

# 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 / 2017

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Special Education Certification PreK-8

Grade Level<sup>(1)</sup>

PreK-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:

Summary of Strengths:

The program reports data for three semesters indicating that between 91%-100% of candidates passed the licensure test.

## 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 evidence in the program report states that 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 appropriate to the licensure requirements. Further, all of the field and clinical experiences are supervised by qualified professionals. However, it is unclear how the program faculty selects university supervisors.

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:

Program faculty report that Assessments 1 (PECT), 2 (Individualized Education Plan Development), 3 (Unit Plan), 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile), and 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan) provide evidence of meeting Standard 1.

For Assessment 1 (PECT), program faculty report that the assessment modules contain questions that align with the standards. Data are disaggregated by module, rather than sub-area. Assessment 1 provides some evidence that candidates master elements of the CEC Preparation Standard, however, because the data is reported by module rather than sub-area it can not be clearly determined that candidates meet have mastered the elements of this standard. These data however provide generally supportive evidence.

Assessment 2 (Individualized Education Plan Development) reports frequency data for each level of each element of the rubric. The rubric indicator for "not met "on several elements of this rubric are described with elements missing, implying that any performance would be on target. Nevertheless, in two out of three administration of this assessment for this program, 10-31% of candidates did not meet the element. No information was provided as to how the program addressed the performance of these candidate.

Assessment 3 (Unit Plan) has one indicator aligned to this standard. It appears

to address CEC 1.2 with all candidates meeting or exceeding target level for this element.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile) uses ratings that are not clearly defined and may result in differing interpretation of the skills by program supervisors who are evaluating teacher candidates and may not provide candidates with explicit feedback on their performance. Additionally, it is unclear whether the criteria of the assessment is informed by the specialty set. Therefore, it cannot be determined from the data reported whether candidates are mastering the major elements of the cited CEC preparation standard.

Assessment 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan) includes two elements said to be aligned to this standard. The first element appears to be broadly aligned and provides some positive data for this standard. Data are only provided for one administration of this instrument.

The preponderance of the evidence indicates that this standard is met with conditions. The assessments do not appear to reflect the depth and breadth of this standard as informed by the specialty set.

#### 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:

Program faculty report that Assessments 1 (PECT), 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile), and 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan) provide evidence of meeting Standard 2.

In Assessment 1 (PECT), program faculty report that the assessment modules contain questions that align with the standard. Data are disaggregated by module. Assessment 1 provides some evidence that candidates master elements of the CEC Preparation Standard. However the data is not disaggregated by subareas and it can not be determined if students meet the elements of this standard. These data however provide generally supportive evidence.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile) uses ratings that are not clearly defined and may result in differing interpretation of the skills by

program supervisors who are evaluating teacher candidates and may not provide candidates with explicit feedback on their performance. Additionally, it is unclear whether the criteria of the assessment is informed by the specialty set. Therefore, it cannot be determined from the data reported whether candidates are mastering the major elements of the cited CEC preparation standard.

Assessment 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan) has one element aligned to this standard with positive candidate performance. Data are only provided for one administration of this instrument.

The preponderance of the evidence indicates that this standard is met with conditions. The assessments do not appear to reflect the depth and breadth of this standard as informed by the specialty set.

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:

Program faculty report that Assessments 1 (PECT), 2 (Individualized Education Plan Development), 3 (Unit Plan), and 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile) provide evidence of meeting Standard 3.

For Assessment 1 (PECT), program faculty report that the assessment modules contain questions that align with the standard. Data are disaggregated by module. Assessment 1 provides some evidence that candidates master elements of the CEC Preparation Standard. However the data is not disaggregated by subareas and it can not be determined if students meet the elements of this standard. These data however provide generally supportive evidence.

Assessment 2 (Individualized Education Plan Development) has one element, writing goals and objectives, that is aligned to this standard and most candidates score in the exceeds/met target ranges.

Assessment 3 (Unit Plan) has three elements aligned to this standard. The unit plan element appears to provide some evidence for this standard, but the not met descriptors appear to focus on surface features.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile) uses ratings that are not clearly defined and may result in differing interpretation of the skills by program supervisors who are evaluating teacher candidates and may not provide candidates with explicit feedback on their performance. Although this assessment provides the strongest evidence of candidate performance, the depth and breath of this standard do not appear to be reflected.

The preponderance of the evidence indicates that this standard is met with conditions..

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:

Program faculty report that Assessments 1 (PECT), 2 (Individualized Education Plan Development), 3 (Unit Plan), 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile), Assessment 5 (Progress Monitoring), 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan), and Assessment 7 (Assessment Practicum) provide evidence of meeting Standard 4.

