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1. Institution Name
Southeastern Louisiana University

2. State
Louisiana

3. Date submitted
MM DD YYYY

4. Report Preparer's Information:
Name of Preparer:
Dr. Camille M. Yates
Phone: Ext.
(985) 549-2406
E-mail:
cyates@selu.edu

5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:
Name:
Flo Winstead
Phone: Ext.
(985) 549-3726
E-mail:
mwinstead@selu.edu

6. Name of institution's program
Master's in Curriculum & Instruction with Concentration in Gifted

7. NCATE Category
Special Education-Gifted
8. Grade levels\(^{(1)}\) for which candidates are being prepared

| 1-12 |

\(^{(1)}\) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

9. Program Type

- Advanced Teaching
- First teaching license
- Other School Personnel
- Unspecified

10. Degree or award level

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only

11. Is this program offered at more than one site?

- Yes
- No

12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered

13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared

| Gifted add-on certification |

14. Program report status:

- Initial Review
- Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required, Recognition with Probation, or Not Nationally Recognized
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions

15. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:

NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section III. Does your state require such a test?
SECTION I - CONTEXT

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of CEC standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

The graduate program in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Gifted is a part of the Department of Teaching and Learning at Southeastern Louisiana University. This program provides candidates an opportunity to acquire add-on gifted certification while working on a master’s degree. Candidates take a variety of core courses required of all Master’s Degree candidates in Curriculum in Instruction. These courses include: Educational Research, Dimensions of Diversity, Design and Development of Instructional Software Teaching in Inclusive Classrooms, Leadership for Change, and a Capstone Seminar. Additionally, they are required to take the following gifted courses: Characteristics of the Gifted Child, Methods and Materials for Teaching the Gifted, Counseling the Gifted, Creativity, and Laboratory Practicum in Teaching the Gifted Child. In addition to a master’s degree, the state of Louisiana requires candidates who request add-on gifted certification to successfully complete: 12 hours of gifted content courses, a laboratory practicum, and an educational technology course.

The Council for Exceptional Children/National Association for Gifted Children (CEC/NAGC Standards, Field Experiences and Clinical Practice Standards, and Assessment System Standards govern the Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Gifted graduate program. Additionally, the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (LCET), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educators (NCATE), and the Southeastern Louisiana University Conceptual Framework, The Effective Educator, regulate this program. Louisiana’s teaching standards for both new and experienced teachers (LCET) were developed from the professional knowledge base on teaching and “craft knowledge” acquired by experienced educators. The LCET form the criteria used to assess the teaching practices of both new and experienced teachers. The State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) approved the LCET in September 1992. Revisions to LCET are approved by the SBESE as needed. Louisiana mandates that programs meet NCATE Standards.

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)

Southeastern Louisiana University candidates in the graduate program are required to have diverse field experiences. In the sequence of courses for the graduate degree in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Gifted, candidates are required to complete a minimum of 78 field-based hours. These field hours are found in the following courses/projects:

In EDUC 648: Characteristics of the Gifted Child, candidates are required to observe for 5 field hours in a regular education classroom (PK-12), and document gifted behaviors. In EDUC 649: Methods and Materials for Teaching the Gifted, candidates are required to implement an Action Research Project and implement an interdisciplinary unit. This is conducted in the teacher’s own or classmate’s classroom (if not currently teaching (PK-12) for a minimum of 20 field hours. In EDUC 647: Creativity, candidates are required to assess students’ creativity and plan and teach appropriate lessons that enhance creativity in their own or classmate’s classroom (if not currently teaching (PK-12) for a minimum of 6 field hours. In EDUC 646: Laboratory Practicum in Teaching the Gifted, candidates are required to assess students, plan and teach differentiated lessons to gifted students in a summer practicum that includes 1st through
8th grade students from a variety of settings for a total of 45 field hours. In EDUC 618: Counseling for the Gifted, candidates are required to design and teach a lesson to a group of students about what it means to be gifted. This is conducted in the teacher’s own or classmate’s classroom (if not currently teaching (PK-12) for 2 field hours. Field/clinical experiences reflect/conducted in grade level/subject areas of teacher’s current certification.

All field experiences are monitored by fully licensed, gifted-certified faculty members at Southeastern Louisiana University. The field hours are purposefully selected and sequenced to provide experiences that begin with introductory level requirements and move developmentally to increasingly complex experiences. Field experiences address all age ranges (PK-12) and reflect and are conducted in grade level/subject areas of the teacher’s current certification/s.

3. Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

Admission: Admission to the graduate program is based on a variety of screening factors. Candidates must apply for admission to Southeastern’s Graduate School, submit transcripts verifying a baccalaureate degree in a certified area of education, and have at least a 2.5 undergraduate grade point average (GPA). A formula taking the undergraduate GPA x 200 points plus the verbal and the quantitative scores from the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) is incorporated to determine at what level the candidate is accepted in to the program. All candidates must achieve at least a total of 1250 points using the above formula. If the candidate achieves 1250 – 1349 points, they are accepted conditionally. However if candidates maintain a 3.0 average, after the initial 12 hours, their status is changed to regular admission status. Graduate candidates who achieve a minimum of 1350 points initially, receive regular admission status. All candidates pursuing graduate studies at Southeastern Louisiana University must maintain a 3.0 GPA in order to remain in good standing.

Retention: Several strategies are employed to support candidates pursuing a graduate degree in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Gifted at Southeastern. The program involves faculty members serving as mentors for graduate program candidates. A list of faculty members with their area(s) of expertise is provided to graduate candidates, school districts, and local schools in the Southeastern service region. The list contains names of faculty members, areas of expertise, contact telephone numbers, and email addresses. Program candidates have a source of professional advice to further their knowledge about problems that they experience during both their graduate studies and the first few years of teaching gifted individuals. These lists are provided to school principals at their district meetings. Gifted faculty (a) develop and continue collaborative partnerships with the school district and local schools, (b) offer information about current and future events occurring in the gifted program, and (c) assist in providing further training for new gifted program graduates.

