



**CYCLE ELEVEN:  
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE  
EXTERNAL EVALUATORS**

**GENERAL-SPECIAL EDUCATION  
MILD/MODERATE: AN INTEGRATED TO  
MERGED APPROACH FOR GRADES 1-5,  
GRADES 4-8, & GRADES 6-12**

**BACCALAUREATE DEGREES AND ALTERNATE  
CERTIFICATION DEGREES/PROGRAMS**

**DECEMBER 22, 2010**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	1
<b>PART I: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS FOR THE ELEVENTH EVALUATION CYCLE .....</b>	<b>2</b>
I. Evaluation of Quality .....	2
II. Evaluation of Certification Requirements .....	4
III. Written Documents .....	4
IV. Final Approval Process .....	4
V. Curriculum Changes to Redesigned Programs .....	5
VI. Program Documentation .....	6
VII. Requests for Additional Information .....	6
<b>PART II: PROGRAM REVIEWS (LISTED ALPHABETICALLY) .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Grambling State University .....	8
Louisiana College .....	11
Louisiana Resource Center for Educators .....	15
Louisiana Tech University .....	18
McNeese State University .....	21

## **PART I: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS FOR THE ELEVENTH EVALUATION CYCLE**

### **I. EVALUATION OF QUALITY**

The Board of Regents (BoR) and State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) selected external consultants who possessed knowledge of current research and effective practices to review and evaluate Integrated to Merged Mild/Moderate Special Education Programs. In addition, state evaluators from the Louisiana Department of Education reviewed all undergraduate teacher preparation programs and alternate certification programs to determine if they met all state certification requirements. Personnel from the Board of Regents also examined all undergraduate and alternate programs to ensure consistency across programs.

The evaluators were charged with reviewing the redesign plans, providing feedback to universities and private providers regarding their proposals and making recommendations to universities, private providers, BoR, and BESE relative to acceptance of the redesigned plans. The primary responsibility of the evaluators was to identify quality programs that should be recommended for state approval and provide recommendations to universities and private providers to enhance the quality of all programs in the state.

#### **Submission**

All universities and private providers were required to submit proposals that met specifications identified within the documents entitled *Guidelines for the General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach for Grades 1-5, Grades 4-8, & Grades 6-12 (August 23, 2009)*. The guidelines identified the specific structure that teacher preparation programs were required to follow when presenting information within the proposals and specific questions that teacher preparation programs were required to answer when describing their programs. Teacher preparation programs were also required to follow new state certification requirements for special education programs. All universities and private providers were required to submit proposals by November 5, 2010.

#### **Review**

The review process was used as a first step to help create high quality programs across the state. The evaluators used a two-stage review process to (1) assess written proposals and (2) conduct interviews via conference calls with key teacher preparation and district representatives. Prior to the interviews, the evaluators were provided copies of the proposals to read. The evaluators reviewed the proposals and jointly identified questions to ask during the interviews. Teams composed of state evaluators and external evaluators conducted 45-minute interviews with teacher preparation representatives including key administrators, faculty, and K-12 school partners on November 20, 2010. At the conclusion of the interviews, each proposal was evaluated based upon written information within the proposals and responses during the interviews. After all proposals had been reviewed, the evaluators discussed their recommendations and stipulations to ensure that consistency existed across proposals. Consensus was reached by the evaluators to determine final recommendations and areas in need of further development. The three recommendations were the following:

## **Review (Cont'd.)**

- *Recommended for Approval:* Programs that exhibited many strengths and had no stipulations.
- *Recommended for Approval with Stipulations:* Programs that had areas in need of further development.
- *Not Recommended for Approval:* Programs that were in need of major program redesign.

Based upon information generated by the evaluators, written program reviews were developed that provided specific feedback about each program. Section I of the Program Reviews contains feedback from the evaluators in the following four areas:

### **A. Program Recommendation**

Statements identifying the types of teacher preparation programs submitted and the recommendations of the evaluators.

### **B. Strengths**

A list of strengths observed in each teacher preparation program by the evaluators.

### **C. Program Stipulations**

A list of stipulations teacher preparation program are required to address for the program(s) to be approved.

### **D. Specific Recommendations for Future Improvement**

A list of recommendations for teacher preparation programs to consider when further developing the program. Teacher preparation programs are not required to address the recommendations in order for their programs to be approved.

