Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ E#:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Instructor:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Semester/Year\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of Evaluation** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | **Exceeds Some Standards** | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | **Does Not Meet Standards** |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Candidate demonstrates professional written communication skills: Overall Rating** | **Candidate demonstrates professional written communication skills** as illustrated by ratings of 5 in all categories. |  | **Candidate demonstrates professional written communication skills** as illustrated by ratings of 3, 4,or 5 in all 5 categories. |  | Candidate does not demonstrate professional written communication skills as illustrated by ratings of 3 or less in more than 2 categories |
| **Form**  (EIU GSLG 3; CEC Adv. St. 6.3; CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3;  CEC/SEBIS6.S1  CEC/SEA4K1; ILCAS1B, E, F; ILBIS1B, E, F) | Candidate develops a clear and detailed Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan that could be implemented without assumption by professional stakeholders as well as the learner’s family. | Candidate develops a clear Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan that potentially could be implemented by professional stakeholders as well as the learner’s family. However, some assumptions are required to be made. | Candidate develops a Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan that potentially could be implemented by professional stakeholders. However, some assumptions may or may not be required. | Candidate develops a Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan that could be understood by professional stakeholders. However, the candidate provided limited detail which impacts possible implementation of the plan. | Candidate develops a Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan, but the candidate lacks clarity and detail which negatively impacts the readability by professional stakeholders. Consequently, the stakeholders could not implement the plan. |
| **Organization**  (EIU GSLG 3; CEC Adv. St. 6.3; CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3;  CEC/SEBIS6.S1  CEC/SEA4K1; ILCAS1B, E, F; ILBIS1B, E, F) | Candidate organizes and includes the components of Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan in accordance with the assignment directions.    Candidate also provides main headings and subheadings within the plan to facilitate understanding of the proposed stakeholders. | Candidate organizes and includes the components of Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan in accordance with the assignment directions.    Candidate also provides main headings within the plan to facilitate understanding of the proposed stakeholders. | Candidate organizes and includes the components of Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan in accordance with the assignment directions.  Candidate also provides main headings within the plan to facilitate understanding of the instructor. | Candidate includes the components of Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan in accordance with the assignment directions. However, the candidate presents components out of sequence.  Candidate may or may not provide main headings within the plan. | Candidate organizes and includes  components of Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan. However, the candidate does not organize the plan in accordance with the assignment directions.  Candidate does not provide main headings within the plan. |
| **Style**  (EIU GSLG 3; CEC Adv. St. 6.3; CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3;  CEC/SEBIS6.S1  CEC/SEA4K1; ILCAS1B, E, F; ILBIS1B, E, F) | Candidate writes using well-developed paragraphs and varying sentence structure. Candidate effectively uses transitions from one idea to the next.  Candidate writes in APA style using appropriate reference and in-text citation procedures. | Candidate writes using well-developed paragraphs and varying sentence structure. However, the candidate lacks clear transitions from one idea to the next.  Although the candidate writes in APA style using appropriate reference and citation procedures, the candidate uses in-text citations in a manner that creates awkwardness in the readability of the text. | Candidate writes using well-developed paragraphs and appropriate sentence structure. Candidate does not use transitions resulting in choppiness throughout the plan.  Although the candidate writes in APA style and includes the essential reference and citation content, the candidate may make minor errors in sequencing or punctuating the content. Candidate may use in-text citations when not required. | Candidate writes using both appropriate and inappropriate sentence structure. Additionally, the candidate does not write using well-developed paragraphs.  Although the candidate attempts to write references and text citations in APA style, the candidate makes major errors in capitalization or inclusion of reference or citation content.  Candidate inconsistently uses citations when required. | Candidate writes using numerous incomplete or run-on sentences. Additionally, the candidate does not write using well-developed paragraphs.  Candidate does not cite content as required by APA or adhere to procedures for writing references. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of Evaluation** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | **Exceeds Some Standards** | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | **Does Not Meet Standards** |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Development**  ((EIU GSLG 3; CEC Adv. St. 6.3; CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3;  CEC/SEBIS6.S1  CEC/SEA4K1; ILCAS1B, E, F; ILBIS1B, E, F) | Candidate meaningfully supports the Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan with varying data sources as well as recent and relevant evidence-based positive approaches.  Candidate explicitly considers the spirit and intent of local, state and federal laws/regulations as well as CEC Code of Ethics when developing a Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan. | Candidate supports the Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan with data and relevant evidence-based positive approaches.  Candidate explicitly considers the mandates of state and federal laws as well as CEC Code of Ethics when developing a Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan. | Candidate supports the Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan relevant evidence-based positive approaches.  Candidate explicitly considers the mandates of state and federal laws when developing a Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan. | Candidate attempts to support the Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan with relevant positive theoretical approaches. However, the candidate provides limited research data. | Candidate provides literature support for the Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan. However, there appears to be little to no relevance to the contents of the Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan. |
| **Mechanics**  (EIU GSLG 3; CEC Adv. St. 6.3; CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3;  CEC/SEBIS6.S1  CEC/SEA4K1; ILCAS1B, E, F; ILBIS1B, E, F) | Candidate writes making no spelling, grammar, capitalization or punctuation errors. | Candidate writes making no grammar errors and fewer than 3 spelling, capitalization, or punctuation errors. | Candidate makes less than 3 grammar errors and 3-5 spelling, capitalization, or punctuation errors. | Candidate makes 3-5 spelling, grammar, capitalization or punctuation errors. | Candidate makes more than 5 spelling, grammar, capitalization or punctuation errors. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of Evaluation** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | **Exceeds Some Standards** | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | **Does Not Meet Standards** |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Candidate demonstrates ability to advocate for the use of positive behavior supports: Professional Presentation**  (EIU GSLG 3; CEC Adv. St. 6.3; CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3;  CEC/SEBIS6.S1  CEC/SEA4K1; ILCAS1B, E, F; ILBIS1B, E, F) | Candidate reflectively writes how the use of positive behavioral supports promote respect, dignity, physical, psychological safety, social acceptance of the learner and his/her peers. Candidate advocates independence and learner involvement in the design of the Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan.  Candidate uses person first language and writes from a strength/ability perspective. | Candidate effectively writes describing why the use of positive behavioral supports promote respect, dignity, and physical, psychological safety, and social acceptance of the learner.  Candidate also promotes learner involvement in the design of the Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan.  Candidate uses person first language. | Candidate writes about the importance of maintaining respect, dignity, and physical, psychological safety of the learner. However, the candidate does not tie the importance of respect, dignity, and safety to the use of positive behavioral supports.  Candidate uses the learner’s interests in the design of the Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan.  Candidate uses person first language. | Candidate states the importance of respect, dignity, and physical, psychological safety of the learner when selecting positive behavior supports. However, the candidate did not appear to meaningfully consider the learner’s interests in the design of the Positive Behavioral Intervention System Plan.  Candidate may or may not use person first language. | Candidate identifies the importance of positive behavioral supports. However, the candidate uses language that minimizes or threatens the respect, dignity, and physical, psychological safety of the learner.  Candidate uses labeling language. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of Evaluation** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | **Exceeds Some Standards** | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | **Does Not Meet Standards** |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Candidate demonstrates knowledge of PBS research**  (EIU GSLG 4; **CAEP GPS 2**; CEC Adv. St. 3.2 and 4.1; CEC/ASCI5K3, CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3, CEC/ACSI6S4;  CEC/SEBIS.3.K2  CEC/SEBIS3.K3  CEC/SEBIS4.K1 CEC/SEA4K1; CEC/SEA6K1; ILCAS 9; ILBIS 9) | Candidate demonstrates a thorough understanding of research by selecting and synthesizing recent and relevant PBS research from various appropriate peer-reviewed sources that supports the importance of the target behavior to the learner’s academic, communicative, social, and/or functional competence in various school environments.  Candidate also demonstrates how research supports the use of the Tier I and proposed Tier II intervention with the learner’s target behavior.  Candidate synthesizes the research in a manner that serves as a literature-based foundation for the proposed PBS Plan. | Candidate demonstrates an understanding of research by selecting and summarizing recent and relevant PBS research from peer-reviewed sources that supports the importance of the target behavior to the academic, social, communicative and/or functional success of the learner in the classroom environments in which the target behavior occurs.  