Portfolio Requirements: Candidates are required to develop and submit an electronic portfolio that demonstrates: their understanding of national standards, their ability to reflect on the connections between standards and their professional practice, and their ability to have an impact on student learning. Portfolio artifacts are submitted for review at three pre-determined portals. The required hours of field experience are from diverse populations. The required professional development hours reflect acquisition of content skills.

Exit: In order to successfully exit the present graduate program in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Gifted, candidates must complete the Comprehensive Exam which consists of three questions: a general gifted question that incorporates knowledge and skills learned in all the gifted courses, a question related to Educational Research, and a question related to Leadership for Change.
The newly redesigned program will replace the Comprehensive Exam with an Action Research Project that will allow candidates to demonstrate their competence and ability to impact student learning. Candidates’ successful completion of the Electronic Portfolio is a requirement for graduating with a Master’s Degree.

In addition to the above requirements, candidates must meet the following requirements for the graduate school:

- Complete curricula prescribed for the program area.
- File a completed Admission to Candidacy for the Degree form.
- Earn a cumulative 3.0 GPA in all graduate work and earn no more than 6 semester hours of “C” grades in course work toward their degree.
- Be recommended for the degree by the faculty committee, department head, and Graduate Dean.
- Be approved for the degree by the Graduate Dean.

4. Description of the relationship (2) of the program to the unit's conceptual framework. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

The Concentration in Gifted is aligned with the Conceptual Framework of the College of Education and Human Development which was revised in 2005 and is comprised of the following four critical components of The Effective Educator:

- **Knowledge of the Learner (KL):** The faculty of the graduate program believe that candidates’ understanding of the learner is necessary to provide effective and equitable instruction. The program prepares candidates to demonstrate and value sensitivity to the needs of all learners, teachers, and students. Candidates acquire an understanding of learners as individuals and incorporate this knowledge through the progression of their educational experiences and as effective professionals, they continue this practice throughout their careers. Diversity is an integral part of the program. The faculty values and promotes equality and diversity for candidates. Each candidate is valued for their diversity, and faculty work to ensure that all members of the learning community treat one another with respect and dignity.

- **Strategies and Methods (SM):** The effective professional demonstrates best teaching practices through inquiry, creativity, and reflective thinking. Strategies and methods of learning are modeled in an attempt to teach candidates to apply these strategies and methods in their own classrooms. The instructors engage candidates in building on personal reservoirs of classroom experiences in the processes of analysis and decision-making. Following active participation in planned classroom and field experiences, candidates apply these skills in authentic experiences in school activities. Diversity is an integral part of the strategies and methods used in the university classroom and exhibited by candidates as they observe, participate, and teach. Candidates examine human development theory, apply proven learning and motivational theories, and infuse concern for diversity to the learning process. Throughout the program, candidates are required to use technology as they apply teaching and learning strategies.

- **Content Knowledge (CK):** Candidates exhibit depth of knowledge in specific content areas as well as knowledge of effective teaching and learning skills and strategies. Aspiring candidates have the necessary content knowledge to effectively impact the learning of their students. Candidates learn about diverse cultures and the relationship of these cultures to teaching and learning and communication with families. To work with all elements of the community, candidates recognize, value, and communicate effectively with various cultural, ethnic, racial, and special interest groups. Technology applications are taught as basic content knowledge and are interspersed throughout the program.

- **Professional Standards (PS):** Candidates in the gifted area of concentration participate in a curriculum based on a variety of standards and principles including those proposed by the Council for Exceptional
Children/National Association for Gifted Children (CEC/NAGC) and the National Board for Professional Teachers (NBPT), the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (LCET) and the Southeastern Louisiana University Conceptual Framework, the Effective Educator. Candidates incorporate these standards in assignments, field experiences, and artifacts through self-assessment as they progress through the program. Diversity and Technology are integral parts of the program as directed by both the national standards and the Conceptual Framework.

The majority of graduate candidates in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Gifted, conduct field experiences in their own classrooms, while faculty members provide candidates with distinctive experiences to expose them to students from diverse environments and groups that may include peer evaluation of instruction, videotapes depicting diverse teaching situations, or matching assessment techniques with diverse learner needs.

5. Indication of whether the program has a unique set of program assessments and their relationship of the program's assessments to the unit's assessment system. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

The program in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Gifted will use the following unit assessments to measure candidate competence:
• MPEC Surveys
• Comprehensive Exam (old program)
• Competency defense of the Action Research Project (new program)
• Portfolio

Candidates develop an electronic portfolio that is used throughout the program. They select artifacts, match those artifacts to appropriate standards, and then reflect on the significance of the artifacts relative to the professional standards, their own learning, and their own professional practice. The portfolio is evaluated by faculty as candidates move through the pre-established portals. The portfolio is designed to promote professional growth and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Candidates are required to articulate beliefs, skills, and strengths.

The College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) is utilizing PASS-PORT, a web-based system for collecting data on candidate performance. With PASS-PORT, candidates are able to move through the portals of the COEHD's assessment system. In addition, PASS-PORT enables candidates to create electronic portfolios that contain valuable artifacts to document knowledge, skills, and dispositions and then to route those documents to faculty for evaluation.

To supplement the unit assessments, the graduate program in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Gifted will use the following program specific assessments:
• Action Research Project Proposal
• Action Research Project Implementation
• Multi-disciplinary Units and Related Lesson Plans
• Self-Reflections
• Peer Evaluations
• Course based evaluations
• Portfolio Artifacts

Program components have been designed to specifically focus on knowledge, skills, and dispositions addressed in the CEC Standards. Candidates will have many opportunities to demonstrate mastery of
6. Please attach files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)

See Attachments panel below.

7. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.

See Attachments panel below.

