

San José State University
Connie L. Lurie College of Education
Department of Special Education
EDSE 228A – Topics in Collaboration and Transition in Special Education - HYBRID
Spring 2016

Instructor: Dr. Jennifer Madigan
Office Location: Sweeney Hall 221
Telephone: (408) (924 3313)
Email: Jennifer.madigan@sjsu.edu
Office Hours: Wednesdays 2:00-4:00
Class Days/Time: Wednesdays 4-6:45
Classroom: SH 230

CONNIE L.LURIE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Lurie College of Education is to empower graduates with the skills, knowledge and dispositions that ensure access to excellence and equity in education for every student in our diverse, technologically complex, global community.

DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of Special Education prepares professionals to be effective educators, leaders in the field, and lifelong learners. We accomplish this goal in collaboration with other departments and community partners. Together we promote equity and excellence in our curricula and instruction by infusing evidence based best practices endorsed nationally.

KNOWLEDGE BASE

The course will cover the continuum of services and multidimensional assessment from the basis of career and vocational education for students with disabilities. The course will have a pragmatic approach to learning about the many facets of transition planning through educational, vocational and community entities in the areas of independent living, social skill building, quality of life, and employment ranging from birth to post secondary aged students. In terms of collaboration, evidence-base practice has shown that where there is parent involvement, students learn more effectively. Professionals who establish effective collaboration and communication with families increase their involvement and satisfaction in the educational process. Both federal and state laws governing special education services, based on the belief that interdisciplinary and interagency collaboration enhances special education programs in the natural environments, support collaboration with both general and special education teachers.

CTC STANDARDS: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Program Standards:

Program Standard 4: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships

The program provides instruction in communicating effectively with (1) individuals with disabilities and their parents and primary caregivers, (2) general and special education teachers, co-teachers, related service personnel, and administrators, (3) Tran disciplinary teams including but not limited to multi-tiered intervention, Section 504, IEP/IFSP/ITP. The program provides opportunities for the candidate to establish and work in partnerships to design, implement, and evaluate appropriate integrated services based on individual student needs. The program informs candidates of the importance of communicating effectively with the business community, public, and non-public agencies, to provide the cohesive delivery of services and bridge transitional stages across the life span of the learners.

PS 7: Transition and Transitional Planning

The program provides opportunities for candidates to plan, implement, and evaluate transitional life experiences for students with disabilities across the lifespan. Each candidate collaborates with personnel from other educational and community agencies to plan for successful transitions by students. Each candidate demonstrates the knowledge and ability to teach students appropriate self-determination and expression skills.

Early Childhood Special Education Standard 8: Collaboration and Teaming

The program provides opportunities to demonstrate the knowledge and skills required to consult and collaborate with other professionals, paraprofessionals, families, caregivers, and community agency personnel in a range of settings to meet the individual needs of infants and young children who have or are at risk for developmental delays and disabilities. Each candidate demonstrates knowledge of interagency collaboration and service coordination, including interagency agreements, referral and consultation. Each candidate demonstrates skill required participating as a team member, to identify and enhance team roles, communicate and problem solve including recognizing the scope of practice parameters for ECSE and roles and expertise of other professionals and disciplines...skills required to consult, collaborate and co-teach with colleagues in general education(e.g., Head start). ..knowledge of adult learning principles required to work effectively and appropriately with team members and the ability to monitor, manage and supervise paraprofessionals to consult, train and provide effective feedback to family members and service providers.

Early Childhood Special Education Standard 5: IFSP, IEP and Transition

Each program offers an opportunity for the candidates to demonstrate knowledge of the IFSP, IEP and the transition processes. Each candidate demonstrates skills in the development, implementation and monitoring of progress of the IFSP/IEP with the family and other team members. Each candidate demonstrates skills required to implement processes and strategies that support transitions among settings for infants and young children. These settings include hospital to home, home to center-based, early intervention to preschool and preschool to kindergarten. Each candidate demonstrates knowledge of Infant/Toddler Learning and Development Foundations, Preschool Learning Foundations and Kindergarten standards and uses this know to implement effective IFSPs, IEP's and transition.

