

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Preparation of Special Educators (2012 Standards)

National 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

Clarion University of Pennsylvania

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

08 / 01 / 2018

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Mid-Level Education with Special Education

Grade Level⁽¹⁾

PK-8

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

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 national recognition of the program(s):

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation OR Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

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

The program meets or exceeds SPA benchmarked licensure test data requirement, if applicable:

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

Met on previous report. Over two administrations, the overall pass rate for Mid-Level Special Education candidates was 86%-100% on all modules.

Summary of Strengths:

The program reflected on and used feedback from previous reviewers to make changes in several assessments. These assessments will allow for candidates to be rated in observable, measurable, and consistent ways across evaluators.

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



Comment:

The program presented evidence of candidate progression through a series of developmentally sequenced field experiences for the range of ages, types and levels of disabilities. Per Pennsylvania regulations, cooperating teachers must have a special education teaching certification, must have at least 3 years of satisfactory certificated teaching experience, and at least 1 year of certificated teaching experience in the school entity where the student teacher is placed. University supervisors are either full time tenure track faculty or are chosen from a pool of adjuncts that have proceeded through the hiring process. This is a university wide process in which candidates provide their vita, cover letter, transcripts, and recommendations. The Special Education Search Committee then reviews all applicants for the adjunct supervisor position. Qualified candidates are interviewed over the phone. All supervisors must have at least 3 years of teaching. Based upon the preponderance of evidence presented, the Field Experiences and Clinical Practices Standard is Met.

Standard 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences

Beginning special education professionals understand how exceptionalities may interact with development and learning and use this knowledge to provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.

(1.1) Beginning special education professionals understand how language, culture, and family background influence the learning of individuals with exceptionalities.

(1.2) Beginning special education professionals use understanding of development and individual differences to respond to the needs of individuals with exceptionalities.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1 (PECT), 2 (IEP), 3(Unit), 4 (STPP), and 6(BIP) were submitted as evidence for Standard 1.

Evidence provided for Assessment 1 (PECT), shows the overall pass rate for Mid Level Special Education candidates was 86%-100% on all modules over two administrations (N = 8). PECT Module 1, Subarea II - Understanding Students with Disabilities and PECT Module 2, Subarea II - Delivery of Specially Designed Instruction are aligned with Standard 1.

Assessment 2 (IEP) requires candidates to write an IEP based on on a target student chosen by the cooperating teacher. For the past three data cycles, all candidates (N = 10) have met or exceeded expectations in all areas. The rubric used for this assessment delineates criteria for candidate performance.

Assessment 3 (Unit) is designed to demonstrate candidates' ability to plan an appropriate sequence of instruction based on obtained summative and formative pre-assessment data, provide instruction, conduct formative pre and post assessments to document student learning, and reflect on student achievement and possible changes in teaching that might impact student learning. One element (Unit Lesson Plans) is aligned with Standard 1; candidates (N =9) are meeting or exceeding expectations on this element.

Assessment 4 (STPP) is a summative assessment completed at the end of the candidate's eight-week student teaching placement. Two elements, Knowledge of students - Learner Development and Knowledge of students- Student needs, are aligned with Standard 1. The STPP rubric focuses on process, rather than product, to help supervisors provide feedback to the teacher candidate regarding their mastery of the CEC standards. Rubric elements are distinguishable from one level of performance to the next, and candidates have met or exceeded expectations in relation to Standard 1 for two administrations of this assessment (N = 8).

Assessment 6 (BIP) requires teacher candidates to collaborate with other professionals to develop a program to change the behavior/s of a student(s) in their special education student teaching placement. Three elements of this assessment are aligned with Standard 1: Student Profile, Antecedent Strategies, and Replacement Behaviors. The rubric has three levels of performance: Does Not Meet Standards, Meets Standards, Exceeds Standards. Rubric elements are defined across these levels in observable terms for candidate performance. Data from three administrations (N=9) of the assessment indicate candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Based upon the preponderance of evidence provided, including narrative on revisions since the previous report, Standard 1 is met.

