

## Sensorveiledning

<b>Emnekode</b>	SPED4400
<b>Emnenavn</b>	Fordypning i spesifikke lærevansker
<b>Studiepoeng</b>	40 (20 i høst pluss 20 i vår)
<b>Studieprogram</b>	Master i spesialpedagogikk
<b>Semester og studieår</b>	Vår 2024
<b>Eksamensform</b>	Skriftlig hjemmeeksamen i lese- og skrivevansker, språkvansker, mattevansker
<b>Karakterskala</b>	A-F
<b>Emneansvarlig</b>	Athanasios Protopapas, Anita Lopez-Petersen
<b>Eksamensdato</b>	Athanasios Protopapas, Anita Lopez-Petersen
	3.-5. juni 2024

### General criteria for grading

- Structure of the answer is logical and content is coherent.
- Syllabus (pensum) and lecture materials are used appropriately; relevant supplementary literature can also be used.
- Answer is written in academic style, whole sentences used (e.g., not only bullet points) and following APA referencing style. Tables can be used (words included in the word limit).
- Word limits are respected for each question.
- All questions must be answered and passed (min. grade E/question) to pass the exam.

## Part-specific criteria for grading

### Question 1 (Language)

Questions:

- a) Hvordan vil du beskrive dette funnmønsteret overfor Johans foresatte? (oppgaven vektes 60%)
- b) Hvilke andre typer atferd vil du se etter som kunne være tegn på autismespekterforstyrrelse? (oppgaven vektes 40%)

Answers:

- a) Hvilke funksjonelle konsekvenser har dårlig språkpragmatikk? (oppgaven vektes 40%)

A good answer will mention impact on understanding figurative language, jokes, as well as knock-on effects (e.g., reading comprehension, social interaction, understanding of other minds and emotions).

- b) Redegjør for noen tilnærminger til tiltak for barn med pragmatiske utfordringer. Hvor effektive er de? (oppgaven vektes 60%)

Should reference relevant sources from lecture slides.

A strong answer will mention specific intervention approaches, developmental sequence, intensity, content, peer involvement, groups, parent involvement. (at least some of these)

Should mention expected treatment effects and prognostic factors (e.g., initial language skills); lack of moderation by age and dosage.

**Question 2 (Reading)**

**Marking scheme for IEP (Reading) Topic in SPED4400 exam (June 2024)**

Grade	Exceptional (A)	Proficient (B-C)	Basic Level (D-E)	Unsatisfactory (F)
<p><b>Student strengths &amp; needs</b> (counts for <b>10%</b> of the total grade for the IEP)</p>	<p>All strengths and needs (one by one or combined whenever feasible) have been addressed based on assessment data and are correct.</p>	<p>One strength or one need is missing or is wrong.</p>	<p>More than one strength or need are missing or are wrong.</p>	<p>Student strengths and/or needs are not addressed or are entirely incorrect or misunderstood.</p>
<p><b>Long Term/Annual Goals</b> (counts for <b>20%</b> of the total grade for the IEP)</p>	<p>(1) All goals match the areas of disability identified from assessment and are consistent with the needs as identified by the examinee. (2) All goals are measurable and can be evaluated with the use of standardized assessment tools or other valid measurements, which are clearly stated. (3) All goals are realistic/ reasonable</p>	<p>Components 1-2 are included. but Goals are not realistic/reasonable to accomplish within a 9-month period. or It is not mentioned which specific tests will be used to assess the goals</p>	<p>One or more goals do not match areas of disability identified and/or One or more goals are not measurable and/or Goals are not reasonable for a school year (9-month period).</p>	<p>Annual goals not included or are entirely incorrect or misunderstood (e.g., they are not stated as specific goals).</p>

	to accomplish within a school year.			
<p><b>Short Term Objectives</b></p> <p>(counts for <b>20%</b> of the total grade for the IEP)</p> <p>Each long-term goal must be broken down into a reasonable sequence of specific and measurable short-term objectives, that is, specific performance goals, that can be achieved with specific intervention.</p>	<p>(1) All objectives are appropriate for annual goals.</p> <p>(2) Objectives will cumulatively lead to achieving the long-term goals if reached</p> <p>(3) All objectives are concrete and measurable.</p>	<p>70-90% of objectives meet all components</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Objectives do not add up to the long-term goals</p>	<p>50-69% of objectives meet all components</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>One or more annual goals are not addressed by the short-term objectives</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Objectives are not stated in sufficiently concrete terms to be directly measurable</p>	<p>Less than 50% of objectives meet all components.</p> <p>E.g., objectives are not concrete performance goals but intervention tasks or areas</p> <p>Or</p> <p>The majority of annual goals are not addressed by the stated short-term objectives</p>
<p><b>Sequence, duration, and evaluation of objectives</b></p> <p>(counts for <b>20%</b> of the total grade for the IEP)</p> <p>Short-term objectives should be presented in a reasonable sequence of increasingly demanding performance targets that, when reached, justify moving on to the next target(s). Wherever relevant, prerequisites must be fulfilled before more advanced goals.</p> <p>Measures assessing performance goals can be informal but must be specified in detail, including materials, difficulty level, task/procedure, and performance goal.</p>	<p>(1) All objectives have anticipated duration</p> <p>(2) Objectives follow a reasonable sequence</p> <p>(3) The evaluation methods are stated and are concrete and valid methods.</p>	<p>70-90% of objectives has anticipated duration and follows a reasonable sequence.</p> <p>And</p> <p>70-90% of the evaluation methods are stated and are valid methods.</p> <p>And/Or</p>	<p>50-69% of objectives has anticipated duration and follows a reasonable sequence.</p> <p>And/or</p> <p>The evaluation methods are stated, but are not valid methods</p>	<p>Less than 50% of objectives have anticipated duration and follow a reasonable sequence.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>The evaluation methods are not stated</p> <p>Or</p>

