

# NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

## Preparation of Special Educators

**Southeastern Louisiana University**  
November 26, 2007

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the **Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)**.

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review     
  Revised Report     
  Response to Conditions

Program(s) Covered by this Review	Program Type:	Award or Degree Level(s)
<b>M.Ed.: Special Education</b>	Advanced Teacher Preparation	Master's Add-On Endorsement

### **PART A—RECOGNITION DECISION** (see Part G for specifics on decision)

#### **A.1—SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):**

- Nationally recognized  
 Nationally recognized with conditions  
 Not nationally recognized

#### **A.2—Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)**

**The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:**

- Yes     
  No     
  Not applicable     
  Not able to determine

Comment: Two Praxis exams are required for state certification. Two years of data show a 100 percent pass rate on both Praxis #0353: Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge and Praxis #0542: Mild Moderate Disabilities. However, upon examination, the 2004-05 data table includes a low score that appears to fall below the criterion for passing Praxis #0353.

The data tables for the Master of Arts in Teaching Mild/Moderate Disabilities initial certification program show the same number of candidates and same scores as shown for this Advanced Teaching Masters Program with add-on certification in special education. The two SELU graduate special education

programs have been submitted as two separate programs. Separate data tables showing Praxis scores and sub-scores for candidates in each of the two masters' programs need to be provided.

**A.3—Summary of Strengths:**

The 10 special education faculty members have appropriate expertise in the area of the program. Several faculty members hold doctorates in special education, certification in mild/moderate disabilities, and have extensive classroom teaching experience. Special education faculty supervises candidates' field experiences.

**PART B—STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS**

CEC Standards	Specific Program or Level: M.Ed. with add-on certification	Specific Program or Level
<p><b>Field Experiences and Clinical Practice Standard.</b> Special education candidates progress through a series of developmentally sequenced field experiences <b>for the full range of ages, types and levels of abilities,</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Not Met</b></p>	
<p>Comment: There is insufficient/conflicting information provided for judging attainment of this standard.</p> <p>Section I of the Program Report states that candidates are required to complete a minimum of 100 field-based hours. Four courses and a practicum are required by the state to gain add-on certification in mild/moderate disabilities to the master's degree. Field hours are attached to each of the required four courses and to the practicum course. The Context Statement in Section I indicates that 60 field hours are completed during the Practicum in Assessment (SPED 641), whereas Section IV (Assessment #8) indicates that SPED 641 is a 15-week practicum.</p> <p>The Program Report states that: ". . . faculty members provide candidates with distinctive experiences to expose them to students from diverse environments and groups." However, Section I of the Program Report also indicates that the majority of candidates conduct field experiences in their own classrooms, which raises the question of whether these experiences include the ages, levels and types of students covered by the 1-12 mild/moderate special education endorsement.</p>		
<p><b>CONTENT STANDARDS</b></p>		
<p><b>Standard 1. Foundations.</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Met with Conditions</b></p>	

CEC Standards	Specific Program or Level: M.Ed. with add-on certification	Specific Program or Level
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.		
<p>Comment: Data from two Praxis exams are cited as Assessment #1. The standard is partially met with data from Praxis #0353 Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge and Praxis #0542: Mild/Moderate Disabilities (Assessment #1). The report includes a chart cross-walking the two Praxis exams with the CEC standards. The narrative and Section II chart both mention a comprehensive exam as part of Assessment #2. The comprehensive exam assessment is not included in this report. Without it, there is not a second content assessment, as required by CEC.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 2. Development and Characteristics of Learners.</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Met with Conditions</b></p>	
<p>Comment: Assessments #1 and #2 are cited for this standard as well. See comments under Standard 1.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 3. Individual Learning Differences.</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Not Met</b></p>	
<p>Comment: SELU cited three assessments for this standard: Ability to Plan Instruction (Assessment #3), Clinical Practice Assessments: Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching – LCET (Assessment #4) and Teacher Work Sample (Assessment #5).</p>		
<p>While planning for individual learning differences is mentioned in the three assessments and rubrics, individual learning differences are clearly not the focus of these measures, nor do they measure the elements of this standard directly. In addition, it is not clear from the candidate instructions or from the scoring rubric for Assessment #3 that the activity is conducted with students who have disabilities. In a program designed for general educators wanting to add an endorsement in special education, one would expect the focus to be on individualizing to meet the needs of students with a variety of exceptionalities. That did not appear to be the case, particularly in the reflection component, which seems very generic.</p>		
<p>In general, the assessment scoring guides and data tables are confusing and do not help make the case for meeting the standards. A variety of scales, terminology and methods of display are used. For example, Assessment #3 included a videotaped lesson scored on a 5-point scale with verbal</p>		