Standard 2: Learning Environments

Beginning special education professionals create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments so that individuals with exceptionalities become active and effective learners and develop emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and self-determination.

(2.1) Beginning special education professionals through collaboration with general educators and other colleagues create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments to engage individuals with exceptionalities in meaningful learning activities and social interactions.

(2.2) Beginning special education professionals use motivational and instructional interventions to teach individuals with exceptionalities how to adapt to different environments.

(2.3) Beginning special education professionals know how to intervene safely and appropriately with individuals with exceptionalities in crisis.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1 (PECT), 4 (STPP), and 6(BIP) were submitted as evidence for Standard 2.

For Assessment 1 (PECT), PECT Module I, Subarea II - Understanding Students with Disabilities and PECT Module 2, Subarea I - Inclusive Learning Environments are aligned with Standard 2. The overall pass rate for Mid-Level Special Education candidates was 86%-100% on all modules over two administrations (N = 8).

Assessment 4 (STPP) has nine elements aligned to Standard 2: Incorporates outside resources into instructional plans; Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport; Creating a culture for learning; Manages classroom behaviors; Organizes physical space and materials; Communicates directions and expectations; Expresses oral and written language; Engage students in learning; Utilizes dimensions of classroom time-structure and pacing. With the exception of Incorporates outside resources, all of the elements show clear alignment to the relevant standard. This rubric uses a four-point scale to evaluate candidate performance (exceeded, met, not met, unacceptable); rubric elements document graduated and measurable performance from one level to the next. Data for two administrations (N = 8) show candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Assessment 6 (BIP) has two elements aligned with Standard 2: Replacement Behaviors and Consequences. The rubric has clear expectations for candidate performance from one level to the next. Data from three administrations (N=9) of the assessment indicate candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Based upon the preponderance of evidence provided, including narrative on revisions since the previous report, Standard 2 is met.

Standard 3: Curricular Content Knowledge

Beginning special education professionals use knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.

(3.1) Beginning special education professionals understand the central concepts, structures of the discipline, and tools of inquiry of the content areas they teach, and can organize this knowledge, integrate cross-disciplinary skills, and develop meaningful learning progressions for individuals with exceptionalities

(3.2) Beginning special education professionals understand and use general and specialized content knowledge for teaching across curricular content areas to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities

(3.3) Beginning special education professionals modify general and specialized curricula to make them accessible to individuals with exceptionalities.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1 (PECT), 2 (IEP), 3 (Unit), and 4 (STPP) were submitted as evidence for Standard 3.

Assessment 1 (PECT) has one element related to Standard 3: Subarea II - Delivery of Specially Designed Instruction. Data are disaggregated by subarea, and the overall pass rate for Mid-Level Special Education candidates was 86%-100% on all modules over two administrations (N =8).

Assessment 2 (IEP) requires candidates to write a complete student-centered and standards-based IEP on a target student chosen by the cooperating teacher. The IEP is based on background information and formal and informal assessment results. One element of this assessment, Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs) is aligned to Standard 3. For three administrations of this assessment, all but one candidate (N = 10) is meeting or exceeding expectations (90% of candidates met requirements).

Assessment 3 (Unit) requires teacher candidates to develop a series of learning activities centered on a central topic (unit) in their special education placement. Three elements of the rubric are aligned to Standard 3: Pretest, Unit Lesson Plans, and Reflection. Candidate performance is evaluated across three levels: exceeded, met, and not met. Expectations are observable and measurable from one level to the next. Data for three cycles indicates candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations (N=9).

Assessment 4 (STPP) has four elements aligned with Standard 3: Understands content knowledge; Knowledge of students-Student needs; Demonstrates understanding of pedagogical content knowledge; and Engage students in learning. Expectations across rubric elements are explicitly stated and measurable. Data from two cycles (N = 8) indicate candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Based upon the preponderance of evidence provided, including narrative on revisions since the previous report, Standard 3 is met.

Standard 4: Assessment

Beginning special education professionals use multiple methods of assessment and data-sources in making educational decisions.

