CEC Guidelines for Program Reviewers

# Roles of Reviewers

Collaborate with your team to decide in a timely way:

* Whether the program report includes clear and convincing evidence that the program assessments, scoring rubrics, and data are present and aligned to the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards as informed by the appropriate specialty set(s).
* Whether the program report includes clear and convincing evidence that the program candidates master the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards as informed by the appropriate specialty set(s).
* Whether the program report overall provides evidence whether it meets the CEC Preparation Standards
* Communicate the evidence or lack thereof for each of the above decisions

# Overview of the Option A Initial Program Report

The program report consists of a Cover Sheet and five sections. The Cover Sheet provides basic information about the program being submitted. Section I presents background and contextual information about the program; Section II includes a chart that lists each of the 6-8 assessments; Section III includes a chart that links the 6-8 assessments with the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards; Section IV provides a two page narrative plus the assessment tool or description, the rubric and/or scoring guide and the data tables for each of the 6-8 assessments; and Section V provides information on how the program faculty have used the data to improve their program and strengthen candidate performance. The following information supplies more detail about each section of the Program Report including information on how to use each section as you complete your evaluation.

## Section I--Context

Section I, the Context Section of the program report, should provide background information for the reviewer. It includes descriptions of faculty expertise and experience in the specialty field, relationship of assessments used in the program to the unit’s assessment system, and the program of study together with the field and clinical experiences required for the program. Concerns, strengths, or deficiencies found in this part of the program report may be seen in the evidence provided for the subsequent sections of the report and may serve to explain that evidence. If, as you read Section I, you have strong concerns about the faculty, curriculum or other components of the program, you may note them on your Reviewer Worksheet and/or include them in Part F, item F.1, of the Program Recognition Report.

## Section II—Assessments and Related Data

Section II is a chart that program developers will use to list the key assessments. You will be using this information as you work through Section III and IV of the report so you may find yourselves clicking back and forth between these sections.

## Section III—Standards Assessment Chart

The chart in Section III links the assessments to the CEC Preparation Standards. Each CEC Preparation Standard is listed in the first column. In the final column developers have checked the numbers of the assessments (from the chart in Section II) that they feel address each CEC Preparation Standard.

## Section IV—Evidence for Meeting CEC Preparation Standards.

In Section IV developers provide a narrative for each of their key assessments. In this narrative they are asked to provide a brief description of the assessment, describe how the assessment addresses the CEC Preparation Standards (as checked in the chart in Section III), a brief analysis of the data findings and an interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting CEC Preparation Standards, indicating the specific major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards by number, title, and/or CEC Preparation Standard. They will also upload three documents for each assessment: the assessment instrument (or complete descriptions of the assessments), the rubric and/or scoring guide for each assessment, and a chart that includes the data for each assessment. When examining the different attachments within the program report, the program should have uploaded no more than 20 attachments. You will also notice that for the 6-8 key assessments, the program has uploaded the narrative, assessment description or tool, scoring guide, and data as one document that should be labeled “Assessment 3”, for example.

As a reviewer, you will use this information as you answer two primary questions: are the assessments appropriate for the cited CEC Preparation Standards and do the candidate data demonstrate that most candidates meet the CEC Preparation Standard. The information in Section IV should give you insight into how the faculty perceive the assessments align with the CEC Preparation Standards and provide information about any data that appear questionable or, perhaps, absent.

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

The purpose of the final portion of the program report, Section V, is to demonstrate that faculty has used results from the key assessments to improve candidate achievement and program performance. The program report template includes these directions to report developers:

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

Reviewer comments on this portion of the program report are placed in Part D of the Program Recognition Report. This information also provides critical information for the Board of Examiners.

# Program Review

## Primary Documents:

The **Program Report** is the evidence submitted by the program faculty to demonstrate that it meets the CEC Preparation Standards. All of the information that you will use to make a decision will be found in the Program Report. This document, submitted on-line, is available to you in PRS through AIMS. You can print out individual sections if you’d prefer to work with a hard copy.

