

# PROGRAM REVIEWS: DOING THEM WELL

FALL 2023  
REVISED

# Agenda

2

## CEC Standards

- 2020 Initial K12 Standards
- Advanced Standards

## Review Language

- Clarity & Quality

## Reviews

- Well-Written Reports

## Rubrics

- Performance-Based

## Conditions Reviews

- Conditions Language



EXPLORE

STANDARDS

IMPROVING YOUR PRACTICE

POLICY AND ADVOCACY

GI

## PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION STANDARDS

- About Our Standards
- Special Education Preparation Standards
- Gifted Education Professional Preparation Standards
- Early Interventionist/Early Childhood Special Educator Preparation Standards

## PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES

- Paraeducator Preparation Guidelines
- Specialty Sets for Specific Practice Areas
- Ethical Principles and Practice Standards

## PROGRAM REVIEW AND RECOGNITION

- CEC Program Review and National Recognition
- Resources for Programs Pursuing National Recognition
- Volunteer Program Reviewer Resources

# CEC Preparation Standards

## CEC Initial Preparation Standards (2012)

1. Learner Development & Individual Differences
2. Learning Environment
3. Curricular Content Knowledge
4. Assessment
5. Instructional Planning & Strategies
6. Professional Learning & Ethical Practice
7. Collaboration

## CEC Advanced Preparation Standards

1. Assessment
2. Curricular Content Knowledge
3. Improving Supports & Services
4. Research & Inquiry
5. Leadership & Policy
6. Professional & Ethical Practice
7. Collaboration

# CEC Practice Based Standards

## CEC Initial Practice Based Standards (2020)

1. Engaging in Professional Learning and Practice within Ethical Guidelines
2. Understanding and Addressing Each Individual's Developmental and Learning Needs
3. Demonstrating Subject Matter Content and Specialized Curricular Knowledge
4. Using Assessment to Understand the Learner and the Learning Environment for Data-Based Decision Making
5. Supporting Learning Using Effective Instruction
6. Supporting Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Growth
7. Collaborating with Team Members

# Consistency to Enhance Reliability and Quality

# Field Experiences

7

- Appropriate to the license and roles for which they are preparing, candidates progress through a **series of developmentally sequenced field experiences...**
  - ...for the full range of:
    - ages,
    - types & levels of abilities, and
    - collaborative opportunities  
across the licensure teachers are being prepared for.
  - ...that are supervised by qualified professionals
  - Program faculty should be involved in supervision and evaluation of field experiences.

# Program Assessment Components

8

## Assessment

- Description
- Instructions

## Evaluation

- Rubrics

## Data

- Total
- Disaggregated ( if more than one program site data must also be disaggregated by site )



# CEC Initial Practice Based Standards

9



7 Practice Based Standards

23 Components

\* Specialty sets are not used with the 2020 K12 Initial Standards

# Frequently Asked Questions

# Evidence of Preparation Area(s) of Licensure

11

## Assessment

- Program faculty should assure that the **content, populations, vocabulary, concepts, settings, and issues** from the specialty set are used throughout the assessment items and components.

## Rubrics focused on Candidate performance

- Program faculty should assure that the **content, populations, vocabulary, concepts, settings, and issues** from the specialty set are used throughout.

## Section I Narrative

- Program faculty should describe how the assessment addresses the specialty set specific **content, populations, vocabulary, concepts, settings, and issues**.

# References to Standards

12

- *Program reviewer references should be specific to “CEC Standards” both Initial and Advanced CEC Standards. Advanced programs should also address “Advanced Knowledge and Skill specialty sets.*
- **CEC Program Reviewers use the CEC Standards and Components as the organizing focus for their review. Their references to “CEC Standards” are to the CEC Practice-Based Standards.**

# Aligning Program Assessments and Components of the CEC Standards

13

- *Must program reports provide evidence that program candidates master the major components of the CEC Standards?*
- CEC requires that a **preponderance of the evidence** establish that the assessments **align with the major components of the CEC Standards** and that program **candidates master the major components in the CEC Standards.**

# Preponderance of Evidence

14

- *What does CEC mean by “a preponderance of the evidence” for the major elements of the CEC Standards?*
- “Preponderance of evidence” is a standard of proof indicating that the evidence is **clear and convincing**. For **each of the CEC Standards** CEC program reviewers judge whether the evidence in the report is clear and convincing. The reviewer looks at **all** of the evidence provided for each standard and makes a decision as to whether it shows that candidates are meeting the standard. A preponderance of evidence cannot be reduced to a simple quantity, i.e. 75% of the components. Some assessments indicated as providing evidence for a standard may vary in their quality and in the strength of the data provided. The decision for each standard is a reasoned judgment by a set of collegial reviewers and auditors based on **all** of the evidence presented.

