

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Preparation of Special Educators

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

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Arkansas State University

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

01 / 18 / 2008

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Special Education-Early Childhood

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)

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

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation [See Part G]

jm Not nationally recognized

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

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

jm Yes

jm No

jm Not applicable

jm Not able to determine

Comment:

The state requires two Praxis II examinations for this program. The pass rate for the three data collection years exceeded 80 percent. In fact, candidates only failed to attain a 100% pass rate one of the three years, with two out of 15 failing the EC-specific exam in 2007-2008.

Summary of Strengths:

Varied field experiences.
Strong, well qualified faculty.
Well developed set of assessments that reflect the Unit's conceptual framework.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

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.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jm

jm

jm

Comment:

The report states that candidates progress through a series of developmentally sequenced field experiences for the full range of ages, types and levels of abilities for PK to grade 4 special education. An attached document clarifies the courses associated with each field experience along with the activities completed for each course-embedded field experience. The report also states that the candidates are engaged in collaborative opportunities that are appropriate to their license, and that there are site-based mentors that the candidates work with at each field experience. Further, the program appears to include at least some individuals pursuing certification through an alternate/additional path (i.e., while teaching). It is not clear how those individuals are able to participate in a variety of experiences comparable to their peers. It also appears that some of these individuals may complete their internship in a general education setting as well, and it is not clear how it is guaranteed that they would be able to demonstrate all of the required knowledge and skills with students who did not have exceptional learning needs.

Standard 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.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The program indicates that Assessment 1 Praxis Examinations, and Assessment 2 P-4 Special Education Portfolio provide evidence related to this standard.

Assessment 1 is the two Praxis II special education exams required by the state for certification (0351 Knowledge Based Core Principles and 0690 Preschool-Early Childhood). Clear links are provided to the CEC standards including Standard 1 (taken from ETS site at www.ets.org). Analysis of data findings from both tests over the past three years demonstrate pass rates of 100% with the exception of an 87% pass rate on 0690 in 2007-2008 (i.e., 2 of 15 candidates did not pass). Mean scores are provided for each exam category, which do not allow direct inferences to be made regarding performance on individual standards.

Assessment 2 is a program portfolio that the candidates must create as a culminating exit assignment. The CEC standards are represented within the entire portfolio. The table of contents and scoring rubric are based directly upon the language of each standard. Although examples of suggested program artifacts are provided, each candidate selects artifacts they believe directly relate to each CEC standard, and must explain why the chosen artifacts represent the standards they are stated to fulfill. Although the portfolio instructions refer to P-4 and provide some exemplars specific to early childhood (EC), the CEC early childhood standards are not referenced. Three years of data have been collected with mean scores provided for the 10 CEC standards including Standard 1. All of the means equal or exceed 2.5 on a 3-point scale, which is also the criterion for achieving a grade of A. Although frequency counts were not provided, from the narrative summary, it would appear that 100% of candidates met each of the standards. Therefore, combined with the Praxis II data, it appears that Standard 1 has been met. The case would have been stronger if the rubric had also specifically addressed standards for early childhood special education.