Candidate also demonstrates how research supports the use of the Tier I and proposed Tier II intervention with the class of target behaviors like the target behavior of the learner with exceptionalities.  Candidate summarizes the research in a manner that serves as a literature-based foundation for the proposed PBS Plan. | Candidate demonstrates an understanding of research by selecting and summarizing a mixture of relevant research and theoretical articles from PBS peer-reviewed sources that support the importance of the target behavior to the primary classroom in which the target behavior occurs.  Candidate also demonstrates how research supports the use of the proposed Tier II intervention with the class of target behaviors like the target behavior of the learner with exceptionalities.  Candidate summarizes the research in a manner that requires some conceptual assumptions to be made to determine whether the candidate presented the literature in a way that supports the proposed PBS Plan. | Candidate demonstrates a limited understanding of research by primarily selecting and summarizing selected theoretical articles from PBS peer-reviewed sources. Consequently, the candidate provides limited research evidence to support the importance of the target behavior.  Candidate also lacks detail in attempting to demonstrate how the literature supports the use of the proposed Tier II intervention with the class of target behaviors.  Candidate summarizes the research in a manner that may require some significant conceptual assumptions to be made to establish a link between the literature-base and the proposed PBS Plan. | Candidate demonstrates a lack of understanding of research by selecting and describing theoretical or research-based PBS articles with no clear organizational structure. As a result, it is not clear that the candidate’s selection of literature supports the importance of the target behavior.  Similarly, the candidate selects and randomly summarizes research with no focus and questionably provides support for the PBS plan. |
| **Categories of Evaluation** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | **Exceeds Some Standards** | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | **Does Not Meet Standards** |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Candidate demonstrates knowledge of the learning environment**: **Description of Setting**  (EIU GSLG 4; CEC Adv. St. 1.1 & 4.3; CEC/ASCI5K3, CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3, CEC/ACSI6S4;  CEC/SEBIS.3.S1  CEC/SEA4K1; CEC/SEA6K1; ILCAS 9; ILBIS 9) | Candidate demonstrates knowledge of the learning environment by discussing in detail the impact of external physical dimensions ( # of floors, temperature, lighting, classroom location, furniture, play areas, etc.) as well as internal dimensions of the various school environments (types of activities occurring in the school, classroom routines, and playground routines) on the learner’s target behavior.  Candidate documents relevant examples from various school settings to support the perceived impact. | Candidate demonstrates knowledge of the learning environment by discussing the impact of external physical dimensions ( # of floors, temperature, lighting, classroom location, furniture, play areas, etc.) as well as internal dimensions of the various school environments (types of activities occurring in the school, classroom routines, and playground routines) on the learner’s target behavior.  Candidate documents examples from the school setting to support the perceived impact. However, the candidate does not clearly establish the impact of the environmental variables on the learner’s target behavior. | Candidate demonstrates knowledge of the learning environment by describing the external physical dimensions ( # of floors, temperature, lighting, classroom location, furniture, play areas, etc.) as well as internal dimensions of the school environment (types of activities occurring in the school, classroom routines, and playground routines).  Candidate attempts to establish impact of the environmental variables on the learner’s general behavior in the school environment. | Candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of the learning environment by describing select external physical dimensions ( # of floors, temperature, lighting, classroom location, furniture, play areas, etc.) and/or select internal dimensions of the school environment (types of activities occurring in the school, classroom routines, and playground routines). Consequently, the candidate presents an incomplete picture of the school environment. | Candidate demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the learning environment by listing the external physical dimensions size, temperature, lighting, classroom location, furniture, play areas, etc.) and/or internal dimensions of only the classroom environment (line-up routines, material collection and return routines, rules for the classroom).  Although the candidate addresses the classroom environment, the candidate does not provide information on other environments within the school. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of Evaluation** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | | **Exceeds Some Standards** | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | **Does Not Meet Standards** |
