committee	1990-2005

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA)
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
Council of Exceptional Children (CEC)
International Reading Association (IRA)
American Speech, Language & Hearing Association (ASHA)

Gail Ochsner
3078 NE Lansing Ct.
H-541-420-8862
gail.ochsner@bend.k12.or.us

EDUCATION
M.S., Speech Communication with emphasis in Speech-Language Pathology, Portland State University, August 1990.
Reading Endorsement-July 2002.
Basic Handicapped Learner Endorsement-January 2005.

WORK EXPERIENCE
2001-present Instructor for Lewis and Clark College (Adjunct Faculty) and Bend LaPine School District

- Instruct teachers, college students, and district staff in the five key components of reading instruction across K-12 curriculum as described in the National Reading Panel Report and the Oregon State English/Language Arts Framework. Classes include overview of effective primary level instructional programs and equip participants with the skills necessary to assess student performance and develop K-12 intervention plans for students with reading disabilities. Participants become familiar with a variety of research-based programs designed to meet the needs of students struggling with reading skill acquisition including English Language Learners.
- Designed and currently implementing training model which includes ongoing modeling and consultation with special education staff instructing students who have failed to make progress in previous reading programs.
- Train staff in multi-sensory, explicit, systematic teaching of phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, reading/listening comprehension, and written language.
- Developed assessment flowchart for creating student profiles of strengths and weaknesses within all areas of reading with the goal of planning and putting into place effective methods and strategies of instruction.
- Coordinated summer reading program for 3-12 students who were severely delayed in their literacy development.
- Consult with teachers, parents, and professionals in the community.

Reading Specialist and Special Education Teacher for Bend-LaPine School District (2001-present)

- Provide evaluation and remedial/preventative instruction to elementary school students who may or may not have learning disabilities.

- Participate as part of multidisciplinary team in charge of leading staff in the identification of students who are performing below grade level and providing extra support to those students. Consult with teachers, principal, and educational assistants.

1997-2002
Reading and Speech Clinic-Reading Specialist/Speech-Language Pathologist/Director
- Diagnosed and treated children and adults with speech, language, and reading impairments including Dyslexia,
- Provided treatment methods such as multi-sensory reading instruction, phonemic awareness development, visual imagery for language comprehension, and FastForWord computer training for auditory processing remediation.

Regional Representative for the Oregon Branch of the International Dyslexia Association
- Worked with Oregon Outreach Committee to bring helpful information about dyslexia to the Central Oregon region.
- Remained current on research developments, maintained a small library of articles and books, and communicated with adults, children and families to determine local area needs.

Speech-Language Pathologist-Central Oregon Regional Programs
- Provided evaluation and management of speech and language impairments in an Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education setting.
- Evaluated and set developed augmentative communication systems for students in elementary through high school

Speech-Language Pathologist-Warm Springs Early Childhood Education Center
- Worked with young children, families, and teachers as part of a multi-disciplinary team to develop language and pre-literacy curriculum, conduct evaluations, implement services, and maintain documentation.
- Provided evaluation and management of speech and language impairments in an Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education setting..
-

1990-1997
Speech-Language Pathologist-Northwest Regional E.S.D Hillsboro, Or. Contracted to Sherwood School District
- Diagnosed and provided speech and language treatment for elementary, middle, high high school populations including children with hearing impairment, articulation disorders, verbal dyspraxia, voice disorders, language learning disabilities, autism, and cognitive impairments.

- Elected as Team Leader for Speech/Language Team at Northwest Regional E.S.D. (96-97). Duties included planning and organizing in-service for E.S.D. staff, conducted team meetings and acted as liaison between the Speech/Language team and administrators.
- Participated on a multi-disciplinary team for Hopkins Elementary, Groner Elementary, and Harvey Clark Elementary. Duties included working as part of a collaborative team to administer and interpret evaluations, determine eligibility and share teaching techniques.
- Supervised CFY Speech-Language Pathologists (95-96, 96-97)
- Worked with a tem to implement a systems unification model at the building level to maximize special education resources. Duties included attending in-service, managing and teaching Special Education and Title-I reading program for kindergarten and first grade, collaborating with K/1 teaching team, and consulting with transdisciplinary team.
- Participated in mentor program through E.S.D. (1990-1991) that included bi-monthly meetings with a mentor SIP, attending state conducted in-service, and using observation as a learning tool.

References available upon request

.

Kathryn Phillips

20036 Rock Bluff Circle Bend, Or 97702
PO Box 9381 Bend Oregon 97708
phone(541) 318-5565
fax (541) 312-4371
mobile (541) 390-6683
toll free 1-800-810-3610
KPhillipsinc@aol.com
www.totalbehaviormanagement.com

Education

Bachelor of Arts in Special Education
Arizona State University, Tempe AZ 1978

Master of Arts in Education Administration
Emphasis in Special Education Administration
Northern Arizona University 1982
Flagstaff, AZ

Post Graduate Studies
Educational Administration
Lewis and Clark College 1998-1999

School Psychology and Counseling
Lewis and Clark College 1996-1998

School Psychology and Special Education Administration
Portland State University 1983-1992

Specialized Training

Crisis Prevention Intervention Training
Trainer of Trainers
November 10, 2000   Bend, Oregon

Dealing with Uncivilized Behavior
February 27, 2000   Eugene, Oregon

Assessment and Diagnosis of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders
May 1-5, 1997   Washington, D.C.