## **Evaluators**

The national consultants responsible for the external evaluation of the special education programs were the following:

Dr. Linda Blanton	Florida International University
Dr. Betty Epanchin	University of North Carolina at Greensboro

The Louisiana Department of Education staff responsible for the evaluation of the program were the following:

Blanche Adams	Division of Certification, Preparation, and Recruitment - LDE
Kristina Braud	Special Education/Literacy - LDE
Frances Davis	Division of Certification, Preparation, and Recruitment - LDE
Debra Dixon	Special Education/Literacy - LDE

The Board of Regents staff responsible for examining consistency across programs was:

Dr. Jeanne Burns                      Louisiana Board of Regents

## **II. EVALUATION OF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

Staff of the Louisiana Department of Education also examined all proposed programs to determine if they met new state certification requirements. Section II of the Program Reviews indicated if all certification requirements were met for proposed programs. If certification requirements were not met, areas that needed to be addressed for program approval were identified.

## **III. WRITTEN DOCUMENTS**

All recommendations of the external evaluators and the Louisiana Department of Education are available on the Board of Regents web site at the following URL.

<http://regents.state.la.us/Academic/TE/redesign.aspx>

## **IV. FINAL APPROVAL PROCESS**

The final approval process was created to ensure that institutions addressed the stipulations in order for high quality programs to exist across the state.

### **Public Universities**

For public universities, all programs recommended for approval by the evaluators are recommended to the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education for full approval.

Programs recommended for approval with stipulations are required to address the areas cited and required to submit program rejoinders to their system board. System boards are required to review the rejoinders and determine if the rejoinders have fully addressed the stipulations. If the rejoinders have not meet system expectations, public universities are required to rewrite the rejoinders to meet the expectations of the system boards.

Once expectations are met, the system boards submit the rejoinders to the Board of Regents. A BoR/SBESE/LAICU Program Review Committee composed of staff from the Board of Regents, State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (i.e., Louisiana Department of Education), and LAICU reviews the evaluators' stipulations and university rejoinders to ensure that all proposed programs addressed certification requirements and evaluation stipulations.

Based upon the review of this committee, recommendations are made to the Board of Regents and State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to approve the programs. Once the two boards approve the programs, universities are allowed to start implementing the redesigned programs.

## **Private Universities and Private Providers**

For private universities and private providers, key personnel review the recommendations of the evaluators and determine how stipulations should be addressed. They prepare rejoinders and submit them to the Board of Regents/Louisiana Department of Education for review by the BoR/BESE/LAICU Program Review Committee. The committee reviews the external evaluators' recommendations and rejoinders to ensure that the programs have addressed certification requirements and evaluation stipulations.

Based upon the review of this committee, recommendations are made to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to approve the programs. Once the board approves the programs, private universities and private providers are allowed to start implementing the redesigned programs.

### **V. CURRICULUM CHANGES TO REDESIGNED PROGRAMS**

The redesigned teacher preparation programs approved by the Board of Regents and/or Board of Elementary and Secondary Education are considered to be the basic framework for the programs. The Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education fully expect teacher preparation programs to improve upon the basic framework as they fully develop and continue to improve course syllabi, institutes, seminars, site-based experiences, evaluations, and other aspects of the redesigned programs. Both boards realize that changes will need to be made to proposed programs as these improvements are made. In addition, changes will need to be made as universities submit the redesigned Official Plans and new syllabi to Curriculum Committees within universities and receive input from other departments within the universities about the courses and degree plans.

Prior to implementation, all teacher preparation programs have the flexibility to make changes in the types of courses to be offered within their Official Plans at the following points in time.

#### **A. Prior to Approval from the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education**

Universities and private providers may use the recommendation of the evaluators to identify changes that they want to make to the Official Plans. These changes must be described within the rejoinders submitted to the system boards. If new courses, seminars, etc. are being proposed, full descriptions must be provided. The BoR/BESE/LAICU Program Review Committee will review these changes once the rejoinders are submitted for approval.

#### **B. After BoR/BESE Approval and Before Program Implementation**

After BoR/BESE approval has been obtained, it may be necessary to change courses and the Official Plan due to decisions made by Curriculum Committees at universities or decisions made by other personnel to strengthen the program. These changes should be made prior to the point that teacher preparation programs submit their Official Plans to the Board of Regents/Louisiana Department of Education. The changes will be reviewed by staff within the Board of Regents and/or Louisiana Department of Education.

## SECTION VI. PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION

**Initial Degree Plans.** A copy of the redesigned programs and rejoinders will be kept by the Board of Regents/Louisiana Department of Education and serve as initial documentation for all approved redesigned teacher preparation programs.

**Official Plans.** Once final changes are made to the Official Plans and courses, seminars, institutes, etc. have been approved by appropriate committees and personnel, copies of the Official Plans must be submitted to the Board of Regents/Louisiana Department of Education. The Board of Regents and Louisiana Department of Education will review the plans, sign the documents, and provide universities and private providers with copies of the signed documents to indicate official approval of the plans.