As you review the Program Report you will have several documents with which to work. The first is the **Reviewer Worksheet** at the end of this document. You will also use the CEC Preparation Standard rubric.

The **Program Review Report** is the official document that you will submit to NCATE and that will be read by the other members of your team. Your team leader will prepare a team Program Recognition Report and the final Program Recognition Report will be reviewed by the CEC Audit Committee, and then sent to the institution. All of the SPAs use the same format for the NCATE Program Recognition Report.

## Overview

When you first open up the Program Report you might find it helpful to begin by reading Section I, scanning Sections II and III, and then opening the attachments and in Section IV. This will give you an understanding of the assessments and how they relate to the CEC Preparation Standards. Next, review the information provided for clinical experience and make your judgments using the CEC Clinical Experience Scoring Guide below.

You can then go to the Reviewer Worksheet (and/or other CEC documents) and work through each of the questions.

The Reviewer Worksheet is organized around your major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards. You are asked to evaluate each of the assessments assigned to a specific CEC Preparation Standard (from Section III of the Program Report), evaluate the reported candidate data, and then to make a decision about whether or not each CEC Preparation Standard is met.

The following information is to help guide you as you answer each of the questions on the Reviewer Worksheet. Rubrics will be developed for each of these questions. The rubrics have three levels: target, acceptable, and unacceptable. Each of these is defined below:

Target: Fully meets and exceeds CEC Preparation Standard

Acceptable: Meets CEC Preparation Standard; weaknesses may be found, but overall the CEC Preparation Standard is met

Unacceptable: Weaknesses are serious and must be addressed prior to positive rating

## CEC Clinical Experience Scoring Guide

Program reviewers examine the evidence in the program report and make a finding for each of the variables in the CEC Clinical Experience Scoring Guide. Overall, the CEC Clinical Experience Standard is met when all of the variables in the scoring guide are “met”, and the CEC Clinical Experience Standard is not met when any of the variables are “not met”. Any other score is rated “met with conditions”.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ELEMENT** | | **NOT MET** | **MET WITH CONDITIONS** | **MET** |
| **Site-based Clinical Educators** | Clinical special educators are credentialed in the special education areas for which the candidate is being prepared,  AND  Selected for their expertise and experience with the individuals and special education services for which the candidate is preparing. | RANDOMLY  OR OCCASIONALLY | NOT CLEARLY  OR  NOT CONSISTENTLY | CLEARLY AND CONSISTENTLY |
| **Coordinating**  **University Faculty Members** | Coordinating special education faculty supervisors are qualified in the special education areas for which the candidates are being prepared,  AND  Selected for their expertise and experience with the individuals and special education services for which the candidate is preparing. | RANDOMLY  OR OCCASIONALLY | NOT CLEARLY  OR  NOT CONSISTENTLY | CLEARLY AND CONSISTENTLY |
| **Placements**  **Sequenced** | Clinical experiences are developmentally sequenced throughout the program to support candidate learning. | RANDOMLY  OR OCCASIONALLY | NOT CLEARLY  OR  NOT CONSISTENTLY | CLEARLY AND CONSISTENTLY |
| **Placements Maximize Experiences** | Clinical experiences are structured to maximize the experience of each candidate with individuals with the exceptionalities across the age, grade, and severity range(s) for which the candidate is being prepared. | RANDOMLY  OR OCCASIONALLY | NOT CLEARLY  OR  NOT CONSISTENTLY | CLEARLY AND CONSISTENTLY |
| **Performance Assessment** | Clinical practice includes ongoing evaluation and feedback of candidate performance from both the clinical special educator and the coordinating faculty member. | RANDOMLY  OR OCCASIONALLY | NOT CLEARLY  OR  NOT CONSISTENTLY | CLEARLY AND CONSISTENTLY |
| **Length of Clinical Preparation** | Clinical experiences are sufficiently extensive and intensive for special education candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills in the professional roles for which they are preparing. | RANDOMLY  OR OCCASIONALLY | NOT CLEARLY  OR  NOT CONSISTENTLY | CLEARLY AND CONSISTENTLY |