Education of Students with Traumatic Brain Injury
Sept. 1995- June 1996   Eugene, Oregon

Substance Abuse and the Brain
October 10, 1994   Portland, Or

Perinatal Substance Abuse Prevention
December 9-15, 1995   Fairfax Virginia 25 CEU

Northwest Conference on Neuropsychology
April 4-8, 1995   San Diego, CA

Educational Implications of Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and Other Drug Effects
Trainer of Trainers for Northwest Regional Laboratory for Drug Free Schools
November 2-6 1992   Portland, OR

Total Quality Management - Langford Institute
August 9-15, 1996   Bend Oregon

Certification

Oregon Basic Elementary
Standard Handicapped Learner
Oregon Basic Administrator

Current Employment and Duties

Educational and Behavioral Consultant
President *Phillips Associates Consulting*   **1989-present**
International speaker on Assessment and Diagnosis of Learning Disorders, Safe Schools and Violence Prevention, Paraeducator Training Series, Fetal Alcohol Syndrome, Traumatic   Brain Injury, Behavioral and Emotional Disorders. Behavioral consultant to Head Start Programs. Evaluator and consultant Oregon Department of Human Services self-sufficiency Programs

Safe Schools and Behavioral Consultant
President *Total Behavior Management*   **2001-present**
National consultant and founder for comprehensive consulting service that provides onsite consulting, trainings and keynote speeches for educators in assessing learning and behavioral issues, creating safe schools and positive schoolwide management plans.

International Presener
Bureau of Education and Research   **2004-present**
Intenational consultant, presenter and key note speaker on behavior management issues. 180 presentations per year in 180 cities around the United States and Canada.

Instructor
Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oregon 1997-present
Plan, instruct, supervise masters-level graduate students
"Interventions for Severe Emotionally and Behaviorally Disorders Students"
"Assessment and Diagnosis in Special Education"
"Educating Students with Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and Other Drug Effects"

Expert Witness
Washington and Oregon State Circuit Courts: 1995-present
Interviews, file review, consultation to attorneys, courtroom testimony
Fetal Alcohol Syndrome, Abuse and Trauma, Learning Disorders and Traumatic Brain Injury.

Previous Work Experience

Assistant Director Special Education Programs
Bend-LaPine School District, Bend, Oregon July 1998-2000

Responsibilities for supervision and evaluation of special programs including: Teen Parent , Life skills, educational resource centers at the elementary, middle and high school levels.

Paraeducator training series, participation on the Total Quality Management Teams, Vertical Team membership and Horizontal team membership. Facilitation of the PERKS parent group, budget preparation and staffing hiring and planning in special education. Liaison for transition services for early childhood special education to kindergarten and high school to work. Coordinator of the School to Work Programs. Member of the Alternative Learning Opportunities Team for the district and participate strategic planning.

Senior Behavioral Consultant
Simmons Associates- The Education Company San Diego CA 1987-2001

National speaker, staff development and onsite consultation on behavioral issues, school and classwide management systems, violence prevention and working effectively with parents.

Educational Consultant, Evaluator and Site Facilitator
Bend, LaPine School District, Bend, Oregon   1995-2002

Evaluations, file reviews, program planning and educational diagnosis of students with learning difficulties including: emotional disturbance, behavioral   problems,learning disabilities, autism, mental retardation, other health impairments, attention deficit disorder and fetal alcohol syndrome. Evaluations of over 1500 individuals during my 18 year tenure. Consultation with teachers, mental health professionals, administrators, parents, corrections. Provide technical assistance regarding the special education law and trainings for staff development on variety of issues. Member of four person committee that determines placements for student exhibiting severe behavior disorders throughout the district.

Adjunct Instructor
Portland State University, Portland, Oregon 1996-1997

Plan, instruct, supervise masters-level students
"Educating Special Needs Students in Early Childhood Education Settings"

Adjunct Instructor
Southern Oregon State College, Ashland, Oregon 1995

Plan, instruct, supervise masters-level students
"Educating Students with Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and Other Drug Effects".

Assessment Specialist and Education Consultant 1988-1995
Deschutes County Education Service District, Bend, Oregon

Emotional, behavioral, educational and vocational assessments of students ages five to twenty-one. Provided consultation services in program planning, diagnosis, community and school-to-work efforts.

Learning Disabilities and Behavioral Specialist
Canby Elementary School District, Canby, Oregon
1979-1985

Assessment, diagnosis, instructional, program planning, teaching. Coordinated services for special education classrooms in district.