REQUIRED TEXT/READINGS:

Blue-Banning, M., Summers, J.A., Frankland, H.C., Nelson, L.L., & Beegle, G. (2004, Winter). Dimensions of family and professional partnerships: Constructive guidelines for collaboration. *Exceptional Children*, 70(2), 167-184.

Greene, G. (April, 2009). *Transition of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) Youth with disabilities: Challenges and opportunities*. Council for Exceptional Children, 2009 Conference and Expo, Seattle, Washington.

Linz, E., Heater, M.J., & Howard, L. (2008). Team teaching high school science: Game plan for success. *TEACHING Exceptional Children Plus*, 5(2), 2-9. (Free download from Google Scholar.)

Lupi, M.H., & Tong, V. M. (2001). Reflecting on personal interaction style to promote successful cross-cultural school home partnerships. *Preventing School Failure*, 45(4), 162-168.

Madigan, J. C. & Scroth-Cavataio, G. (2011). IDEIA 2004: Building collaborative partnerships and effective communication between administrators, special and general educators, and multi-disciplinary professionals. *Principal Leadership*, (12)3, 26-30.

Meyers, A. & Eisenman, L. (2005). *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 37(4), 52-58. Retrieved from: http://www.braininjurymn.org/annual_conference/CONF-2008-presentations/ThurI-A-TransitionTools/Articles/Student-Led-IEP-Taking-First-Step.pdf

Mueller, T.G. (2009). IEP facilitation: A promising approach to resolving conflicts between families and schools. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 41(3), 60-68.

DOCUMENT: California Department of Education. (2004). *Transition to adult living, a guide for Secondary education*. Download this document free of charge from the Cal STAT web site: www.calstat.org/info.html

RECOMMENDED TEXTS

TEXT: Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2010). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*, (6th edition). Pearson Education Co.

Turnbull, A., Turnbull, R., Erwin, E., & Soodak, I. (2006). *Families, professionals, and exceptionality: Positive outcomes through partnerships and trust*. (5th edition). Pearson Education Co

DROPPING AND ADDING

Students are responsible for understanding the policies and procedures about add/drop, grade forgiveness, etc. Refer to the current semester's [Catalog Policies](http://info.sjsu.edu/static/catalog/policies.html) section at <http://info.sjsu.edu/static/catalog/policies.html>. Add/drop deadlines can be found on the [current academic calendar](http://www.sjsu.edu/academic_programs/calendars/academic_calendar/) web page located at http://www.sjsu.edu/academic_programs/calendars/academic_calendar/. The [Late Drop Policy](http://www.sjsu.edu/aars/policies/latedrops/policy/) is available at <http://www.sjsu.edu/aars/policies/latedrops/policy/>. Students should be aware of the current deadlines and penalties for dropping classes.

Information about the latest changes and news is available at the [Advising Hub](http://www.sjsu.edu/advising/) at <http://www.sjsu.edu/advising/>.

ASSIGNMENTS

Assignment #1 Individualized Transition Plan Collaborative Team Project - 50 points - 6 Teams

The goal of this assignment is to develop an Individual Transition Plan for a student in the grade level that you are teaching or involved in at your school or program. Use Rubric in Appendix for presentation content and guidelines. The 6 teams will be designated as follows:

1. Birth to Pre-K (ES to Preschool and Preschool to Kindergarten)
2. K-Grade 1
3. Grade 2-4
4. Grade 5-7
5. Grade 8-12
6. Post High School, Community Based Education

The ITP will be determined by group consensus and the student will be a “real “student who will remain anonymous. Once the team has determined the student, the team will follow the student through the “eyes” of your classmate who will report information to the team about student’s needs, aspirations, family demographics, relevant disability and accommodation information, academic skills, vocational options, mobility needs, independent living skills, social, recreation, sexuality, quality of life considerations, rational for job-career options and support services needed. You as a team will collaboratively prepare and present to the class a full ITP. Use form from your local school district area or program. The completed ITP and any supporting documents and visuals for the presentation are due the night of the presentation. ECSE students see Dr. Hughes about the content modifications for the transition plans in ECSE.