## CEC Preparation StandardReview

### Are the assessments components aligned with the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards?

Program assessments, including the scoring rubrics and the data, must be aligned with the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards. There must be a clear and convincing match between the elements of the CEC Preparation Standard and what the assessment is measuring. It is quite likely that a single assessment could address components of several CEC Preparation Standards (as indicated in the chart in Section III of the program report). Here are some questions that reviewers might ask as they evaluate alignment of the assessments:

CONTENT Do the same or consistent content topics appear in the assessments that are in the CEC Preparation Standards?

RANGE Do the assessments address the range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are delineated in the CEC Preparation Standard? Some major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards are very comprehensive, some cover smaller elements. In general, is the preponderance of the content of the CEC Preparation Standard addressed by the assessments assigned to it? If the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standard is very dense and covers a number of concepts, it is not necessary to check off every single element. It is better to look holistically at the CEC Preparation Standard as you compare it to the assessments. CEC resources should be helpful to you when addressing this question.

### Do the assessments assess meaningful cognitive demands and skill requirements at challenging levels for candidates?

Here are two questions that reviewers might ask as they evaluate this question:

COMPLEXITY Are the assessments congruent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill requirements described in the CEC Preparation Standards?

DIFFICULTY Is the level of effort required, or the difficulty or degree of challenge of the assessments consistent with CEC Preparation Standards? Is this level reasonable for candidates who are ready to teach or to take on other professional educator responsibilities?

From what you find in the assessment, the instructions, and the scoring guide, is the assessment measuring what it purports to measure?

SPECIFICITY Are the assessments vague or poorly defined? The assessments might include an entry like “portfolio entries, test results, observations.” What entries? What test results? What observations? These need to be identified as specific experiences. Is the assessment information oblique or confused? Sometimes the response does not actually address the CEC Preparation Standard.

OTHER REMINDERS FOR REVIEWERS If grades are used as evidence, then the program report must follow the instructions on the NCATE website that describes how programs use grades to assess content knowledge. This document should give a description of the assessment by providing brief descriptions of the courses and a rationale as to why these courses were chosen, show alignment between the course grades and the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards, submit grading policies and a minimum expectation for candidate grades and finally, present data tables presenting, at a minimum, the grade distributions and mean course grades for candidates in the selected courses. Institutions cannot claim that an acceptable grade in a course in which an important experience is embedded is sufficient to assume that the specific experience is satisfactory. For example, if a research project in a required course is cited, as an example of how candidates meet a CEC Preparation Standard, the course grade (which includes many measures beyond the research project) cannot automatically be assumed to reflect information about candidate mastery of the CEC Preparation Standard. Please see http://www.ncate.org/institutions/GuidelinesGrades.asp?ch=90 for NCATE’s grades policy, which went into effect in fall 2008.

### Are the assessments free from bias?

From information provided in the program report, reviewers should be able to infer some important qualities about the avoidance of bias. Assessments should be constructed in ways that avoid bias in both language and in testing situations. Perhaps the easiest way to avoid bias is the use of a well developed scoring guide or rubric.

Reviewers can consider the following question: Are the assessments and their scoring guide free from racial, ethnic, gender, cultural, or other bias?

### In the scoring guides (rubrics) is each of the levels of candidate proficiency distinct and appropriate?

A scoring guide is the tool faculty use to determine candidates’ ratings on specific assessments. Scoring guides should address relevant and meaningful attributes of candidate knowledge and performance related to the standards on an assessment task and should be used to reach meaningful decisions. Scoring guides can take many forms (such as Likert scales and rubrics) depending on the assessment activity.

