



COMMISSION ON  
TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
*Ensuring Educator Excellence*

**Academic Years 2008-2011**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>University of San Diego</b>
<b>Date report is submitted</b>	<b>September 15, 2011</b>
<b>Program documented in this report</b>	<b>Education Specialist Credential: DHH</b>
<b>Name of Program</b>	<b>University of San Diego/John Tracy Clinic DHH Graduate Program</b>
<b>Credential awarded</b>	<b>Education Specialist Credential: DHH</b>
<b>Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes</b>	
<b>If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered</b>	<p>The program is actually two blended programs offered jointly through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) USD at the John Tracy Clinic, Los Angeles campus for onsite courses, as well as,</li> <li>2) through online courses,</li> <li>3) including internship teaching placements at various school sites in California and other U. S. states</li> </ol>
<b>Program Contact</b>	<b>Steven Gelb, Ph.D., Associate Dean</b>
<b>Phone #</b>	<b>619 – 260 - 4893</b>
<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>sgelb@sandiego.edu</b>
<b>If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Mary D. McGinnis, Paula S. Krist, Ph.D.</b>
<b>Phone #</b>	<b>213 748-5481 x 225 John Tracy Clinic, 619 – 260 - 4270</b>
<b>E-mail</b>	<b>mmcinnis@jtc.org , pkrist@sandiego.edu</b>

## **OVERVIEW**

At the University of San Diego, the School of Leadership and Education Sciences offers four credential programs. K-12 multiple subjects and single subject credential candidates, and candidates in special education credential areas are within the Department of Learning and Teaching. Administration credential candidates are part of the Educational Leadership Development Academy in the Department of Leadership Studies. Candidates seeking the credential in school counseling are served by the Department of Counseling and Marriage and Family Therapy.

All of the credential programs are aligned with the overarching School of Leadership and Education Sciences conceptual framework called ACE: academic excellence, critical inquiry, reflection; community and service; and, ethics, values and diversity. The ACE themes are an integral part of the program and candidate assessment system.

All of the credential programs are administered on campus at the University of San Diego, except for the Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Credential. The DHH credential is administered at the John Tracy Clinic in Los Angeles, a facility renowned for its work with families of the deaf and hard of hearing. Although candidates are admitted to credential programs through a common process, their progress toward the credential is overseen and maintained by the appropriate department. Each program has distinct midpoint and endpoint assessments that emphasize the specialized skills appropriate to that credential area. Records are kept in each department and summarized with assistance from the Office of Assessment Support.

Because USD became part of the first cohort of universities involved in NCATE's Transformation Initiative option, the Commission changed our cohort placement from Orange to Red. Therefore, in this Biennial Report, we are presenting summaries for the past three years, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. Section B is included in each report.

This report summarizes the Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Credential program. The Appendix contains summaries of candidate data for each assessment described in SECTION A.

## SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

### PART I – Contextual Information

#### Programs Offered

The John Tracy Clinic (JTC) in Los Angeles, a renowned leader in the field of education for parents and their children with hearing loss, administers USD's California credential program for Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Candidates are admitted to USD's credential programs through a common process, but candidate progress toward the DHH credential is overseen by USD and administered and documented by John Tracy Clinic faculty and staff. The USD/JTC DHH Graduate Program has distinct beginning, midpoint, and endpoint assessments unique to the specialized knowledge, skill, and disposition sets appropriate to the California DHH Education Specialist Credential areas. Records are maintained at JTC, and summarized with the assistance of USD SOLES's office of Assessment Support.

The USD/JTC DHH Graduate Program includes two programs to maximize the available number of highly-qualified candidates for the field of deaf education. Though candidates in both programs take the same courses and have the same requirements, each program attracts a different candidate population that differs in background and goals.

The **Onsite Program** is an intensive 11-month program designed to meet the CTC Education Specialist Credential in Deaf and Hard of Hearing. The program takes place at the JTC Los Angeles campus, with the research course taken online through USD. Most Onsite candidates are new to the field of deaf education, and sometimes education in general. They receive intensive daily mentoring to attain the technical knowledge, skills, and disposition sets required.

The **Distance Learning Program** was designed to meet the requirements of the California DHH Intern Credential. This program attracts candidates who usually have a background in education, may already be credentialed, either in general education or deaf education, and may already have master's degrees. The interns may be teaching full-time in California or in any other state program that can meet the rigorous requirements of the USD/JTC Program. These requirements include the candidate's attendance at two summer residencies, an approved school placement, and an approved mentor who will spend one week at JTC during the first summer residency in the JTC Mentorship Training Program in preparation for mentoring the Distance Learning intern over the two-year program. The Distance Learners in California usually seek a California credential, while those out of state usually seek the master's degree, without the credential, since they do not intend teaching in California.

The CTC Triennial Program Review includes data from each candidate in both the Onsite and the Distance Learning programs, since they all take the same courses, whether or not they are seeking a California credential or only a master's degree. Tables reflect assessment data for all candidates on each of the Embedded Signature Assessments, while separate tables delineate the numbers of candidates and completers who apply for the California DHH credential.

The USD/JTC DHH Graduate Program is aligned with the standards for all its accrediting bodies, including the Council on Exceptional Children (CEC, which is the special education

NCATE SPA), INTASC standards, CTC state TPEs, and WASC, as well as the USD ACE themes.

**Program Model**

The USD/JTC DHH Graduate Program is based on a *Professional Development School Model*, where graduate candidates are immersed in the evidence-based practices of the programs at John Tracy Clinic, including fieldwork and practicum experiences in services for parent-infant, preschool, auditory-verbal therapy, speech/language assessments, occupational therapy screening and treatment, parent counseling, audiological assessment, device fitting, testing, and troubleshooting, parent education classes and parent support groups, sibling program, the International Summer Session (English) and the International Summer Session in Spanish (offered in Spanish).

Key elements of the USD/JTC DHH Graduate Program include 1) 16 graduate-level courses/44 units, 2) a cohort model of collaborative support for both the Onsite Program and the Distance Learning Program, 3) full-time, intensive courses integrated with extended practica, with high-quality, daily, individual mentoring in the Onsite Program, 4) coursework concurrent with supervised practica linking theory to practice, 5) one-year Onsite program (1 course on WebCT), combining best-practice curricula and practica, 6) two-year Distance Learning Program with two summer residencies and extended practica at JTC, and mentoring at the home school site, 7) online courses taught by world-renowned faculty for the Distance Learning Program, 8) state-of-the-art professional education facilities with the latest instructional technology, 9) practica in a state-of-the-art family-centered early intervention and early childhood DHH center with state-of-the-art audiological and consultation facilities, 10) fieldwork and practicum experiences through the range of California’s DHH credential areas with high-need children and diverse families through JTC’s programs, as well as through JTC’s long-standing partnerships with local district programs and national programs.

<b>Program Specific Credential Information: Education Specialist: DHH</b>			
<b>Numbers of Credential Candidates and Completers Reported: 2008-2011</b>			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Candidates</b>	<b>Completers</b>
2008-2009	Onsite	7	7
2008-2010	Distance Learning	2	2
2009-2010	Onsite	7	5
2009-2011	Distance Learning	1	0
2010-2011	Onsite	3	1
<b>Totals</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>

<b>Changes Since CTC Approval of Current Program Document</b>	
<b>2008</b>	
Summer 2008	Due to feedback from previous graduate candidates and mentors in the Distance Learning Program, the JTC Mentorship Training Program was created to help mentors for Distance Learners/Interns with their mentoring philosophy and skills. As at the beginning of the program, mentors continued to be flown out and housed with their Distance Learning graduate candidates at JTC's expense.
Summer 2008	A textbook was adopted for the JTC Mentorship Training Program: Zachary, J. (2000). <i>The Mentor's Guide: Facilitating Effective Learning Relationships</i> . Jossey-Bass Publishing.
Summer 2008	As a condition of acceptance into the Distance Learning Program, mentors, who had previously been encouraged to spend time at JTC for Distance Learners/Interns, were required to spend 3 days at JTC in the new Mentorship Training Program during their graduate candidate's first summer residency.
<b>2009</b>	
Summer 2009	Distance Learning mentors who had spent the required 3 days at the JTC Mentorship Training Program had provided feedback that they would like more time to spend at JTC. The JTC Mentorship Training Program residency requirement was increased to require one week in the program.
Summer 2009	Mentors who had replaced mentors who had left the Distance Learner's schools were invited to spend the second summer at JTC to get to know the mentoring process.
Summer 2009	A weakness was found in the Thematic Unit assessment for the Onsite candidates, who usually do not have the educational background that the Distance Learners have. The site of EDSP 560 DHH: Elementary Curricula class was changed so that it was held on the campus of a Los Angeles Unified School District, where the adjunct faculty is a supervisor/teacher. The candidates would then get more hands-on experience with elementary-level children while they are creating the thematic unit. The candidates spend time observing, assessing, and teaching, so that the concepts are more concrete for them by the time they create their thematic unit.
<b>2010</b>	
Spring 2010	Candidate dispositions became an issue worth documenting carefully. The <i>JTC Dispositions Evaluation</i> was created, tested, and implemented over the next year (2010-2011). The <i>JTC Dispositions Evaluation</i> became the basis for USD SOLES' Disposition Evaluation, to be instituted online for all SOLES PEU programs beginning Summer 2011.
Summer 2010	To document all of their teaching events, all graduate candidates entering for 2010 were required to purchase Flip-type video cameras so they could be responsible for their own documentation and analysis. Video files were also to be uploaded to a JTC server for accreditation reviews.
Summer 2010	Riverside County Office of Education (RCOE) and JTC formed a partnership to bring high-quality education to DHH students in Riverside. Because there was no appropriate mentor for the two Distance Learning candidates from RCOE, a contract was negotiated whereby JTC would procure an appropriate mentor who