CEC Standards	Specific Program or Level: M.Ed. with add-on certification	Specific Program or Level
<p>anchors/descriptors, a holistic lesson plan rubric scored on a 4-point scale with different verbal anchors, and a self-critique of instruction scored on a 5-point scale and a third set of verbal descriptors. The data for all three instruments is reported in tables using a 4-point scale and means that range up to 5.0. While the triangulation of data is a useful strategy, one marked discrepancy between the perceptions of faculty and candidates regarding the use of assessment (faculty rating of 1.0 on a 5-point scale; student rating of 3.8 on a 4-point scale) was not addressed in the narrative.</p> <p>Part V of the Program Report does address the committee's plan for added emphasis in all graduate coursework including understanding exceptionalities, legal and societal issues, and service delivery for students who have disabilities. Nevertheless, it is unclear what action was taken with the candidate cohort when 100% of the candidates failed to meet competency on Assessment #3. (Similar issues were evident in other assessments as well.)</p> <p>Since a second measure of candidates' knowledge of content is required for Assessment #2, in order to provide a stronger evaluation of candidate content knowledge, this new assessment and rubric/scoring guide could be designed to address substantive knowledge elements of CEC Standards 1, 2, and 3.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 4. Instructional Strategies.</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Met</b></p>	
<p>Comment: SELU cited three assessments for this standard: Ability to Plan Instruction (Assessment #3), Clinical Practice (Assessment #4) and Teacher Work Sample (Assessment #5).</p> <p>There is sufficient evidence that this standard has been met in the data provided for portions of Assessments #3 and #4. The data from the 'Instruction' sub-section on LCET (19 components) in Assessment #3, and the 'Instructional Strategies' (7 competencies) in the Special Education Language/Learning Strategies Addendum (Assessment #4) address aspects of this standard.</p> <p>The candidates' Self-Critique of a Video Taped Lesson (part of Assessment #3) is an appropriate assignment for the Methods of Teaching course but a weaker assessment for meeting this standard. Given the alignment with standards as shown on the data table, the Self-Critique Video is more clearly aligned with CEC Standard 7 (Planning) and/or reflective practice (Standard 9: CC9S11) than with this standard. Also, the scoring guide for the Unit Holistic Lesson Plan (part of Assessment #3) and the scoring guide for the Teacher Work Sample (Assessment #5) are minimally aligned with CC4 and GC4 skills, being primarily aligned with CC 5, 7, and 8 skills. The Unit Lesson Plan and TWS are a better fit with Standards 5, 7, and 8.</p> <p>These large comprehensive assessments go far beyond the scope of Standard 4. For example, repeating the entire LCET for each relevant standard tends to obscure the alignment by including large amounts of data not clearly related to the standard being examined. For clarification, indicate what sub-section(s) of each comprehensive assessment directly aligns with each standard. The data tables for the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (LCET) are identical for Assessments #3 and #4. LCET uses a 5-point rating scale in both assessments. However, the Addendum to LCET added in fall 2006 uses a 4-point</p>		