Regardless of the form the scoring guides take, they should have written and shared criteria for judging performance that indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated. They should be explicit enough to anchor judgments about the degree of success on a candidate assessment.

Many assessments are little more than checklists completed at the end of the student teaching experience. They do not define what is being sought and the ratings are in some cases mere numbers or words subject to broad interpretation (e.g., 1, 2, or 3; or excellent, good, acceptable). Such instruments do not provide either candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.

To be reliable, assessments must be capable of yielding approximately the same values across raters. One way to achieve inter-rater reliability is to train raters, but this is difficult to evaluate in this paper review. A second and more practical approach is to review instruments carefully that are highly explicit as to expectations and ratings.

When evaluating scoring guides, reviewers can consider such questions as the following:

Are scoring guides clear and explicit about faculty expectations for candidate proficiencies in relation to CEC Preparation Standards?

Do scoring guides address relevant and meaningful attributes of candidate performance on an assessment task? Do assessments and scoring guides work together so that different levels of candidate proficiency can be distinguished clearly?

When rubrics are used, is there specific guidance on what a rater might look for?

### Do the data as reported indicate the extent to which the candidates meet the CEC Preparation Standard?

The key summarizing question is whether the program present convincing evidence that its graduates can demonstrate that they have mastered the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards? The primary sources of information for you to use to address this question are the narratives and data charts in Section IV for each assessment. This should give you a complete picture of the data, how faculty interprets the data, and any contextual issues that might have had an impact on the data.

### CEC Preparation Standard[[1]](#footnote-1) Review Rubric

The CEC Preparation Standard Review Rubric is designed to be used separately with each of the CEC Preparation Standards in conjunction with the CEC Preparation Standard Rubric Worksheet. Program reviewers examine the evidence in the program report for each of the program assessments cited as aligning with the CEC Preparation Standards, and make a finding for each on the variables in the rubric for each of the CEC Preparation Standards. Overall, a CEC Preparation Standard is “met” when the reviewer finds that all four ratings are “met”, and the CEC Preparation Standard is not met when any of the variables are “not met”. Any other score is rated “met with conditions”.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Assessment** | **NOT MET** | **MET WITH CONDITIONS** | **MET** |
| **Section 4 Assessment Components[[2]](#footnote-2)** | The components of the program assessment(s) cited for this standard are missing, incomplete, or not coordinated with each other | The narrative descriptions and scoring guides for the program assessment(s) are present, but incomplete or not coordinated with other components,  OR  The narrative descriptions and scoring guides for the program assessment(s) are present, but complete and coordinated with other components, but the data for the program assessment(s) is missing or incomplete. | The components of the program assessment(s) are present, complete, and coordinated with each other. |
| **Assessment Content** | The content of the program assessment(s) content does not align with or does not appropriately assess the depth and breadth of a preponderance of the elements of the CEC Standard as informed by the specialty set for the area(s) of preparation. | The content of the program assessment(s) content aligns inconsistently or incompletely with or it inconsistently assesses the depth and breadth of the elements of the CEC Standard as informed by the specialty set for the area(s) of preparation. | Program assessment content consistently aligns with and assesses the depth and breadth of the elements of the cited CEC Standard as informed by the specialty set for the area(s) of preparation. |
| **Scoring Guides/**  **Rubrics** | The scoring rubric/guide does not clearly describe performance expectations for each distinct level of candidate mastery in relation to the elements of the cited CEC Standard as informed by the specialty set.  OR | The rubric/ scoring guide describes the performance expectations for each distinct level of candidate mastery in relation to the elements of the CEC Standard as informed by the specialty set too broadly or subjectively.  OR | The rubric/scoring guide clearly and consistently describes performance expectations for each distinct level of candidate mastery in relation to the elements of the CEC Standard as informed by the specialty set allowing objective and unbiased judgments.  AND |
| The scoring guide/rubric does not align with the elements of the cited Standard as informed by the specialty set | The scoring guide/rubric inconsistently or incompletely aligns with the elements of the cited Standard as informed by the specialty set | The scoring guide/rubric consistently and completely aligns with the elements of the cited Standard as informed by the specialty set |
| **Candidate Performance Data** | The data are not disaggregated by program, application, and, if appropriate by program location  OR | The data are only partially disaggregated by program, application, and, if appropriate by program location  OR | The data are consistently disaggregated by program, application, and, if appropriate by program location  AND |
| The data are not aggregated to align to the elements of the cited CEC Preparation Standard as informed by the specialty set  OR  The data are not displayed at the same level as collected  OR | The data are only partially aggregated to align to the elements of the cited CEC Preparation Standard as informed by the specialty set  OR  The data are only partially displayed at the same level as collected  OR | The data are consistently aggregated to align to the elements of the cited CEC Preparation Standard as informed by the specialty set  AND  The data are consistently displayed at the same level as collected  AND |
| Program assessment(s) performance data do not demonstrate that candidates master a preponderance of the elements for the cited CEC Preparation Standard as informed by the specialty set. | Program assessment(s) performance data is not sufficient to demonstrate candidates master a preponderance of the elements for the cited CEC Preparation Standard as informed by the specialty set. | Program assessment(s) performance data clearly and consistently demonstrate candidates master a preponderance of the elements for the cited CEC Preparation Standard as informed by the specialty set. |