# Rubrics

15

- *Our program faculty use a 3-tier rating scale (i.e. “Unacceptable,” “Acceptable,” or “Proficient”). Is this acceptable for program review?*
- Reviewers look for whether performance of "Unacceptable", "Acceptable", or "Proficient" are **clearly described for each indicator and each rating and are clearly focused on candidate performance.**
- Assigning each of the three tiers (or 4 or 5) is acceptable. To ensure inter-rater reliability each rating for each indicator on the rubric must be well defined and differentiated specific to quality of candidate performance.

# Rubric Indicators

16

- Rubric indicator should be aligned to CEC Standards and components in apparent ways.
- CEC does **not** require that each rubric indicator align to only 1 Standard or singular component.
- Do **not** make comments in your reviews that would lead faculty to believe the CEC expectation is for a 1-to-1 correspondence.



# Performance Assessments

17

- Assessments and rubrics should be focused on performance, **not surface features of a product being assessed.**
- Indicator language should focus on observable performances that demonstrate what candidates know (knowledge) and are able to do (skills).
- Indicators should focus on quality of candidate performance, not quantity.

# Performance Assessments

18

- ❑ Indicators should reflect the degree of difficulty or quality of effort.
- ❑ Indicators should be well defined and should provide raters with explicit guidelines.
- ❑ Indicators should be observable, avoiding words like “some,” “all,” “satisfactory,” and other ambiguous words.
- ❑ Performance levels should be performance based using observable behavioral terms.
- ❑ The assessment and the rubric should be designed to require observers/raters to make judgements on consequential attributes of candidates.

# Rubric Evaluation

19

- Things to consider and provide comments on as needed:
  - ▣ Are the descriptors focused on candidate performance?
  - ▣ Do the rubrics address what candidates know and demonstrate they can do?
  - ▣ Do the cell descriptors distinguish the differing levels of candidate performance in observable ways?
  - ▣ Are the cell descriptors likely to be interpreted in the same way by different evaluators?

# Data

20

- ❑ **Initial submission program reports (Option 1)** must include data for at least 2 administration cycles of the assessments.
- ❑ In the case of state or national examinations that are given multiple times throughout the year, data from two university terms must be included.
- ❑ **Recognition with Conditions reports** must include data from at least 1 administration cycle of the assessments beyond the data in the initial report generated by the rubrics included in the resubmission. Data must be provided for each assessment cited on the Section III table.
- ❑ Under no conditions does CAEP require program reports to include data from more than three administration cycles of the assessments.
- ❑ **A program is eligible for “Recognized with Conditions” with no or insufficient data but can not be “Recognized” without data.**
- ❑ **If program is offered in more than one site disaggregated data must be provided for each site.**

# State Assessments/edTPA

21

- Faculty may use state assessments or the edTPA as supplementary evidence for meeting CEC Standards, but faculty **may not use state assessments or the edTPA as a sole source of evidence for meeting any CEC Standard.**
- As with portfolio assessments, programs may use **one of the tasks** and the scores for it **or the entire edTPA.** Discrete **edTPA rubrics can not be used or modified;** the test and the scoring must be consistent with the parameters of a proprietary test.

# Well-Written Reviews

# Writing Style

23

- Write in professional language.
- DO NOT:
  - Use “I” or “me” or any other first-person language
  - State opinions or tell program faculty how to solve problems
  - Make side comments or direct questions to program faculty or CEC Audit Team
- AVOID:
  - Prescriptions
  - Overstatements
  - Personal observations
- **Proof, proof, and proof again!**

# Mechanics

24

- Write in simple, complete, active-voice sentences.
- Be sure cut-and-pastes fit the program you are reviewing.
- Check spelling



# Thorough Reports

25

- Write comments that support the rating for each CEC Standard.
- Write narrative for each section and each part, excluding *only*:
  - “Directions to the Site Team” for which reviewers may or may not choose to respond;
  - “Strengths,” **IF** the program is being recognized with conditions or not recognized.

# Thorough Reports

26

## The Evidence

- The program report identifies in the Section III table that the following program assessments provide evidence that CEC Standard 3 and its components are met:
  - Assessment 3, Explicit Instruction Lesson Plan
  - Assessment 5, Curriculum-Based measurement Project
  - Assessment 6, Behavior Change Project

# Thorough Reports

27

## Your Findings

- The cited Assessments, **the description, rubric, and program candidate data** for each are provided and aligned to each other.
- The Explicit Instruction Lesson Plan and the Curriculum-based Measurement Project provide evidence that the **assessments and rubrics are aligned with the major components of the CEC Standard.**
- **The report provides data for these assessments that support the candidates are mastering the Standards and major components of the CEC Standard.**

## Your Conclusions

- ***The preponderance of the evidence establishes that the program assessments align with the CEC Standard, and that the program candidate data indicate candidates are mastering the consequential attributes of entry level special educators in the area of the licensure being earned.***

# Non-Alignment Problem

28

## Your Findings

- The Assessments cited on the Section III table, the **description, rubric, and program candidate data** for each are present but are not aligned in apparent ways to the Standard.
- The Explicit Instruction Lesson Plan and the Curriculum-based Measurement Project DO NOT provide evidence that the **assessments or rubrics are aligned in any apparent ways with the major components** of the CEC Standard..
- Given the program assessments and rubrics **are NOT aligned to this CEC Preparation Standard and its components**, there is insufficient evidence that **the candidates are demonstrating mastery performance consistent with the expectations inherent in this Standard and its components.**