|  | **5** | | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Candidate demonstrates knowledge and understanding of different groups in a pluralistic society: Description of School Population**  (EIU GSLG 4; CEC Adv. St. 3.2; CEC/ASCI5K3, CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3, CEC/ACSI6S4;  CEC/SEBIS5.K1  CEC/SEA4K1; CEC/SEA6K1; ILCAS 9; ILBIS 9) | Candidate effectively demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of the needs of different groups in a pluralistic society by describing how the school population with a focus on learner demographics (e.g. grade range, % of learners with and without exceptionalities, socioeconomic status, cultural diversity), family demographics (family composition, SES, cultural diversity) and teacher demographics (e.g. years teaching, # of general educators, # of special educators, average class size/case load) interact to impact the learners’ behavior.  Candidate uses the learner, family, and teacher demographic data to support the perceived impact on the frequency and intensity of the learner’s target behavior within the home and school environment | | Candidate demonstrates solid knowledge of the needs of different groups in a pluralistic society by describing how the school population with a focus on learner demographics (e.g. grade range, % of learners with and without exceptionalities, socioeconomic status, cultural diversity) and teacher demographics (e.g. years teaching, # of general educators, # of special educators, average class size/case load) impact the learners’ behavior.  Candidate uses the learner and teacher demographic data to support the perceived impact on the frequency and intensity of the learner’s target behavior within the school environment | Candidate demonstrates knowledge of the needs of different groups in a pluralistic society by describing how the school population with a focus on learner demographics (e.g. grade range, % of learners with and without exceptionalities, socioeconomic status, cultural diversity) impacts the learners’ behavior.  Candidate uses the learner demographic data to support the perceived impact on the occurrence of the learner’s target behavior. | Candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of the needs of different groups in a pluralistic society by describing the school population with a focus on learner demographics (e.g. grade range, % of learners with and without exceptionalities, socioeconomic status, cultural diversity). However, the candidate does not establish how learner demographics may impact the occurrence of the learner’s target behavior. | Candidate demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the needs of different groups in a pluralistic society by describing the demographics (e.g. grade, exceptionality, socioeconomic status, cultural diversity) of the targeted learner.  Candidate may or may not establish how the learner’s demographics impact the occurrence of the learner’s target behavior. |
| **Categories of Evaluation** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | **Exceeds Some Standards** | | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | **Does Not Meet Standards** |
|  | **5** | **4** | | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Candidate demonstrates knowledge of positive behavioral supports: Description of Tier I Support - Rules**  (EIU GSLG 4; **CAEP GPS 2**; CEC Adv. St. 4.3; CEC/ASCI5K3, CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3, CEC/ACSI6S4;  CEC/SEBIS3.S3  CEC/SEBIS5.S4  CEC/SEA4K1; CEC/SEA6K1; ILCAS 9; ILBIS 9) | Candidate demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of behavioral supports by observably describing the school-wide, classroom behavioral expectations (tier I behavioral demands) as well as home behavioral expectations.  Candidate demonstrates a predictive and functional relationship between the rules and the learner’s behavioral response to the environmental demands.  Candidate discusses the social validity and impact of the home, classroom, and school behavioral expectations on the learners’ behavior and supports the discussion with relevant observations from teachers, other service providers, peers, and the learner’s family. | Candidate demonstrates solid knowledge of behavioral supports by observably describing the school-wide and classroom behavioral expectations (tier I behavioral demands).  Candidate establishes a functional relationship between the rules and the learner’s behavioral responses. However, the candidate does not demonstrate predictability of the learner’s behavior.  Candidate discusses the social validity and impact of the classroom and school behavioral expectations on the learners’ behavior and supports the discussion with relevant observations from teachers, other service providers, and the learner’s peers. | | Candidate demonstrates selective knowledge of behavioral supports by observably describing the school-wide behavioral expectations (tier I behavioral demands).  Candidate discusses the rules and the learner’s behavioral responses. However, the candidate does not demonstrate a functional relationship between the behavioral expectations and the learner’s response(s).  Although the candidate discusses the impact of school behavioral expectations on the learner’s behavior, the candidate lacks relevant observational examples to support the perceived impact. | Candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of behavioral supports by describing the school-wide behavioral expectations (tier I behavioral demands). However, the candidate writes in unobservable terms.  Candidate discusses the impact the school-wide rules have on the learner’s behavior. However, the candidate  lacks observational data to support the perceived impact. | Candidate demonstrates a lack of knowledge of behavioral supports by listing the school-wide behavioral expectations (tier I behavioral demands). However, the candidate writes in unobservable terms.  Candidate lists the learner’s behavioral responses, but it is not clear whether the learner’s behavioral responses are to the rules or to another antecedent. Consequently, the candidate does not establish impact of the rules on the learner’s behavioral responses. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of Evaluation** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | **Exceeds Some Standards** | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | **Does Not Meet Standards** |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Candidate demonstrates knowledge of positive behavioral supports: Description of Tier I Support – Rewards and Consequences**  (EIU GSLG 4; **CAEP GPS 2**; CEC Adv. St. 4.3; CEC/ASCI5K3, CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3, CEC/ACSI6S4;  CEC/SEBIS3.S3  CEC/SEBIS5.S4  CEC/SEA4K1; CEC/SEA6K1; ILCAS 9; ILBIS 9) | Candidate demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of positive behavioral supports by describing the classroom and school-wide tier I reward and consequence system. In addition, the candidate cites the rewards and consequences used with the learner in the home environment.  Candidate examines the rewards and consequences from a continuum and functional perspective and provides a rationale for the selection and impact of rewards and consequences on the learner’s behavior. In addition, the candidate discusses potential variables that could impact the efficacy of the rewards and consequences in respect to the frequency and intensity of the learner’s challenging behavior. Candidate supports their perceptions with relevant observational data. | Candidate demonstrates solid knowledge of positive behavioral supports by describing the classroom and school-wide tier I reward and consequence system.  Candidate examines the rewards and consequences from a functional perspective and provides a rationale for the selection and impact of rewards and consequences on the learner’s behavior. In addition, the candidate identifies potential variables that could impact the efficacy of the rewards and consequences have on the occurrence of the learner’s challenging behavior and supports their perception with meaningful observational data. | Candidate demonstrates selective knowledge of positive behavioral supports by describing the school-wide tier I reward and consequence system.  Candidate discusses the rewards and consequences from a continuum perspective and provides a rationale for the selection and impact of rewards and consequences on the learner’s behavior. Candidate supports their perceptions with examples.  Although the candidate identifies variables that could impact the efficacy of the rewards and consequences on the occurrence of the learner’s challenging behavior, the candidate lacks clear data support. | Candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of positive behavioral supports by describing the school-wide tier I reward system. The candidate does not describe consequences that are used when the learner demonstrates challenging behavior.  Candidate lists the rewards and provides a rationale for the selection and/or impact of rewards on the learner’s behavior. Candidate may or may not support their perceptions with examples.  Candidate does not appear to consider variables that could impact the efficacy of the rewards on the occurrence of the learner’s challenging behavior. | Candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of positive behavioral supports by describing the school-wide tier I consequence system. The candidate does not describe rewards that are used when the learner demonstrates appropriate behavior.  Candidate lists the consequences and provides a rationale for the selection and/or impact of the consequences on the learner’s behavior. Candidate may or may not support their perceptions with examples.  Candidate does not appear to consider variables that could impact the efficacy of the consequences  on the occurrence of the learner’s challenging behavior. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of Evaluation** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | **Exceeds Some Standards** | | | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | | **Does Not Meet Standards** |
|  | **5** | **4** | | | **3** | **2** | | **1** |
| **Candidate demonstrates knowledge of the role of the PBS team in selecting the learner and target behavior:** **Description of Roles and Procedures of the PBS Team – Learner and Target Behavior**  (EIU GSLG 4; CEC Adv. St. 4.3 and 7.2; CEC/ASCI5K3, CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3, CEC/ACSI6S4;  CEC/SEBIS.3.S3  CEC/SEA4K1; CEC/SEA6K1; ILCAS 9; ILBIS 9) | Candidate demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of the role of the PBS teamin collaboratively selecting the learner and target behavior by using data acquired in home and school settings from the learner’s family, teachers, other service providers, and the learner’s peers to support the ineffectiveness of Tier I interventions and justify the need for additional positive behavioral supports for the learner demonstrating challenging behavior.  Candidate triangulates the various home and school data sources and uses the data to select a socially valid, functionally responsive, and positive target replacement behavior.  Candidate observably and measurably defines the target replacement behavior and sets expectations for performance that are commensurate with the learner’s abilities and the expectations of the home and school environments. | Candidate demonstrates solid knowledge of the role of the PBS teamin collaboratively selecting the learner and target behavior by using data acquired in various school settings from the teachers, other service providers, and the learner’s peers to support the ineffectiveness of Tier I interventions and justify the need for additional positive behavioral supports for the learner demonstrating challenging behavior.  