In Assessment 1 (PECT), program faculty report that the assessment modules contain questions that align with the standard. Data are disaggregated by module. Assessment 1 provides some evidence that candidates master elements of the CEC Preparation Standard. However the data is not disaggregated by subareas and it can not be determined if students meet the elements of this standard. These data however provide generally supportive evidence.

Assessment 2 (Individualized Education Plan Development) has some evidence aligned with CEC 4.2. Up to 30 % of the candidates did not meet target expectations on these elements.

Assessment 3 (Unit Plan) has one element aligned to this standard a post test with almost all candidates scoring above target on this element.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile) uses ratings that are not clearly defined and may result in differing interpretation of the skills by program supervisors who are evaluating teacher candidates and may not provide candidates with explicit feedback on their performance. Additionally, it

is unclear whether the criteria of the assessment is informed by the specialty set. Therefore, it cannot be determined from the data reported whether candidates are mastering the major elements of the cited CEC preparation standard.

Assessment 5 (Progress Monitoring) is performance based with specific criteria in the rubric. However, it is unclear that the assessment is aligned with the specialty set. Assessment 5 provides some data that the candidates are meeting the standard.

Assessment 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan) has alignment to this standard with positive evidence. Data were only submitted from one administration of this assessment.

Assessment 7 (Assessment Practicum) includes a performance-based rubric differentiation across proficiency level descriptors. Data area only available from one administration of this assessment.

Overall, this standard is met.

#### 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:

Program faculty report that Assessments 1 (PECT), 2 (Individualized Education Plan Development), 3 (Unit Plan), 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile), 5 (Progress Monitoring), and 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan) provide evidence of meeting Standard 5.

For Assessment 1 (PECT), program faculty report that the assessment modules contain questions that align with the standard. Data are disaggregated by module. Assessment 1 provides some evidence that candidates master elements of the CEC Preparation Standard. However the data are not

disaggregated by subareas and it can not be determined if students meet the elements of this standard. These data however provide generally supportive evidence.

Assessment 2 (Individualized Education Plan Development) has multiple element indicated as aligned to this standards. The alignment is not clear in many of the rubric elements. The majority of candidates scored in the target or exceeds target ranges on this assessment.

Assessment 3 (Unit Plan) has two elements aligned to this standard. Only one broad element appears to do that. The majority of candidates score as meeting or exceeding target.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile) uses ratings that are not clearly defined and may result in differing interpretation of the skills by program supervisors who are evaluating teacher candidates and may not provide candidates with explicit feedback on their performance. Additionally, it is unclear whether the criteria of the assessment is informed by the specialty set. Therefore, it cannot be determined from the data reported whether candidates are mastering the major elements of the cited CEC preparation standard.

Assessment 5 (Progress Monitoring) is a case study and not performance based. It is unclear that the assessment is aligned with this standard as informed by the specialty set. Assessment 5 provides some limited data that the candidates are meeting the standard. Data are provided from two administrations of this instrument.

Assessment 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan) has elements that are indicated as aligned to this standard. They are very broad, and some do not appear to reflect this standard as informed by the specialty set. Data are only provide for one administration from this assessment.

This standard is met with conditions. The preponderance of the evidence does establish that the program assessments provide clear and convincing evidence that candidates meet this standard as informed by the specialty set. The assessments do not appear to reflect the depth and breadth of this standard as informed by the specialty set.

#### 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:

Program faculty report that Assessments 1 (PECT), 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile), 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan), 7 (Assessment Practicum), and 8 (Collaboration Case Study) provide evidence of meeting Standard 6.

For Assessment 1 (PECT), program faculty report that the assessment modules contain questions that align with the standard. Data are disaggregated by module. Assessment 1 provides some evidence that candidates master elements of the CEC Preparation Standard. However the data is not disaggregated by subareas and it can not be determined if students meet the elements of this standard. These data however provide generally supportive evidence.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile) uses ratings that are not clearly defined and may result in differing interpretation of the skills by program supervisors who are evaluating teacher candidates and may not provide candidates with explicit feedback on their performance. Additionally, it is unclear whether the criteria of the assessment is informed by the specialty set. Therefore, it cannot be determined from the data reported whether candidates are mastering the major elements of the cited CEC preparation standard.

In Assessment 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan), alignment with the standard is inconsistent and the language of the assessment is not informed by the specialty set. Therefore, Assessment 6 offers limited evidence that candidates are mastering the major elements of the cited CEC preparation standard. Data are only provided from one administration of this assessment.

Assessment 7 (Assessment Practicum) includes a performance-based rubric with differentiation across proficiency level descriptors, but these descriptors are not clearly informed by either the CEC preparation standard nor the appropriate speciality set. Therefore, Assessment 7 cannot offer data that candidates are mastering the major elements of the cited CEC preparation standard. Data are only provided from one administration of this assessment.

Assessment 8 (Collaboration Case Study) is case study based and has inconsistent alignment with the specialty set. It provides some limited evidence that the candidates have mastered the elements of this standard.