	would work with both interns at least weekly throughout the two-year program, while RCOE would undertake the costs of the mentor. The administrator of the DHH program came to the JTC Mentorship Training Program to learn what was required. The first year of the RCOE/JTC (Summer 2010-Spring 2011) was an overwhelming success, as attested to by the two interns, the administrator, and the mentor.
Summer 2010	A weakness was found in the Thematic Unit assessment for the Onsite candidates, who usually do not have the educational background that the Distance Learners have. The site of EDSP 560 DHH: Elementary Curricula class was changed so that it was held on the campus of a Los Angeles Unified School District, where the adjunct faculty is a supervisor/teacher. The candidates would then get more hands-on experience with elementary-level children while they are creating the thematic unit. The candidates spend time observing, assessing, and teaching students, so that the concepts are more concrete for them by the time they create their thematic unit.
<b>2011</b>	
Spring 2011	Because of advances in distance learning technologies, the Distance Learning application program agreement was modified to indicate that distance learning technologies could be used for mentoring 3 of the required 4 times per month, but face-to-face mentoring must occur at least once a month.
Spring 2011	Due to some candidates' difficulties with technical audiological testing, JTC now offers free tutoring for graduate candidates offered by one of the JTC audiologists.
Spring 2011	Due to some candidates' difficulties with technical audiological testing, audiology observation hours were added to the summer term for both Onsite and Distance Learners.
Spring 2011	Analysis of portfolios over time indicated even some good candidates whose artifacts showed exceptional depth were producing formulaic, lack-luster portfolios. Moreover, despite how portfolio management had been blended into the program, some candidates were taking an inordinate time to finish portfolios. Since all candidates do several teaching events over the program already, a capstone reflection/rubric was proposed in lieu of the portfolio, and will be implemented with the 2011 cohort.
Spring 2011	Onsite graduate candidates have expressed shock and dismay over the lack of quality teaching that they see during their experiences in public schools, particularly during their general education week in a mainstream class. Arrangements will be made to have faculty who teach in the public schools do a seminar on the demands of teachers in public schools.
Summer 2011	It was noted that the titles of two courses do not accurately reflect their content. The titles of <i>EDSP 560 Elementary Curricula</i> and <i>EDSP 560P Elementary Practicum</i> will be changed to reflect fieldwork at levels reflecting the California credential areas covered (birth-22).

## SECTION A—CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

### PART II—Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

### PART III – Analyses of Candidate and Program Data

#### Description of Primary Candidate Assessments

Type of Assessment	Name of Assessment	Type/Form of Assessment	When Assessment is Administered
<b>Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment</b>	Ling Listening and Spoken Language Project	Essay/Power Point Project on DHH Content Knowledge	<b>EDSP 557</b> <b>DHH: Auditory-Verbal Therapy Principles</b> Spring Term prior to EDSP 557P Auditory-Verbal Practicum
<b>Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in special education</b>	Personal Pedagogy of Practice Narrative	Research- & Practice-Grounded Benchmark Assignment	<b>EDUC 500</b> <b>Research Design</b> Spring Term before elementary student teaching; part of decision to recommend for Preliminary Education Specialist Credential
<b>Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction</b>	Elementary Level Thematic Unit Plan	Comprehensive project with individualized goals in core academic areas & special education pedagogy, instruction, & assessment	<b>EDSP 559/EDSP 560</b> <b>DHH: Elementary Curricula</b> Prior to or concurrent with elementary student teaching
<b>Assessment #4: Assessment of student teaching</b>	Analysis of Early Childhood Practicum Teaching Event, using <i>Auditory-Verbal Educator Teaching Behaviors Checklist</i>	Analysis of Teaching Event, Checklist of Competencies	<b>EDSP 594P/558P</b> <b>DHH: Early Childhood Practicum</b> At end of preschool student teaching, before elementary school student teaching
<b>Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning</b>	Analysis of Teaching Event, using <i>Auditory-Verbal Teaching Behaviors Checklist</i>	Analysis of Teaching Event & Analysis of Student Learning, Checklist of Competencies	<b>EDSP 593P/557P</b> <b>DHH: Auditory-Verbal Practicum</b> Prior to elementary student teaching Half-way through Program
<b>Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses CED standards</b>	Analysis of Early Intervention Practicum Teaching Event	Rubric for Early Intervention Practicum	<b>EDSP 550F/EDSP 552P</b> <b>DHH: Early Intervention Practicum</b> Onsite: Fall term Distance Learners: 1 <sup>st</sup> Summer Residency

## Assessment 1-Ling Listening and Spoken Language Inservice Project

### A. Description of Assessment:

The *Ling Listening and Spoken Language Inservice Project* is a culmination of the technical knowledge, skills, and dispositions reflective of the Listening and Spoken Language philosophy of the JTC/USD DHH Graduate Program as it aligns with the content knowledge and skills identified in the CTC and CEC education specialist standards. Coming mid-point through the program, it reflects the candidate's growing knowledge of the specialized techniques required in the profession. As an inservice module, it prepares a candidate to become a *teacher-leader*, building the expectation in the candidate that the *teacher-leader* will lead others with special knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

### B. Assessment Alignment with Standards:

Assessment Component	CEC Standards		CTC Standards	
	CEC Content Standard	CEC DHH Standard	DHH	TPE
1. Evidence-Based Principles of Practice in Listening and Spoken Language Approach	1-Foundations 9-Professional & Ethical Practice	ICC1K1, ICC1K3, ICC1K4, ICC1K5, ICC1K6, ICC1K7, ICC1K8, ICC1K9, ICC1K10, ICC1S1, DHH1K3, DHH1K4, DHH1S1,	1	1, 12, 13
2. Learning Environment that Facilitates Listening and Spoken Language	5-Learning Environment & Social Interaction 7-Instructional Planning	ICC5K1, ICC5K3, ICC5K4, DHH5K1, ICC5S2, ICC5S3, ICC5S4, ICC5S5, ICC5S8, ICC5S9, ICC5S12, DHH5S2, DHH5S4, CHH5S5	4	10, 11
3. Assessment for Listening and Spoken Language	8-Assessment 2-Development of Characteristics of Learners 3-Individual Differences	ICC8K1, ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K4, DHH8K1	5, 1, 8	2, 3
4. Instructional Strategies for Listening and Spoken Language	4-Instructional Strategies 6-Language	ICC4K1, ICC4S3, ICC4S4, ICC4S5, DHH4S1, DHH4S3	6	1A, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

### C. Analysis of Data:

Data reported for the *Ling Listening and Spoken Language Inservice Project* here is from the 2008-2010 Level I Education Specialist Credential program *Philosophy of Education* assignment that is transitioning to the new special education content knowledge assignment. Between 2008-2010, both distance and onsite JTC graduate candidates performed at the acceptable (2) or meets (3) level of performance. On competencies 1 through 4, all candidates achieved ratings of acceptable through exceeds. It is clear that the typical candidates in the Distance Learning program, who are often seasoned teachers, achieve higher ratings overall than the Onsite candidates, who tend to be new to the field of deaf education. (See Appendix A for detailed candidate data.)

### D. Interpretation of How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards:

The *Ling Listening and Spoken Language Inservice Project* has been part of the midpoint evaluation since the DHH Program's CTC accreditation in 2005, when the program began. Candidates tend to present lower scores in the Instructional Strategies for Listening and Spoken Language. This is due to the heavy emphasis on Learning Environment that Facilitates Listening and Spoken Language, and on Assessment for Listening and Spoken Language in EDSP 557. Although candidates are familiar with the theories of the Instructional Strategies for Listening and Spoken Language, they have not had much time to practice them, so they remain a bit



theoretical to the candidates. This weakness is rectified once the candidates student teach in EDSP 557P DHH: Auditory-Verbal Practicum, when the theories become part of their practice.

## Assessment 2 - Personal Pedagogy of Practice

### A. Description of Assessment:

The *Personal Pedagogy of Practice* is a reflective articulation of inquiry into understanding the content knowledge and skills identified in the CTC and CEC education specialist standards. Using an action research focus, the assignment aligns with the USD emphasis on the student-as-researcher with a global social justice perspective.