8. Candidate Information
Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of Candidates Enrolled in the Program</th>
<th># of Program Completers(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) NCATE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

9. Faculty Information
Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Campbell, Kathleen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(5)</td>
<td>Ph. D., Ed. Leadership, University of New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Please use this area to provide the faculty member's highest degree, field, and university.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Edwards, Cheryl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp;</td>
<td>Ph.D., Curriculum &amp; Instruction, Louisiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role of the faculty member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service: List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years</td>
<td>Six publications in national peer reviewed publications; three publications on mentoring published by the LA Dept. of Education (2006); presentations at the MSERA, SERA, NCPEA, LCPEA, and LERA, 2005-2008. Program chair/president elect of LERA 2007-008. Presented workshop on team building to Livingston principals and asst. principals. Worked with a Washington Parish high school improvement team and faculty. Currently working with a St. Tammany high school on best practices in instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools</td>
<td>Certification: Type A Louisiana Certificate, Academically Gifted, Social Studies, English, Principal PK-12 Teaching Experience: 30 yrs middle school English and social studies teacher, academically gifted teacher; high school principal (grades 9-12) for 2 years; middle school principal (grades 5-8) for 10 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Jacob, Shirley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp;</td>
<td>PH.D., Administration and Supervision, University of Southern Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the</td>
<td>Department Head, Department of Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role of the faculty member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service: List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years</td>
<td>Inducted to Educator’s Honor Role (2006) - SLU Program Reviewer for national conference – ATEMembership – 3 University Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools</td>
<td>Clinical SupervisionCertification: Type A Louisiana Certificate, Grades 1-8, Gifted PK-12 Teaching Experience: 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member Name</td>
<td>Palka, Jackie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University&lt;sup&gt;(5)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ed.D., in Curriculum and Instruction, Louisiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member&lt;sup&gt;(6)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank&lt;sup&gt;(7)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship&lt;sup&gt;(8)&lt;/sup&gt;, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service&lt;sup&gt;(9)&lt;/sup&gt;; List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years&lt;sup&gt;(10)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Editor of Louisiana Reading Association State Journal; Conducted Gifted Evaluation Study in St. Tammany Parish School District; 2004-2005 school year; Palka, J. (2004) Lessons on literacy: An experience in co-teaching Academic Exchange Quarterly, 8 (3), 286- 292.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools&lt;sup&gt;(11)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Certification: Type A Louisiana Certificate Reading Specialists, Gifted, Principal/Supervisor, Supervisor of Student Teachers Teaching Experience: 23 years public school teaching (LA), 1 year Supervisor of Gifted Program (OH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Simoneaux, Paul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University&lt;sup&gt;(5)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M.Ed., Curriculum &amp; Instruction +30, Nicholls State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member&lt;sup&gt;(6)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank&lt;sup&gt;(7)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship&lt;sup&gt;(8)&lt;/sup&gt;, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service&lt;sup&gt;(9)&lt;/sup&gt;; List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years&lt;sup&gt;(10)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>State Committee on Higher Education Portfolio Development; Honorary Faculty Coach for women’s basketball and volleyball, Spring 2003 &amp; 2004; Created professional organization for teacher candidates. (SEAS) Southeastern Education Association of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools&lt;sup&gt;(11)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Clinical Supervision Certification: Type A Louisiana Certificate, Grades 1-8, Reading Specialist, Gifted PK-12 Teaching Experience:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Vicknair, Janis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University&lt;sup&gt;(5)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M.Ed., Supervision and Administration Education +30, Southeastern Louisiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member&lt;sup&gt;(6)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank&lt;sup&gt;(7)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Coordinator of Field Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship&lt;sup&gt;(8)&lt;/sup&gt;, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service&lt;sup&gt;(9)&lt;/sup&gt;; List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years&lt;sup&gt;(10)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Southern Association and Accreditation facilitator Outstanding Clinician in Teacher Education for the State of Louisiana (Supervisor of Student Teachers) April 2004 National Endowment for the Humanities Award-Summer 1990-$2000 grant Study of Morte d’Arthur by Sir Thomas Malory Southern Connecticut State University/YaleMember:TESOL (Teachers of English to Students of Other Languages)--State and national.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools&lt;sup&gt;(11)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Clinical Supervision Certification: Social Studies, English, Supervisor of Student Teaching, Principal, Parish or City School Supervisor of Instruction, Academically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member Name</td>
<td>Warren, Debra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(^{(5)})</td>
<td>M.Ed., Elementary Education, Centenary College of Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(^{(6)})</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(^{(7)})</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship(^{(8)}), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service(^{(9)}): List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(^{(10)})</td>
<td>Presenter- KDP International: Using Children's Literature to teach Science Concepts to Struggling Readers in the Middle School, Fall 2005; Kappa Delta Pi International – Counselor; Member- Loranger Elementary School PTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(^{(11)})</td>
<td>Clinical Supervision Certification: Type A Louisiana Certificate, Grades 1-8, Special Education: Mild Moderate, Gifted, Reading Specialist PK-12 Teaching Experience:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Yates, Camille</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University(^{(5)})</td>
<td>Ph.D., in Special Education, University of Southern Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(^{(6)})</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank(^{(7)})</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship(^{(8)}), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service(^{(9)}): List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(^{(10)})</td>
<td>Institute for Teaching and Professional Enhancement (ITPE) 05-06; Action Research as a Transformative Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(^{(11)})</td>
<td>Certification: Type A Mississippi Certificate, Home Economics, Supervisor of Student Teaching and Practicum PK-12 Teaching Experience: 11 years in Home Economics, Elementary, SPED Resource; (Gifted, Elementary K-3/4-8), AA (Instructional Technology K-12), AAAA (Mild/Moderate K-12) Other: LaTAAP Assessor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(5)}\) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.
\(^{(6)}\) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator
\(^{(7)}\) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor
\(^{(8)}\) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.
\(^{(9)}\) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.
\(^{(10)}\) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.
\(^{(11)}\) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

**SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS**
In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the CEC standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

1. In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the CEC standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program. (Response limited to 250 characters each field)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Number of Assessment</th>
<th>Name of Assessment (12)</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment (13)</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Administered (14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)</td>
<td>COMPS</td>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>Culmination of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in special education (required)</td>
<td>Action Research Project Proposal</td>
<td>Project Proposal</td>
<td>EDUC 648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction (required)</td>
<td>Parallel Curriculum Unit</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>EDUC 649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #4: Assessment of student teaching (required)</td>
<td>Practicum Observation of Teaching</td>
<td>Observation of Teaching</td>
<td>EDUC 646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning (required)</td>
<td>“What It Means To Be Gifted” Lesson</td>
<td>Lesson Plan</td>
<td>EDUC 618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards (required)</td>
<td>Artifact Reflection</td>
<td>Project Reflection</td>
<td>EDUC 649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards (optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #8: Additional assessment that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(12) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.
(13) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).
(14) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEC Standards</th>
<th>Assessment Title</th>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Point of Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS**

For each CEC standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple CEC standards.

1. **FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE STANDARD**

Special education candidates progress through a series of developmentally sequenced field experiences for the full range of ages, types and levels of abilities, and collaborative opportunities that are appropriate to the license or roles for which they are preparing. These field and clinical experiences are supervised by qualified professionals.

Information should be provided in Section I (Context) to address this standard.

2. **CONTENT STANDARDS**

1. **Foundations.** Special educators understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society. Special educators understand how these influence professional practice, including assessment, instructional planning, implementation, and program evaluation. Special educators understand how issues of human diversity can impact families, cultures, and schools, and how these complex human issues can interact with issues in the delivery of special education services. They understand the relationships of organizations of special education to the organizations and functions of schools, school systems, and other agencies. Special educators use this knowledge as a ground upon which to construct their own personal understandings and philosophies of special education.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the program is preparing candidates.

2. **Development and Characteristics of Learners.** Special educators know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human
beings. Special educators understand the similarities and differences in human development and the characteristics between and among individuals with and without exceptional learning needs (ELN). Moreover, special educators understand how exceptional conditions can interact with the domains of human development and they use this knowledge to respond to the varying abilities and behaviors of individual’s with ELN. Special educators understand how the experiences of individuals with ELN can impact families, as well as the individual’s ability to learn, interact socially, and live as fulfilled contributing members of the community.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.

3. Individual Learning Differences. Special educators understand the effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual’s learning in school and throughout life. Special educators understand that the beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures can affect relationships among and between students, their families, and the school community. Moreover, special educators are active and resourceful in seeking to understand how primary language, culture, and familial backgrounds interact with the individual’s exceptional condition to impact the individual’s academic and social abilities, attitudes, values, interests, and career options. The understanding of these learning differences and their possible interactions provides the foundation upon which special educators individualize instruction to provide meaningful and challenging learning for individuals with ELN.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the program is preparing candidates.

4. Instructional Strategies. Special educators possess a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to individualize instruction for individuals with ELN. Special educators select, adapt, and use these instructional strategies to promote positive learning results in general and special curricula and to appropriately modify learning environments for individuals with ELN. They enhance the learning of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills of individuals with ELN, and increase their self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem. Moreover, special educators emphasize the development, maintenance, and generalization of knowledge and skills across environments, settings, and the lifespan.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the program is preparing candidates.

5. Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Special educators
actively create learning environments for individuals with ELN that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with ELN. In addition, special educators foster environments in which diversity is valued and individuals are taught to live harmoniously and productively in a culturally diverse world. Special educators shape environments to encourage the independence, self-motivation, self-direction, personal empowerment, and self-advocacy of individuals with ELN. Special educators help their general education colleagues integrate individuals with ELN in regular environments and engage them in meaningful learning activities and interactions. Special educators use direct motivational and instructional interventions with individuals with ELN to teach them to respond effectively to current expectations. When necessary, special educators can safely intervene with individuals with ELN in crisis. Special educators coordinate all these efforts and provide guidance and direction to paraeducators and others, such as classroom volunteers and tutors.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.

6. Language. Special educators understand typical and atypical language development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual’s experience with and use of language. Special educators use individualized strategies to enhance language development and teach communication skills to individuals with ELN. Special educators are familiar with augmentative, alternative, and assistive technologies to support and enhance communication of individuals with exceptional needs. Special educators match their communication methods to an individual’s language proficiency and cultural and linguistic differences. Special educators provide effective language models and they use communication strategies and resources to facilitate understanding of subject matter for individuals with ELN whose primary language is not English.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of language for and with individuals with ELN through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.

7. Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice. Special educators develop long-range individualized instructional plans anchored in both general and special curricula. In addition, special educators systematically translate these individualized plans into carefully selected shorter-range goals and objectives taking into consideration an individual’s abilities and needs, the learning environment, and a myriad of cultural and linguistic factors. Individualized instructional plans emphasize explicit modeling and efficient guided practice to assure acquisition and fluency through maintenance and generalization. Understanding of these factors as well as the implications of an individual’s exceptional condition, guides the
special educator’s selection, adaptation, and creation of materials, and the use of powerful instructional variables. Instructional plans are modified based on ongoing analysis of the individual’s learning progress. Moreover, special educators facilitate this instructional planning in a collaborative context including the individuals with exceptionalities, families, professional colleagues, and personnel from other agencies as appropriate. Special educators also develop a variety of individualized transition plans, such as transitions from preschool to elementary school and from secondary settings to a variety of postsecondary work and learning contexts. Special educators are comfortable using appropriate technologies to support instructional planning and individualized instruction.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.

8. Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and special educators use multiple types of assessment information for a variety of educational decisions. Special educators use the results of assessments to help identify exceptional learning needs and to develop and implement individualized instructional programs, as well as to adjust instruction in response to ongoing learning progress. Special educators understand the legal policies and ethical principles of measurement and assessment related to referral, eligibility, program planning, instruction, and placement for individuals with ELN, including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Special educators understand measurement theory and practices for addressing issues of validity, reliability, norms, bias, and interpretation of assessment results. In addition, special educators understand the appropriate use and limitations of various types of assessments. Special educators collaborate with families and other colleagues to assure non-biased, meaningful assessments and decision-making. Special educators conduct formal and informal assessments of behavior, learning, achievement, and environments to design learning experiences that support the growth and development of individuals with ELN. Special educators use assessment information to identify supports and adaptations required for individuals with ELN to access the general curriculum and to participate in school, system, and statewide assessment programs. Special educators regularly monitor the progress of individuals with ELN in general and special curricula. Special educators use appropriate technologies to support their assessments.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.

9. Professional and Ethical Practice. Special educators are guided by the profession’s ethical and professional practice standards. Special educators practice in multiple roles and complex situations across wide age and developmental ranges. Their practice requires ongoing attention to legal matters along with serious professional and ethical considerations. Special
educators engage in professional activities and participate in learning communities that benefit individuals with ELN, their families, colleagues, and their own professional growth. Special educators view themselves as lifelong learners and regularly reflect on and adjust their practice. Special educators are aware of how their own and others' attitudes, behaviors, and ways of communicating can influence their practice. Special educators understand that culture and language can interact with exceptionalities, and are sensitive to the many aspects of diversity of individuals with ELN and their families. Special educators actively plan and engage in activities that foster their professional growth and keep them current with evidence-based best practices. Special educators know their own limits of practice and practice within them.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.

10. Collaboration. Special educators routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with ELN are addressed throughout schooling. Moreover, special educators embrace their special role as advocate for individuals with ELN. Special educators promote and advocate the learning and well-being of individuals with ELN across a wide range of settings and a range of different learning experiences. Special educators are viewed as specialists by a myriad of people who actively seek their collaboration to effectively include and teach individuals with ELN. Special educators are a resource to their colleagues in understanding the laws and policies relevant to Individuals with ELN. Special educators use collaboration to facilitate the successful transitions of individuals with ELN across settings and services.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the preparation program is preparing candidates.

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. The assessments must be those that all candidates in the program are required to complete and should be used by the program to determine candidate proficiencies as expected in the program standards. Assessments and scoring guides should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards.

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas that are addressed in NCATE’s unit standard 1:
• Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
• Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
• Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare a document that includes the following items: a two page narrative that responds to questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 (below) and the three items listed in question 5 (below). This document should be attached as directed.

1. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
2. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
3. A brief analysis of the data findings;
4. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording; and
5. Attachment of assessment documentation, including:
   (a) the assessment tool or description of the assignment;
   (b) the scoring guide for the assessment; and
   (c) candidate data derived from the assessment.

It is preferred that the response for each of 5a, 5b, and 5c (above) be limited to the equivalent of five text pages, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

All three components of the assessment (as identified in 5a-c) must be attached, with the following exceptions: (a) the assessment tool and scoring guide are not required for reporting state licensure data, and (b) for some assessments, data may not yet be avail

1. State licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge. CEC standards addressed in this entry could include all of the standards. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

See Attachments panel below.

2. Assessment of content knowledge\(^{(15)}\) in special education. CEC standards addressed in this assessment could include but are not limited to Standards 1 and 2. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations; written interpersonal/presentational tasks; capstone projects or research reports addressing cross-disciplinary content; philosophy of teaching statement that addresses the role of culture, literature, and cross-disciplinary content; and other portfolio tasks
Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 2

See Attachments panel below.

Assessment 3

See Attachments panel below.

Assessment 4

See Attachments panel below.

Assessment 5

See Attachments panel below.
6. Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

7. Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

8. Additional assessment that addresses CEC standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty’s interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

Section V Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

The Process

The College of Education and Human Development at Southeastern Louisiana University has designed a system for monitoring the use of data for program improvement. Whenever data is received, a report is generated. That report is shared with the Dean’s Administrative Council (DAC). The DAC reviews the report, analyzes the results, reflects on the significance, and discusses possible program or unit implications. The report is then disseminated to respective program chairs/directors who, again, review and analyze before they send to the appropriate program faculty. Faculty review the data and determine the type of response that is indicated. The data might require an action, decision, or proposal. If so, that
information is sent back to the DAC for approval. The DAC creates an executive summary and is then responsible for the dissemination of that document to the appropriate audience which might include the Council for Teacher Educators (CTE), the public, or an appropriate committee. This process allows for the dissemination of data to appropriate people, involves the college in the decision-making process, ensures appropriate analysis of data by a variety of constituents, and allows data to be effectively used for program improvement.

Content
Since there is no required praxis examination that tests content knowledge of candidates seeking gifted certification, they must demonstrate their knowledge of content and their ability to apply that content to practical situations in a variety of ways throughout the curriculum. To ensure appropriate, research-based content, the program is framed around the CEC/NAGC Standards. Overall, candidates seem to have a good grasp of the tenets that are evident in the body of content knowledge inherent in the field of gifted education.