Candidate uses the school data sources to select a socially valid and positive target replacement behavior. However, it is not clear that the candidates established agreement across the data sources.  Candidate observably and measurably defines the target replacement behavior and sets expectations for performance that are commensurate with the learner’s abilities and the expectations of the school environment. | | | Candidate demonstrates knowledge of the role of the PBS teamin collaboratively selecting the learner and target behavior by using data acquired from those classroom teacher(s) where the challenging behavior primarily occurs.  Candidate uses the data to support the ineffectiveness of Tier I interventions and justify the need for additional positive behavioral supports for the learner demonstrating challenging behavior.  Additionally, the candidate uses the data obtained from the learner’s teacher(s) to select a socially valid, and positive target replacement behavior.  Candidate observably and measurably defines the target replacement behavior and sets expectations for performance that are commensurate with the learner’s abilities. | Candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of the role of the PBS teamin collaboratively selecting the learner and target behavior by using data collected primarily from by the candidate within the classroom environment.  Candidate uses the data to attempt to justify the need for additional positive behavioral supports for the learner demonstrating challenging behavior. However, the candidate did not demonstrate the ineffectiveness of the Tier I intervention. Consequently, the candidate calls into question whether the learner needs additional positive behavioral supports.  While the candidate may use data to select a socially valid behavior, the candidate may operationally define the behavior in unobservable terms and negative terms.  Candidate thereby sets expectations with the purpose of decreasing the challenging behavior instead of increasing the target replacement behavior. | | Candidate demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the role of the PBS teamin collaboratively selecting the learner and target behavior by selecting the learner and the target behavior based on perception instead of actual data.  Candidate uses persuasive opinion to attempt to justify the need for additional positive behavioral supports for the learner demonstrating challenging behavior. Consequently, the candidate did not demonstrate the ineffectiveness of the Tier I intervention.  Candidate selects the target behavior based on professional opinion and uses unobservable and negative terms to operationally define the behavior.  Candidate may or may not set expectations for learner demonstration of the target behavior. |
| **Candidate demonstrates knowledge of evidence-based positive behavioral supports:** **Selects and describes the Tier II Intervention**  (EIU GSLG 4; **CAEP GPS 2**; CEC Adv. St. 3.3, 3.4 & 4.3 ; CEC/ASCI5K3, CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3, CEC/ACSI6S4;  CEC/SEBIS3.S3  CEC/SEBIS5.S4  CEC/SEA4K1; CEC/SEA6K1; ILCAS 9; ILBIS 9) | Candidate demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of evidence-based positive behavioral supports by apparently considering the demands of the home and school environments, age-appropriateness of the behavior, impact of the disability on the behavior, and self-management skills of the learner in selecting an evidence-based tier II Intervention.  Candidate thoroughly describes the steps to be followed in implementing the tier II intervention and discusses the role and training needs (inclusive of technology) of the family, teachers/staff, and the learner play in implementing the tier II intervention.  Candidate discusses how the tier II intervention will result in improved social competence in the home and school environments. | | Candidate demonstrates solid knowledge of evidence-based positive behavioral supports by considering the demands of the various school settings, age-appropriateness of the behavior, impact of the disability on the behavior, and the contributing individual factors of the learner in selecting an evidence-based tier II Intervention.  Candidate thoroughly describes the steps to be followed in implementing the tier II intervention and discusses the role and resource/training needs (including technology) of teachers/staff and the learner in implementing the tier II intervention.  Candidate discusses how the tier II intervention will result in improved social competence in academic and non-academic school environments. | Candidate demonstrates knowledge of evidence-based positive behavioral supports by considering the demands of the teacher and classroom, age-appropriateness of the behavior, impact of the disability on the behavior, and individual differences of the learner in selecting an evidence-based tier II Intervention.  Candidate clearly describes the steps to be followed in implementing the tier II intervention and discusses the role and resource needs (including technology) of the teacher/staff plays in its implementation.  Candidate describes how the tier II intervention will result in improved social acceptance in the classroom or school. | | Candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of evidence-based positive behavioral supports by considering the impact of the disability on the learner’s behavior. However, the candidate appears to lack awareness of other variables important in selecting an evidence-based tier II Intervention.  Candidate lists the steps to be followed in implementing the tier II intervention but provides limited detail which impacts the ability to determine how the tier II intervention will have a positive impact on the learner’s behavior.  Candidate provides a lack of detail as to the role and resources needs (including technology) of the teacher. | | Candidate demonstrates a lack of knowledge of evidence-based positive behavioral supports by considering a tier II intervention. While documented in the literature, will be non-responsive to the learner’s behavioral needs.  Consequently, the candidate does not consider function and dimensions of the behavior as well as other critical factors that could influence the success of the intervention. |