### B. Assessment Alignment with Standards

Assessment Component	CEC Standards		CTC Standards	
	CEC Content Standard	CEC DHH Standard	DHH	TPE
1. Articulation of Personal Ethical Standards of Practice (SOLES ACE & CEC)	9-Professional & Ethical Practice	ICC9K1, ICC9S1, ICC9S3, ICC9S5, ICC9S6, DHH1K2, DHH1K4	2	4, 12, 13
2. Strategic Planning & Assessment of Emerging Needs Within Diverse Community of Learners	2- Characteristics of Learners 3-Ind. Lrn Differences 8 Assessment	ICC2K2, ICC2K3, ICC2K4, ICC3K2, ICC3K4, ICC3K5, ICC8S3, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, DHH1S1, DHH8K1	1, 5, 7, 8	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9
3. Education Specialist as Communicator, Collaborator, Case Manager & Co-Teacher	6-Communication 7-Instruct Planning 10-Collaboration	ICC6K2, ICC6K3, ICC6K4, IGC6K2, ICC7S2, ICC7S3, ICC10K1, ICC20K2, ICC10K3, ICC10K4, DHH10K1, DHH10S1	3, 4, 11	5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13
4. Global Perspective of Philosophical Foundations of Education	1-Foundations 6-Communication	ICC1K1, ICC1K4, ICC9K7, ICC1K8, ICC9K9, ICC1K10, ICC1S1, ICC6S2, DHH9K1, DHH9K2, DHH9K3	3, 4	1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9
5. Learning Environment Structure, Organization, Management & Delivery of Grade Appropriate Content	5-Lrn Environment Social Interactions 7-Instruct Planning	ICC5K1, ICC5K2, ICC5K3, ICC5K4, ICC5K5, ICC5K6, ICC5K8, ICC5S1, ICC5S2, ICC5S3, ICC5S4, ICC5S5, ICC5S6, ICC5S7, ICC5S8, ICC5S9, ICC5S10, ICC5S11, ICC5S12, ICC5S13, ICC5S14, ICC5S15, ICC5S16, ICC7S7, ICC7S11, ICC7S14, DHH5K1	6, 7, 8, 9, 10	2, 3, 8, 9, 10
6. Research Validated Theories of Practice – CSTP Domain 6 Develop as a Professional Educator Candidate as M.ED Research Scholar	1-Foundations 9-Professional & Ethical Practice	ICC1K1, ICC9K3, ICC9K4, IGC9K2, ICC9S11, DHH6K1, DHH6K2, DHH6K3, DHH6K4, DKHH6K5, DHH7K1	2, 4,	1, 12, 13

### C. Analysis of Data:

Evaluation data for the *Personal Pedagogy of Practice* assignment described here will not be available until the new summer 2010 preliminary Education Specialist Credential candidates complete their spring 2011 courses. Data reported here is from the 2008-2010 Level I Education Specialist Credential program *Philosophy of Education* assignment that is transitioning to the new special education content knowledge assignment. Between 2008-2010, both distance and onsite JTC graduate candidates performed at the acceptable (2) or meets (3) level of performance. On competency 1-personal ethics & 6-foundations, the ratio of meets to acceptable is evenly distributed. On competencies 2-classroom diversity, 3-collaboration & case manager, 4-global foundations, 5-management roles and student behavior, the meets classification ranges from 56%-67%. These same categories show an average of 33% at meets & 67% acceptable in 2010. This is due to increased expectations for these categories as alignment with the new Preliminary Education Specialist credentials were unfolded by CTC. (See Appendix C for detailed candidate data.)

#### **D. Interpretation of How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards:**

The *Philosophy of Education* assignment has been part of the exit criteria from student teaching since our 2004 CEC recognition. Candidates are strongest in the content knowledge areas of foundations, instructional needs identification and differentiated instruction strategies. Engagement with other professionals, parents and individuals from diverse backgrounds showed candidates were knowledgeable, but further need for field application of theory is warranted. As the concepts of co-teaching, collaboration and differentiated instruction for students with special needs and English learners is increasing across California, our candidates demonstrate a good knowledge and abilities base in these areas. This data, combined with candidate exit interviews and dialog with university & district field supervisors informed the new *Pedagogy of Practice*.

### **Assessment 3 - Thematic Unit for Elementary Curriculum**

#### **A. Description of Assessment:**

The *Thematic Unit for Elementary Curriculum Rubric*, created in EDSP 559 DHH: Elementary Curricula, is the culminating final project demonstrating the technical knowledge and skills necessary for curriculum presentation and adaptations for elementary-age students who are deaf and hard of hearing, as well as dispositions reflective of the Listening and Spoken Language philosophy of the JTC/USD DHH Graduate Program as it aligns with the content knowledge and skills identified in the CTC and CEC education specialist standards. Coming at the end of the program, but prior to or co-requisite with elementary student teaching, it reflects the candidate's growing knowledge of the specialized knowledge and techniques required in the profession. The *Thematic Unit for Elementary Curriculum* prepares a candidate to become a *teacher-leader*, building the expectation to the candidate that the *teacher-leader* will lead others with special knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

## B. Assessment Alignment with Standards

Assessment Component	CEC Standards		CTC Standards	
	CEC Content Standard	CEC DHH Standard	DHH	TPEs
<b>1. Literature-Based Theme</b> Choice of theme, information on central literature, vocabulary lists with contexts, vocabulary activities, ELL considerations.	1. Foundations 2. Characteristics of Learners 3. Individual Differences 4. Instructional Strategies	ICC1K1, ICC1K10, ICC2K2, ICC2K5, ICC2K6, ICC3K2, ICC3K4, ICC3K5, ICC4S3, ICC4S5, , ICC5K1, ICC5K2, ICC5K3, ICC5K8, ICC5S1, ICC5S4, ICC5S6, ICC5S7, ICC5S12, ICC5S13, ICC6K1, ICC6S1, ICC6S2, ICC7K1, ICC7K2, ICC7K3, ICC7K4, ICC7S1, ICC7S2, ICC7S4, ICC7S5, ICC7S6, ICC7S7, ICC7S10, ICC7S11, ICC7S12, ICC7S13, ICC7S15,  DHH1K3, DHH3K1, DHH3K2 D&HH4K1, D&HH4S2, D&HH4S3, D&HH4S4, D&HH5S2, D&HH5S4, D&HH5S5, D&HH6K1, D&HH6K5, D&HH6S1, D&HH6S2, D&HH6S3, D&HH6S5, D&HH7S1, D&HH7S2, D&HH7S3, D&HH7S4, D&HH8K1	1, 2, 3, 4	3, 4
<b>2. Lesson Plans Aligned with State Frameworks &amp; Standards</b> Objectives, standards, language goals, auditory goals, speech goals, procedure, scripts, questions, follow-up activities, assessment of learning	2. Characteristics of Learners 3. Individual Differences 4. Instructional Strategies 6. Language 7. Instructional Planning 8. Assessment	ICC1K1, ICC1K10, ICC2K2, ICC2K5, ICC2K6, ICC3K2, ICC3K4, ICC3K5, ICC4S3, ICC4S5, , ICC5K1, ICC5K2, ICC5K3, ICC5K8, ICC5S1, ICC5S4, ICC5S6, ICC5S7, ICC5S12, ICC5S13, ICC6K1, ICC6S1, ICC6S2, ICC7K1, ICC7K2, ICC7K3, ICC7K4, ICC7S1, ICC7S2, ICC7S4, ICC7S5, ICC7S6, ICC7S7, ICC7S10, ICC7S11, ICC7S12, ICC7S13, ICC7S15, ICC8K1, ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S8,  DHH1K3, DHH3K1, DHH3K2 D&HH4K1, D&HH4S2, D&HH4S3, D&HH4S4, D&HH5S2, D&HH5S4, D&HH5S5, D&HH6K1, D&HH6K5, D&HH6S1, D&HH6S2, D&HH6S3, D&HH6S5, D&HH7S1, D&HH7S2, D&HH7S3, D&HH7S4, D&HH8K1, D&HH8S2, D&HH8S3,	1,4, 5, 6, 9,	1, 2, 3, 10, 11
<b>3. Integration with Core Curriculum Areas Integration</b> with curriculum, included social studies, science, math, art, music, literacy activities	3. Individual Differences 4. Instructional Strategies 7. Instructional Planning 9-Prof & Ethical Practice	ICC8K1, ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K4, ICC9K1, ICC9K2, ICC9S7, ICC9S8, ICC9S9, ICC9S11, ICC9S13, ICC10k1, ICC10K4, ICC10S8, ICC10s10  DHH8K1, D&HH10S1	2, 3, 5, 1, 8, 7	1, 4, 5, 6A, 7
<b>4. Instructional Planning</b> Planning logistics, sequence of lessons, amount of time planned for each, possibilities for lessons as enrichment or review or assessment	4-Instruct Strategies 7 Instruct Plan 10-Collaboration 5. Learning Environments & Social Interactions 8. Assessment	ICC4K1, ICC4S3, ICC4S4, ICC4S5, DHH4S1, ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S8,  DHH4S3, D&HH8K1, D&HH8S2, D&HH8S3,	1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11	1A, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11

### **C. Analysis of Data:**

Data reported here for the *Thematic Unit for Elementary Curriculum Rubric* is from the 2008-2010 Level I Education Specialist Credential program. Between 2008-2010, both distance and onsite JTC graduate candidates perform at the target (3) or exceeds (4) level of performance. On components 1 through 4, all candidates achieved ratings of target through exceeds. 89% of the 2008 cohort scored at the exceeds level and 11% scored at the target level. In the 2009 cohort, 82% of the candidates scored at the exceeds level and 18% of the candidates scored at the target level. In the 2010 cohort, 77% of the candidates scored at the exceeds level and 23% scored at the target level. On competency one, choice of theme, supporting information and ELL strategies, 92 % of all candidates scored at the exceeds level. On competence number two, creating 10 complete lesson plans, 84% of all candidates scored at the exceeds level. One competency number 3, integration of all aspects of the curriculum, 83% of all candidates scored at the exceeds level. On competency number 4, planning logistics and use of time, 88% of all candidates scored at the exceeds level. (See Appendix A for detailed candidate data.)