## Your Conclusions

- *The preponderance of the evidence does not establish that the program assessments align with the CEC Standard, and that the program candidate data indicate candidates are mastering the respective consequential attributes of the area of licensure being earned.*

# Considerations

29

- CEC reviews any reports submitted; number of majors is not a consideration neither is number for which data is reported. Low numbers are **NOT** a reason for conditions.
- If you are reviewing a Recognized with Conditions report a **decision for a standard can NOT be lowered from one given in previous report.**

# Decision Support

30

- The Program Review Report must support the decision.
- Areas for considerations should tell program faculty **what needs to be addressed, not what is wrong or how to fix it.**

# Decision Support

31

## □ **C.1. Candidates' Knowledge of Content**

The preponderance of the evidence presented for the program assessments and the extent of their alignment to the major elements of the CEC Standards (or does not) establishes that the program candidates have satisfactory mastery of special education professional content knowledge.

## □ **C.2. Candidates' Ability to Understand and Apply Pedagogical and Professional Content Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions**

The preponderance of the evidence presented for the program assessments and the extent of their alignment to the major elements of the CEC Standards (or does not) establishes candidates' satisfactory ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

# Recognized with Conditions Decisions

Writing

Reviewing



# Recognized with Conditions

33

- Always (**and this means always**) use the language on the following slide in Part A of your review. Recognition Decisions of program review reports that you are recognizing with conditions.
- Use this language **verbatim**; put it into a Word document and copy/paste. You can add any additional conditions needed, such as those specific to Field Experience or P-12 Impact Assessment or if program offered at more than one site that in the next submission data must be disaggregated by site.

# Recognized with Conditions

34

- CEC Standards x, y, z were found to be either “not met” or “met with conditions”. For each CEC Preparation Standard and/or CEC Field Experience Standard judged either “not met” or “met with conditions,” the program resubmission report must provide:
- Section II and Section III tables that document the alignment of each program assessment to the major components of the CEC Standards;
- For each assessment cited on the Section III table as evidence that one or more Standards are met the assessment descriptions, rubric, and data must be provided. Alignment to the CEC Standards and the major components must be apparent in each of these;
- Rubrics must focus on candidate performance and consequential attributes of candidate performance and indicator performance levels must clearly describe progression of candidate performance; and
- At least one application of data ( for each site if program is offered at more than one site) that was not included in a prior submission that was generated by the rubrics in the resubmission must be included. Data must be aligned to Standards and components in apparent ways. Data must provide clear and convincing evidence that candidates demonstrate mastery of the CEC Standards and components.
- ADD CONDITIONS SUCH AS FIELD EXPERIENCE AS NEEDED.

# Recognized with Conditions

35

- Whenever a “conditions” program report has additional conditions, add these specific conditions to the review report.
- The assessment description, performance focused rubric, and data form a vital chain and as the metaphor points out, the chain is only as strong as the weakest link. It is helpful to program faculty if the program review report specifically identifies what was not done.
- For example, *“While all the materials described above are required in the resubmission, the rubrics were particularly problematic, were not performance-based, and will require extensive refinement and revisions.”*

# Reviewing Resubmitted Conditions Reports

36

- All previously “not met” conditions need to be “met”.
  - ▣ **DO NOT RE-REVIEW CEC STANDARDS THAT WERE MET PREVIOUSLY.**
- No new conditions may be cited unless the resubmission reflects changes in assessments or alignment that result in the need for additional conditions.
- If on the third review, **clear progress toward meeting conditions has not been made**, bite the bullet and give a “not recognized.”

# For Programs You Are Reviewing (Option 1 and Recognized with Conditions)

37

- Ask these questions:
  - Do:
    - ▣ assessments,
    - ▣ rubrics and
    - ▣ data
  - align in **clear and convincing ways** to the major the Standards and major components of the CEC Practice Based Standards?
  - Do they meet the data requirements?

# For Programs You Are Reviewing (Option 1 and Recognized with Conditions)

38

- Ask these questions:
  1. Are rubrics performance based?
  2. Do rubric indicators clearly describe performance with increasing degrees of difficulty for indicator performance ratings?
  3. Are indicators focused on consequential attributes of candidates?

# Can't Make a Decision?

39

- Refer to the Audit Team **as soon as possible**, and please include the reason(s) as to why you cannot make a decision.

# Questions?

40

- Please email Kathlene ([ksshank@eiu.edu](mailto:ksshank@eiu.edu)) & Brad ([bduncan@exceptionalchildren.org](mailto:bduncan@exceptionalchildren.org))
- *Language to include in Response to Conditions decisions, the CAEP guidelines on EPP-created rubric frameworks, and this PowerPoint are available at <https://exceptionalchildren.org/standards/volunteer-program-reviewer-resources>.*





THANK YOU very, very much!!!