Informal and formal measures indicate that candidates have an understanding of the following areas as they relate to gifted learners: characteristics, assessment measures, definitions, facets of giftedness, twice exceptional students, strategies/methods, materials, learning styles, differentiation, creativity, curriculum models, theories/theorists, historical foundations, local, state, and national policies/procedures, diversity, culture, and national standards. Informal measures such as Assessment 3, the Parallel Curriculum Unit, Assessment 4, the Practicum Assessment/Observation Form, Assessment 5, “What it means to be Gifted” teaching assignment and Assessment 6, Artifact Reflection are used to measure candidate understanding of gifted learners. Formal measure such as Assessment 1, the Comprehensive Exam and Assessment 2, Action Research Proposal/Project are used to determine candidate essential knowledge to teach gifted learners. Candidates have demonstrated not only their knowledge of the content but also their ability to apply that content to a variety of practical situations. Experiences were designed that allowed them to work effectively in their own classrooms and the classrooms of their colleagues and also with local students enrolled in summer programs. A thorough analysis of data indicates that candidates sometimes lacked the ability to see the “bigger picture” Some candidates had a hard time moving away from more traditional views of the learning process and looking at content acquisition through a different lens. They need more time to study a variety of curriculum models and opportunities to explore the similarities and differences among the models. A greater emphasis should be placed on essential understandings, the importance of complex concepts, and the impact of units of study on the lifelong learning of students. Re-designed courses are incorporating these indicated changes.

The Comprehensive Examination has been the major culminating assessment used to decide if candidates have the necessary knowledge to teach gifted learners. Overall, candidates in the gifted program have been very successful in this area. However, research shows that a paper-and-pencil activity is not as accurate an indicator as an experience that would require candidates to demonstrate their new knowledge in an authentic setting. For this reason, the Department of Teaching and Learning has decided to replace the Comprehensive Examination with an Action Research Project. The Action Research Project would require students to determine an actual “problem area” in their classroom, analyze relevant research, propose a solution, implement that solution, analyze results, reflect on lesson effectiveness, and document impact on student learning.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
Candidates demonstrated their competence in Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions in a variety of ways throughout the program. The graduate program in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Gifted is designed around the CEC/NAGC Standards and focused on best practices for educators of the gifted. This ensures that all of the professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions indicated in these well-researched standards are integrated throughout the curriculum. Candidates demonstrated their competency in these standards through
Assessments 1 through 6. They were able to identify which standard(s) connected to classroom experiences/expectations in Assessment 6 (Artifact Reflection) and then reflect on how completing certain assignments proved their competency relative to specific standards. They understand the standards and see their practical relevance. Candidates worked collaboratively with colleagues in their university classrooms, in their local schools, and at the district level. They interacted with parents in a variety of ways. They reflected on their own learning and also on the impact that their teaching had on the learning of their own students (Assessment 5). Reflection is sometimes difficult, especially for candidates who have never before been required to do this. But, candidates are improving in their ability to reflect as faculty is becoming more adept at modeling the process. Candidates were observed in authentic teaching situations and assessed for appropriate dispositions (Assessment 4). They demonstrated their ability to treat students fairly and with respect, to make ethical decisions, to organize their time, and to demonstrate professional behaviors. Observations and self-reflections revealed that candidates understood giftedness and could design and implement appropriate lessons that would impact the learning and achievement of their students. A thorough analysis of data indicated that while candidates are improving in their ability to reflect on their own teaching and the learning of their students, there is room for improvement in this area. More instruction in the process of reflection will be included in revised courses. Also, more modeling of the reflective process by faculty who are teaching these courses will be included in the program. Some candidates, especially those who had no previous experiences with gifted learners, had a hard time relating to specific needs of gifted students. They often relied on the more traditional definitions and stereotypes of “giftedness” and the more traditional teaching methods that they learned in their undergraduate teacher education program. They often failed to see the unique qualities that separate gifted students from regular education students. These candidates need more experiences with classrooms that include gifted students. Efforts are underway to build more of these types of experiences into the curriculum of these candidates.

Student Learning
The reflective component built into each of the courses required candidates to consider and to reflect upon the learning of their own students. Classroom discussions and assignments focused on the link between teaching and learning and required candidates to consider the unique needs of each of their students as they planned instructional activities. Candidates analyzed data from their own students (Assessment 5) in an attempt to determine the impact they were having on student learning. Lessons that were constructed were designed to focus on student learning/achievement. Candidates were able to appropriately link learning goals/objectives with assessment measures and then to analyze the impact of lessons/units of study. They made connections between formal and informal data and demonstrated their ability to interpret test results. Candidates were required to analyze their own teaching effectiveness and to document their justification for their self-analysis. Some candidates seemed to have the ability to naturally assess their own effectiveness while others struggled. There is definitely an indication for more university-related instruction in this reflective process. Candidates need to be taught how to identify specific lesson components and then to connect those components directly to student learning. The ability to link what the teacher does and what the student learns must be strengthened. Newly redesigned courses will include opportunities for students to identify and practice this skill. Faculty who teach courses need to more effectively model all aspects of the reflective process and to build more reflective opportunities into the curriculum.

Overall Analysis of Candidate Assessment Results
Candidates have demonstrated their new understandings by answering content related questions, planning and implementing appropriate units of study; finding and analyzing research; reflecting on their own learning; participating in discussions/conversations; sharing their findings with others; designing, implementing, and analyzing action research projects; reflecting on the impact of their teaching on their students’ learning; demonstrating appropriate dispositions; and identifying/finding solutions to social-emotional related issues. Major areas for improvement include problems with reflection and with
recognizing the unique needs of gifted students.

Use of Program Data for Unit Changes
After reviewing data obtained from Comprehensive Exams and analyzing research about the most effective way to assess candidate content knowledge, the faculty in the Department of Teaching and Learning decided that they could more accurately assess the ability of candidates to demonstrate and apply content knowledge with an Action Research Project. This project would not only require candidates to demonstrate their mastery of content but also to demonstrate their ability to apply this knowledge in an authentic setting. The proposed Action Research Project will require candidates to identify an authentic problem in their classroom, review relevant research that might help them develop a solution, determine a plan of action that might solve the problem, implement that plan, and then reflect on the results. Students would be required to self-assess their own performance and also analyze the effect they had on student learning. In the revised program, the Action Research Project will replace the Comprehensive Examination.