### **D. Interpretation of How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards:**

The *Thematic Unit for Elementary Curriculum Rubric* has been part of the midpoint evaluation since the DHH Program's CTC accreditation in 2005, when the program began. Candidates tend to present lower scores in the Integration of the Curriculum (#1) competency because this competency requires broad and deep knowledge of how to find opportunities in the various domains for the application of auditory, language, speech, and cognitive development principles. Although candidates are familiar with the principles of an integrated curriculum, they have not had much time to apply them, so the issues remain a bit abstract to the candidates. This weakness is rectified once the candidates student teach in EDSP 595P/560P DHH: Elementary Practicum, where the theories become part of their practice. A change in the new program, however, has been made, so that candidates get more hands-on experience with elementary-level children while they are creating the thematic unit. The Onsite candidates, often new to education, are now spending fieldwork hours in elementary-level classrooms during EDSP 560, in which this assignment is done. The candidates spend time observing, assessing, and teaching students, so that the concepts are more concrete for them by the time they create their unit.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment 4-Analysis of Early Childhood Practicum Teaching Event Auditory-Verbal Education Teaching Behaviors Checklist (EDSP 594P/558P)</b></p>
---

### **A. Description of Assessment:**

The *Auditory-Verbal Education Teaching Behaviors Checklist* is an assessment created by the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, an international licensing organization for professionals in the field of education of children who are deaf and hard of hearing. The AG Bell Association uses the checklist in the licensing process for Listening and Spoken Language Specialist, Certified Auditory-Verbal Educators (LSLS, Cert AV-Ed), an internationally recognized professional certification. The checklist evaluates the candidate's skills in developing listening and spoken language, classroom management, lesson planning and presentation. Effective Spring 2011, the USD/JTC DHH Program added a section on professional dispositions and a rubric scale using 100 points to a failing grade of less than 70 points. The data for this assessment will not be available until the candidates complete their

Spring 2011 courses. The checklist evaluates a candidate's understanding of the content knowledge and skills identified in the CTC and CEC education specialist standards.

### B. Assessment Alignment with Standards

Assessment Component	CEC Standards		CTC Standards	
	CEC Content Standard	CEC DHH Standard	DHH	TPEs
1. Teaching Behaviors that support Listening and Spoken Language  CSTP 3: Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students  CSTP 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning	6-Language 8-Assessment 2-Development and Characteristics of Learners 3-Individual Differences	ICC1K1, ICC2K2, ICC2K3, ICC2K5, ICC2K6, ICC3K1, ICC3K4, ICC3K5, ICC4K1, ICC5K8, ICC6K2, ICC6S1, ICC6S2, ICC8S5, ICC8S8, ICC9S6  D&HH 1K3, D&HH2K1, D&HH3K2, D&HH4S1, D&HH4S2, D&HH4S3, D&HH5S2, D&HH5S5, D&HH6K1, D&HH6K2, D&HH6K3, D&HH6K4, D&HH6K5, D&HH6S2, D&HH6S3, D&HH6S4, D&HH6S5, D&HH7S3, D&HH8S3	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 2
2. Teaching Behaviors that support Auditory Skills Development in the DHH Classroom  CSTP B: Assessing Student Learning	2-Development and Characteristics of Learners 3-Individual Differences 4-Instructional Strategies 5-Learning Environments/Social Interactions 6-Language 8-Assessment	ICC1K1, ICC2K2, ICC2K4, ICC3K1, ICC4K1, ICC4S3, ICC4S4, ICC4S5, ICC5K3, ICC5S1, ICC5S3, ICC5S9, ICC6K1, ICC6K2, ICC6K3, ICC6K4, ICC6K5, ICC7K1, ICC7K2, ICC7S3, ICC7S9, ICC7S10, ICC7S11, ICC7S12, ICC7S13, ICC8S1, ICC9S5, ICC9S7, ICC9S11,  D&HH1K3, D&HH4K1, D&HH4S1, D&HH5S2, D&HH6S1, D&HH6S2, D&HH6S3, ICC6S4, ICC6S5, D&HH7K1, D&HH7S1, D&HH8K1, D&HH9S1	1,3,4,5, 6,7,8	8, 9, 2, 3, 10, 4, 5
3. Teaching Behaviors that support Management of a Special Day Class for DHH Learners  CSTP 1: Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning	5-Learning Environments/Social Interactions 2-Development and Characteristics of Learners 3-Individual Differences 9-Professional and Ethical Practice 10-Collaboration	ICC1K10, ICC2K1, ICC2K3, ICC2K4, ICC3K3, ICC3k4, ICC4S4, ICC4S5, ICC5K1, ICC5K2, ICC5K3, ICC5K4, ICC5K5, ICC5K6, ICC5K7, ICC5K8, ICC5K9, ICC5S1, ICC5S2, ICC5S3, ICC5S4, ICC5S5, ICC5S8, ICC5S9, ICC5S10, ICC5S11, ICC5S12, ICC5S13, ICC5S15, ICC6K3, ICC6S1, ICC6S2, ICC7K4, ICC7K5, ICC7S7, ICC7S10, ICC7S11, ICC7S12, ICC7S13, ICC7S14, ICC9K1, ICC9K2, ICC10K2, ICC10S3, ICC10S9, ICC10S10  D&HH3K1, D&HH3K2, D&HH5K1, D&HH5S2, D&HH5S4, D&HH5S5, D&HH6K1, D&HH6K2, D&HH6K3, D&HH6K4, D&HH6K5, D&HH6S1, D&HH6S2, D&HH6S3, D&HH6S3, D&HH6S4, D&HH6S5, D&HH7K1, D&HH7S1, D&HH7S3, D&HH9K1, D&HH9K6, D&HH9K7, D&HH9K8, D*HH9K11	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
4. Teaching Behaviors that support Lesson Planning for the DHH Classroom.  CSTP 4. Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students	7-Instructional Planning 4-Instructional Strategies 8-Assessment 2-Development and Characteristics of Learners 3-Individual Differences	ICC1K10, ICC2K1, ICC2K3, ICC2K4, ICC3K3, ICC3k4, ICC4S4, ICC4S5, ICC5K1, ICC5K2, ICC5K3, ICC5K4, ICC5K5, ICC5K6, ICC5K7, ICC5K8, ICC5K9, ICC5S1, ICC5S2, ICC5S3, ICC5S4, ICC5S5, ICC5S8, ICC5S9, ICC5S10, ICC5S11, ICC5S12, ICC5S13, ICC5S15, ICC6K3, ICC6S1, ICC6S2, ICC7K4, ICC7K5, ICC7S7, ICC7S10, ICC7S11, ICC7S12, ICC7S13, ICC7S14, ICC9K1, ICC9K2, ICC10K2, ICC10S3, ICC10S9, ICC10S10  D&HH3K1, D&HH3K2, D&HH5K1, D&HH5S2, D&HH5S4, D&HH5S5, D&HH6K1, D&HH6K2, D&HH6K3, D&HH6K4, D&HH6K5, D&HH6S1, D&HH6S2, D&HH6S3, D&HH6S3, D&HH6S4, D&HH6S5, D&HH7K1, D&HH7S1, D&HH7S3, D&HH9K1, D&HH9K6, D&HH9K7, D&HH9K8, D&HH9K11	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
5. Teaching Behaviors that support Professional Dispositions  CSTP 6: Developing as a Professional Educator	1-Foundations 3-Individual Differences 6 Language 9-Professional and Ethical Practice	ICC1K4, ICC1K7, ICC1K9, ICC1K10, ICC2K3, ICC2K4, ICC3K1, ICC3K3, ICC3K4, ICC5K4, ICC5K7, ICC5K8, ICC5S1, ICC6K1, ICC6K2, ICC5K3, ICC7S3, ICC7S8, ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S8, ICC9K2, ICC9S1, ICC9S2, ICC9S5, ICC9S6, ICC9S7, ICC9S8, ICC9S9, ICC9S10, ICC9S11, ICC9S12, ICC9S13, ICC10K2, ICC10K3, ICC10K4, ICC10S1, ICC10S2, ICC10S3, ICC10S10  D&HH5K1, D&HH9S1, D&HH10S1	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11	5, 6, 7, 11, 8, 2, 12, 13

### **C. Analysis of Data:**

Data reported here is from the 2008-2010 Level I Education Specialist Credential candidates who were evaluated on the *Auditory-Verbal Educator Teaching Behaviors Checklist*. Both distance and onsite JTC graduate candidates for the cohorts of 2008, 2009, and 2010 performed at the acceptable (2) or meets (3) level of performance. The Education Specialist Credential candidates from both cohorts who graduated in 2010 received an average score of 3.7 for the Listening and Spoken Language competencies, an average score of 3.7 on Auditory Skill Development competencies, average score of 3.3 on the Classroom Management competencies, and an average score of 3.8 on Lesson Planning and Presentation competencies. The range of scores in these competencies was from 2.8 - 4.0. The same categories show that 93% of the candidates' scores were between 3 and 4. The candidates who graduated in the 2009 cohorts received an average score of 3.8 for the Listening and Spoken Language competencies, an average score of 3.8 on Auditory Skill Development competencies, average score of 3.7 on the Classroom Management competencies, and an average score of 3.9 on Lesson Planning and Presentation competencies. The range of scores in these competencies was from 2.9 - 4.0. The same categories show that 95% of the candidates' scores were between 3 and 4. The candidates who graduated in the 2008 cohorts received an average score of 3.9 for the Listening and Spoken Language competencies, an average score of 3.9 on Auditory Skill Development competencies, average score of 3.7 on the Classroom Management competencies, and an average score of 3.8 on Lesson Planning and Presentation competencies. The range of scores in these competencies was from 2.9 - 4.0. The same categories show that 96% of the candidates' scores were between 3 and 4. (See Appendix A for detailed candidate data.)

