

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 / 2009

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Instructional Specialist in 4-12 Special Education

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]

jⁿ 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:

jⁿ Yes

jⁿ No

jⁿ Not applicable

jⁿ Not able to determine

Comment:

Pass rates were consistently above the 80% criterion.

Summary of Strengths:

Varied field experiences.

Strong, well qualified faculty.

Assessments reflect the Unit's conceptual framework and are clearly aligned with CEC standards and CC/GC competencies.

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

jⁿ

jⁿ

jⁿ

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 special education grades 4-12. 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 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
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

Standard 1: Foundations is addressed by Assessments 1 and 2.

Assessment 1 is the two Praxis II special education exams required by the state for certification (0351 Knowledge Based Core Principles and 0352 Application of Core Principles across Categories). 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 92% pass rate on 0352 in 2007-2008 (i.e., 1 of 12 candidates did not pass). Mean and median 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 are stated to fulfill. Specific artifacts have been aligned with the CEC Common Core (CC) and Individualized General Education Curriculum (GC) knowledge and skills, which are appropriate for the mild-moderate certificate candidates receive upon program completion. The portfolio instructions refer to grades 4-12 and provides exemplars specific to this program. Three years of data have been collected with mean scores provided for the 10 CEC standards including Standard 1. The mean scores for Standard 1 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 most of the standards-based criteria. Therefore, combined with the Praxis II data, it appears that Standard 1 has been met.

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
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

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.

Analysis of data findings from both tests over the past three years demonstrate pass rates exceeding 80%. 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 are stated to fulfill. 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, the only knowledge and skills referenced are from the Common Core (CC) and Individualized General Education Curriculum (GC) competencies which apply to this program. 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. Again, the assignment description and rubric are aligned with standards and CC and Individualized General Education Curriculum knowledge/skills related to the IEP. There is sufficient evidence to determine that Standard 2 has been met.

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. Analysis of data findings from both tests over the past three years demonstrate pass rates exceeding 80%. 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. The assessment is aligned with CC and GC competencies. 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. Three years of mean scores and standard deviations were provided for unit plan components related to

Standard 3, which 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. The data table for this assessment is identical to--and appears to have been erroneously copied from--the P4 report. Overall, however, the data suggest candidates are adequately prepared to address CEC Standard 3 without the inclusion of the optional Assessment 8.

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
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Standard 4: Instructional Strategies is addressed by Assessments 1-8. Assessments 1-3 have been discussed under Standards 1-3. 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 or GC knowledge and skill competencies. 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 and GC 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. Although the data table heading refers to the 4-12 program, the course title (ELSE 5743) and the actual data appear to be identical to that for the P-4 program. 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. The title of the data table indicates it is for the 4-12 program; however, it is identical to the table included for Assessment 7 in the P-12 report. Assessment 8 is a program exit survey; as described above, the data table appears to have been copied from the P4 report in error. Although there appears to be adequate support for Standard 4 in the first five assessments, the inclusion of three assessments with the wrong data tables is a cause for concern.

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. Most of the assignment rubrics are aligned with the GC and CC competencies as well. 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; it is unclear whether this was an error of inclusion or omission. 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, but the data appear to be from the P4 program. 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 again are from the P4 program rather than the 4-12 program. Therefore, based on the usable data from Assessments 1, 2, and 4, 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
jn	jn	jn

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. 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 exceeding 80%. 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 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 on 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. 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 2.56 to 2.67 on a 3-point scale. Assessment 8 is a graduate exit survey that functions primarily as a tool for program evaluation; as noted earlier, the data appear to have been copied erroneously from the P4 report. Based on the strength of support from Assessments 1, 2, and 4, it appears that Standard 6 has been met.

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
jn	jn	jn

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, the differentiated unit plan (DUP) that candidates create as part of a six lesson plan unit twice--once for a course and once during their internship experience. Eight elements of the 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. Assessment 4 consists of data from lab/internship evaluations. A section of the rubric devoted to Standard 7. If the candidates are all completing their internship with students with ELN, these 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. 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. As noted earlier, data tables for Assessment 7 and 8 appear to be duplicates of those for the P4 program. Transitional planning did not appear to be addressed in any of the assessments. However, based on Assessments 1-4, it appears that Standard 4 has been substantially met.

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 the candidate 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 a special education setting. Assessment 5, the behavior intervention project, provides strong, direct evidence that candidates know how to gather and use assessment data to plan instruction and measure student progress over time. Assessment 6, the formal assessment project, requires candidates to conduct and interpret formal and educational assessments of 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, includes two items related to Standard 8 - types/terminology of assessment, and special education process. As noted earlier, data from Assessments 6-8 were disregarded in making a determination on this standard, since they appeared to be erroneous. Based on the strength of Assessments 1-5, however, there is sufficient evidence to justify a rating of Met for Standard 8.

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 2.46 to 2.73 over three years of data collection. Although the score of 2.46 may indicate a relative area of concern, the use of mean scores rather than frequency counts does not reflect whether this lower score was due to generalized lower performance across all candidates, or much lower scores by a few candidates. 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. Assessments 7 and 8 were not included in this analysis because of the data discrepancies noted earlier. However, even without these two assessments, it appears that Standard 9 was met by most candidates.

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
jñ	jñ	jñ

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 2.89-2.93 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.

Although data from Assessments 6, 7, and 8 provide limited evidence, enough evidence is provided by other assessments for Standard 10 to be met.

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, which are aligned with Common Core and General Curriculum knowledge and skills competencies. 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, data from Assessments 6-8 duplicated the tables provided in the P4 report. Overall, sufficient evidence to demonstrate the candidates' knowledge of content was provided. This conclusion would be strengthened by confirmation from data derived from Assessments 6-8.

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

Evidence of candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions was provided. Assessments 3 and 4 are very specific and cover a great many elements of several standards completely. Likewise, Assessments 6, 7, and 8 provide evidence of candidate competence in understanding and applying pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions--although the data were not usable.

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

Assessment 5 is a very well designed assessment measuring candidate effects on student learning. Assessment 4 also provides observational data concerning candidate impact on student learning.

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 education 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. The discussion of data from Assessments 6-8 needs to be re-examined after the accuracy of those data has been confirmed.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

Data for Assessments 6, 7 and 9 are needed that clearly are for this program and not the P-4 program.

Data should be provided through frequency counts or percentage of candidates performing at each level in each element.

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.

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.

PART G -DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- j_n Program is nationally recognized. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation. *Please note that once a program has been nationally recognized, it may not submit a revised report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns.*

Please click "Next"

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