Assignment #2 Communication Log and Paper- 60 points

The purpose of this activity is to identify your communication style across several contexts with at least 3 of the following different groups of people: (a) students’ families,(b) professionals, (c) school colleagues,(d) school team members, (e) class team members, etc. It may be a brief interaction phone call or email or a longer one such as an IEP/IFSP/ faculty meeting, workshop, etc.

First read Lupi and Tong’s 2001 article for background information. Then keep a log of 6 different interactions (10 pts/each) with 3 different groups of people. Write up each Interaction according to the following format using Steps 1-3 and then write a Summary using Step 4:

Step 1 – Identify the nature and purpose of the interaction including time, day, persons, etc.

Step 2 – List and describe your verbal and nonverbal (facial expressions, body language) responses. Be as descriptive as possible. Note your tone and volume of voice, language and speech used in your specific responses and the degree of comfort during the interaction.

Step 3 – Identify your style of interaction during each specific event. Use the following categories:

Categories:

- a. Verbal – Aggressive (verbal responses with authoritarian tone):

- b. Verbal – Non- aggressive (verbal response with objective and neutral tone):
- c. Nonverbal – Listening (facial, gestural or body language that indicates listening):
- d. Other Body Language (indicates interest or disinterest, e.g., shaking hands, turning away or towards a person):
- e. Emphatic Behaviors (words or gestures of comfort, responding to emotions):
- f. Uncomfortable type of responses (distancing, weak smile, non-responsive):

Step 4 - Summary: Write up a summarized analysis of your communication and interaction style from your documented 6 events (10 pts). Include an evaluation of your style for all 6 events and determine your most common or dominant style. For example, do you interact differently with families than with colleagues, etc. Determine if you need to make any modifications to your style or behaviors in order to promote more effective communication in the future with these different groups of people (Adapted from Lupi & Tong, 2001).

Assignment #3 Online Canvas Topics - 75 points

GRADING CRITERIA AND POINTS:

All assignments need to be word processed, free of grammatical and spelling errors and turned in on time. Lateness will result in the loss of 1/2 point per day (24/7).

Transition Project:	50 points: Due May 10 in Canvas
3 Canvas Lessons	75 points: Due Feb. 23, March 22, April 5
Communication Paper:	60 points: April 26
Participation:	15 points: Ongoing
Total:	200 points

Grading Scale

200-196 = A+	195 –185 =A	185 - 180= A-
179 – 175 = B+	174 - 169 = B	168 – 160 = B-
159 – 154 = C+	153-147 = C	146 - 140= C-
139 – 135 = D+	134-128 = D	127 – 120 = D-
Below 120=F		

UNIVERSITY POLICIES

Academic integrity

Your commitment as a student to learning is evidenced by your enrollment at San Jose State University. The [University’s Academic Integrity policy](http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/S07-2.htm), located at <http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/S07-2.htm>, requires you to be honest in all your academic course work. Faculty members are required to report all infractions to the office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development. The [Student Conduct and Ethical Development website](#) is available at

http://www.sa.sjsu.edu/judicial_affairs/index.html. Instances of academic dishonesty will not be tolerated. Cheating on exams or plagiarism (presenting the work of another as your own, or the use of another person's ideas without giving proper credit) will result in a failing grade and sanctions by the University. For this class, all assignments are to be completed by the individual student unless otherwise specified. If you would like to include your assignment or any material you have submitted, or plan to submit for another class, please note that SJSU's Academic Policy S07-2 requires approval of instructors.