### **D. Interpretation of How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards:**

The *Auditory-Verbal Educator Teaching Behaviors Checklist* has been part of the exit criteria from student teaching since our 2004 CEC recognition. Candidates are strongest in the content knowledge areas of listening and spoken language development, child development, instructional needs identification and differentiated instruction strategies. Engagement with other professionals, parents and individuals from diverse backgrounds showed candidates were knowledgeable but further need for field application of theory is warranted. As the concepts of listening and spoken language development and auditory skills development are added to the requirements for professionals who are providing services to children who are deaf and hard of hearing, our candidates demonstrate a good knowledge and abilities base in these areas as well as the skills needed for effective classroom management and lesson planning. The on-going need to standardize and fine tune the scoring of the candidates on the checklist prompted the change from a scale of 4-3-2-1 to a scale of 100-70 points in 2011. Interest expressed by master teachers and instructors/supervisors in evaluating professional dispositions resulted in the creation of one additional item to be evaluated ("Professional Dispositions: Deals honestly, sincerely, warmly, sensitively and respectfully with diversity in parents, caregivers, children and colleagues.") and informed the *Auditory-Verbal Educator Teaching Behaviors Checklist* which will be used to assess the skills of future candidates. On the evaluation of their first experience as preschool lead teacher, several candidates in the 2010 cohort scored below the expectations of the faculty, which was surprising, based on their prior performance in the program. A change for the 2011 cohort provided candidates a series of informal, ungraded opportunities to lead the class with the master teacher's support. This allowed them to become more familiar with, and consequently to be less stressed in their graded lessons to perform better.

## Assessment 5 - Analysis of Auditory-Verbal Practice Teaching Event

### A. Description of Assessment:

The *Analysis of Auditory-Verbal Practice Teaching Event* is a reflective evaluation on the culmination of 30 practicum hours providing auditory-verbal therapy to families of children with hearing loss in **EDSP 557P DHH: Auditory-Verbal Practicum**. The assessment consists of a videotape of the one of the candidate's sessions with a family and their child, an accompanying lesson plan, with completed evaluations of effects on caregiver/child learning, a self-evaluation based on the A. G. Bell Academy for Listening and Spoken Language *Auditory-Verbal Teaching Behavior Checklist*, and a self-evaluation essay relating to the knowledge and skills identified in the CTC and CEC education specialist standards.

### B. Assessment Alignment with Standards

Auditory-Verbal Therapy Teaching Competency Assessment Component	CEC Standards		CTC Standards	
	CEC Content Standard	CEC Initial Special Education Standard	DHH	TPEs
<b>1. Planning of Therapy Program</b>  <u>CTSP</u> 4-Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students 1- Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning	2-Development & Learner Characteristics 3-Individual Differences 7-Instructional Planning	ICC2K1, ICC2K2, ICC2K5, ICC2K6, DHH2K1, DHH2K2, ICC3K1, ICC3K2, ICC4K1, ICC4S3, DHH4S4, ICC5K2, ICC5K3, ICC5S4, ICC5S5, ICC7S10, ICC7S11, ICC7S12, ICC7S13, DHH7S2, ICC9S1, ICC9S2, ICC9S9, ICC9S11, ICC9S13	1, 2, 5, 7, 8	1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11
<b>2. Instructional Presentation</b> (Audition, Speech/Language, Communication)  <u>CSTP</u> 3-Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning	2- Learner Characteristics 4-Instructional Strategies 5-Learning Environment & Social Interactions 6-Language 8-Assessment	DHH4K1, ICC4S1, ICC4S2, ICC4S4, ICC4S5, ICC4S6, DHH4S1, DHH4S3, ICC5K1, ICC5S6, DHH5S4, DHH5S5, ICC6K1, ICC5K2, ICC6K3, DHH6K1, DHH6K2, DHH6K3, DHH6K4, DHH6K5, ICC6S1, ICC6S2, DHH6S1, DHH6S2, DHH6S3, DHH6S4, DHH6S5, ICC7S4, ICC7S5, ICC7S6, ICC7S9, ICC7S15, DHH7S1, ICC8K1, ICC8K3, DHH8K1, ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8, ICC8S9, DHH8S1, DHH8S2, DHH8S3, ICC9S8	4, 5, 6	2, 3
<b>3. Parent Guidance and Education</b>  <u>CTSP</u> 2-Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning 5-Assessing Students for Learning	10-Collaboration	ICC2K3, ICC2K4, ICC3K3, ICC3K4, ICC3K5, CHH3K2, ICC5K4, ICC5K5, ICC5K8, ICC5K9, ICC5K10, ICC5S1, ICC5S2, ICC5S3, ICC5S7, ICC5S8, ICC5S9, ICC5S10, ICC5S11, ICC5S12, ICC5S14, DHH5S2, DHH5S3, ICC7S2, ICC7S3, ICC7S7, ICC7S8, ICC7S14, ICC9S5, ICC9S7, ICC10K3, ICC10K4, ICC10S1, ICC10S2, ICC10S3, ICC10S5, ICC10S8, ICC10S10, DHH10S1	2, 7, 9, 10, 11	10, 11, 13
<b>4. Diagnostic and Reporting Skills</b>  <u>CSTP</u> 5-Assessing Students for Learning	8-Assessment	ICC8K1, ICC8K2, ICC8K3, ICC8K4, ICC8K5, ICC8S1, ICC8S2, ICC8S3, ICC8S4, ICC8S5, ICC8S6, ICC8S7, ICC8S8, ICC8S9, DHH8K1, DHH8S1, DHH8S2, DHH8S3	5, 8	2, 3
<b>5. Professional Qualities</b>  <u>CTSP</u> 6-Developing as a Professional Educator	1-Foundations	ICC9K1, ICC9K2, ICC9K3, ICC9K4, ICC9S1, ICC9S2, ICC9S3, ICC9S4, ICC9S5, ICC9S6, ICC9S7, ICC9S8, ICC9S9, ICC9S10, ICC9S11, ICC9S12, ICC9S13, DHH9K1, DHH9K2, DHH9K3, DHH9S1	2	12, 13

### C. Analysis of Data:

Data reported here is from the 2008-2010 Level I Education Specialist Credential program assignment that is transitioned in Fall 2010 to the new special education content knowledge assessment.

Between 2008-2010, both distance and onsite JTC graduate candidates performed at the acceptable (2) or meets (3) level of performance. (See Appendix A for detailed candidate data.)

**Assessment 6 - Analysis of Early Intervention Practicum Teaching Event  
(EDSP 550F/552P)**

**A. Description of Assessment:**

The *Analysis of Early Intervention Rubric* is an assessment created by the instructors of the University of San Diego/John Tracy Clinic Teacher Education Program. The rubric directs the candidates' attention to the skills and behaviors that support best practice in the field of early intervention for families of infants and toddlers who are deaf or hard of hearing. The rubric describes and evaluates the candidates' skills early intervention auditory-verbal behaviors. The practicum rubric evaluates a candidate's understanding of the content knowledge and skills identified in the CTC and CEC education specialist standards.