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in response to issues cited in previous recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report or a response to condition report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4 (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

C.1—Candidates’ knowledge of content
One of the three questions on Assessment #1 comprehensive exam is related specifically to students with gifts and talents, and accounts for 50 percent of the final score. The other two questions relate to educational leadership and research which each account for 25 percent of the final score. From the information provided, and without the actual exam questions, it is difficult to ascertain the level of competency and content mastery candidates can demonstrate in answering the one question.

We have provided the additional questions for educational leadership and research along with the scoring rubrics and data. In addition we revised the data chart to reflect the standards associated with each part of the rubrics.

C.2—Candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions
The assessments addressing understanding and application of pedagogy and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions are vague in assessing candidates’ knowledge and abilities in these areas. Assessment tools are briefly described identifying what is expected of candidates. However, this is not congruent with the rubrics. The scoring rubrics focus more on the process of completing the assessment and have little focus on how well the assessment meets the standards.

We realigned and explicated the rubrics for Assessment 1 (Comps), Assessment 2 (Action Research), Assessment 3 (Parallel Curriculum), Assessment 4 (Classroom Observation), Assessment 5 (“What it means to be Gifted” Teaching Assignment), and Assessment 6 (Artifact Reflection) to focus more on congruency with the standards.

C.3—Candidate effects on P-12 student learning
Assessment #5 ‘What It Means to Be Gifted’ makes an attempt to assess candidates’ effects on P-12
student learning by having candidates reflect on their lesson effectiveness. However, there is no specific evidence that candidates formatively assess their impact on P-12 student learning.

We added the pre and post assessment activity that shows how candidates formatively assess their impact on student learning in the classroom. They reflect on the impact of their instruction. We also aligned the rubric subparts with the appropriate standards.

**PART D—EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

The program appears to have a plan in place for program improvement. Although Section V presents areas for improvement, it is not clear what data were utilized to make these recommendations.

**Section V Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance**

**The Process**

The College of Education and Human Development at Southeastern Louisiana University has designed a system for monitoring the use of data for program improvement. Whenever data is received, a report is generated. That report is shared with the Dean’s Administrative Council (DAC). The DAC reviews the report, analyzes the results, reflects on the significance, and discusses possible program or unit implications. The report is then disseminated to respective program chairs/directors who, again, review and analyze before they send to the appropriate program faculty. Faculty review the data and determine the type of response that is indicated. The data might require an action, decision, or proposal. If so, that information is sent back to the DAC for approval. The DAC creates an executive summary and is then responsible for the dissemination of that document to the appropriate audience which might include the Council for Teacher Educators (CTE), the public, or an appropriate committee. This process allows for the dissemination of data to appropriate people, involves the college in the decision-making process, ensures appropriate analysis of data by a variety of constituents, and allows data to be effectively used for program improvement.

**Content**

Since there is no required praxis examination that tests content knowledge of candidates seeking gifted certification, they must demonstrate their knowledge of content and their ability to apply that content to practical situations in a variety of ways throughout the curriculum. To ensure appropriate, research-based content, the program is framed around the CEC/NAGC Standards. Overall, candidates seem to have a good grasp of the tenets that are evident in the body of content knowledge inherent in the field of gifted education.

Informal and formal measures indicate that candidates have an understanding of the following areas as they relate to gifted learners: characteristics, assessment measures, definitions, facets of giftedness, twice exceptional students, strategies/methods, materials, learning styles, differentiation, creativity, curriculum models, theories/theorists, historical foundations, local, state, and national policies/procedures, diversity, culture, and national standards. Informal measures such as Assessment 3, the Parallel Curriculum Unit, Assessment 4, the Practicum Assessment/Observation Form, Assessment 5, “What it means to be Gifted” teaching assignment and Assessment 6, Artifact Reflection are used to measure candidate understanding of gifted learners. Formal measure such as Assessment 1, the Comprehensive Exam and Assessment 2, Action Research Proposal/Project are used to determine candidate essential knowledge to teach gifted learners. Candidates have demonstrated not only their knowledge of the content but also their ability to apply that content to a variety of practical situations. Experiences were designed that allowed them to work effectively in their own classrooms and the classrooms of their colleagues and also
with local students enrolled in summer programs. A thorough analysis of data indicates that candidates sometimes lacked the ability to see the “bigger picture.” Some candidates had a hard time moving away from more traditional views of the learning process and looking at content acquisition through a different lens. They need more time to study a variety of curriculum models and opportunities to explore the similarities and differences among the models. A greater emphasis should be placed on essential understandings, the importance of complex concepts, and the impact of units of study on the lifelong learning of students. Re-designed courses are incorporating these indicated changes.

The Comprehensive Examination has been the major culminating assessment used to decide if candidates have the necessary knowledge to teach gifted learners. Overall, candidates in the gifted program have been very successful in this area. However, research shows that a paper-and-pencil activity is not as accurate an indicator as an experience that would require candidates to demonstrate their new knowledge in an authentic setting. For this reason, the Department of Teaching and Learning has decided to replace the Comprehensive Examination with an Action Research Project. The Action Research Project would require students to determine an actual “problem area” in their classroom, analyze relevant research, propose a solution, implement that solution, analyze results, reflect on lesson effectiveness, and document impact on student learning.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
Candidates demonstrated their competence in Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions in a variety of ways throughout the program. The graduate program in Curriculum and Instruction with a Concentration in Gifted is designed around the CEC/NAGC Standards and focused on best practices for educators of the gifted. This ensures that all of the professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions indicated in these well-researched standards are integrated throughout the curriculum. Candidates demonstrated their competency in these standards through Assessments 1 through 6. They were able to identify which standard(s) connected to classroom experiences/expectations in Assessment 6 (Artifact Reflection) and then reflect on how completing certain assignments proved their competency relative to specific standards. They understand the standards and see their practical relevance. Candidates worked collaboratively with colleagues in their university classrooms, in their local schools, and at the district level. They interacted with parents in a variety of ways. They reflected on their own learning and also on the impact that their teaching had on the learning of their own students (Assessment 5). Reflection is sometimes difficult, especially for candidates who have never before been required to do this. But, candidates are improving in their ability to reflect as faculty is becoming more adept at modeling the process. Candidates were observed in authentic teaching situations and assessed for appropriate dispositions (Assessment 4). They demonstrated their ability to treat students fairly and with respect, to make ethical decisions, to organize their time, and to demonstrate professional behaviors. Observations and self-reflections revealed that candidates understood giftedness and could design and implement appropriate lessons that would impact the learning and achievement of their students. A thorough analysis of data indicated that while candidates are improving in their ability to reflect on their own teaching and the learning of their students, there is room for improvement in this area. More instruction in the process of reflection will be included in revised courses. Also, more modeling of the reflective process by faculty who are teaching these courses will be included in the program. Some candidates, especially those who had no previous experiences with gifted learners, had a hard time relating to specific needs of gifted students. They often relied on the more traditional definitions and stereotypes of “giftedness” and the more traditional teaching methods that they learned in their undergraduate teacher education program. They often failed to see the unique qualities that separate gifted students from regular education students. These candidates need more experiences with classrooms that include gifted students. Efforts are underway to build more of these types of experiences into the curriculum of these candidates.