## Final Program Recognition Decision

After you have made individual decisions for each of the CEC Preparation Standards, you are asked to make one recognition decision for the program overall. In general, CEC expects reviewers to use their professional judgment in making decisions. However, it is important that decisions are made consistently by reviewers within SPAs and across SPAs. This is difficult to do when we are unable to all meet together and share our thoughts, comments, and opinions until we reach consensus. The **CEC Clinical Preparation Scoring Guide** has been developed to help reviewers make consistent decisions.There are three possible decisions

**Program Report Decision Guide for Revised CEC Preparation Standards**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program Report Decision** | **Criteria** |
| **Recognized** | All CEC Preparation Standards and the CEC Clinical Experience Standard are “met”  AND  The program report clearly and convincingly supports a finding that the program meets the elements of the CEC Clinical Experience Standard. |
| **Recognized with Conditions** | Up to eight CEC Preparation Standards including Clinical Experience Standard are “met with conditions.”  AND  Fewer than four CEC Preparation Standards and the Clinical Experience Standard are “not met.**”** |
| **Not Recognized** | Four or more CEC Preparation Standards including the Clinical Experience Standard are “not met.” |

**Program Report Decision Guide for Existing Initial and Advanced CEC Preparation Standards**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program Report Decision** | **Criteria** |
| **Recognized** | All CEC Preparation Standards and the CEC Clinical Experience Standard are “met”  AND  The program report clearly and convincingly supports a finding that the program meets the elements of the CEC Clinical Experience Standard. |
| **Recognized with Conditions** | Up to eleven (seven for advanced level) CEC Preparation Standards including Clinical Experience Standard are “met with conditions.”  AND  Fewer than four CEC Preparation Standards and the Clinical Experience Standard are “not met.**”** |
| **Not Recognized** | Four or more CEC Preparation Standards including the Clinical Experience Standard are “not met.” |

# CEC Program Recognition Report

The CEC Program Recognition Report is the formal document that you complete and submit to NCATE. Your team leader, using individual reviewer reports and other input, will complete the team report that will be submitted to NCATE. The CEC Audit team will have access to all the individual reviewer reports as well as the final report. A Program Recognition Report should be completed for each program report you review.

The CEC Program Recognition Report has 7 sections. The following information provides information about each section and describes how to use information from the Reviewer Worksheet to complete the report.

## Introductory Information:

Complete this information for each program. This information can be copied from the Cover Sheet of the Program Report.