## B. Assessment Alignment with Standards

Assessment Component	CEC Standards		CTC Standards	
	CEC Content Standard	CEC Initial Special Education Standard	DHH	TPEs
<b>1. Parent Education</b> Competence in adult education, child development, audition, language, and speech development.	1-Foundations 6-Language 7-Instructional Planning 8-Assessment 2-Development and Characteristics of Learners 3-Individual Differences 10-Collaboration 9-Professional and Ethical Practice	ICC1K4, ICC1K5, ICC1K7, ICC1K10, ICC1S1, ICC2K1, ICC2K2, ICC2K3, ICC2K4, ICC2K5, ICC2K6, ICC2K7, ICC3K1, ICC3K3, ICC3K4, ICC3K5, ICC4K1, ICC4S4, ICC4S5, ICC5K5, ICC5K7, ICC5K8, ICC5K9, ICC5K10, ICC5S1, ICC5S2, ICC5S3, ICC5S4, ICC5S5, ICC5S6, ICC5S8, ICC5S9, ICC5S10, ICC5S11, ICC5S12, ICC5S13, ICC6K1, ICC6K2, ICC6K3, ICC6S1, ICC6S2, ICC7S2, ICC7S3, ICC7S6, ICC7S7, ICC7S14, ICC8S1, ICC8S5, ICC8S8, ICC9K1, ICC9K2, ICC9S1, ICC9S2, ICC9S6, ICC9S7, ICC9S8, ICC9S9, ICC9S10, ICC9S11, ICC9S12, ICC9S13, ICC10K1, ICC10K2, ICC10K3, ICC10K4, ICC10S1, ICC10S2, ICC10S3, ICC10S5, ICC10S8, ICC10S10  D&HH1K2, D&HH1K3, D&HH1K4, D&HH2K1, D&HH2K2, D&HH3K1, D&HH3K2, D&HH4S1, D&HH4S3, D&HH5K1, D&HH5S2, D&HH5S4, D&HH5S5, D&HH6K1, D&HH6K2, D&HH6K3, D&HH6K4, D&HH6K5, D&HH6S1, D&HH6S2, D&HH6S3, D&HH6S4, D&HH6S5, D&HH7K1, D&HH7S1, D&HH7S2, , D&HH7S3, D&HH8S1, D&HH8S3, D&HH9K1, D&HH9K2, D&HH10S1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	4, 5, 10, 11, 8, 9, 2, 3, 12, 13
<b>2. Parent Interaction</b>  a. Development of rapport with parents and sensitivity to cultural and linguistic diversity.  b. Assessment of skills in coaching qualities and techniques.  c. Use of natural environments and daily routines to achieve goals and facilitate parent-child learning .	1-Foundations 9-Professional and Ethical Practice 10-Collaboration 2-Development and Characteristics of Learners 3-Individual Differences 4-Instructional Strategies 5-Learning Environments/Social Interactions 6-Language 8-Assessment 7-Instructional Planning	ICC1K4, ICC1K5, ICC1K7, ICC1K10, ICC1S1, ICC2K1, ICC2K2, ICC2K3, ICC2K4, ICC2K5, ICC2K6, ICC2K7, ICC3K1, ICC3K3, ICC3K4, ICC3K5, ICC4K1, ICC4S4, ICC4S5, ICC5K5, ICC5K7, ICC5K8, ICC5K9, ICC5K10, ICC5S1, ICC5S2, ICC5S3, ICC5S4, ICC5S5, ICC5S6, ICC5S8, ICC5S9, ICC5S10, ICC5S11, ICC5S12, ICC5S13, ICC6K1, ICC6K2, ICC6K3, ICC6S1, ICC6S2, ICC7S2, ICC7S3, ICC7S6, ICC7S7, ICC7S14, ICC8S1, ICC8S5, ICC8S8, ICC9K1, ICC9K2, ICC9S1, ICC9S2, ICC9S6, ICC9S7, ICC9S8, ICC9S9, ICC9S10, ICC9S11, ICC9S12, ICC9S13, ICC10K1, ICC10K2, ICC10K3, ICC10K4, ICC10S1, ICC10S2, ICC10S3, ICC10S5, ICC10S8, ICC10S10  D&HH1K2, D&HH1K3, D&HH1K4, D&HH2K1, D&HH2K2, D&HH3K1, D&HH3K2, D&HH4S1, D&HH4S3, D&HH5K1, D&HH5S2, D&HH5S4, D&HH5S5, D&HH6K1, D&HH6K2, D&HH6K3, D&HH6K4, D&HH6K5, D&HH6S1, D&HH6S2, D&HH6S3, D&HH6S4, D&HH6S5, D&HH7K1, D&HH7S1, D&HH7S2, , D&HH7S3, D&HH8S1, D&HH8S3, D&HH9K1, D&HH9K2, D&HH10S1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	4, 5, 10, 11, 8, 9, 2, 3, 12, 13
<b>3. Facilitation of Interaction</b> Professional modeling with information embedded in child-parent interactions. Application of ELL strategies: Total Physical Response Comprehensible Input Language Experience Stories Conversational Approach Embedded, Contextualized Learning Teaching Language through Content	1-Foundations 5-Learning Environments/Social Interactions 2-Development and Characteristics of Learners 3-Individual Differences 9-Professional and Ethical Practice 10-Collaboration	ICC1K4, ICC1K5, ICC1K7, ICC1K10, ICC1S1, ICC2K1, ICC2K2, ICC2K3, ICC2K4, ICC2K5, ICC2K6, ICC2K7, ICC3K1, ICC3K3, ICC3K4, ICC3K5, ICC4K1, ICC4S4, ICC4S5, ICC5K5, ICC5K7, ICC5K8, ICC5K9, ICC5K10, ICC5S1, ICC5S2, ICC5S3, ICC5S4, ICC5S5, ICC5S6, ICC5S8, ICC5S9, ICC5S10, ICC5S11, ICC5S12, ICC5S13, ICC6K1, ICC6K2, ICC6K3, ICC6S1, ICC6S2, ICC7S2, ICC7S3, ICC7S6, ICC7S7, ICC7S14, ICC8S1, ICC8S5, ICC8S8, ICC9K1, ICC9K2, ICC9S1, ICC9S2, ICC9S6, ICC9S7, ICC9S8, ICC9S9, ICC9S10, ICC9S11, ICC9S12, ICC9S13, ICC10K1, ICC10K2, ICC10K3, ICC10K4, ICC10S1, ICC10S2, ICC10S3, ICC10S5, ICC10S8, ICC10S10  D&HH1K2, D&HH1K3, D&HH1K4, D&HH2K1, D&HH2K2, D&HH3K1, D&HH3K2, D&HH4S1, D&HH4S3, D&HH5K1, D&HH5S2, D&HH5S4, D&HH5S5, D&HH6K1, D&HH6K2, D&HH6K3, D&HH6K4, D&HH6K5, D&HH6S1, D&HH6S2, D&HH6S3, D&HH6S4, D&HH6S5, D&HH7K1, D&HH7S1, D&HH7S2, , D&HH7S3, D&HH8S1, D&HH8S3, D&HH9K1, D&HH9K2, D&HH10S1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	4, 5, 10, 11, 8, 9, 2, 3, 12, 13

### **C. Analysis of Data:**

Data reported here is from the 2008-2010 Level I Education Specialist Credential candidates who were evaluated on the *Analysis of Early Intervention Practicum Rubric*. Both distance and onsite JTC graduate candidates for the cohorts of 2008, 2009, and 2010 performed at the acceptable (2) or meets (3) or superior (4) level of performance. The Education Specialist Credential candidates from both cohorts who graduated in 2010 received an average score of 3.4 for the competencies in adult education, child development, audition, language, speech development, an average score of 3.5 on competencies in developing rapport with parents and demonstrating sensitivity to cultural and linguistic diversity, skills in coaching qualities and techniques, and using natural environment and daily routines to achieve goals and facilitate parents and children learning together, and an average score of 3.3 on the facilitating interaction competencies. The range of scores in these competencies was from 3.1 - 4.0. The same categories show that 100% of the candidates' scores were between 3 and 4. In the 2010 cohorts, 44% of the candidates received scores in the superior range. The candidates who graduated in the 2009 cohorts received an average score of 3.8 for the competencies in adult education, child development, audition, language, speech development, an average score of 3.8 on competencies in developing rapport with parents and demonstrating sensitivity to cultural and linguistic diversity, skills in coaching qualities and techniques, and using natural environment and daily routines to achieve goals and facilitate parents and children learning together, average score of 3.7 on facilitating interaction competencies. The range of scores in these competencies was from 2.4 - 4.0. The same categories show that 92% of the candidates' scores were between 3 and 4. In the 2009 cohorts, 69% of the candidates received scores in the superior range. The candidates who graduated in the 2008 cohorts received an average score of 3.6 for the competencies adult education, child development, audition, language, speech development, an average score of 3.9 on competencies in developing rapport with parents and demonstrating sensitivity to cultural and linguistic diversity, skills in coaching qualities and techniques, and using natural environment and daily routines to achieve goals and facilitate parents and children learning together, and an average score of 3.7 on the competencies in facilitating interaction. The range of scores in these competencies was from 2.9 - 4.0. The same categories show that 100% of the candidates' average scores were between 3 and 4. In the 2008 cohorts, 88% of the candidates earned scores in the Superior range. (See Appendix C for detailed candidate data.)

### **D. Interpretation of How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards:**

The *Analysis of Early Intervention Practicum Rubric* has been part of the exit criteria from student teaching since our 2004 CEC recognition. Candidates are strongest in the content knowledge areas of listening and spoken language development, child development, developing rapport with parents and demonstrating sensitivity to cultural and linguistic diversity, skills in coaching qualities and techniques, and using natural environment and daily routines to achieve goals and facilitate parents and children learning together. As the concepts of early intervention coaching techniques, and listening and spoken language development and auditory skills development are added to the requirements for professionals who are providing services to families of infants and toddlers who are deaf and hard of hearing, our candidates demonstrate a good knowledge and abilities base in these areas as well as the skills needed for providing effective early intervention services.

**SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION**

**PART IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate/Program Performance**

Because of the small number of candidates in each cohort, faculty are able to make program adjustments on an ongoing basis. The table below is maintained to track issues as they arise, list what solutions or changes are implemented, and describe what results are seen after implementation.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Issue/Data</b>	<b>Solution/Change</b>	<b>Results</b>
<b>2008</b>			
Summer 2008	Feedback from previous graduate candidates and mentors in the Distance Learning Program indicated they needed help with mentoring skills.	The JTC Mentorship Training Program was created to help mentors for Distance Learners/Interns with their mentoring philosophy and skills. As at the beginning of the program, mentors continued to be flown out and housed with their Distance Learning graduate candidates at JTC’s expense.	Much more satisfactory reports from graduate candidates (though not all) on how their mentors are helping them.
Summer 2008	Faculty determined a need for a textbook grounded in theory and approach that fits the JTC program philosophy and research-based evidence to anchor the JTC Mentorship Program.	A textbook was adopted for the JTC Mentorship Training Program: Zachary, J. (2000). The Mentor’s Guide: Facilitating Effective Learning Relationships. Jossey-Bass Publishing.	Reports from mentors are favorable on the use of the book.
Summer 2008	Distance Learning Mentors are not required to be onsite for the JTC Mentorship Program, but are strongly encouraged to join us for 3 days of training. Not all mentors were taking advantage of the offer of free airfare and housing for the program.	As a condition of acceptance into the Distance Learning Program, mentors, who had previously been encouraged to spend time at JTC for Distance Learners/Interns were required to spend 3 days at JTC in the new Mentorship Training Program during their graduate candidates’s first summer residency.	Much better compliance with mentor documentation of weekly mentoring.
<b>2009</b>			
Summer 2009	Distance Learning mentors who had spent the required 3 days at the JTC Mentorship Training	The JTC Mentorship Training Program was changed to require one week in the program.	Other staff members of DL school sites wanted to participate in the week-long training, and

	Program had provided feedback that they would like more time to spend at JTC.		wanted hours of credit for it. They reported that they gained valuable perspective on the program and their own knowledge, skills, and dispositions changed.
Summer 2009	DL mentors occasionally changed for a grad student over the 2-year program, leaving the new mentor without training.	Mentors who had replaced mentors who had left the Distance Learner's schools were invited to spend the second summer at JTC to get to know the mentoring process.	Mentors who spent the second summer residency at JTC reported great benefit to their mentoring and understanding of the demands of the program.
Summer 2009	A weakness was found in the Thematic Unit assessment for the Onsite candidates, who usually do not have the educational background that the Distance Learners have. The Onsite candidates require more experience before attempting their Thematic unit.	The site of EDSP 560 DHH: Elementary Curricula class was changed so that it is now held on the campus of a Los Angeles Unified School District, where the adjunct faculty is a supervisor/teacher.	The candidates get more hands-on experience with elementary-level children while they are creating the thematic unit. The candidates spend time observing, assessing, and teaching students, so that the concepts are more concrete for them by the time they create their thematic unit.
<b>2010</b>			
March 2010	Need to add Universal Design for Learning and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports to program, as required by Federal OSEP grant	Added 2 assignments to EDSP 553/EDSP 550, and follow-through in lesson planning in each methods and practicum course	Candidates understood how to incorporate UDL and PBIS into lesson planning
Spring 2010	Candidate dispositions became an issue worth documenting carefully.	The <i>JTC Dispositions Evaluation</i> was created, tested, and implemented over the next year (2010-2011).	The <i>JTC Dispositions Evaluation</i> became the basis for USD SOLES' Disposition Evaluation, to be instituted online for all SOLES programs beginning Summer 2011.

Summer 2010	The technology demands of documenting so many teaching events throughout the program became too difficult for the JTC Multimedia and Technology Department.	To document all of their teaching events, all graduate candidates entering for 2010 were required to purchase Flip-type video cameras so they could be responsible for their own documentation and analysis.	Video files were also to be uploaded to a JTC server for accreditation reviews. Candidates have much more control over their documentation now, and the technology formats are consistent throughout the program. The Flip is now used for many more courses for instant feedback on techniques.
Summer 2010	Riverside County Office of Education administration wanted to build a strong auditory-oral program, but only had one JTC-trained teacher. The administration approached JTC to ask about a partnership to help two candidates apply as interns to the USD/JTC Program.	Riverside County Office of Education (RCOE) and JTC formed a partnership to bring high-quality education to DHH students in Riverside. Since there was no appropriate mentor for the two Distance Learning candidates from RCOE, a contract was negotiated whereby JTC would procure an appropriate mentor who would work with both interns at least weekly throughout the two-year program, while RCOE would undertake the costs of the mentor. The administrator of the DHH program came to the JTC Mentorship Training Program to learn what was required.	The first year of the RCOE/JTC (Summer 2010-Spring 2011) was an overwhelming success, as attested to by the two interns, the administrator, and the mentor.
<b>2011</b>			
January 2011	Distance learning applicant was having a hard time finding an onsite mentor, & asked about DL technology for mentoring	DL application program agreement modified to indicate that DL technologies could be used for mentoring for 3 per month of the weekly sessions, with face-to-face mentoring must required at least once a month	Candidate could apply for the DL Program

Jan-Mar 2011	Two Onsite grads not doing well in audiology, low grades on tests	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Added free tutor in mornings (audiologist at JTC)</li> <li>2. Added audiology observations Thursday mornings in lieu of program observations</li> </ol>	Higher grades in audiology
March 2011	Faculty needed help with request for accreditation data	Train all faculty on CEC standards, CCTC standards CED standards and the rubrics and how they align. During NCATE process, collect all rubrics, assessment descriptions, data format, etc. and give to instructors for each course so we have the data and correct format for next time. Make sure their syllabi reflect the assessments and rubrics and data.	Worked with new adjunct faculty for Fall 2011 to help write syllabus to format and standards, create tables that highlight assignments for hyperlinks, etc.
March 2011	Need a final program assessment for all candidates that fits for onsite & distance learning candidates (can't be portfolio, since DL may not do that)	Create a rubric for Final Program Reflection and have onsite candidates write it during last elementary student teaching seminar, and DL candidates do it at end of program as part of EDSP 560P (for both onsite candidates and DLs who don't seek CA credential)	
March 2011	Revise rubrics for AVT Lab to reflect new CEC standards: Final Report, Self-evaluation		
March 2011	Need rubric scoring for Parent Workshop evaluation for better data collection	Re-do the rubric for Parent Workshop Oral Presentation to add rubric numbers 1-4	

March 2011	Grads have negative emotions about the lack of quality in the public education in the mainstream for DHH students during their general education week	Need to allow time and space for grads to reflect and share their observations and feelings. Have an itinerant instructor come on a Tuesday/Wednesday of the gen ed week for an afternoon seminar on observations to educate candidates the demands of an itinerant in the public school system.	
March 2011	Accreditation demands required safer data gathering and storage.	Require <u>all</u> instructors to send electronic copies of candidate evaluations to JTC at end of each semester, including rubric, rubric scoring for each element on rubric for each candidate, grade sheet for course with all grades, artifacts (DVD, essay, etc.), and save in Accreditation Data folder, as well as individual Grad Files, as appropriate.	
Spring 2011	Analysis of portfolios over time indicated even some good candidates whose artifacts showed exceptional depth were producing formulaic, lack-luster portfolios. Moreover, despite how portfolio management had been blended into the program, some candidates were taking an inordinate time to finish portfolios.	Since all candidates do several teaching events over the program already, a capstone reflection/rubric is being designed in lieu of the portfolio, and will be implemented with the 2011 cohort.	
Spring 2011	Onsite graduate candidates have expressed shock and dismay over the lack of quality teaching that they see during their experiences in public schools, particularly during their general education week in a mainstream class.	Arrangements will be made to have faculty who teach in the public schools do a seminar on the demands of teachers in public schools.	
Summer 2011	It was noted that the titles of two courses do not	Forms have been requested to change course titles. Assignments	

	accurately reflect their content. The titles of <i>EDSP 560 Elementary Curricula</i> and <i>EDSP 560P Elementary Practicum</i> will be changed to reflect fieldwork at levels reflecting the California credential areas covered (birth-22).	will be highlighted to indicate fieldwork with ages/levels birth to 22.	
--	--	---	--



## SECTION B: ALL PROGRAMS

There have been changes for the School of Leadership and Education Sciences that have affected all of the credential programs at the University of San Diego. The most important are summarized on the following table:

<b>SOLES changes</b>	
2008-2009	Electronic delivery of teacher candidate and counseling intern evaluations.
2008-2009	Revision of Task Stream DRF for teacher candidate embedded signature assignments
2008-2009	Electronic delivery of teacher candidate and counseling intern evaluations
Spring 2009 Fall 2010	SOLES hosted PACT assessor training for USD and other San Diego area assessors, including some USD supervisors
Summer 2010	SOLES PEU approved to be part of first cohort in NCATE's Transformation Initiative Option
Fall 2009	School Counseling Program hired two tenure-track faculty members
2009-2010	Liberal Studies Program Review
2009-2010	Creation of Liberal Studies Liberal Studies Advisory Council (to replace the TEG) comprised of faculty from SOLES and the College of Arts and Science faculty
2009-2010	Revision of assignments and rubrics for embedded signature assignments in teacher credential programs to better align with PACT
2010-2011	First Administrative Credential Candidates trained as PACT assessors
Spring 2010	Migration of all surveys and evaluations to Qualtrics survey software to increase efficiency of administration, data analysis and program improvement
Spring 2010	Course evaluations moved to electronic format, SurveyDig
Fall 2010	SOLES hosted PACT/TPAC conference

In our 2008 Biennial Report, SOLES identified five areas that all of the SOLES credential programs targeted for improvement during the next two years:

1. The three departments in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences that offer and oversee credential programs have recognized the fact that increased communication among the programs would benefit all of the credential candidates. The programs indicate they plan to develop stronger ties among candidates in different credential programs. We will examine the standards for each credential area to determine common courses, shared experiences and opportunities for collaborative interdisciplinary activities. The Associate Dean will lead monthly meetings of the credential areas to expedite this process; the first meeting will be in November 2008.
  - Since 2008, a great deal of structured collaboration between the school counseling program and the department of teaching and learning has occurred around action research. The annual conference to showcase both programs candidates' action research projects has required close collaboration between faculty and candidates across programs. In addition, Dr. Rowell from the school counseling program, and Dr. Inoue from the department of learning and teaching, have co-taught a combined section of research methods for candidates from both programs. More recently faculty

from the administrative services credential have begun collaborating with faculty from the department of learning and teaching for USD's Transformation Initiative (TI), which features mentorship of preliminary multiple and single subject credential candidates by administrative services level one candidates. We have found these more focused collaborations more useful than monthly meetings and we stopped meeting monthly as a large group after Spring 2009.