<p>The duration of working on each short-term objective should be specified (and overlap accounted for) so that the total will cover the one-school-year period (9 months) and will add up to achieving the long-term goal(s).</p>		<p>There are minor inconsistencies or gaps in the sequence/overlap</p>		<p>Evaluation methods are stated but do not concern short-term performance objectives (e.g., may relate to intervention tasks or areas instead)</p>
<p><b>Specially Designed Instruction</b> (counts for <b>30%</b> of the total grade for the IEP)</p> <p>An instructional program should be designed and presented, that will be concrete and specifically address the stated short-term objectives (and, by extension, the annual goals).</p> <p>Ideally this would consist in one or more specific intervention programs, but this may not be feasible (e.g., none existing in Norwegian), so it is acceptable to provide specific instructions to special Ed teachers for designing and implementing appropriate tasks (including materials, duration, and procedure). It is also acceptable to use an existing English-language program (either a specific program or an instructional method) as long as it is appropriately and specifically adapted to the Norwegian language and context. This can be either explicitly stated or may be obvious from the content of the objectives or the selection of materials.</p> <p>It is not enough to discuss general background regarding interventions or even to present reviews of relevant</p>	<p>(1) The description of each instructional program or combination of programs is informative for addressing all of the above annual goals.</p> <p>(2) Each instructional program matches the specific stated annual goals and short-term objectives.</p> <p>(3) Duration and sequence is fully addressed when relevant (especially if more than one program is recommended)</p>	<p>The description of each instructional program or combination of programs is insufficient in informing how it will address the annual goals.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Some (up to one third) of the instructional programs do not precisely match the goals and objectives.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Not all details of duration/sequencing/overlap are fully addressed</p>	<p>The description of each instructional program or combination of programs is insufficient in informing how it will address each one of the annual goals.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Some (up to one half) of the instructional programs do not precisely match the goals and objectives.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Issues of duration/sequencing/overlap are ignored or incorrect</p>	<p>Specific instruction programs are not described (e.g., only generic/background information is provided)</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Less than half of the indicated instructional program(s) are appropriate for addressing the stated goals and objectives.</p>

<p>intervention programs from the literature, as the exam concerns construction of an IEP, not an essay.</p> <p>Proper citations are expected when justifying interventions but, again, this should be an IEP, not a review.</p>				
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

**Note:** Exams demonstrating overall gross misunderstanding receive an F grade even if the average score according to the indicated weighting results in a higher grade. For example, an exam with correctly identified areas of weakness (A in the first criterion) and some relevant elements of instructional programs (D in the last criterion) averages out to E, even if there are major problems such as some non-measurable annual goals (D) and no understanding of what short-term objectives are or how they should be structured and evaluated (F in both criteria). In such a case an F grade should be given nevertheless because lack of basic understanding of the structure and function of an IOP is demonstrated. In general, a passing grade presupposes passing each criterion.

=====

### Question 3 (Mathematics)

Word limit: 2000- 2500 words

Guidelines for grading:

Both questions need to be answered. The answers are graded separately, and the mean score of those will be the grade for the math part.

a)

For a good answer the following are included in the answer:

- RTI framework is correctly described especially related to assessment procedure; what kind of assessment (screening, progress monitoring, individual testing) can be conducted at different tiers (Tiers 1–3), by whom, and how information from assessment guides instructions (i.e., intensity and level of support).

in addition to the criteria set for a good answer, some or all of the following points are included in the answer:

- Student shows understanding about the differences in the Norwegian context and the original RTI framework, for example, by comparing or linking RTI to the Norwegian context
  - Bonus if the candidate mentions relevant assessment tools to be used both at school and at PPT
- Student describes the different cut-off points used in the interpretation of the test results
- Student describes and discusses why certain assessment tools are used – for example, what those measure, reliability (standardized vs. non-standardized), why those are suitable to be used for screening, progress monitoring or more individual testing (i.e., pros and cons)
- Other areas, in addition to mathematics, to be assessed at PPT are described and reasoned, and collaboration between school, PPT and parents are discussed.

b)

For a good answer the following are included in the answer:

- The answer needs to be clearly connected to the literature, and practical examples are used to support the answer

- Student describes a research-based method or intervention program for supporting Liv:

- Student describes how the chosen approach can be used to support specific skills relevant for Livs development:

Approach specific examples: Using manipulatives and illustrations (visual aids) or specific games and interactive online platforms for place-value understanding, transcoding and arithmetic development. En god besvarelse tar utgangspunkt i casebeskrivelsen, og klarer her å implementere elevens styrker og svakheter når det gjelder hvilke tiltak som vil kunne være hensiktsmessige for Liv. Ettersom eleven også strever med motivasjon, bør dette også implementeres som et spesifikt element i opplæringen.

in addition for the criteria set for a good answer, some or all of the following points are included in the answer:

- Relevant methods and intervention programs are presented and thoroughly evaluated relating to Liv difficulties and potential
  - Student describes what kind of research evidence there is related to the methods and the intervention programs
  - Student suggests how the methods/programs can be implemented (frequency, intensity)
- In addition to describing the method and intervention program, the student evaluates and shows understanding of its use in teaching and research: for example, how this type of method or program can be conducted at school (e.g., in classroom/small group/individually, as a supplemental, resources needed), and how its use may differ between research and practice purpose
- Students discusses how the effectiveness of the intervention can be assessed and how this is connected to the RTI approach (e.g., deciding the level and intensity of support)

=====