The preponderance of the evidence indicates this standard is met with conditions.

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:

Program faculty report that Assessments 1 (PECT), 2 (Individualized Education Plan Development), 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile), 5 (Progress Monitoring), 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan), and 8 (Collaboration Case Study) provide evidence of meeting Standard 7.

For Assessment 1 (PECT), program faculty report that the assessment modules contain questions that align with the standard. Data are disaggregated by module. Assessment 1 provides some evidence that candidates master elements of the CEC Preparation Standard. However the data is not disaggregated by subareas and it can not be determined if students meet the elements of this standard. This assessment provides general supportive evidence.

Assessment 2 (Individualized Education Plan Development) has three elements indicated as being aligned to this standard. They are limited in providing evidence as they do not appear to reflect the performance aspect of this standard.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Performance Profile) uses ratings that are not clearly defined and may result in differing interpretation of the skills by program supervisors who are evaluating teacher candidates and may not provide candidates with explicit feedback on their performance. Additionally, it is unclear whether the criteria of the assessment is informed by the specialty set. Therefore, it cannot be determined from the data reported whether candidates are mastering the major elements of the cited CEC preparation standard.

Assessment 5 (Progress Monitoring) has one element aligned to this standard. It appears to focus on what is included in the report rather than reflecting the elements of this standard as informed the the specialty set. Data from two administrations of this assessment were submitted.

Assessment 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan) includes a component where candidates gather information from the teacher, indicating some alignment to

CEC 7.3I Candidates score. Two other elements are said to be aligned. This assessment offers limited evidence that candidates are mastering the major elements of the cited CEC preparation standard. Data are only provided from one administration of this assessment.

Although Assessment 8 (Collaboration Case Study) is a simulation, but it offers the clearest evidence for this standard.

Overall, this standard is met.

## PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

### C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Candidates' knowledge of content is primarily documenting through Assessment 1, where all candidates pass the state test.

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

Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills and dispositions is not clearly documented for all standards.

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

Assessment 6 (Behavior Plan) provides the best data for P-12 student learning. Assessment 5 (Progress Monitoring) is based on a case study and Assessment 7 Assessment Practicum also provide some evidence. Overall, the assessments demonstrate that candidates are able to determine their 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)

It was reported that program faculty analyze data and make appropriate changes to the program, i.e., changes in the presentation of material related to Assessment 2 (IEP Development) and the addition of Assessment 6 (Behavior Intervention Plan) and Assessment 8 (Collaboration Case Study). They are also currently making changes in Assessment 5 (Progress Monitoring). The inconsistent or little alignment to standards or evidence that assessments are informed by the appropriate specialty sets, provide little evidence that changes are made based on the standards as informed the specialty set.

## **PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### Areas for consideration

The program might consider selecting the two or three assessments that provide the clearest evidence for each standard and then further refine the rubrics for those assessments to more clearly reflect the standard as informed by the specialty set. Assessment 5 should relate to candidate's determination of their actual impact on student learning, as opposed to evaluation of a case study.

## **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 with Conditions. The program has received a decision of conditional national recognition. See below for details.



## NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM DD YYYY  
08 / 01 / 2019

Subsequent action by the institution: Programs will have a maximum of two opportunities to resubmit a report with revisions to receive National Recognition. A report addressing the conditions must be submitted in accordance with the dates provided on the National Recognition Report. A program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it has the required data and is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this Recognition Report. If no reports are submitted by the noted date, the program's recognition status will expire and revert to Not Recognized. In case the status expires, the program will not be able to submit a Response to Conditions Report, but may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review if time permits for the current CAEP accreditation cycle. Otherwise, the program may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review for the next CAEP accreditation cycle, three years before the site visit.

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a second Response to Conditions Report, the next report must be submitted by the date below. Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM DD YYYY  
03 / 15 / 2019

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

CEC Preparation Standards 1,2,3,5,6 and Field Experience were found to be "met with conditions". For each CEC Preparation Standard or CEC Field Experience Standard judged "met with conditions", the program resubmission report must provide:

1. The Section II and Section III tables that document the alignment of each program assessment to the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standard as informed by the appropriate specialty set;
2. The assessment descriptions, scoring guide/rubric, and data for each of the program assessments that provide the evidence that they are aligned to the major elements of each of CEC Preparation Standard as informed by the specialty area knowledge and skills set; and
3. Sufficient performance data for reviewers to determine that the preponderance of the performance data for each of the CEC Preparation Standard as informed by the appropriate specialty set demonstrate that the program candidates master the major elements of the CEC Preparation Standards as informed by the appropriate CEC knowledge and skill set. At least one additional set of data must be submitted for each assessment included.

See comments under each standard met with conditions as well as areas for consideration.

**Please click "Next"**

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