Published

"Project: COLOR" an arts curriculum for children with emotional disturbances.

1984 Ednick Publishers

"GetOregonized" fourth grade social studies text book state adopted
        contributing author
        1988 Holt Reinhart and WInston

Fostering Resiliency in Children: Applications in Logotherapy 1999
        Counseling guide for developing resiliency in high risk children using
        logotherapy counseling approach.

Assessing Behavior in Children 2004
        A practical guide for preschool providers in identifying behaviors that in need of specially
        designed behavior programs.
        Total behavior Management Publications

The Ultimate Guide to Playground Discipline 2005
        A guide for teachers, administrators and playground supervisors for developing safe,
        peaceful playgrounds.
        Total Behavior Management Publications

Dealing with Difficult Parents 2006
        A survival guide for teachers in dealing with difficult parents of their students.
        Total Behavior Management Publications

Current Professional Organizations
Council for Exceptional Children
American Counseling Association

References available upon request

Lee Ann R. Sharman
836 Oak Street
Lake Oswego, Oregon 97034
(503) 697-1459

Education

Educational Administrator Licensure, 2003
LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE

M.S., 1989, Counseling and School Psychologist
Pupil Personnel Services Credential
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

B.A., 1983, Psychology
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

Professional Experience

8/2000 - present

CLACKAMAS EDUCATION SERVICE DISTRICT, Clackamas, OR
Coordinator, Child Evaluation and Service Center
As a licensed administrator and school psychologist, manage the provision of special education services provided by the Center.
- Supervision of 20 full and part-time practitioners
- Coordination of the planning and delivery of multidisciplinary, psycho-educational evaluations for referred students
- Design, plan, and revise evaluation program models consistent with best practice, legal requirements, and district needs
- Provide consultation and professional development to districts on assessment and current issues in special education
- Develop and manage department budget
- Member of County Special Education Advisory Team
- Participant, Clackamas County Mediation Project
- 2003/2004 ASK Project Coordinator for ESD

2005 – present

LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE, Portland, OR
Adjunct Professor, Graduate School of Counseling and Education
Teach graduate level course in Assessment and Diagnosis, designed for educators earning an endorsement in special education.

2002 – present

WESTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY, Monmouth, OR
Private practitioner, Learning Disabilities Project
Provide independent psycho-educational evaluations for adults

who present with a wide variety of emotional and learning difficulties. Clients are referred to WOU by Vocational Rehabilitation and the Department of Health and Human Svcs.

8/1996 – 6/2000　　WEST LINN-WILSONVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT, West Linn, Oregon
School Psychologist
Responsibilities included psycho-educational assessment, with a focus on learning disabilities, cognitive functioning, and emotional/behavioral disorders; consultation with parents and teachers, student counseling, case management, and program design for several schools in the district.

3/1994 – 6/1995　　MANHATTAN BEACH SCHOOL DISTRICT, Manhattan Beach, Ca.
School Psychologist
Responsibilities included assessment, consultation with parents and teachers, student counseling, and case management.

1/1988 – 3/1990　　ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Credentialed Intern Psychologist
Responsibilities included assessment, play therapy, parent education and counseling, consultation with teachers and administrators, and staff development. Initiated, developed and implemented all policies and procedures for the new special education program.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Board of Directors, Oregon Branch/International Dyslexia Society
National Association of School Psychologists
Oregon School Psychologists Association
Panel Member, State Strengths and Weaknesses Committee

REFERENCES

Barbara Bolstad, Special Education Director, CESD
(503) 675-4150
Dr. Albert Greenwood, Clinical Psychologist
(503) 805-4575
Christine Moore, Department Head, Lewis and Clark College
Teacher Education Program
(503) 768-6128
Ken Kosko, WOU Education Evaluation Center Director
(503) 838-8751

12. If programs are submitted as a result of a modification, units will provide a crosswalk of coursework between old and new programs.

Original Approved Program (Former Standards)

The following information is the required crosswalk for changes from the originally accredited program to the current program seeking accreditation. During the time the Lewis & Clark College GSEC has offered a special education endorsement there have been two reauthorizations of the primary special education legislation IDEA 1997 & the 1999 Regulations, and IDEIA 2004 & the 2006 Regulations. Following each change in federal authorization, there has been related change in Oregon state law as represented in the OARs. Changes have been both substantive and procedural. The changes have required careful review of legal requirements by the faculty and appropriate course changes.

In 2000, the Basic Handicapped Learner endorsement became the Special Education Endorsement (or Basic/Standard Exceptional Learner I as appropriate given the candidate's background). One response of the GSEC to these changes has been the changes to the special education courses and practica as detailed below.

Original Endorsement Program

Beginning in 1994, a group of special education administrators approached the faculty of Lewis & Clark College requesting them to consider adding a **Basic Handicapped Learner Endorsement.** In collaboration with this group of Directors, the faculty of Lewis & Clark GSEC designed a program to reflect the Oregon special education standards current at that time. The original **Basic Handicapped Learner Endorsement** program was **15 semester hours**. The program was crafted to reflect the standards and meet the requirements of public school clinical practice in special education. Instructors in the original program were a combination of graduate school teacher education faculty and practicing special education administrators.