Campus Policy in Compliance with the American Disabilities Act

If you need course adaptations or accommodations because of a disability, or if you need to make special arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please make an appointment with me as soon as possible, or see me during office hours. Presidential Directive 97-03 requires that students with disabilities requesting accommodations must register with the [Disability Resource Center](http://www.drc.sjsu.edu/) (DRC) at <http://www.drc.sjsu.edu/> to establish a record of their disability.

Plagiarism and Recycled Papers

San Jose State University policy forbids students to submit assignments in two different courses, except by permission of the instructor, and to plagiarize previously written material. If an instructor utilizes a plagiarism detection system (i.e., Turnitin.com), it is written in the green sheet.

SUGGESTED ONLINE RESOURCES

Transition Basics: www.dcn-cde.ca.gov/dctrain/index.html

Diagnostic Center North: www.dcn-cde.ca.gov

Teaching Exceptional Children

www.teachertube.com

NICHY: www.nichcy.org?pages/Home.aspx

Job Accomodation Nework: www.jan.wvu.edu

Disabilities Resources and Information: www.dssc.org

Exceptional Children

www.childhoodmatters.org

www.nuestrosninios.com

RECOMMENDED READINGS

Frattura, E.M., & Capper, C.A. (2007). New teacher teams to support integrated comprehensive services. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 39(4), 16-21.

Harvell, P., & Dawson, R. (2006). *Transition portfolios and guides*. Freemont, CA: Northern California Diagnostic Center. Retrieved August 1, 2009 from <http://www.dcn-cde.ca.gov/portfolios.htm>

Matuszny, R.M., Banda, D.R., & Coleman, T.J. (2007). A progressive plan for building collaborative relationships with parents from diverse backgrounds. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 39(4), 24-31.

Praisner, C. L. (2003). Attitudes of elementary school principles toward the inclusion of students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 69(2), 135-146.

Sadler, F. (2003). The itinerant special education teacher in the early childhood special education classroom. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 35(3), 8-15.

Sailor, W., & Rogers, B. (March, 2005). Rethinking inclusion: Schoolwide applications. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 503-509.

Schroth-Cavataio, G. (Winter, 2005). Forming relationships: Supportive and collaborative. *Academic Exchange*, 94-99.

Thoma, C., Tamura, R., Scott, L., & Doval, E. (2009). *Universal Design for Transition: An Idea Whose Time Has Come*. Council for Exceptional Children, 2009 Conference and Expo, Seattle, Washington

Whitbread, K.M., Bruder, M.B., Fleming, G., & Park, H.J. (2007). Collaboration in special education: Parent –professional training. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 39(4), 6-14.

Course Schedule – Wednesday Section

Week	Date	Topics, Readings, Assignment Due dates
1	2/3	Course Introduction/Requirements; Uncocktail Party; Transition Team Formation Read Mueller Article
2	2/10	Presentation SCCOE: How to Facilitate an IEP Read Lupi & Tong article
3	2/17	No Face to Face Class – Canvas Online Class – Transition Training
4	2/24	Advanced Communication; Conflict Management; Team Time Read Madigan article
5	3/2	Conflict Management, cont. Team Time Read Blue-Banning et al. Article
6	3/9	Cultural Presentation
7	3/16	No Face to Face Class – Canvas Online Class
8	3/23	No Face to Face Class – D2L Online Class Read Giangreco Article
9	3/30	No Class – Spring Break

Week	Date	Topics, Readings, Assignment Duedates
10	4/6	Giving Effective Feedback; Team Time Read Linz article
11	4/13	Co-Teaching Models; Team Time Read RTI article
12	4/20	RTI; Case Management; Team Time
13	4/27	Presentation: Working with Paraprofessionals Due: Communication Log and Paper
14	5/4	Due: Transition Team Presentations – Teams # 1-3
15	5/11	Due: Transition Team Presentations – Teams # 4-6

Transition Project Rubric – 50 pts.