| **Categories of Evaluation** | **Consistently Exceeds Standards** | **Exceeds Some Standards** | | | **Meets Standards** | **Inconsistently Meets Standards** | | **Does Not Meet Standards** |
|  | **5** | **4** | | | **3** | **2** | | **1** |
| **Candidate demonstrates knowledge of behavioral assessment**: **Selection of Tier II Data Collection Procedures and Support Implementation**  (EIU GSLG 4; CEC Adv. St. 1.1 & 4.3; CEC/ASCI5K3, CEC/ASCI4S1, CEC/ASCI4S3, CEC/ACSI6S4;  CEC/SEBIS.3.S1  CEC/SEA4K1; CEC/SEA6K1; ILCAS 9; ILBIS 9) | For both the school and home environment, the candidate demonstrates knowledge of behavioral assessment by incorporating various appropriate formative and summative data collection procedures to evaluate the impact of the tier II positive behavioral support on the learner’s academic and social behavior.  Candidate considers the feasibility, dimensions of the learner’s behavior, and training needs to appropriately use the data collection procedures.  Candidate identifies an appropriate schedule for collecting data and the roles professionals, family and learner will play in collecting and analyzing data.  In addition, the candidate describes how data will be triangulated and communicated to stakeholders. | Within the school environment, the candidate demonstrates knowledge of behavioral assessment by selecting an appropriate formative and summative data collection procedure to evaluate the effectiveness of the tier II positive behavioral support on the learner’s academic and social behavior.  Candidate considers feasibility as well as the dimensions of the learner’s behavior in selecting the data collection procedures.  Candidate identifies an appropriate schedule for collecting data and the roles professionals will play in collecting and analyzing data.  In addition, the candidate describes how data will be synthesized and communicated to stakeholders. | | | Within the school environment, the candidate demonstrates knowledge of behavioral assessment by selecting appropriate summative data collection procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of the tier II positive behavioral support on the learner’s academic and social behavior.  The candidate identifies the schedule for data collection, the roles of data collectors, and methods for analyzing and communicating the findings to stakeholders. | Within the classroom environment, the candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of behavioral assessment by selecting quantitative data collection procedures that may or may not be appropriate to evaluating the effectiveness of the tier II positive behavioral support on the learner’s academic and social behavior.  The candidate may describe a realistic data collection schedule, but the candidate did not describe the role of the classroom teacher or support personnel in the data collection process.  Furthermore, the candidate is not clear as to how data will be analyzed and communicated to stakeholders. | | Regardless of the environment, the candidate demonstrates a lack of knowledge of behavioral assessment by failing to consider the dimensions of the learner’s behavior in selecting fata collection procedures. Consequently, the candidate selects inappropriate data collection procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of the tier II positive behavioral support on the learner’s academic and social behavior.  The candidate describes an unrealistic data collection schedule, and the candidate did not describe the role of the classroom teacher or support personnel in the data collection process.  Consequently, the candidate is not clear as to how data will be analyzed and by whom. Candidate does not address how data will be communicated to stakeholders. |
|  | **5** | | **4** | **3** | | | **2** | **1** | |
| **Candidate demonstrates knowledge of technology to collect and analyze data**  (EIU GSLG 1; **CAEP GPS 5**; CEC Adv. St. 4.1; CEC/ACSI5S2, CEC/ACSI6S4; CEC/SEA1K1; ILCAS 6A; ILBIS 9) | Candidate seamlessly integrates technology into the PBS plan with the purpose being to collect, accurately analyze, and meaningfully present and reflect on formative and summative data.  Candidate considers the technology access and literacy of the learner’s family and other professional stakeholders when selecting data formats. | | Candidate incorporates technology into the PBS plan with the purpose being to collect, accurately analyze, and meaningfully present summative data.  Candidate considers the technology access of the learner’s family and other professional stakeholders when selecting data formats. | Candidate includes technology into the PBS plan with the purpose being to collect, accurately analyze and present formative and/or summative data.  Candidate lists possible data formats appropriate to the learner’s family and other professional stakeholders. | | | Candidate attempts to include technology into the PBS plan with the purpose being to analyze and present formative and/or summative data. However, the candidate makes errors in the use of technology impacting the analysis and presentation of the data.  Candidate lists possible data targeting a single audience. | Candidate ineffectively integrates technology into the PBS plan by selecting technology to present summative data. However, the candidate proposes to present data in a manner that fails to show impact. | |