## Part A Recognition Decision

A.1. CEC Decision on CEC recognition of the program

In this section put your decision, taken from the [**CEC Preparation Standard Reviewer Rubric**](#_CEC_Content_Standard)**.** There are three possible decisions: Nationally Recognized, Nationally Recognized with Conditions, Further Development Required/Recognized with Probation.

A.2 Test Results

The information on the 80% pass rate can be taken from the Cover Sheet in the Program Report. There is place for you to add comments, as appropriate.

A.3 Summary of Strengths

It is important that you cite strengths of the program that you have noticed. Strengths can either be specific aspects of the program (e.g. diversity of clinical sites) or more global statements (e.g. a major focus on teaching in urban settings), but should not be just a reiteration of the sections of the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards.

Here are a couple of examples of well written “Summary of Strength” statements:

“Emphasis on reflective practitioner throughout education coursework”,

“Use of an action research project that focuses candidates on their effect on student learning.”

“Review process is data driven and there is evidence of revisions/program changes resulting from examination of collected assessment data. Assessments included in review clearly demonstrate evidence that most candidates are meeting the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards. Rubrics are detailed, easy to understand, clear in their analysis, and aligned with relevant CEC Preparation Standards.”

## Part B Status of Meeting major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards

In this section cite each individual CEC Preparation Standard as Met, Met with Conditions or Not Met. Take this information from Column F of the Reviewer Worksheet. If a CEC Preparation Standard is found Met with Conditions or Not Met, you must include a comment to explain why it is met with conditions or not met. The comment should provide enough information for the program to be able to understand the issue. Some guidelines for writing the comments:

* Use objective, impartial language
* Be complete so no other information is needed to understand why CEC Preparation Standard is “not met.”
* Explanation must be related only to the CEC Preparation Standard
* Be as clear and specific as possible
* Use direct language without being harsh or unprofessional
* Don’t use modifiers that appear tentative or uncertain
* Cite weaknesses if these have not already been addressed

Do not include specific instructions for remediation (e.g. the faculty should develop a new course). Any “suggestions” from the reviewers will be taken as “commands” by the faculty. It is not the reviewers’ role to proscribe programmatic changes, but to provide explanation for why particular CEC Preparation Standards were not met.

To give you some guidance, here are a couple of examples of well written comments for Part B:

The assessment cited for this CEC Preparation Standard does not align specifically to critical thinking and judgment; rather it is focused on planning lessons that improve student understanding using various reading processes.

The program cites assessment 5, the rubric and data table based on the state assessment, as providing evidence that this CEC Preparation Standard has been met. However, reviewers found no mention of building family and community relationships in this assessment tool. Also, reviewers found no scoring guides or rubrics in the information provided to help understand how a candidate is rated as “distinguished, “proficient” or “developing”. Again, there was no information specific to the relationship of the state assessment and the NAEYC standards, including standard 2

## Part C—Evaluation of Program Report Evidence

In Part C you are asked to evaluate how well the program’s assessments and candidate data address content knowledge, pedagogical and professional content knowledge skills and dispositions, and candidate impact on student learning. The information in Part C summarizes the program report evaluation in a way that will be extremely useful to the Board of Examiners when they evaluate the unit against Unit Standard 1.

In this section, reviewers should discuss how appropriately the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards were addressed in each of the three categories, C.1, C.2, and C.3; whether the assessments were of sufficient quality to address the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards; how effective the scoring guides were in identifying appropriate levels of proficiency, and to what extent candidates are meeting the CEC Preparation Standards. To complete Part C, you should use the chart in Section III of the Program Report. To complete section C.1, find those CEC Preparation Standards that have “Content Knowledge” checked in the second column and summarize your decisions for those CEC Preparation Standards (or components of those CEC Preparation Standards). For C.2, find those CEC Preparation Standards in the Section III chart that are cited for “Pedagogical/Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions. For C.3, find those CEC Preparation Standards that are cited for “Effect on Student Learning.”