Team # _____ Names _____ Score _____

Elements	Level 1 Insufficient (1 pt)	Level 2 Below Aver. (2 pt)	Level 3 Average (3 pts)	Level 4 Above Aver. (4 pts)	Level 5 Exceptional (5 pts)
1. Collaboration amongst team members	Missing, not Clear or Effective; Limited evidence 0-20%	Somewhat Clear and Effective; Some evidence 20-40 %	Satisfactory level of Clarity, Effectiveness & Evidence 40-60%	Majority Clear and Effective; Most Evidence 60-80%	Very Clear and Highly Effective; Comprehensive Evidence 80--100%
2. Oral Communication w/Audience inc. KISS principle	Missing, not Clear or Effective; Limited evidence 0-20%	Somewhat Clear and Effective; Some evidence 20-40 %	Satisfactory level of Clarity, Effectiveness & Evidence 40-60%	Majority Clear and Effective; Most Evidence 60-80%	Very Clear and Highly Effective; Comprehensive Evidence 80--100%
3. Introduction	Missing, not Clear or Effective; Limited evidence 0-20%	Somewhat Clear and Effective; Some evidence 20-40 %	Satisfactory level of Clarity, Effectiveness & Evidence 40-60%	Majority Clear and Effective; Most Evidence 60-80%	Very Clear and Highly Effective; Comprehensive Evidence 80--100%
4. Subject Matter Knowledge of Topic	Missing, not Clear or Effective; Limited evidence 0-20%	Somewhat Clear and Effective; Some evidence 20-40 %	Satisfactory level of Clarity, Effectiveness & Evidence 40-60%	Majority Clear and Effective; Most Evidence 60-80%	Very Clear and Highly Effective; Comprehensive Evidence 80--100%
5. Cohesiveness of Presentation	Missing, not Clear or Effective; Limited evidence 0-20%	Somewhat Clear and Effective; Some evidence 20-40 %	Satisfactory level of Clarity, Effectiveness & Evidence 40-60%	Majority Clear and Effective; Most Evidence 60-80%	Very Clear and Highly Effective; Comprehensive Evidence 80--100%

6. Use of Technology inc. powerpoint and equipment	Missing, not Clear or Effective; Limited evidence 0-20%	Somewhat Clear and Effective; Some evidence 20-40 %	Satisfactory level of Clarity, Effectiveness & Evidence 40-60%	Majority Clear and Effective; Most Evidence 60-80%	Very Clear and Highly Effective; Comprehensive Evidence 80--100%
7. Summarization	Missing, not Clear or Effective; Limited evidence 0-20%	Somewhat Clear and Effective; Some evidence 20-40 %	Satisfactory level of Clarity, Effectiveness & Evidence 40-60%	Majority Clear and Effective; Most Evidence 60-80%	Very Clear and Highly Effective; Comprehensive Evidence 80--100%
8. Addressed Questions	Missing, not Clear or Effective; Limited evidence 0-20%	Somewhat Clear and Effective; Some evidence 20-40 %	Satisfactory level of Clarity, Effectiveness & Evidence 40-60%	Majority Clear and Effective; Most Evidence 60-80%	Very Clear and Highly Effective; Comprehensive Evidence 80--100%
9. Evaluation Tool with 5 Questions for audience to complete at end	Missing, not Clear or Effective; Limited evidence 0-20%	Somewhat Clear and Effective; Some evidence 20-40 %	Satisfactory level of Clarity, Effectiveness & Evidence 40-60%	Majority Clear and Effective; Most Evidence 60-80%	Very Clear and Highly Effective; Comprehensive Evidence 80--100%
10. Written Materials	Missing, not Clear or Effective; Limited evidence 0-20%	Somewhat Clear and Effective; Some evidence 20-40 %	Satisfactory level of Clarity, Effectiveness & Evidence 40-60%	Majority Clear and Effective; Most Evidence 60-80%	Very Clear and Highly Effective; Comprehensive Evidence 80--100%