Candidates in the **Basic Handicapped Learner Endorsement** program held **Basic** and or **Basic/Standard Teaching certification**. The GSEC Lewis & Clark special education endorsement program candidates on campus, and in Central Oregon, were fully certified teachers on entry into the special education endorsement program. Most of these

teachers were employed by a school district to teach special education full or part time. The original 15 semester hours of program courses were:

SPED 510	Educating Students with Special Needs	3 SH
SPED 511	Behavior Change Interventions	2 SH
SPED 516	Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	2 SH
SPED 513	Assessment & Diagnosis	4 SH
SPED 514	Curriculum & Instruction	3 SH
SPED 544	Practicum	1 SH
	Basic Handicapped Leaner Total Credits	15 SH

Major Modifications

Create SPED 545 Practicum I

Modifications to the approved program include removing one credit of practicum formerly embedded in SPED 513/632 making it a separate course SPED 545 Practicum I. SPED 513 /63 was originally 4 semester hours . This course became 3 semester hours. One credit was used to create SPED 545/645 Practicum I as a stand-alone course. **(+ 1 SH)**

Change of Practicum Structure & Substance

SPED 544, the original special education practicum course became SPED 546 Practicum II. With this change, the practicum experience now begins in September (SPED 545) consistent with the public school year calendar of most districts, and continues through May or June depending on candidate needs, with SPED 546 Practicum II. This makes a full year practicum opportunity for students to receive training and support through observation and conferences.   In addition to this change, in 2005 the Council of Exceptional Children (CEC) Standards were incorporated as required knowledge and skills to be demonstrated during each of the practica. This change was documented through the practicum observation form.

The new Oregon State Standards have been incorporated into the practicum observation forms. Two supervisors began staffing practicum candidates on a weekly basis to determine inter-rater reliability and each candidate's progress toward proficiency in all standards, as noted on the guide, during Fall 2010. (See Practicum Forms following this document.)

Course Addition

Research has consistently shown that the majority of students identified as eligible for special education are in the category of learning disabled. The majority of these students have a reading disability. In 2005/2006, SPED 517/527, Teaching Reading for Students with Special Needs was added to the special education endorsement program. As valid research has increased, particularly in terms of Response to Intervention (RtI), and the need for quality reading instruction before students are considered for special education eligibility, the focus on teaching reading has only become more critical. SPED 517 is intended to provide targeted instruction directly in teaching the five major areas of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension) across age levels and disabilities for special education endorsement candidates.   **(+1 SH)**

Course Addition

In 2006, as a direct result of the 2006 IDEA Special Education Regulations, SPED 535/635 was added to the special education endorsement program. SPED 535/635 Current Issues in Special Education is the course where changes, substantive or procedural, can be included, reviewed and analyzed before the candidate's endorsement program is complete. In the semester before the course begins students are surveyed to determine where they believe they need additional training. The teaching faculty is also surveyed to determine their analysis of what is needed. SPED 535, Current Issues in Special Education provides another opportunity to increase teacher effectiveness by linking current research, the needs of each candidate and clinical practice in local education agencies.

As initially conceived, SPED 535/635 was one semester hour. After review of the initial course, faculty at both program sites determined that candidates needed an

additional credit hour at the conclusion of their program. A further review of all endorsement courses indicated that the majority of students had two years of special education practice on entry into the program. SPED 510/626 was consequently reduced to 2 credit hours. [The Central Oregon program continued SPED 626 at 3 credit hours for the first two years, but will change to 2 credit hours in SPED 626 in June, 2011.]

(+ 2 SH)

Current Program with Major Modifications (in semester hours – SH)

Courses

All courses listed and described are required for the special education endorsement.

SPED 510	Educating Students with Special Needs	2 SH
SPED 511	Behavior Change Interventions	2 SH
SPED 516	Interventions for Severely Challenged Students	2 SH
SPED 513	Assessment & Diagnosis	3 SH
SPED 545	Practicum I	1 SH
SPED 514	Curriculum & Instruction	3 SH
SPED 546	Practicum II	1 SH
SPED 517	Teaching Reading for Students with Special Needs	1 SH
SPED 535	Current Issues in Special Education	2 SH
	Special Education Endorsement	**18 SH**
	Basic Exceptional Learner I Endorsement	**18 SH**

All program changes have been part of the GSEC Faculty Curriculum Committee review process. Reasons for the change are detailed in writing and through presentation and must be voted on by the Committee before the change process proceeds. The Special Education endorsement program has been formally reviewed by the GSEC Curriculum Committee three times. This process provides multiple opportunities for studying the relationship between the courses presented and outcomes in the form of special education teacher preparedness. All changes have been based on state and federal law and were designed to impart knowledge, techniques, and problem solving strategies that candidates can apply clinically in Oregon public schools.