Student Learning
The reflective component built into each of the courses required candidates to consider and to reflect upon the learning of their own students. Classroom discussions and assignments focused on the link between teaching and learning and required candidates to consider the unique needs of each of their students as they planned instructional activities. Candidates analyzed data from their own students (Assessment 5) in an attempt to determine the impact they were having on student learning. Lessons that were constructed were designed to focus on student learning/achievement. Candidates were able to appropriately link learning goals/objectives with assessment measures and then to analyze the impact of lessons/units of study. They made connections between formal and informal data and demonstrated their ability to interpret test results. Candidates were required to analyze their own teaching effectiveness and to document their justification for their self-analysis. Some candidates seemed to have the ability to naturally assess their own effectiveness while others struggled. There is definitely an indication for more university-related instruction in this reflective process. Candidates need to be taught how to identify specific lesson components and then to connect those components directly to student learning. The ability to link what the teacher does and what the student learns must be strengthened. Newly redesigned courses will include opportunities for students to identify and practice this skill. Faculty who teach courses need to more effectively model all aspects of the reflective process and to build more reflective opportunities into the curriculum.

Overall Analysis of Candidate Assessment Results
Candidates have demonstrated their new understandings by answering content related questions, planning and implementing appropriate units of study; finding and analyzing research; reflecting on their own learning; participating in discussions/conversations; sharing their findings with others; designing, implementing, and analyzing action research projects; reflecting on the impact of their teaching on their students’ learning; demonstrating appropriate dispositions; and identifying/findings solutions to social-emotional related issues. Major areas for improvement include problems with reflection and with recognizing the unique needs of gifted students.

Use of Program Data for Unit Changes
After reviewing data obtained from Comprehensive Exams and analyzing research about the most effective way to assess candidate content knowledge, the faculty in the Department of Teaching and Learning decided that they could more accurately assess the ability of candidates to demonstrate and apply content knowledge with an Action Research Project. This project would not only require candidates to demonstrate their mastery of content but also to demonstrate their ability to apply this knowledge in an authentic setting. The proposed Action Research Project will require candidates to identify an authentic problem in their classroom, review relevant research that might help them develop a solution, determine a plan of action that might solve the problem, implement that plan, and then reflect on the results. Students would be required to self-assess their own performance and also analyze the effect they had on student learning. In the revised program, the Action Research Project will replace the Comprehensive Examination.

PART E—AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION
Evidence is lacking concerning candidates’ competency related to issues of cultural and linguistic diversity.

In Assessment 2, candidates consider the implementation of their action research, they consider issues related to Learning Environments and Social Interactions (Standard 5) as well as Language and Communication (Standard 6).

In Assessment 4, candidates are asked to consider the social climate, diversity issues, and social interactions that will be a part of the summer experience and to consider appropriate ways of dealing
with any issues that might arise. Candidates are observed at various times throughout the experience.

In Assessment 6, candidates demonstrate their understanding of the standards in the reflective piece that accompanies the artifacts and it is probable that the pool of candidates will address all standards.

The program needs to revise its rubrics so that they reflect quantifiable measures of candidate performance and align with the respective assessment tool. Rubrics should report data using a consistent scale and language that align with CEC standards.

Rubrics were revised to more accurately reflect quantifiable measure of candidate performance and realigned with CEC standards. See rubrics in Assessments 1-6.

Assessment #4 Classroom Observation is a group thematic lessons project designed for culturally diverse students with gifts and talents and has the potential to be a very effective comprehensive assessment. However, the open-ended qualitative rubric does not specifically assess candidate products or performance and is not comprehensive enough to address standards for which this assessment is said to be aligned.

The rubric was aligned with standards to more accurately reflect candidate performance and product and to obtain more quantifiable data.

Assessment #2 Action Research Proposal can be a comprehensive assessment; however, without knowing what question candidates come up with, a decision about the ability of this assessment to meet standards is not able to be made. Also, the scoring rubric focuses more on the process of the action research proposal and not so much on content.

The scoring rubric was redesigned to address more content related data versus process related. See Assessment 2.

A subsequent report should include information on program’s field placements across age ranges.

Field experiences address all age ranges (PK-12) and reflect and are conducted in grade level/subject areas of the teacher’s current certification/s.

PART F—ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1—Comments on context and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

Only two faculty members have specific experience or certification teaching gifted students; it is not clear how supervision will be provided for candidates.

We have updated a more complete list of faculty available to supervise candidates.

Faculty certifications listed show only highest degree earned with no field of study, so it is difficult to determine qualifications. Only one faculty member appears to have experience or hold certification in this field.

Field of study was added to more clearly represent faculty qualifications.

Please click "Next"
This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.