- (4.1) Beginning special education professionals select and use technically sound formal and informal assessments that minimize bias
- (4.2) Beginning special education professionals use knowledge of measurement principles and practices to interpret assessment results and guide educational decisions for individuals with exceptionalities
- (4.3) Beginning special education professionals in collaboration with colleagues and families use multiple types of assessment information in making decisions about individuals with exceptionalities
- (4.4) Beginning special education professionals engage individuals with exceptionalities to work toward quality learning and performance and provide feedback to guide them.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Standard 4: Assessment was met in the previous report.

Standard 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies

Beginning special education professionals select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities.

- (5.1) Beginning special education professionals consider an individual's abilities, interests, learning environments, and cultural and linguistic factors in the selection, development, and adaptation of learning experiences for individual with exceptionalities.
- (5.2) Beginning special education professionals use technologies to support instructional assessment, planning, and delivery for individuals with exceptionalities.

(5.3) Beginning special education professionals are familiar with augmentative and alternative communication systems and a variety of assistive technologies to support the communication and learning of individuals with exceptionalities.

(5.4) Beginning special education professionals use strategies to enhance language development and communication skills of individuals with exceptionalities

(5.5) Beginning special education professionals develop and implement a variety of education and transition plans for individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and different learning experiences in collaboration with individuals, families, and teams

(5.6) Beginning special education professionals teach to mastery and promote generalization of learning.

(5.7) Beginning special education professionals teach cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills such as critical thinking and problem solving to individuals with exceptionalities.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1 (PECT), 2 (IEP), 3 (Unit), 4 (STPP), and 5 (Progress Monitoring) were submitted as evidence for Standard 5.

Assessments 1 (PECT) has several components aligned with Standard 1: Module 1, Subarea III - Assessment and Program Planning and Implementation and Module 2, Subarea I - Inclusive Learning Environments and Subarea II - Delivery of Specially Designed Instruction. The past two data cycles show an 86%-100% pass rate for all candidates (N=8).

Assessment 2 (IEP) has four elements aligned with Standard 5: Strengths, Academic, developmental, and functional needs related to student's disability; Employment, and Independent Living; Measurable Annual Goal(s) (MAG); and Program Modifications and Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) (including adaptations) and Related Services. Required performance is measurable and observable across levels, which include exceeded, met, and not met. For three data cycles (N = 10), most candidates have met or exceeded expectations. During the spring 2017 administration, one candidate did not meet criterion on Strengths, Academic, developmental, and functional needs related to student's disability, Measurable Annual Goal(s), and Program Modifications and Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) (including adaptations) and Related Services. As stated previously, a remediation plan was put in place to assist candidates in meeting targets.

Assessment 3 (Unit) has three elements aligned with Standard 5: Unit Goal and PA Academic Standards; Unit Lesson Plans; and Use of Instructional Materials & Resources. These elements are defined on the rubric with observable and measurable candidate performance expectations. While the rubric uses language specific to the state of Pennsylvania in one element, these expectations would be considered universal for beginning special educators. Data for three cycles indicate candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations on elements related to Standard 5 (N = 9).

Six elements of Assessment 4 (STPP) are aligned with Standard 5: Knowledge of students- Student needs; Selecting Instructional Outcomes- Developing Goals and Objectives; Demonstrates understanding of instructional planning-

active engagement; Demonstrates understanding of instructional planning-models, structure, and grouping; Incorporates outside resources into instructional plans; and Demonstrates questioning skills; Engage students in learning. Each element is defined in observable and measurable behaviors across expectation levels. As stated previously, this assessment uses four levels to evaluate candidate performance: exceeded, met, not met, unacceptable, and is used during the student teaching experience. Data from two cycles (N = 8) indicate candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Assessment 5 (Progress Monitoring) requires candidates to measure student progress during field placement. Candidates are required to interpret student data, represent the data in the form of a graph as well in written form, write a goal for the student, identify instructional or intervention used, analyze the effect of the instruction/intervention on the student, and recommend changes as necessary. The narrative indicates the assignment was changed from a case study to work in a field placement, based on feedback in the previous report. There are three elements aligned to Standard 5: Measurable goals/objectives; Evaluation of the Data; and Instructional Adjustments. Expectations for candidate performance are defined in observable, measurable terms across three levels (exceeded, met, not met). Because feedback was used from previous reviewers and changes were made in the way the assessment was completed data from only one cycle was available. 100% of candidates (N = 2) met or exceeded expectations.