Standard 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. 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.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The program indicates that Standard 2, Development and Characteristics of Learners, is addressed by Assessments 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7. Assessment 1 is the two Praxis II special education exams required by the state for certification (0351 Knowledge Based Core Principles and 0690 Preschool-Early Childhood). Clear links are provided to the CEC standards. Analysis of data findings from both tests over the past three years demonstrate pass rates of 100% with the exception of an 87% pass rate on 0690 in 2007-2008 (i.e., 2 of 15 candidates did not pass). Mean scores are provided for each exam category, which do not allow direct inferences to be made about individual standards. Assessment 2 is a program portfolio that candidates must create as a culminating exit assignment. The CEC standards are reflected throughout the portfolio. The table of contents and scoring rubric are based directly upon the language of each standard. Although examples of suggested program artifacts are provided, each candidate selects artifacts they believe directly relate to each CEC standard and must explain why the chosen artifacts represent the standards they stated to fulfill. Although the portfolio instructions refer to P-4 and provide some exemplars specific to early childhood (EC), the CEC early childhood standards are not referenced. Three years of data have been collected with mean scores provided for the 10 CEC standards. All of the means equal or exceed 2.5 on a 3-point scale, which is also the criterion for achieving a grade of A. Although frequency counts were not provided, from the narrative summary, it would appear that 100% of candidates met each of the standards. Assessment 3 is a differentiated unit plan (DUP) that candidates must create as part of a six lesson plan unit. One section of the DUP is linked to standard 2 in which candidates must create a description of a student with exceptional learning needs (ELN). Both the assignment description and the rubric contains the language of Standard 2; again, however, the only knowledge and skills referenced are from the Common Core (CC) and Individualized General Curriculum (GC) standards rather than those for Early Childhood (EC). Three years of mean scores and standard deviations were provided for unit plan components related to Standard 2, which exceeded 2.5 on a 3-point rubric. Assessment 5 consists of a behavior intervention project in which candidates must pick a target behavior, collect baseline data, implement interventions, and collect data to demonstrate impact. Specific items included in the assignment description and rubric directly relate to Standard 2. Mean scores and standard deviations over three years indicate candidates scored above 2.5 on a 3-point scale. Assessment 7 consists of writing an IEP for a student with ELN. The assignment description and rubric are aligned with standards and CC and GC knowledge/skills related to the IEP, not with those for EC or for an IFSP.

Standard 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.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences is addressed by Assessments 1, 2, 3, and 8. Assessment 1 is the two Praxis II special education exams required by the state for certification (0351 Knowledge Based Core Principles and 0690 Preschool-Early Childhood.) Clear links are provided to the CEC standards. Analysis of data findings from both tests over the past three years demonstrate pass rates of 100% with the exception of an 87% pass rate on 0690 in 2007-2008. Mean scores are provided for each exam category, which do not allow direct inferences to be made about individual standards. Assessment 2 is a

program portfolio candidates create as a culminating exit assignment. The CEC standards are reflected across the entire portfolio. The table of contents and scoring rubric are based directly upon the language of each standard. Although examples of suggested program artifacts are provided, each candidate selects artifacts they believe directly relate to each CEC standard, and must explain why the chosen artifacts represent the standards they stated to fulfill. Although the portfolio instructions refer to P4 and provide some exemplars specific to early childhood (EC), the CEC early childhood standards are not referenced. Three years of data have been collected with mean scores provided for the 10 CEC standards. All of the means equal or exceed 2.5 on a 3-point scale, which is also the criterion for achieving a grade of A. Although frequency counts were not provided, from the narrative summary, it would appear that 100% of candidates met each of the standards. Assessment 3 is a differentiated unit plan (DUP) that candidates must create as part of a six lesson plan unit. One section of the DUP is linked to Standard 3 in which candidates must create a description of a student with exceptional learning needs (ELN). Both the assignment description and the rubric contains the language of standard 3; again, however, the only knowledge and skills referenced are from the Common Core (CC) and General Curriculum (GC) standards rather than those for Early Childhood (EC). Three years of mean scores and standard deviations provided for unit plan components related to Standard 3 exceeded 2.5 on a 3-point rubric. Assessment 8 is a graduate program exit survey. Candidates are to rate themselves in all 10 CEC content standards as either not prepared by the program, adequately prepared by the program, or well prepared by the program. The language of each content standard is used explicitly in the survey, and ratings were obtained for each element of each standard. One year of data is presented, with percentage of ratings in each category. An area of relative weakness was identified specific to Standard 3. (NOTE: The descriptors in the narrative and table do not match.) Overall, the data suggest candidates are adequately prepared to address the general CEC Standard 3; however, the assessments and scoring rubrics are not specific to EC.