2. All areas have started to examine their mechanisms for assessing and documenting student learning. Increased effort will be placed on the organization and recording of direct evidence of student learning. In addition, the increased dialogue across the programs noted above will provide an opportunity for faculty to share best practices in teaching and assessment.
  - The cross-program activities in action research and the Transformation Initiative feature collaborations around the assessment of student learning. In the past three years, the department of learning and teaching has developed and piloted the use of a rigorous action research project rubric to support and critique candidates' projects aimed at documenting increases in student learning. The TI collaboration between administrative services and teacher education candidates focuses on improving teacher candidates' lessons and increasing student learning.
3. All SOLES programs will increase dialogue and training for full-time and part-time faculty regarding "ACE" themes and performance indicators associated with the themes.
  - Full and part-time faculty in the department of learning and teaching have been in dialogue regarding the development and assessment of embedded signature assignments derived from objectives linked to "ACE" themes in the multiple and single subject credential courses. More work needs to be done to increase dialogue with the school counseling and administrative services full and part-time faculty.
4. SOLES programs will work to refine the documentation of assessment activities and faculty actions based on assessment data. SOLES Director of Assessment is examining electronic management systems to determine the best way for the school to record its more coordinated program assessment data in a SOLES Director of Assessment is examining electronic management systems to determine the best way for the school to record its program assessment data, analysis, and actions via a centralized system.
  - We have made three important improvements in terms of electronic management of data. First, we have migrated all surveys and evaluations for teacher and school counselor fieldwork to Qualtrics survey software. Survey implementation and data analysis are facilitated by the Office of Assessment Support. Second, we moved our course evaluations to SurveyDig, which is a tool that allows candidates to evaluate courses and instructors through their university email accounts. Third, the Office of Assessment Support adopted the use of Task Stream's Accountability Management System (AMS) system to document program level assessment for non-credential programs.

5. Full time faculty will provide leadership, support and mentorship for part-time faculty. This will include the appointment of lead faculty for each course and the development of standardized syllabi and assessments.
  - The last three years have seen a number of personnel and organization changes in the leadership of credential programs, and because of this, monitoring of the quality of leadership by lead faculty has been spotty. The newly appointed chairs of the department of learning and teaching and the new department of counseling and marital family are committed to supervising this process closely. Under the leadership of Dr. Paula Krist, Assistant Dean of Assessment Support, standardization of assessments and use of electronic data tracking systems has continued to move forward.

In the next two years The School of Leadership and Education Sciences will focus on the following areas of development across the professional education unit:

1. Development of SOLES Strategic Plan 2012-2017
2. Unit-wide assessment of candidate dispositions.
3. Faculty involvement in the use of TaskStream AMS. Ideally, the Office of Assessment Support will create a faculty team who will be able to work together to assess the assessment plans and results of SOLES programs.
4. Continued enhancement of electronic documentation and assessment of candidate performance. Administrative Services programs have decided to adopt FolioTec to collect candidate artifacts and portfolios electronically beginning in 2011-2012.

**APPENDIX**

**Education Specialist Deaf and Hard of Hearing  
Assessment Data**



## Assessment 2 - Personal Pedagogy of Practice

### Assessment 2–Candidate Assessment Data Summary

#### PERSONAL PEDAGOGY OF PRACTICE –END OF STUDENT TEACHING&/OR MASTER DEGREE PROGRAM

Performance Domain &Candidate Level of Knowledge & Skill Competency	2008						2009						2010					
	Distance		Onsite		Total		Distance		Onsite		Total		Distance		Onsite		Total	
	N=5		N=4		N=9		N=6		N=6		N=12		N=6		N=6		N=12	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>1. Articulation of Personal Ethical Standards of Practice (SOLES ACE &amp; CEC)</b>																		
Exceeds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meets	4	80	1	25	5	56	2	33	5	83	7	58	1	17	5	83	6	50
Acceptable	1	20	3	75	4	44	4	67	1	17	5	42	5	83	1	17	6	50
Unacceptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>2. Strategic Planning &amp; Assessment of Emerging Needs Within Diverse Community of Learners</b>																		
Exceeds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meets	4	80	1	25	5	56	4	67	5	63	9	75	2	33	2	33	4	33
Acceptable	1	20	3	75	4	44	2	33	1	37	3	25	4	67	4	67	8	67
Unacceptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3. Education Specialist as Communicator, Collaborator, Case Manager&amp; Co-Teacher</b>																		
Exceeds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meets	4	80	1	25	5	56	3	0	5	63	8	67	2	33	2	33	4	33
Acceptable	1	20	3	75	4	44	3	0	1	37	4	33	4	67	4	67	8	67
Unacceptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>4. Global Perspectives Philosophic Foundations of Education</b>																		
Exceeds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meets	4	80	1	25	5	56	5	0	5	63	10	63	2	33	2	57	4	33
Acceptable	1	20	3	75	4	44	1	0	1	37	2	37	4	67	4	43	8	67
Unacceptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5. Learning Environment Structure Organization, Management &amp; Delivery of Grade Appropriate Content</b>																		
Exceeds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meets	4	80	1	25	5	56	2	0	5	63	7	58	2	33	2	57	4	33
Acceptable	1	20	3	75	4	44	4	0	1	37	5	42	4	67	4	43	8	67
Unacceptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>6. Research Validated Theories of Practice</b>																		
Exceeds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meets	4	80	1	25	5	56	1	0	5	63	6	50	5	57	5	57	10	67
Acceptable	1	20	3	75	4	44	5	0	1	37	6	50	1	43	1	43	2	33
Unacceptable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**June 2011: Before New California Credential Candidates will complete their research course under the new preliminary credential. Data listed here is the earlier version of the Pedagogy of Practice Essay for the Level I Education specialist credential between 2008-10.**







## Assessment 5 - Analysis of Auditory-Verbal Practice Teaching Event

### Assessment 5 Candidate Assessment Data Summary

#### ANALYSIS OF AUDITORY-VERBAL PRACTICE TEACHING EVENT – PRIOR TO ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHING

Assessment Component	2008						2009						2010					
	Distance		Onsite		Total		Distance		Onsite		Total		Distance		Onsite		Total	
	N=4		N=4		N=8		N=6		N=7		N=13		N=2		N=7		N=9	
<b>6. Planning of Therapy Program</b>	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Advanced	1	25	0	0	1	12	2	33	0	0	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate	3	75	2	50	5	63	4	67	4	57	8	62	2	100	2	29	4	44
Beginning	0	0	2	50	2	25	0	0	3	43	3	23	0	0	5	71	5	56
Unsatisfactory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>7. Instructional Presentation</b>	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Advanced	1	25	0	0	1	12	2	33	0	0	2	15	0	0	1	14	1	11
Intermediate	2	50	1	25	3	38	3	50	6	86	9	69	1	50	2	29	3	33
Beginning	1	25	3	75	4	50	1	17	1	14	2	15	1	50	4	57	5	56
Unsatisfactory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>8. Parent Guidance &amp; Education</b>	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Advanced	1	25	0	0	1	14	2	33	1	14	3	23	0	0	1	14	1	11
Intermediate	1	25	0	0	1	14	3	50	3	43	6	46	2	100	4	57	6	67
Beginning	2	50	3	100	5	72	1	17	3	43	4	31	0	0	2	29	2	22
Unsatisfactory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>9. Diagnostic &amp; Reporting Skills</b>	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Advanced	1	25	0	0	1	12	2	33	2	29	4	31	1	50	0	0	1	11
Intermediate	2	50	2	50	4	50	2	33	4	57	6	46	0	0	3	43	3	33
Beginning	1	25	2	50	3	38	2	33	1	14	3	23	1	50	4	57	5	56
Unsatisfactory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>10. Professional Qualities</b>	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Advanced	1	25	0	0	1	12	2	33	3	43	5	38	1	50	2	29	3	33
Intermediate	2	50	3	75	5	63	4	67	3	43	7	54	1	50	1	14	2	22
Beginning	1	25	1	25	2	25	0	0	1	14	1	8	0	0	4	57	4	45
Unsatisfactory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