Based upon the preponderance of evidence provided, including narrative on revisions since the previous report, Standard 5 is met.

Standard 6: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice

Beginning special education professionals use foundational knowledge of the field and the their professional Ethical Principles and Practice Standards to inform special education practice, to engage in lifelong learning, and to advance the profession.

(6.1) Beginning special education professionals use professional Ethical Principles and Professional Practice Standards to guide their practice

(6.2) Beginning special education professionals understand how foundational knowledge and current issues influence professional practice

(6.3) Beginning special education professionals understand that diversity is a part of families, cultures, and schools, and that complex human issues can interact with the delivery of special education services

(6.4) Beginning special education professionals understand the significance of lifelong learning and participate in professional activities and learning communities.

(6.5) Beginning special education professionals advance the profession by engaging in activities such as advocacy and mentoring

(6.6) Beginning special education professionals provide guidance and direction to paraeducators, tutors, and volunteers.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1 (PECT), 6 (BIP), and 8 (Collaboration Case Study) were submitted as evidence for Standard 6.

Assessment 1 (PECT) has one area aligned with Standard 6: Module I, Subarea

I Foundations and Professional Practice. The past two data cycles show an 86%- 100% pass rate for all candidates (N=8).

One element of Assessment 6 (BIP) is aligned with Standard 6: Interviews. While the data table shows alignment with element 6.1, the rubric shows alignment only for Standard 4: Interviews CEC 4.1, 4.3 IGC-IIC4.S1, IGC-IIC.4.S3. Based on the rubric, interviews are conducted with the learner's teacher in order to gather information for the BIP. A clear connection is not made to Standard 6, although one could be made with further evidence.

Assessment 8 (Collaboration Case Study) provides candidates an opportunity to use what they have learned about collaboration and to apply that knowledge to case studies asking them to review various aspects of collaboration including conflict resolution, consensus decision making, and problem solving. All elements of the rubric are aligned to CEC Standards 6 and 7. Three data cycles show candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations (N = 14).

Based upon the preponderance of evidence provided, including narrative on revisions since the previous report, Standard 6 is met.

Standard 7: Collaboration

Beginning special education professionals collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, individuals with exceptionalities, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways to address the needs of individuals with exceptionalities across a range of learning experiences.

- (7.1) Beginning special education professionals use the theory and elements of effective collaboration
- (7.2) Beginning special education professionals serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues
- (7.3) Beginning special education professionals use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and collaborators

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Standard 7: Collaboration was met in the previous report.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Evidence provided for Assessment 1 (PECT), shows the overall pass rate for Mid Level Special Education candidates was 86%-100% on all modules over two administrations (N = 8).

Assessment 2 (IEP) requires candidates to write an IEP based on on a target student chosen by the cooperating teacher. Data were provided for three cycles; candidates (N = 10) have met or exceeded expectations in most areas. A small number of candidates (1/2 for the Spring 2017 administration) did not meet target expectations in the areas of Present Levels of Academic Achievement, Present Level of Functional Performance, How the disability affects involvement and progress in general education & progress in general education curriculum, Strengths, Academic, developmental, and functional needs related to student's disability, State Assessments and Local Assessments, Measurable Annual Goal(s), and Program Modifications and Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) (including adaptations) and Related Services. Candidates not meeting expectations were put on a remediation plan and changes were made to the course. The rubric used for this assessment delineates criteria for candidate performance.