Special Education Endorsement Courses
in which Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions are Taught and Assessed

	SPED 510/626	SPED 511/629	SPED 516/628	SPED 513/632	SPED 514/633	SPED 544/644	SPED 517/527
K.1. Knows how to create an inclusive classroom that affirms the dignity of all students.	X	X	X			X	
K.2. Knows essential concepts of content, planning, assessment, and instruction for students with disabilities.	X		X	X	X	X	X
K.3. Knows ethical, legal, intellectual, and professional responsibilities.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S.1. Responds to individual differences through differentiated instruction.	X		X	X	X	X	X
S.2. Can evaluate and teach appropriate social skills.		X	X				
S.3. Manages individual, small group and classroom procedures and routines.		X				X	
S.4. Analyzes and manages student behavior.		X				X	
S.5. Creates Individual Education Programs, which build on student strengths and support student needs.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S.6. Demonstrates lesson planning in support of student learning and the ability to implement lesson plans.			X		X	X	X
S.7. Uses standardized assessments and Curriculum Based Assessment (CBA) to inform instruction.			X	X	X	X	X
S.8. Differentiates instruction using ongoing assessment information.			X	X	X	X	X

	SPED 510/626	SPED 511/629	SPED 516/628	SPED 513/632	SPED 514/633	SPED 544/644	SPED 517/527
S.9. Maintains documentation of student learning.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S.10. Uses assistive technology in support of student learning.			X		X		
S.11. Practices professional habits.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S.12. Communicates well in writing, speech, and personal interactions with parents, colleagues, and administrators.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S.13. Engages in reflective practice.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
D.1. Understands and respects individual and cultural differences.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
D.2. Assists students in developing learning strategies which support lifelong learning.		X	X	X	X	X	X
D.3. Reflects on students work to inform, practice, and enhance student learning.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
D.4. Understands the role and identity of teaching by connecting theory and practice.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Relationship Between OAR 584-065-0030/0040:
Special Educator Endorsement and Special Education / Teacher Education
Program Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	Theory and foundations of exceptional learner education	Law and policy	IEP development and implementation	Collaboration / consultation	Behavior supports / community links	Assessment / evaluation - academic	Assessment / evaluation - functional	Curriculum and instruction - academic	Curriculum and instruction - functional	Specialized supports and technology	General education curriculum and foundations	Multi-cultural and diversity issues	Practicum experience
K.1. Knows how to create an inclusive classroom that affirms the dignity of all students.		X	X	X	X			X			X		X
K.2. Knows essential concepts of content, planning, assessment, and instruction for students with disabilities.	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
K.3. Knows ethical, legal, intellectual, and professional responsibilities.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	
S.1. Responds to individual differences through differentiated instruction.	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S.2. Can evaluate and teach appropriate social skills.		X	X		X		X		X				
S.3. Manages individual, small group and classroom procedures and routines.			X	X	X			X	X		X		X

Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	Theory and foundations of exceptional learner education	Law and policy	IEP development and implementation	Collaboration / consultation	Behavior supports / community links	Assessment / evaluation - academic	Assessment / evaluation - functional	Curriculum and instruction - academic	Curriculum and instruction - functional	Specialized supports and technology	General education curriculum and foundations	Multi-cultural and diversity issues	Practicum experience
S.4. Analyzes and manages student behavior.		X			X		X		X	X			
S.5. Creates Individual Education Programs, which build on student strengths and support student needs.	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S.6. Demonstrates lesson planning in support of student learning and the ability to implement lesson plans.	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S.7. Uses standardized assessments and Curriculum Based Assessment (CBA) to inform instruction.	X		X			X	X	X	X			X	
S.8. Differentiates instruction using ongoing assessment information.	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X
S.9. Maintains documentation of student learning.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X
S.10. Uses assistive technology in support of student learning.		X	X	X		X	X	X		X			

Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	Theory and foundations of exceptional learner education	Law and policy	IEP development and implementation	Collaboration / consultation	Behavior supports / community links	Assessment / evaluation - academic	Assessment / evaluation - functional	Curriculum and instruction - academic	Curriculum and instruction - functional	Specialized supports and technology	General education curriculum and foundations	Multi-cultural and diversity issues	Practicum experience
S.11. Practices professional habits.	X	X		X	X	X	X	X					X
S.12. Communicates well in writing, speech, and personal interactions with parents, colleagues, and administrators.			X	X		X	X					X	X
D.1. Understands and respects individual and cultural differences.	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
D.2. Assists students in developing learning strategies which support lifelong learning.			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
D.3. Reflects on students work to inform, practice, and enhance student learning.	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X
D.4. Understands the role and identity of teaching by connecting theory and practice.	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X

Portfolio of Evidence
Special Educator Endorsement/Continuing Teaching License

Course	Evidence	Faculty Evaluation

Course | **Evidence** | **Faculty Evaluation**

SPED 510

Educating Students with Special Needs
1. Final examination. Procedural/Substantive/Legal and Pedagogy Analysis and Applications

