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Standard 1.1

1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories:

- the learner and learning;
- content;
- instructional practice; and
- professional responsibility.
Standard 5.3

5.3 ... The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.
Develop candidates’ knowledge of special education content and teaching
Identify candidates who are not progressing as expected and provide feedback and assistance in a timely manner
Assess and evaluate program for continual improvement
CAEP Suggested Assessments

- GPA – Grades
  - Subjective - Includes other criteria besides targeted objectives - Grade inflation
- Application Projects/Lesson Plans/Observations
  - Snap shot- Isolated assessments - Limited usefulness for assessing progress overtime - Limited usefulness for continual improvement
- Content Knowledge Licensure Tests Sub-scores
  - Limited usefulness for continual improvement – Does not identify candidates who have difficulty in a timely manner
Limitations for Showing Progress

- Isolated periodic data points
  - Cannot be compared to each other, measure different constructs
  - Cannot show gains in same knowledge base overtime
  - Can only answer questions about knowledge and/or skills demonstrated at the moment of assessment
Assessment Question

How do we consistently measure candidate performance overtime?

- Intervene early
- Show growth over a complete knowledge base
- Compare individual student performance to expected growth rates
- Examine for program decision-making
What we need

- An assessment that can be given repeatedly
- Assessment that measures the same knowledge base
- Can graph progress
- Calculate growth trends
- Identify discrepancies
  - Individual student growth
  - Specific populations
  - Trends in specific classes relative to others
Solution

Curriculum Based Evaluation provides the technology to answer questions regarding individual student progress, class performance, grade level performance, school performance.

Thirty years of research and implementation.

Curriculum Based Measures are used in K-12 settings. Why couldn’t they be used in higher education?
Progress Monitoring Assessments

Curriculum Based Measurement

Vocabulary Content Assessment - Acquisition of pedagogical and content knowledge
Performance Assessment – Indicators linked to rubrics of edTPA. Used consistently, across three practica
Vocabulary

- Indicator of content area knowledge and academic achievement for all ages (Saville-Troike, 1984; Laufer, 1997)
- Vocabulary knowledge positively correlated with comprehension (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012)
- Medical schools identified specific terms that indicate content knowledge and mapped across courses (Dexter, et al., 2012)
- Vocabulary as a measure of breadth of knowledge superior to measures of depth of knowledge (Read, 2000; Laufer, 2004)
Vocabulary knowledge has been found to be the largest predictor of success in content areas for middle and high school students (Espin & Deno, 1995).

Numerous studies show correlation between vocabulary matching and other measures of content knowledge ($r= .56 - .84$) for high school students (Nolet & Tindal, 1995; Busch & Espin, 2003; Espin, Busch, Shin & Kruschwitz, 2001; Espin, Shin, & Busch, 2005).
If we can do this in high school with a content area, why not with college students in a content area?
CBM sensitive to changes in instruction - parallel forms and representative of a corpus of knowledge.

Only a few data points needed to generate a trend, usually three.

Instructors can respond quickly to potential problems by changing instruction or providing supports.
Faculty selected key vocabulary terms from their courses, Tier Three Words (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2013)

- Conditions of learning, expressive language disorder, situational expectation, median, behavior

Faculty developed student-friendly definitions according to criteria (i.e., relatively short, no utilization of any part of the term, avoid technical jargon)
Faculty met to discuss terms and definitions across courses that were shared.

Assessment committee reviewed and revised list and submitted final list back to faculty for further review and revision.

Faculty met to inspect each term for importance to the program and clarity of definition.

Each faculty reviewed their terms to ensure integrity of definition.

The Corpus
Terms and definitions entered into an excel file

A total of 1,120 terms for courses across eight quarters of the program

- e.g., Introduction to Special Education; Education, Culture and Equity; Reading Instruction for Students with Disabilities; Intervention for Classroom Management; Students with Complex Needs; Special Education Law, Educational Psychology, Curriculum-Based Evaluation, Effective Teaching, Collaborations with Families, Professionals, and Communities, Interventions for Learning Problems, Behavior Assessment and Intervention
Designing the Instrument

How many pages should it be?
How many terms per page are reasonable?
Should we use distractors?
How quickly could an expert take the assessment?
How many minutes should we allow?
Do we measure both accuracy and fluency?
Should we have the definitions first or the terms first?
When and how frequently should it be administered?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Word Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a philosophical belief that events, including human behavior, follow</td>
<td>A &quot;Dead Man Rule&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certain fixed patterns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classification system for types of levels of learning</td>
<td>B Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraction whose numerator is equal to or greater than the denominator</td>
<td>C Conditions of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informal test of whether a particular event is a behavior that cannot</td>
<td>D Determinism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be achieved by an inorganic organism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interference in the production of language</td>
<td>E Expressive language disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middlemost item, center of list (not average)</td>
<td>F Improper fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overt actions and covert thoughts and feelings, both academic and social</td>
<td>G Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules and conventions associated with specific situations</td>
<td>H Pessimist viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools can do little unless the student's physical make-up or home and</td>
<td>I Reading rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social environment are altered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the speed at which a student reads a passage</td>
<td>J Situational expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Product

- Terms randomly sampled from the corpus
- New random sample for each quarter
- 100 definitions and terms
- Divided into 10 pages, 10 terms per page
- 10 Minutes for the assessment
- Every student assessed
- Assessment each quarter at mid-term
What We Should See

- Should see growth trends overtime with individuals and with cohorts
- Should predict who is at risk for failure
- Should be correlations with performance on other snapshot assessments given at key points in the program (e.g., First Block Lesson Plans, Final Block Project)
- Should show growth trends that correlate with outcomes in practica, internship, and possibly grades
- Areas of weakness in the program for continual improvement
Fall 2015

Scores
Mean
Linear (Mean)
Winter 2016

Scores
Mean
Linear (Mean)

Quarter in Program
Possible Reasons for the Pattern

- Possible reasons for dip in trend during 7th quarter
  - Students generally complete last of elementary education coursework at the end of their program.
  - Standardization procedures may not have been followed
  - Only one special education course in quarter six and only one course in quarter seven. Two quarters in a row may have limited the opportunity for focus upon special education content.
Continual Improvement

How do we promote maintenance?

Are we ensuring that SPED content is being infused throughout the program in order to maintain knowledge and generalize into other curricula?

We now have the three data points

Do we want to examine further and make changes or do we decide if the trend is acceptable?
Next Steps

- Can we look at low performers and determine how to intervene?
- Can we look at groups as to their overall performance and gain insight into what should or shouldn’t be taught?
- Can we check to see if there is a relationship between student performance on the vocabulary with other assessments such as edTPA, grades across courses, snapshot projects?
- Is it possible to establish cut scores early in the program to predict future performance?
- Is this a possible indicator as to success student teaching?
Thank you for your kind attention

Further questions contact:

Gail.coulter@wwu.edu
LeAnne.Robinson@wwu.edu