Assessment 3 (Unit) is designed to demonstrate candidates' ability to plan an appropriate sequence of instruction based on obtained summative and formative pre-assessment data, provide instruction, conduct formative pre and post assessments to document student learning, and reflect on student achievement and possible changes in teaching that might impact student learning. Candidates (N =9) are meeting or exceeding expectations on this element.

Assessment 6 (BIP) requires teacher candidates to collaborate with other professionals to develop a program to change the behavior/s of a student(s) in their special education student teaching placement. The rubric has three levels of performance: Does Not Meet Standards, Meets Standards, Exceeds Standards. Rubric elements are defined across these levels in observable terms for candidate performance. Data from three administrations (N=9) of the assessment indicate candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Based on the preponderance of evidence, candidates demonstrate knowledge of content.

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

Assessment 3 (Unit) is designed to demonstrate candidates' ability to plan an appropriate sequence of instruction based on obtained summative and formative pre-assessment data, provide instruction, conduct formative pre and post assessments to document student learning, and reflect on student achievement and possible changes in teaching that might impact student

learning. Candidates (N =9) are meeting or exceeding expectations on this element.

Assessment 4 (STPP) is a summative evaluation used during the student teaching placement. It uses a four-point scale to evaluate candidate performance (exceeded, met, not met, unacceptable); rubric elements document graduated and measurable performance from one level to the next. Data for two administrations (N = 8) show candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Assessment 6 (BIP) requires teacher candidates to collaborate with other professionals to develop a program to change the behavior/s of a student(s) in their special education student teaching placement. The rubric has three levels of performance: Does Not Meet Standards, Meets Standards, Exceeds Standards. Rubric elements are defined across these levels in observable terms for candidate performance. Data from three administrations (N=9) of the assessment indicate candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Assessment 8 (Collaboration Case Study) provides candidates an opportunity to use what they have learned about collaboration and to apply that knowledge to case studies asking them to review various aspects of collaboration including conflict resolution, consensus decision making, and problem solving. All elements of the rubric are aligned to CEC Standards 6 and 7. Three data cycles show candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations (N = 14).

Based upon the preponderance of evidence submitted, candidates the ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions, as appropriate for beginning special educators.

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

Assessment 5 (Progress Monitoring) requires candidates to measure student progress during field placement. Candidates are required to interpret student data, represent the data in the form of a graph as well in written form, write a goal for the student, identify instructional or intervention used, analyze the effect of the instruction/intervention on the student, and recommend changes as necessary. The narrative indicates the assignment was changed from a case study to work in a field placement, based on feedback in the previous report. Expectations for candidate performance are defined in observable, measurable terms across three levels (exceeded, met, not met). Because feedback was used from previous reviewers and changes were made in the way the assessment was completed data from only one cycle was available. 100% of candidates (N = 2) met or exceeded expectations.

Assessment 6 (BIP) requires teacher candidates to collaborate with other professionals to develop a program to change the behavior/s of a student(s) in their special education student teaching placement. The rubric has three levels of performance: Does Not Meet Standards, Meets Standards, Exceeds

Standards. Rubric elements are defined across these levels in observable terms for candidate performance. Data from three administrations (N=9) of the assessment indicate candidates are meeting or exceeding expectations.

Based upon the preponderance of evidence submitted, candidates have satisfactory effects on P-12 student learning, as appropriate for beginning special educators.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

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

The narrative provided indicated program faculty meet to discuss assessment results by including specific changes since the last report.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the CAEP site visitors:

PART G -DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- National Recognition. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the provider's next CAEP accreditation decision in 5-7 years. The Recognition Report will serve as program level evidence for the accreditation cycle it has been initiated. To retain recognition and to gather new evidence for the next accreditation cycle, another program report must be submitted mid-cycle 3 years in advance of the next scheduled accreditation visit. The program will be listed as Nationally Recognized through the semester of the next CAEP accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and CAEP. The institution may designate its program as Nationally Recognized by the SPA, through the semester of the next CAEP accreditation decision, in its published materials. Please note that once a program has been Nationally Recognized, it may not submit another report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns cited in the recognition report.

Please click "Next"

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