

**NATIONAL COUNCIL for the SOCIAL STUDIES
Summary Report of Program Review Decisions**

Date of Review: Fall 02

X Initial review
 2nd review
 3rd review

Coordinator of Reviews: Charles B. Myers

Institution Submitting Program

State

Eastern Michigan University

MI

Program(s)

Degree Level

Secondary social studies
Secondary history
Secondary geography
Secondary political science
Secondary economics
Secondary psychology

Baccalaureate
Post-baccalaureate

Decisions

Program(s) that merits national recognition

None

Program(s) not approved for national recognition

Secondary social studies
Secondary history
Secondary geography
Secondary political science
Secondary economics
Secondary psychology

Standards Met or Not Met

Met: 3.2, 3.3

Not Met: 1.1 – 1.10, 2.1 – 2.5, 3.1, 3.4

Summary of Overall Program Strengths

Summary of Overall Program Weaknesses

Status of Performance Assessment Transition

Not applicable for social studies reviews

Comments on Contextual Information

Explanation and Rationale for Not Met Decisions for Each Standard

This section of the program reviewers' report includes a synopsis of the rationale and recommendations for each standard NOT MET. The report follows the order and format of the professional specialty association standards. Standards not listed are assumed MET.

For the undergraduate program:

Standards 1.1 – 1.10 are Not Met for all undergraduate programs.

Standards 2.1 – 2.5 are Not Met for the respective undergraduate majors.

Although much programmatic information is provided for all standards, the adequacy of the programmatic evidence has been judged as follows:

Standards 1.1, 1.4, 1.6, and 1.10 – adequate for all programs

Standard 1.2 – adequate for all programs, except economics because information about this standard is not sufficient for this major

Standard 1.3 – adequate for social studies, history, and geography, but not for political science, psychology, and economics because information about this standard is not sufficient for these majors

Standards 1.5 and 1.9 - not adequate for all programs because the courses/activities listed do not address the content of the respective standards clearly

Standard 1.8 - not adequate for all programs because only course titles are listed (How the individual courses address this standard is not explained.)

The programmatic evidence for Standards 2.1 – 2.5 is adequate for all five respective program majors.

The testing evidence is not adequate for all programs because:

- (1) No course-base testing evidence is provided for any standards.
- (2) The state-test-based testing evidence is not specific enough to address the content of any specific standard, except for Standard 2.1 (for the history major).

The reviewers are not clear what the “pass rate” percentages mean, but, if they represent the percentage of the candidates in a major who passed the test – for example, 63% for history majors -- they believe the pass rates of 63% for history, 55% for geography, and 66% for political science are rather low.

The performance evidence is not adequate for all standards because, although what is presented is useful, it relies almost exclusively on the development of units in History 481 and it does not assess candidate classroom performance with secondary students. As a result what is presented does not appear to be thorough enough to enable the faculty to determine if each candidate can teach successfully the content of each respective standard to secondary school students.

Standard 3.1 is Not Met because the matrix response only discusses courses required for the respective majors.

Standard 3.4 is Not Met because it is not addressed in the matrix responses of the report.

For the post-baccalaureate program:

The reviewers could not find enough information in the report to make a separate judgment about the post-baccalaureate program. They, therefore, assume that the judgments stated above for the undergraduate program also apply at the post-baccalaureate level.

If the faculty of Eastern Michigan University chooses to submit a rejoinder, it should address specifically the following:

Concerning programmatic evidence:

Programmatic evidence needs to show how the courses and experiences within courses that are listed address the specific content of the standard and, therefore, show the faculty that each candidate has had the opportunity to learn the content of each standard.

Concerning testing evidence:

Course-based testing evidence is needed for each standard, it needs to be drawn from the courses and experiences listed in the programmatic evidence responses, and it needs to show that candidates understand the content of each standard. This evidence should include the following information for each standard:

- 1) How the test assesses the content of the particular standard;
- 2) The criteria used to assess candidate understanding of the content;
- 3) How the grades that separate the best, average, and poorest test performances are organized; and
- 4) The test results (grades) assigned to a recent cohort of candidates

State-test-based testing evidence for social studies content knowledge is needed, unless the state requires no such test. These test data need to include for each candidate in a cohort of candidates both the overall test score and any sub-scores that address the specific standards. For example, if the state test provides sub-scores in the following areas, they should be provided: history (Standards 1.2 and 2.1), geography (Standards 1.3 and 2.2), government and civics (Standards 1.6, 1.10 and 2.3), psychology (Standards 1.4 and 2.5), and economics (Standards 1.7 and 2.4).

Performance evidence needs to include all of the following for each standard:

- 1) How the expected candidate teaching performances address each standard;
- 2) How the performances demonstrate the candidate can teach school students the content of the standard;
- 3) The criteria that are used to evaluate the quality of the candidates classroom performances;
- 4) How grades are distributed so that they separate candidate performances of high, average, and low quality; and
- 5) The grades assigned to a recent cohort of candidates.

If the faculty chooses to submit a rejoinder, the reviewers suggest that faculty members consult the NCSS web page – www.ncss.org -- for the document, “Advice Concerning the Preparation of an Institution’s Social Studies Teacher Education Program Review

Report.” They might also attend an NCSS Social Studies Teacher Education Program Standards Clinic.

In rejoining this Summary Report of Program Review Decisions, the faculty should submit two copies of the rejoinder. The rejoinder should consist of the cover page; a copy of this Summary Report of Program Review Decisions; necessary introductory materials; the complete matrix for all Not Met standards; and attached documents necessary to explain, clarify, elaborate, or reinforce information presented in the matrix.

If these suggestions are not clear, please call Charles B. Myers, the NCSS Coordinator of Social Studies Teacher Education Program Reviews, at 615-322-5577.