Standard 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.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

Standard 4: Instructional Strategies is addressed by Assessments 1-8. Assessments 1-3 have been discussed in Standards 1-3. The same concerns relative to lack of EC-specific information apply to this standard as well. Assessment 4 consists of data from lab/internship evaluations completed by both the university supervisor and the site mentor. A section of the rubric is devoted to items related to Standard 4; however, the elements assessed are mostly related to one aspect of the standard and do not reflect the CC, GC or EC knowledge and skill sets included in the CEC standards. Three years of mean scores and standard deviations are provided; however, the nine items for Standard 4 have been aggregated into a single score, making it difficult to draw conclusions about the various elements. Assessment #5 consists of a behavior intervention project in which candidates must pick a target behavior, collect baseline data, implement interventions, and collect data to demonstrate impact. Specific items included in the assignment description and rubric directly relate to Standard 4, as well as to the CC, GC, and EC knowledge and skills. Aggregate mean scores and standard deviations over three years indicate candidates scored above 2.5 on a 3-point scale. Assessment #6 consists of a formal assessment project in

which candidates must conduct and interpret formal and educational assessments of students with ELN. One specific item is included in the assignment description and rubric directly related to and using the language of Standard 4, and the assignment is linked to a course that is specific to ECSE. The mean scores for the Standard 4 item across three years ranged from 2.52 to 2.76 on a 3-point scale. Assessment 7 consists of writing an IEP for a student with ELN. Specific items are included in the assignment description and rubric directly related to and using the language of Standard 4. Again, the assignment description and rubric are aligned with standards and CC and GC knowledge/skills related to the IEP, not with those for EC or for an IFSP. Assessment 8 is a program exit survey, as described above.

Standard 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.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jn

jn

jn

Comment:

Standard 5 is addressed by Assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8. As discussed above, each of these assessments demonstrates alignment, to some degree, with the general CEC standards. Some of the assignment rubrics are crosswalked with the GC and CC competencies, but rarely with EC knowledge and skills. Assessments 1 and 2 purport to cover all the standards and therefore provide support for Standard 5. Assessment 3 is listed for Standard 5 in the table, but the assessment itself does not refer to the standard in the instructions or scoring rubric; perhaps this was an error. Assessment 4, the internship evaluation, does include items that directly relate to modification of the learning environment and collaboration for inclusion. Assessment 7, the IEP, addresses accommodations, modifications and supports that ELN would require to be successful in the classroom. The only assessment that directly addresses the aspects of Standard 5 related to cultural understanding and valuing diversity was Assessment 8, the program exit interview; the data demonstrated this to be an area of relative concern. None of the instruments appear to address the creation of environments that encourage self-efficacy and facilitate social interactions. Therefore, it is not clear that all elements of Standard 5 have been met.

Standard 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.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jñ

jñ

jñ

Comment:

Standard 6 is addressed by Assessments 1, 2, 4, and 8. Assessment 1 is the two Praxis II special education exams required by the state for certification (0351 Knowledge Based Core Principles and 0690 Preschool-Early Childhood). Clear links are provided to the CEC standards including Standard 6. Analysis of data findings from both tests over the past three years demonstrate pass rates of 100% with the exception of an 87% pass rate on 0690 in 2007-2008. Mean scores are provided for each exam category, which do not allow direct inferences to be made about individual standards. Assessment 2 is a program portfolio that candidates must create as a culminating exit assignment. The CEC standards are richly represented within the entire portfolio. The table of contents and scoring rubric are based directly upon the language of each standard. Although examples of suggested program artifacts are provided, each candidate selects artifacts they believe directly relate to each CEC standard and must explain why the chosen artifacts represent the standards they stated to fulfill. Although the portfolio instructions refer to P-4 and provide some exemplars specific to early childhood (EC), the CEC early childhood standards are not referenced. Three years of data have been collected with mean scores provided for the 10 CEC standards including Standard 6. All of the means equal or exceed 2.5 on a 3-point scale, which is also the criterion for achieving a grade of A. Although frequency counts were not provided, from the narrative summary, it would appear that 100% of candidates met each of the standards. Assessment 4 consists of data from lab/internship evaluations. There is an entire section of the rubric devoted to Standard 6, including elements related to ELNs whose primary language is not English, vocabulary development, self-monitoring strategies, and augmentative/alternative communication. The mean scores for three years of data range from 2.75 to 2.89 on a 3-point scale. Assessment 8 is a graduate exit survey that functions primarily as a tool for program evaluation. Candidates rated their skill in using augmentative/alternative communication devices as an area of relative weakness. Although explicit alignment with EC knowledge and skills would have strengthened the case, there is adequate evidence that the program met Standard 6.