1. _____

2. Instructional Paradigm: Case study & presentation

2. _____

SPED 511

Behavior Change Interventions for Students with Serious Emotional Behavioral Disorders
3. Functional Behavioral Analysis

3. _____

4. Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP aggressive/disruptive student)

4. _____

SPED 513

Assessment and Diagnosis
5. Case Study 2: Assessment Portfolio for Special Ed. eligibility (survey level test(s); achievement tests(s); supporting criterion referenced assessment)

5. _____

6. Case Study 3: Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) Reading

6. _____

7. Assessment Practicum Log

7. _____

SPED 514

Curriculum and Instruction for Special Needs Students
8. GE Curriculum, high incidence disabilities & learning: Curriculum Study:

8. _____

9. IEP Project

9. _____

10. Facilitated IEP meeting & critique

10. _____

11. Adaptations Resource Notebook (Accomodations & modifications references/ materials/procedures/forms)

11. _____

SPED 516   **Interventions for Severely Challenged Students**
                   12. Training checklist for paraprofessionals: 12. _____

                   13. Reflection Paper: Autism   13. _____

SPED 544   **Practicum**
                   14. Practicum observation/feedback form   14. _____

                   15. Post-Observation Conference   15. _____

SPED 517   **Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs**
                   16. Reading Instruction assessment/instruction system   16. _____

Lewis & Clark College

Special Education
Practicum Competency Form

Student Name:

Observer:

Date: _____ Setting: _____ Authorization Level: _____

Students being recommended for their initial Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teacher Education License must be at the basic level in all categories. Competencies are based on the GSEC guidelines and CEC Standards of Professional Performance

Domain l: The Learning Environment

Component 1.a. Create an Environment of Safety and Respect **(CEC Standard # 2, #3 ,# 5 #10)**

1.a.1. Teacher-Student Interaction (1/1 –small group—class)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.2. Student Interaction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.3. Manage Behavior (FBA/BIP)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.4. Utilize Physical Space	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.5. Manage SPED Process & Related Forms	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 1.c. Establish a Culture for Learning **(CEC Special Educator Standards, # 1, 3, 4, 7)**

1.c.1. Respond to Learner's Interests and Needs (Relevance to IEP)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.c.2. Share Knowledge and Passion for Learning (**Facilitate attention**, **support participation**)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 2.b. Teaching-Learning Cycle (CEC Special Educator Standard, # 6, # 7)

2.b.2. Communicate Clearly and Effectively	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

2.b.3. Uses a Variety of Techniques to Promote Student Participation and Learning (**Differentiated Instruction Accommodations-Modifications**)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 2.c. Assessment Cycle (CEC Special Educator Standard # 8)

2.c.1. Demonstrates Flexibility and Responsiveness to Students (**Data System & Integration**)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator	Course
Observation							

Lewis & Clark College
Department of Teacher Education
Special Educator Endorsement

Practicum Competency Form

Student Name:_____

Observer: _____

Date:_____

Students being recommended for their initial Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teacher Education License must be at the basic level in all categories.

Domain l: The Learning Environment

Component 1.a. Create an Environment of Safety and Respect

1.a.1. Teacher-Student Interaction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.2. Student Interaction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.3. Manage Classroom Procedures	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.4. Utilize Physical Space	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.a.5. Manage Student Behavior	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 1.c. Establish a Culture for Learning

1.c.1. Respond to Learner's Interests and Needs	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

1.c.2. Share Knowledge and Passion for Discipline	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 2.b. Teaching-Learning Cycle

2.b.2. Communicate Clearly and Effectively	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

2.b.3. Uses a Variety of Techniques to Promote Student Participation and Learning	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation						

Component 2.c. Assessment Cycle

2.c.1. Demonstrates Flexibility and Responsiveness to Students	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator	Course
Observation							

Lewis & Clark College

Special Education Practicum /Standards Competency Form

Candidates Name:_____ **_____**

Faculty Observer: _____ **_____**

Date(s):_____ Setting/School:_____ Authorization Level:_____

Students being recommended for the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teacher Education License must least meet basic level in all categories. Standards 1 through 10 would be reflected in each area observed and specifically as noted below.

Standard I: Foundations Candidate demonstrates evidence based principles, theories and relevant legal requirements.

Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of the Learner Candidate demonstrates respect for students and understanding of human development.

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences. Standard 4: Instructional Strategies

GSEC Component 1.a 1, 1.a.2., 1.a.3., Create an Environment of Safety and Respect

1a.1 Teacher-Student Interaction (1/1 –small group—class)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	
Observation /Description						

1.a.2. Student Interaction	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Note observed	
Observation /Description						

1.a.3. Manage Behavior (FBA/BIP)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	

Observation /Description

1.a.4. Utilize Physical Space	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	

Observation /Description

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences. Candidate demonstrates understanding of the effects of the learners' exceptional condition(s).