The last page of the Reviewer Worksheet has a table to help you organize your response to Part C. In each of the sections of Part C you should write relatively brief (1-2 paragraphs) that summarize your evaluation of the relevant CEC Preparation Standards.

Here are a couple of examples of well written comments for Part C:

The institution indicated assessments to address areas of content knowledge essential for elementary teachers. However, evidence from Assessment 2 was not available; other assessments provided only limited data for some areas of content knowledge (i.e., science and social studies); and no evidence was available to indicate knowledge of the arts, health education, and physical education.

The institution indicated Assessments 3, 4, and 5 address ACEI’s standards applicable to pedagogical knowledge and skills. However, the elements of the scoring rubrics and the candidate data presented only indirectly or narrowly addressed most of these standards. It was difficult for reviewers to see relationships from the information and candidate data presented that was clearly directed toward and aligned with the applicable standards.

Analysis of student learning is clearly covered in the assessments. Many of the projects are cross-referenced and cover content, pedagogy, as well as student learning impact standards.

## Part D—Evaluation of the Use of Assessment Results

In Part D, you should provide your evaluation of the information submitted in Section V of the Program Report. Questions for consideration might include:

Is it clear that assessment evidence is used by the institution in evaluating the program, counseling candidates, and revising courses or other elements of the program?

Has the institution made program changes based on assessment evidence?

Do you find the faculty interpretations consistent with the evidence provided in the program report?

Are the implications for programs that appear in this section of the program report derived from the interpretations?

Here are a couple of examples of well written comments for Part D:

Supportive evidence is clear for all assessments and there is a procedure in place for the evaluation and application of that evidence for the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program.

The program appears to understand that it has considerable work to do; some significant weaknesses have been identified and the program indicates it knows it must work on these. This review should assist in the process.

The university has provided evidence that they have adjusted their program based on data collected from the first cohort of candidates. In one example from the Contextual Statement, an analysis was made of the match between content expectations of the program and of candidates’ performance on the Praxis II exam as a way to determine monitor trends that may indicate the need for adjustment to the program.

## Part E—Areas for Consideration

In this section of the Program Recognition Report, reviewers would address broad, programmatic issues that the review team feels may be affecting the program, but may not be CEC Preparation Standards based. This is a section where the review team can address any issues affecting the program even if the program is nationally recognized. Finally, the review team may choose to use this section to give “guidance” to programs on how to proceed in addressing issues within the program, especially if the decision is Not Nationally Recognized.

## Part F—Additional Comments

Part F provides you with the opportunity to make any additional comments that you think are appropriate. In F.1 your comments should focus on the Context Statement and other issues that were not addressed elsewhere in this report. In F.2, you can cite concerns for follow-up by the Board of Examiners. These could be issues related to the NCATE Unit Standards but not related to the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards. For example, you may be concerned about the number of faculty assigned to the program in relation to the number of candidates or you could be concerned that the clinical practice experiences are not sufficient for the program.

## Part G: Conditions Statement

Part G acts essentially as a contract between the CEC and the program. The conditions should be clear, objective, and based on evidence or lack thereof. REMEMBER, THE TEAM THAT LOOKS AT THE RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORT WHEN IT IS SUBMITTED WILL FOCUS ONLY ON THIS CONDITIONS SECTION TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE PROGRAM IS RECOGNIZED.

Here are a couple of examples of well written comments for Part D:

Notes:

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

Comment for Board of Examiners:

Final Decision:

\_\_\_\_\_ Nationally Recognized

\_\_\_\_\_ Not Nationally Recognized

\_\_\_\_\_ Decision Deferred, More Information Required

Comments:

\_\_\_\_\_ Recognized with Conditions

Comments:

1. “Standard” herein mean the seven initial or advanced CEC Preparation Standards with their twenty-eight elements as informed by the appropriate specialty set(s). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Program assessment components required in Section 4 of the program report include the narrative description, the scoring guide, and the candidate performance data. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)