**Changes in Degree Plans.** As universities and private providers make future changes to the Official Plans to strengthen the programs, they must submit a form to the Board of Regents/Louisiana Department of Education identifying the courses that will be changed. These changes will be reviewed for approval by staff within the Board of Regents and Louisiana Department of Education once the changes are submitted. Universities and private providers will be provided signed documents indicating approval of the changes.

## SECTION VII: REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For questions and information regarding the **program evaluation**, please e-mail the following individual within the Board of Regents:

Dr. Jeanne Burns at [jeanne.burns@la.gov](mailto:jeanne.burns@la.gov)

For questions and information regarding **certification requirements**, please e-mail the following individual within the Louisiana Department of Education:

Blanche Adams at [blanchea.adams@la.gov](mailto:blanchea.adams@la.gov).

**PART II: PROGRAM REVIEWS**  
**(Listed Alphabetically)**



## GRAMBLING STATE UNIVERSITY

### I. SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION

Evaluators examined the overall quality of the proposed programs and developed the following section.

#### A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

TYPE(S) OF PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>Practitioner Teacher Program – General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach</b>	<p><b>a. Grades 1-5</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</i></p> <p><b>b. Grades 6-12 (English)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</i></p>

#### B. STRENGTHS

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An overarching philosophy relating to inclusive practices seems evident in the written materials about the program.</li> <li>• Collaboration appears strong internally among faculty and externally with schools.</li> <li>• A number of recruitment strategies (e.g., community contacts) are described that would appear to be effective.</li> <li>• Good plans are outlined for program completers, particularly the E-workshops.</li> <li>• The selection of cooperating teachers includes finding those who are master teachers in their schools, are National Board certified, or who are dually certified in general and special education.</li> <li>• The proposal shows that courses are aligned with LCET and CEC standards, and with Grambling’s education conceptual framework.</li> <li>• The signature assessments seem to be located at strategic points. It is noted that one assessment is focused on the impact of candidates’ performances on the learning of the students they teach.</li> <li>• The proposal indicates that faculty will model collaboration (e.g., co-teaching) for their candidates.</li> </ul>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

1. Syllabi/descriptions were not available for EDPT 452 and 453. *Please provide the narrative descriptions for these courses.*
2. Several courses (i.e., EDPT 415, EDPT 416, and EDPT 413) are described as focusing on both general and special education; however, the texts and readings seem weighted almost exclusively toward special education. *Please provide a more balanced listing of texts and resources to support courses that integrate content from both general and special education.*
3. RTI, as presented in EDPT 416, was not presented in relationship to struggling learners or students who have disabilities. *Please revise the course objectives to more clearly target current understandings about and approaches to implementing RTI.*

**D. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS**

*None*

**SECTION II: CERTIFICATION EVALUATION**

Staff of the Louisiana Department of Education examined each program to determine if it would meet certification requirements established by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and prepared this section.

<b>AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p><b>1. Practitioner Teacher Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach - Grades 1-5</b></p>	<p><i>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</i></p> <p><i>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</i></p> <p>During the interview, university team members acknowledged they were aware the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program (LaTAAP) was repealed in the 2010 Louisiana Legislative Session. Bulletin 746, Louisiana Standards for State Certification of School Personnel has been revised to include the new evaluation standards contained in ACT 54 and deleted verbiage regarding LaTAAP. <i>Please delete LaTAAP as an assessment requirement for Practitioner candidates on pages 16, 22, 30 &amp; 59 and replace with “local evaluation plan” to align with current policy.</i></p>

## SECTION II: CERTIFICATION EVALUATION

Staff of the Louisiana Department of Education examined each program to determine if it would meet certification requirements established by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and prepared this section.

<b>AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<b>2. Practitioner Teacher Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach - Grades 6-12 (English)</b>	<i>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</i>  <i>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</i>  <i>Same as above.</i>

**LOUISIANA COLLEGE**

**I. SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

Evaluators examined the overall quality of the proposed programs and developed the following section.