CEC Standards	Specific Program or Level: M.Ed. with add-on certification	Specific Program or Level
<p>rating scale. The mean scores provided are misleading when attempting to compare how well standards are met across the assessment system.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The data tables for the unit and class specific assessments (Assessments #3-#8) indicate four levels of candidate proficiency: Unsatisfactory, Approaching Expectations, Meeting Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, as well as mean scores for each of the rubric/scoring guide criteria evaluated. For each assessment, indicate what level of proficiency meets the standard(s) addressed. It is not clear whether "Approaching Expectations" is considered an acceptable level of proficiency by the program. Proficiency on the assessment should equal proficiency on the standard(s). Also, rather than reporting mean scores, indicate the number and percentage of candidates who meet each category of proficiency, such as: "Standard(s) Not Met," "Standard(s) Met," "Standard(s) Exceeded"; or "Unacceptable," "Acceptable," "Target." Also, for Assessments #3 -#8, clearly indicate what happens to those candidates who do not participate in an assessment assignment and/or do not meet the assessment components being evaluated.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 5. Learning Environments and Social Interactions.</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Not Met</b></p>	
<p>Comment: SELU cited three assessments for this standard: Ability to Plan Instruction (Assessment #3), Clinical Practice (Assessment #4) and Classroom Management Plan (Assessment #6).</p> <p>There is insufficient evidence to judge this standard as fully met. There is a lack of clarity in the documentation provided to identify the relationship between the substantive elements of the standard and the assessment(s) referenced. The data presented for the 'Management' sub-section of LCET are identical for Assessment 3C and Assessment 4C. Alignment with nine CC5 and two GC5 <u>skills</u> indicate the majority of 16 of 17 candidates meet the 11 competencies evaluated. However, there are 11 CC5 and GC5 skills for Standard 5 that are not demonstrated in a classroom setting.</p> <p>The rating scale for Classroom Management Plan (Assessment #6) shows alignment with five specific CC5 skills. The Management Plan is a course assignment adopted in August 2006 in order for candidates to demonstrate in-depth understanding of CEC Standard 5. It can be inferred that the candidates' have an adequate understanding of individuals with exceptional learning needs to design a positive learning environment for students with exceptional learning needs. Further information is needed to judge candidates' ability to apply this knowledge base in a classroom setting.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 6. Language.</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Not Met</b></p>	

CEC Standards	Specific Program or Level: M.Ed. with add-on certification	Specific Program or Level
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Comment: SELU cited Clinical Practice (Assessment #4) for Standard 6.</p> <p>There is insufficient evidence to judge this standard as met. There is minimal alignment of the LCET instrument and the Language/Instructional Strategies Addendum with the component skills and knowledge covered by the language standard. Further, the assessment results where there is alignment (e.g., use of technology to support instruction) indicate that the candidates in the program do not have this competency mastered. Stronger alignment with the major elements of this standard is necessary. Although Section V of the Program Report addresses this standard as an area in need of improvement, the program needs to describe the steps being taken to improve the candidates’ performance in this area.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 7. Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice.</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Met with conditions</b></p>	
<p>Comment: SELU cited three assessments for this standard: Ability to Plan Instruction (Assessment #3), Clinical Practice (Assessment #4) and Teacher Work Sample (Assessment #5).</p> <p>The scoring guides and data tables provide evidence that this standard is partially met. Three of 10 components of the Unit Holistic Plan Evaluation (Assessment #3), the ‘Planning’ sub-section (7 objectives) of LCET Report on Student Teaching/Practicum (Assessments #3 and #4), and Part II: Lesson Plan (1 objective) for TWS (Assessment #5) are aligned with specific CC7 and GC7 skills. The LCET data provide a stronger measure of general education planning than for special education planning.</p>		

CEC Standards	Specific Program or Level: M.Ed. with add-on certification	Specific Program or Level
<p>The LCET 4-point scale scoring guide (Assessment 4B) shows an eighth objective under 'Planning': "Develops an Individualized Education Plan and/or Individualized Family Plan . . . ." However, the data table does not include objective 8, a critical component for candidates being endorsed as special education teachers.</p> <p>The data tables for the 'Planning' sub-section of LCET and the Unit Holistic Evaluation indicate that 11 of 17 candidates were rated 'Unsatisfactory' in "Integration of technology into Planning or Implementation." A stronger assessment for Standard 6 as noted earlier would also address elements of this standard.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 8. Assessment.</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Not Met</b></p>	
<p>Comment: SELU cited three assessments for this standard: LCET Clinical Practice (Assessment #4) and Teacher Work Sample (Assessment #5) and Final Case Study (Assessment #7).</p> <p>According to the data tables for these three assessments, it appears that all candidates failed to meet expectations for at least one component of this standard. Most were rated unsatisfactory on more than one element, and all candidates failed four assessment items on the LCET. Although the program report indicates changes are being made in the program, it appears clear that the cohort of candidates reported did not demonstrate competency on this standard.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 9. Professional and Ethical Practice.</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Met</b></p>	