Standard 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.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jñ

jñ

jñ

Comment:

Standard 7 is addressed by Assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8. Assessments 1 and 2 (the Praxis II and portfolio) appear to cover this standard. Additional support is provided by Assessment 3 differentiated unit plan (DUP) that candidates must create as part of a six lesson plan unit twice--once for a course and once during their internship experience. Eight elements unit plan/rubric are linked to Standard 7's requirement that candidates must design quality lesson plans to assist a student with ELN. Both the assignment description and the rubric contains the language of Standard 7. If this assignment is completed in a setting with young children with ELN, it would provide strong support for Standard 7; however, that is not clear, since it appears that many of the candidates may be completing these assignments in their own classrooms which may--or may not--be early childhood special education classrooms or include young students with ELN. Assessment 4 consists of data from lab/internship evaluations. A section of the rubric is devoted to Standard 7. If the candidates are all completing their internship with young children with ELN, the data would also be strong evidence that Standard 7 had been met. Assessment 5 consists of a behavior intervention project in which candidates must pick a target behavior, collect baseline data, implement interventions, and collect data to demonstrate impact. Specific items included in the assignment description and rubric directly relate to Standard 7, and to CC and GC knowledge and skills (although not to EC specifically). Assessment 7 consists of writing an IEP for a student with ELN. Two items are included in the assignment description and rubric directly related to Standard 7, dealing with adequately describing the student's present level of performance and writing goals and objectives. Assessment 8 is a graduate survey program evaluation. Candidates are to rate themselves in all 10 CEC content standards as either not prepared by the program, adequately prepared by the program, or well prepared by the program. The language of each content standard is used explicitly in the survey along with the assignment description. Because it is unclear that all candidates have the opportunity to work directly with young children with ELN, under the supervision of an appropriately certified mentor, it is difficult to determine whether this standard has been adequately addressed. Transitional planning (e.g., from preschool to elementary) did not appear to be addressed in any of the assessments.

Standard 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.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

Standard 8 is addressed by Assessments 1-8. As discussed earlier, Assessments 1 and 2 (the Praxis II

and portfolio) provide limited support for all 10 CEC standards. Assessment 3, the differentiated unit plan (DUP), includes one item that specifically requires candidates to describe how they will assess students on their performance. Use of formative assessment to guide instruction is introduced indirectly (e.g., error correction). This component could be strengthened to address impact on student learning and planning for future instruction. Assessment 4 consists of data from lab/internship evaluations completed by the district mentor and university supervisor. Five items were listed as directly related to Standard 8, and would provide strong support for Standard 8 if all candidates are completing their internship in an ECSE setting. Assessment 5 - the behavior intervention project provides strong, direct evidence that program participants know how to gather and use assessment data to plan instruction and measure student progress over time. Assessment 6, the formal early childhood assessment project, requires candidates to conduct and interpret formal and educational assessments of young students with ELN. Assessment 7, the IEP, provides minimal support for Standard 8; the only related item is writing a satisfactory present level of performance from existing assessment data. Assessment 8, the graduate program exit survey, included two items related to Standard 8 - types/terminology of assessment, and special education process. Candidates rated their preparation as high in these two areas. In general, it appears that Standard 8 has been met. However, the alignment with EC-specific knowledge and skills could be strengthened.

Standard 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.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

Standard 9 is addressed by Assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8. Assessments 1 and 2 (the Praxis II and portfolio) provided limited support for all 10 CEC standards. Assessment 3, the DUP, includes only one item related to one aspect of Standard 9--reflective practice. Assessment 4, the internship evaluation, provides an opportunity for evaluation of candidates in five elements of Standard 9--practicing within the Code of Ethics, exhibiting high expectations, demonstrated excellent oral and written communication skills, valuing diversity, and self-evaluating/reflecting. Mean scores were consistently high in this area, ranging from 2.85 to 2.94 over three years of data collection. Assessment 5, the behavior change project, provides a number of items directly related to Standard 9 involving use of evidence-based practice, ethical practice in behavioral interventions, reflection, and professionalism. This assessment provides strong support for Standard 9. Assessment 7, the IEP, also includes components related to the legal and ethical requirements for special educators. Assessment 8, the program exit survey, indicated that 95% of graduates in 2007-2008 considered themselves well prepared in this area.

