

First Critique X
Second Critique
Third Critique

**NCATE
Compliance with Specialty Guidelines**

Professional Organization: The Council for Exceptional Children

Institution Submitting Program: Eastern Michigan University

Program: Teacher of Students with Emotional Impairments
Teacher of Students with Hearing Impairments
Teacher of Students with Cognitive Impairments
Teacher of Students with Physical Impairments and Other Health Impairments
Teacher of Students with Visual Impairments

Degree Level: Undergraduate (Bachelor's)

Review Date: October 24-27, 2002

REPORT ON STANDARDS:

Field and Clinical Practice Standards: The current field experience program component exceeds the standards as set forth by CEC. Experiences provided are in a variety of settings and with students of varying ages. Field experiences are commensurate with the license for which the candidate is preparing. Performance expectations are well delineated, are sequential, provide field experiences in a variety of settings, and follow a skill progression that conforms to best practices in the field. Supervision is provided by qualified personnel. Program met target levels for all three components of this standard.

Assessment System Standards:

The standards as a whole are met. The following standards were met at the target criteria level:

- Multiple measures (both internal and external) are used and are systematic and ongoing across components of the program (e.g., content, course work, field experiences).
- The assessment system includes critical decision points.

The Assessment Plan clearly shows the program has determined multiple assessment points and has developed an overall framework for implementing a performance-based assessment system. This includes assessments within each course during three broad levels of introductory, intermediate and advanced courses as well as during multiple other points. Many assessments are logically related to course requirements. As the assessments which are described are further developed, the program should ensure that they truly represent outcomes as it is not clear that they all do (i.e., Assessment Point #2 lists completion of coursework with a grade of C or better, satisfactory completion of 25 hours of field experiences. Listed in the data column however, are evaluation forms and rubrics). The report provides good detail related to the description of each point in the assessment sequence yet it does not describe or provide the individuals assessment in any detail nor are draft rubrics included.

The operational plan is detailed with tasks either completed or clear indications of how they are to be completed. Timelines are clear and appropriate. Data will be collected and analyzed beginning in Fall 2002 although some preliminary data was available related to the state tests and student teaching evaluation.

Although CEC standards are included (not the Knowledge and Skills as titled in table on page 27) it is difficult to tell the relationship between individual performance assessments and the standards as they are generically listed by assessment point. It might be clearer if there was a one-to-one correspondence between the “Instrumentation/Activities,” criteria, and rubrics listed in column 3 and 4 of the Assessment Plan (p. 27) and the descriptions of the Assessment Sequence by decision points (pages 29-32).

It is somewhat unclear how the assessment system is communicated to candidates. There is a thorough description of the advising process and brief mention of the dispositions, but student need a fuller explanation of what will happen at various points in the process.

It is recommended that the program identify a specific process and procedures for how aggregated data will be analyzed and used for program improvement.

Special Education Content Standards: The standards as a whole are met although it was difficult to rate this standard due to the fact that the program has not yet developed many of the actual performance assessments, criteria, or evaluation rubrics. Again, the relationship between the proposed assessments and specific content standards is relatively global.

Please note that CEC is recommending that programs develop 8-12 key comprehensive assessments that taken as a whole demonstrate candidate mastery of the 10 Special Education Content Standards. These assessments can be course-based and/or field-based, but need to provide validation that the candidate meets the standards

PERCEIVED PROGRAM STRENGTHS:

Strong field experience component

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

OTHER COMMENT/CONCERNS:

The program understands the shift to an outcomes-based system and has a reasonable plan for completing this process. The report is extremely well written, concise, and organized. Reviewers were able to locate necessary information. The web-based version was easily navigated.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING COMPLIANCE OR NONCOMPLIANCE WITH THE SPECIALTY GUIDELINES (i.e., has the institution adequately met the specialty guidelines?): The Undergraduate programs listed below at Eastern Michigan University have been approved as meeting the CEC/NCATE Specialty Standards for Special Education.

Program: Teacher of Students with Emotional Impairments
 Teacher of Students with Hearing Impairments
 Teacher of Students with Cognitive Impairments
 Teacher of Students with Physical Impairments and Other Health Impairments
 Teacher of Students with Visual Impairments

Final Decision: All Programs approved as meeting the CEC/NCATE Specialty Standards for Special Education