Standard 4: Instructional Strategies: Candidate demonstrates a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies for facilitating critical thinking, problem solving ,self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem across settings.

1.a.5. Manage SPED Process and all related Forms	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	

Observation /Description

493

Standard 5: Learning Environments & Social Interaction Candidates create & facilitate learning environments to encourage, independence, self-motivation, self-direction and self-advocacy.
Component 1.c. Establish a Culture for Learning

1.c.1. Respond to Learner's Interests and Needs (Relevance to IEP)	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	
Observation /Description						

Facilitate attention,& **support student participation [task approach, organization ,time-on-task, task completion, task evaluation]**	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not observed	
Observation Description						

Standard 6: Language Candidates demonstrate understanding of exceptional learner's language acquisition and development across language content, form and use. Component 2.b. Teaching-Learning Cycle

Shapes environments to support development of communication skills. 2.b.2. Communicate Clearly and effectively	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Not Observed	
Observation Description						

Standard 7: Instructional Planning Candidate demonstrates demonstrate individualized decision-making and individualized instruction

2.b.3. Uses a Variety of Techniques to Promote Student Participation and Learning **(Differentiated Instruction Accommodations-Modifications)**	Unsatisf actory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator
Observation /Description						

Standard 8: Assessment Candidates practice evidences multiple forms of assessment (formal and informal, formative and summative) to make educational decisions at all stages of the special education process. Data analysis is an integral program component.

Component 2.c. Assessment Cycle

2.c.1. Demonstrates Flexibility and Responsiveness to Students **(Data System & Integration)**	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	Date	Evaluator	Course
Observation/Description							

Standard 9 Professional & Ethical Practices Candidates demonstrate awareness and ongoing attention to legal matters, professional growth and ethical practices.

Standard 10 Collaboration Candidates collaborate with families, general educators, community agencies and professional outside the school setting in support of the exceptional learning needs of individuals.

Observation Description

Student:_____**Reviewer 1:**_____

Date Received_____**Reviewer 2:**_____

Instructions: Please check only one rating for each of the areas below. Indicate date of materials; sign and date review on last page, and return completed review to program director.

SPED 626: Educating Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Assigned Disability			
2. Presentation of Disability Report			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 629: Behavior Change Interventions for Students with Serious Emotional Behavioral Disorders	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
3. Functional Behavioral Analysis: Instructor's notes			

(SPED 629, continued)			
4. Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP aggressive/disruptive student): Instructor's notes			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 628: I**nterventions for Severely Challenged Students**	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
5. Summary Reflection Project and Paper			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 632: Assessment and Diagnosis	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
6. Case Study: Assessment Portfolio for Special Ed. Eligibility (standardized assessment test & report)			

(SPED 632, continued)			
7. Case Study: Curriculum-Based Assessment			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 645: Practicum I	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Log Hours			
2. Observation and Conference (filed by supervisor)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

ED 633: Curriculum and Instruction for Special Needs Students	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
8. Completed IEP Project			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 627: Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
9. Reading Outline: Detailed Description in 5 Key Areas			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 646: Practicum II	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Log Hours			
2. Observation and Conference (filed by supervisor)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 635: Current Issues in Special Education	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
10. Participation and Completion of Seminar Project			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

Reviewer 1:   **Date:**

Reviewer 2:   **Date:**

Additional Comments (optional):

Student:_____**Reviewer 1:**_____

Date Received_____**Reviewer 2:**_____

Instructions: Please check only one rating for each of the areas below. Indicate date of materials; sign and date review on last page, and return completed review to program director.

SPED 510: Educating Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Answer Manual: Procedural, Substantive, Legal; Pedagogy Analysis and Applications			
2. Instructional Paradigm: Case Study and Presentation			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 511: Behavior Change Interventions for Students with Serious Emotional Behavioral Disorders	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
3. Functional Behavioral Analysis: Instructor's notes			

(SPED 511, continued)			
4. Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP aggressive/disruptive student): Instructor's notes			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 513: Assessment and Diagnosis	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
5. Case Study: Assessment Portfolio for Special Ed. Eligibility: Survey level test(s), achievement tests, supporting criterion reference assessment			
6. Case Study: Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM): Reading or Math			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 545: Practicum I	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Log: Assessment Hours			
2. Observation /Conference Form (filed by Supervisor)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 514: Curriculum and Instruction for Special Needs Students	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
7. Curriculum Study: GE Curriculum & Standards Integration, Lesson Plan 5			
8. IEP Project and Critique Notes			

9. Facilitated IEP Meeting and Critique			

(SPED 514, continued)

Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):

SPED 516: Interventions for Severely Challenged Students: STAR and FACTER Case Study	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.

Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):

SPED 546: Practicum II	**0=Does not meet standard.** Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	**1=Proficient in standards.** All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	**2=Exceeds standards.** All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
1. Practicum Observation Form			

2. Observation and Conference (filed by supervisor)			
(SPED 546, continued)			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 517: Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.
Reading Instruction Assessment/Instruction System			
Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):			

SPED 535: Successful Completion of Summary Experience	0=Does not meet standard. Inc., or 2 C grades, or no grades. Incomplete practica, poor performance. Instructor reviews unsatisfactory.	1=Proficient in standards. All grades are B or above. Proficient in all practica reviews. Instructor reviews confirm expertise.	2=Exceeds standards. All grades A. Exceeds in all practica reviews. Instructor evaluations confirm excellence.

Further comments (reviewers, please initial and date):

Reviewer 1:_____**Date:**_____

Reviewer 2:_____**Date:**_____

Additional Comments (optional):

O=Not Acceptable	1= NNO (Necessary not observed)	2= Emerging	3=Proficient	4= Excellent	Not Observed
Does not demonstrate understanding of disabilities Does not adapt teaching to substantive requirements Does not adapt teaching to procedural requirements	Does not demonstrate teaching element required by setting circumstance/disability Provides incorrect explanation of substantive & procedural requirements	*Demonstrates* a *partial* understanding of the elements required by setting/circumstance/ disability *Does not* complete all requirements effectively Provides incomplete explanation	*Demonstrates* understanding of elements required by setting/circumstance/disability Completes *most* requirements, effectively Provides complete explanation of substantive & procedural	*Demonstrates* effective understanding of the elements required by setting/circumstance/ disability. Provides complete, research-based explanations of requirements	

Candidate's Name:_____ **Faculty Observer:** _____

Date(s):_____ **Setting/School:** _____ **Authorization Level**:_____

Students being recommended for the Special Educator Endorsement and the Continuing Teacher Education License must least meet Proficient level in all categories. Standards 1- 10 would be reflected in each area observed and specifically as noted in an area as outlined below.

Standard I: Foundations Candidate demonstrates evidence based principles, theories and relevant legal requirements.

Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of the Learner Candidate demonstrates respect for students and understanding of human development.

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences **Standard 4: Instructional Strategies**

GSEC Component 1.a 1, 1.a.2., 1.a.3., Create an Environment of Safety and Respect

1a.1 Teacher-Student Interaction (1/1 –small group—class)	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed
Observation /Description						

1.a.2. Student Interaction	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed
Observation /Description						

508

1.a.3. Manage Behavior (FBA/BIP)	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

1.a.4. Utilize Physical Space	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences. Candidate demonstrates understanding of the effects of the learners exceptional condition(s).

Standard 4: Instructional Strategies: Candidate demonstrates a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies for facilitating critical thinking, problem solving ,self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem across settings.

1.a.5. Manage SPED Process and all related Forms	0 Not acceptable	1 Necessary N. O.	2 Emerging	3 Proficient	4 Excellent	Not Observed

Observation /Description

1.c.1. Respond to Learner's Interests and Needs (Relevance to IEP)	0 **Not acceptable**	1 **Necessary N. O.**	2 **Emerging**	3 **Proficient**	4 **Excellent**	**Not Observed**
Observation /Description						

Facilitate attention, & **support student participation [task approach, organization ,time-on-task, task completion, task evaluation]**	0 **Not acceptable**	1 **Necessary N. O.**	2 **Emerging**	3 **Proficient**	4 **Excellent**	**Not Observed**
Observation Description						

Standard 6: Language Candidates demonstrate understanding of exceptional learner's language acquisition and development across language content, form and use. Component 2.b. Teaching-Learning Cycle

Shapes environments to support development of communication skills. 2.b.2. Communicate Clearly and effectively	0 **Not acceptable**	1 **Necessary N. O.**	2 **Emerging**	3 **Proficient**	4 **Excellent**	**Not Observed**
Observation Description						

Standard 7: Instructional Planning Candidate demonstrates demonstrate individualized decision-making and individualized instruction

2.b.3. Uses a Variety of Techniques to Promote Student Participation and Learning (**Differentiated Instruction Accommodations-Modifications)**	**0** **Not acceptable**	**1** **Necessary N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not Observed**	**Date**	**Evaluator**
Observation /Description								

Standard 8: Assessment Candidates practice evidences multiple forms of assessment (formal and informal, formative and summative) to make educational decisions at all stages of the special education process. Data analysis is an integral program component.

Component 2.c. Assessment Cycle

2.c.1. Demonstrates Flexibility and Responsiveness to Students (**Data System & Integration)**	**0** **Not acceptable**	**1** **Necessary N. O.**	**2** **Emerging**	**3** **Proficient**	**4** **Excellent**	**Not Observed**	**Date**	**Evaluator**	**Course**
Observation/Description									

Standard 9 Professional & Ethical Practices Candidates demonstrate awareness and ongoing attention to legal matters, professional growth and ethical practices.

Standard 10 Collaboration Candidates collaborate with families, general educators, community agencies and professional outside the school setting in support of the exceptional learning needs of individuals.

Observation Description