Standard 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.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j _n	j _n	j _n

Comment:

Standard 10 is addressed by Assessments 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8. Assessment 6, although not listed in the Section III chart, also refers to Standard 10.

Assessments 1 and 2 (the Praxis II and portfolio) provide limited support for all 10 CEC standards. Assessment 4 consists of data from lab/internship evaluations. The rubric includes four ways in which candidates can demonstrate competency on Standard 10--confidentiality and respect, culturally responsive collaboration, knowledge of laws and policies, and transition. Mean scores ranged from 2.88-3.00 on a 3-point scale over three years of data collection. Assessment 5 consists of a behavior intervention change project in which candidates must pick a target behavior (academic, behavior), collect baseline data, and then implement interventions and measure changes over time. The first phase of the project requires collaboration to develop the intervention plan, and provides limited support for Standard 10. Assessment 6 consists of a formal assessment project in which candidates must conduct and interpret formal and educational assessments of students with ELN. As part of that project, they conduct a parent interview, which is scored as being related to Standard 10. Assessment 7 consists of writing an IEP for a student with ELN. One item related to Standard 10 requires the candidate to accurately reflect team and parent input into the present level of performance of the IEP. While this provides weak support for Standard 10, it raises the question of whether team and parent input are not reflected in the remainder of the IEP as well. Data from Assessment 8, the exit survey, indicate that program graduates in 2007-2008 identified collaboration as a relative area of concern--specifically related to culturally responsive factors/communication and concerns of families.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Assessments 1-8 are aligned with CEC Standards, and the program candidates appear to have demonstrated mastery on all of the assessments. Assessments 1 and 2, the Praxis II examinations and the exit portfolio provide adequate coverage in the area of content. Other assessments address various elements of special education content knowledge as well; however, little evidence was provided to demonstrate candidate competencies on the Early Childhood (EC) knowledge and skills. Overall, the reviewers found sufficient evidence to demonstrate the candidates' knowledge of content. This conclusion would be strengthened by aligning at least one assessment with the EC standards to supplement the Praxis and portfolio.

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

The reviewers found evidence of the candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and

professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Assessments 3 and 4 are very specific and cover a great many elements of several standards. Likewise, Assessments 6, 7, and 8 also provide evidence of candidate competence in understanding and applying pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

Assessment 5 is a very well designed assessment measuring candidate effects on student learning. The candidates must analyze a student in terms of strengths, weakness, and disability. Assessment 4 also provides observer data concerning the impact of program candidates in the classroom.

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)

Each assessment specifically lists alignment to the SPA standards, and to common core and individualized general curriculum competencies. The analysis of data findings and discussion indicate that program faculty have examined the data and when applicable identified areas of relative concern needing to be addressed as a result of the data. The report also reflected specific changes the program has made, including using an electronic format (Live Text) to gather assessments and report findings.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

Consider focusing on the assessments that most clearly address each standard. Several of the assessments include only one or two items that provide weak support for a particular standard.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

It is unclear how all candidates, particularly those in their own classrooms, are assured of opportunities to demonstrate standards related to special education - early childhood.

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

It is unclear how all candidates, particularly those in their own classrooms, are assured of opportunities to demonstrate standards related to special education - early childhood.

PART G -DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- j_n Program is nationally recognized with conditions. 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 below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM DD YYYY
02 / 01 / 2011

Subsequent action by the institution: To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below.

The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period.

If the program is submitting a Response to Conditions Report **for the first time**, the range of possible deadlines for submitting that report are 4/15/09, 9/15/09, 2/1/10, or 9/15/10. *Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 9/15/09 submission date noted above. However, the program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this recognition report.*

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a **second** Response to Conditions Report, the report must be submitted by the date below.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM DD YYYY
09 / 15 / 2010

The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (or within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued). See above for specific date.

The assessments need to be refined and incorporate the depth and breadth of the CEC Early Childhood knowledge and skills.

Field experiences need to be described to indicate how they are implemented and supervised to assure each and every candidate fully participates in experiences appropriate to the area in which they are preparing to be licensed.

Please click "Next"

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