CEC Standards	Specific Program or Level: M.Ed. with add-on certification	Specific Program or Level
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Comment: SELU cited all eight assessments for this standard. The content of Standard 9 appears to have been woven throughout the curriculum, and is reflected by components of all eight assessments.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 10. Collaboration.</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Not Met</b></p>	
<p>Comment: SELU cited Participation in Decision-Making Meetings (Assessment #8) for this standard.</p> <p>Assessment #8 is intended to demonstrate competency on Standard 10. Candidates are required to participate in and reflect on a decision-making meeting for a student with a disability or suspected of having one. However, the instrument and rubric are only partially aligned with the elements of the standard. The report indicates that one candidate did not complete the assignment, without discussing the outcome of that decision not to complete this part of their capstone experience. Participation in one meeting as part of a semester-long practicum seems like a rather weak measure for collaboration.</p>		

## PART C—EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

### C.1—Candidates’ knowledge of content

The evidence for content knowledge is equivocal. The program used the two required Praxis II exams to demonstrate content knowledge, and used them for both Assessment 1 and 2. Further, the data tables appear to be the same data provided for the MAT program, suggesting that the data may not have been disaggregated appropriately. A comprehensive exam was listed in both the narrative and the assessment table in Section II but was not included in this report.

### C.2—Candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Data in this area are uneven, with some standards being covered more completely than others. This may be due, in part, to the use of the generic LCET unit assessment in several key areas. Items on the LCET that more closely reflect special education standards were not used in this assessment system. It was also unclear whether all of the application and field activities took place in classrooms that included students with disabilities.

The program does not seem to include an assessment of candidates' dispositions. This may be appropriate for candidates who are certified teachers pursuing a master's degree with an add-on certification in special education. The Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (LCET) instrument included with Assessment #4 includes a sub-section "Other" (7 competencies) that address some critical competencies for special education. This section is not assessed and does not show on the data tables provided in either Assessment #3 or Assessment #4. The LCET sub-sections evaluated by this program are: Planning, Instruction, and Assessment.

### **C.3—Candidate effects on P-12 student learning**

Candidates' ability to positively impact P-12 student learning is partially demonstrated in Assessment #5 (Teacher Work Sample) and Assessment #8 (Case Study Report). The TWS data reported indicate relative weaknesses in describing instructional resources, in assessment planning, and in analysis of pre and post assessment results. The case study data indicate that almost half of the candidates (7 of 16) did not meet expected proficiency in providing instructional recommendations based on assessment results.

## **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 has been redesigned recently, and some assessments were new at the time this report was written. Based on these assessment results, program faculty identified areas of concern to address in coursework and supervision. They also plan to revise the assessment instruments.

Content Knowledge: Based on the results from the Core Content Knowledge (Praxis exam #0353) the CEC SPA Committee note changes to be made to improve the program. In all graduate education programs, service delivery for students with disabilities, legal and societal issues, and understanding exceptionalities will be given greater emphasis. A new special education course is being offered that emphasizes service delivery for students with disabilities in inclusive settings, accommodations and modifications for individuals with disabilities, as well as information about individuals from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The results from the Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities exam (Praxis #0542), although showing strengths in all areas, also noted relative weaknesses in candidates' ability to apply their knowledge and skills in areas of assessment, curriculum & instruction, and management. The Special Education faculty plans to meet to discuss specific strengths and weaknesses in the curriculum and incorporate changes in future graduate special education courses.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions: The special education program has recently been redesigned. The faculty analyzed the assessment data from one term in order to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the program and to plan for any needed changes. Section V of the Program Report notes that the candidates require more training in applying research-supported methods for academic and non-academic instruction of individuals with disabilities, including appropriate adaptations

and technology for these individuals. The special education faculty will apply for grants for technology equipment for candidates to borrow and use in their classrooms while being trained. The faculty also plans to highlight functional behavior assessment and implementation of positive behavior supports in future behavior management courses.