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><b>1. Practitioner Teacher Program – General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach</b></p>	<p><b>a. Grades 1-5</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Not Recommended for Approval</i></p> <p><b>b. Grades 4-8 (Math, Science, Social Studies &amp; English)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Not Recommended for Approval</i></p> <p><b>c. Grades 6-12 (Content Areas: Agriculture, Business, Computer Science, Family &amp; Consumer Science, Journalism, Marketing, Social Studies, Speech, Technology Education, Art, Music, Health &amp; Physical Education, English, Math, Environmental Science, Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, General Science, Physics, Computer Science, English, French, German)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Not Recommended for Approval</i></p>

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The faculty and administrators interviewed seem committed to offering programs in teaching that are grounded firmly in a clear philosophical mission.</li> <li>• Holding weekly department meetings to plan collaboratively is an excellent approach.</li> </ul>

## C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS

### STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

1. This program needs to prepare teachers who are skilled and competent to teach in inclusive settings in both general and special education classrooms. In this proposal, the vision of how general education and special education are integrated is not clear and the primary reason for not being recommended for approval. *If submitting a proposal in the future, please have your faculty develop a clear vision and philosophy regarding inclusive practice in an integrated-merged program. Have your team members clearly articulate the vision and philosophy during the interview and within the written proposal.*
2. It did not appear that Louisiana College used the *Guidelines for the General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach for Grades 1-5, Grades 4-8, & Grades 6-12 (August 23, 2009)* to develop the proposal and information was missing from the proposal. *If submitting a proposal in the future, please use the guidelines to develop the proposal and address all elements of the proposal identified in the guidelines.*
3. Programs are offered at three grade levels with the same 5 courses used for each program level. Faculty explained that differentiation among grade levels occurs in the Fall/Spring sequence of courses/experiences. *Provide a written explanation about the specific ways that grades level courses are differentiated to ensure that content and appropriate pedagogy are addressed sufficiently at each level. Also include how special education is integrated within each grade level.*
4. Courses and internship descriptions are very general and without specific information about the intersection of general and special education. *Revise syllabi to show the intersection of general and special education and how candidates acquire the depth of knowledge needed in, for example, special education.*
5. Faculty and administrators interviewed explained that the three programs are anchored in a *practitioner approach* and that this approach explains why resources and readings would not include theoretical and conceptual material. *Please provide a balance of resources for students to ensure students' learning and performances are grounded in both the theoretical and the practical aspects of the profession of teaching.*
6. Current practices (e.g., RTI) were not evident in written materials and faculty reported in the interview that some content would be added beginning this next summer. *Please redesign courses to ensure that they include the most current educational practices relating to inclusive practices in schools.*
7. Field experiences were mentioned in course materials and explanations were provided in the interview with faculty and administrators. *Please provide a clear written description of the progression of field experiences along with how sites/mentors are chosen and evaluated.*
8. Assessments were not described in the proposal and while some explanations were provided in the interview with faculty and administrators, these explanations were not provided in sufficient depth to fully understand the process. *Please provide a clear written description of the assessment system, along with how WEAVE Online is included.*

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS (CONT'D.)**

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
9.	Admission and Recruitment approaches were not described in any depth in the proposal and some information was gathered in the interview, but not sufficiently to fully understand these processes. <i>Please provide a written description of admission and recruitment approaches.</i>
10.	The number of full-time faculty devoted to the three programs is unclear. <i>Please provide a written description of the faculty supporting the three programs and include a description of how the visiting faculties contribute to the programs.</i>

**D. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>	
1.	<i>None</i>

**SECTION II: CERTIFICATION EVALUATION**

Staff of the Louisiana Department of Education examined each program to determine if it would meet certification requirements established by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and prepared this section.

<b>AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p><b>1. Practitioner Teacher Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach - Grades 1-5</b></p>	<p><i>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</i></p> <p><i>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</i></p> <p>The Practitioner Teacher Program Grades 1-5 requires demonstration of proficiency in reading competencies through successful completion of 9 credits hours in reading or pass the reading competency assessment (Praxis Teaching Reading 0204 exam). <i>Please provide clarification on how reading will be addressed.</i></p>

**SECTION II: CERTIFICATION EVALUATION (CONT'D.)**

<b>AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p><b>2. Practitioner Teacher Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach Grades 4-8 (English, Math, Science, Social Studies)</b></p>	<p><i>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</i></p> <p><i>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</i></p> <p>The Practitioner Teacher Program Grades 4-8 requires demonstration of proficiency in reading competencies through successful completion of 6 credits hours in reading. <i>Please provide clarification on how reading will be addressed.</i></p>
<p><b>3. Practitioner Teacher Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach Grades 6-12 (Agriculture, Business, Computer Science, Journalism, Marketing, Social Studies, Speech, Technology Education, Art, Music, Health &amp; Physical Education, English, Mathematics, Environmental Science, Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, General Science, Physics, French, German)</b></p>	<p><i>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</i></p> <p><i>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Practitioner Teacher Program Grades 6-12 requires demonstration of proficiency in reading competencies through successful completion of 3credits hours in reading. <i>Please provide clarification on how reading will be addressed.</i></li> <li>b. The General-Special Mild/Moderate Grades 6-12 is only offered in the core subject areas such as English, math, sciences, social studies, and foreign languages). <i>Please delete the other subject areas from the proposal.</i></li> </ul>

## LOUISIANA RESOURCE CENTER FOR EDUCATORS

### I. SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION

Evaluators examined the overall quality of the proposed programs and developed the following section.