Effects on Student Learning: Based on the data results, the special education faculty discussed the candidates' need for improvement in their ability to plan for classroom diversity and individual student differences. The instructors of the graduate methods course and practicum plan to infuse more information about teaching students from diverse backgrounds into these courses. Also, candidates will be required to visit classrooms and observe different instructional methods in other school districts and instructional settings that differ from their current settings. The TWS assessment will be reviewed and revised based on data from the fall 2007 practicum.

## **PART E—AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION**

- Separate data tables should be provided for candidates in each of the two masters' programs.
- Descriptions of comprehensive exams, rubric/scoring guides, and how an instrument is aligned with CEC content standards are vague.
- Standard 6 Language should have a more clearly aligned assessment and rubric.
- Collaboration is implied throughout many of the program assignments but not adequately evaluated.

## **PART F—ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

The program does seem to meet the state requirements for add-on certification in mild/moderate disabilities: four courses and a practicum course. More information is needed to clarify the types and variety of special education experiences that are provided during the 100 hours of fieldwork. The Context Statement indicates that candidates are "provided with professional development opportunities such as the Mock IEP and The Dyslexia simulation . . ." (p.3). The breadth of experiences seems limited but may be appropriate for an add-on certificate. There seems to have been a good faith effort in designing rubrics as well as considerable time and effort spent in aligning the unit assessments with the CC and GC specific knowledge and skills. The difficulty appears when a single component being rated on the LCET is intended to evaluate multiple Special Education (CC and GC) skills. It is often difficult to "tease out" whether the components actually reflect the critical elements of the 10 CEC Standards.

Section I.5: **Indication whether the Program has a unique set of Program assessments . . .** describes a different set of program assessments than those in the Section II chart of assessments. Specifically, the narrative in I.5 references a comprehensive exam, graduate exit survey, and structured interview. The comprehensive exam is listed in the table as part of Assessment #2, but is not included in this report. The exit survey and structured interview are not mentioned again.

The distinction between completers of the MAT program and this add-on advanced program are unclear. Some of the data reported appear to have been aggregated across programs, and reported for both without distinguishing between the two populations. Some major adjustments were needed to address the difficulty candidates had in the areas of assessment and technology. There needs to be follow-up to insure that these concerns have been remediated.

#### **F.2—Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:**

### **PART G—TERMS AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS FOR DECISIONS**

**Program is nationally recognized with conditions.** The program is recognized through spring 2009. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified above, in its published materials. **National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.**

***Subsequent action by the institution:*** To retain accreditation, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted within 18 months, or no later than **April 15, 2009**. The report must address the conditions ***specified in the box below***. Failure to submit a report by the date specified above will result in loss of national recognition.

Unless required to submit earlier by the state, programs are encouraged to take the full time period specified above to address conditions to recognition. If conditions to recognition are not removed in the Response to Conditions report, program status will change to Not Recognized.

**National recognition with conditions.** The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (see above for specific date):

Provide a preponderance of evidence to meet standards listed as not met or met with conditions.

Provide separate data tables showing Praxis II scores and sub-scores separately for candidates in each of the two masters' programs that lead to initial licensure in special education.

Develop an assessment of candidate content knowledge that is clearly aligned with CEC content standards.

Provide a detailed description of the comprehensive exams, rubric/scoring guide, and candidate data that address candidates' knowledge of content.

Clearly align assessment and rubric/scoring guide with specific dimensions of Standard 6 Language.

Show ongoing collaboration with families, other educators, service providers, and members of community agencies.

Incorporate the language of the standards (not just the sub-skills) into the assessments and scoring rubrics.

Use a consistent scoring scale for assessments (i.e., 3 vs. 4 vs. 5-points).

Use consistent language for categories across scoring rubrics.

Describe observable behaviors in clear objective terms.

Implement the changes planned by the faculty in Part D of the Program Report with the goal of enhancing the special education focus of the course work and field experiences. Pilot new scoring guides/rubrics for reliability and collect candidate data for any new and/or enhanced assessments.