#### A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

TYPE(S) OF PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>Practitioner Teacher Program – General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach</b>	<p><b>a. Grades 1-5</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Not Recommended for Approval</i></p> <p><b>b. Grades 4-8 (Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and English)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Not Recommended for Approval</i></p> <p><b>c. Grades 6-12 (Content Areas: Mathematics, Social Studies, English, Biology, General Science, Chemistry, and Physics)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Not Recommended for Approval</i></p>

#### B. STRENGTHS

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admission procedures include screening for dispositions and individual interviews. The use of the on-line assessment developed by Gallop is an innovative screening technique.</li> <li>• A large number of stakeholders were involved in redesigning the program.</li> <li>• The practitioner advisors are experienced professionals with many years of working as teachers, student teacher supervisors, coaches, and administrators.</li> <li>• Based on information gathered during the interview, the curriculum spirals through the year of accelerated training. The summer institute constitutes Phase 1 and focuses on content and structured teaching skills. During the academic year, while participants teach in their own classrooms, they also participate in Learning Team Seminars. The focus of these seminars is practical and applied. It would appear that these seminars will provide support and as-needed learning opportunities that contribute to higher retention rates.</li> </ul>



## C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS

### STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

1. Both the written materials and the responses during the interview indicated that this is a dual track program in which teachers can opt out of special education. Such an option is inconsistent with the conception of an integrated to merged program model and is the primary reason this proposal was not approved. This program needs to prepare teachers who are skilled and competent to teach in inclusive settings in both general and special education settings. In this proposal, the vision of how general education and special education are integrated is not clear. Most of the text is focused on special education. *Please complete page 2 and provide more information regarding the program vision and philosophy regarding inclusive practice in an integrated – merged program.*
2. It is not clear how the program ensures that participants receive the range of experiences that will prepare them to teach in both general education and special education. Form 9 identifies activities that candidates are expected to complete in the field but these activities are general. It is not clear how candidates enroll in the modules as well as complete clinical work during Phase 1 and how candidates are ensured quality clinical experiences in Phase 2 when they are employed as the teacher of record. Page 24, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, addresses these issues but the statements are too general. It is not clear that clinical sites are selected on the basis of their knowledge and experience with inclusive practice nor is it clear what, if any, preparation is provided to colleagues in the field with respect to the integrated to merged model. *Please describe Phase 1 and Phase 2 field experiences in greater depth and provide more specific information regarding plans for clinical work. The tools for evaluating field experiences also need to be identified.*
3. Six modules are identified for Phase 1, and for each, a 2-page reflective theory to practice paper is required. The rubric used to evaluate these papers is a 5-point rating scale, not a rubric that specifies expectations. While a valuable activity, such an assignment does not provide sufficient evidence for determining that skills and knowledge have been mastered. *Please provide an assessment of knowledge and skills that is more specific and tied to standards.*
4. The module descriptions are simply lists of knowledge and skills and learner outcomes from the CEC standards, followed by a list of assignments and then a list of references/empirical support. These need to be integrated and based on the most current version of the standards. *Please show alignment between the CEC and INTASC standards and the course/experience offerings. Matrices/charts, course descriptions/ syllabi and descriptions of field experiences all need to reflect this linkage between standard, learning experience and outcome or assessment.*
5. In the proposal, an elaborate list of data to be gathered is detailed on page 27, but these data sources are not specific and it is not clear what type of data will be obtained. *Please provide program evaluation plans that are more specific.*

**D. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<i>None</i>

**SECTION II: CERTIFICATION EVALUATION**

Staff of the Louisiana Department of Education examined each program to determine if it would meet certification requirements established by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and prepared this section.

<b>AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p><b>1. Practitioner Teacher Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach - Grades 1-5</b></p>	<p><i>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</i></p> <p><i>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</i></p> <p>Form 6 was not completed to show courses, number of contact hours required for each segment. <i>Please complete Form 6.</i></p>
<p><b>2. Practitioner Teacher Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach - Grades 4-8 (English, Math, Science, Social Studies)</b></p>	<p><i>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</i></p> <p><i>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</i></p> <p>During the interview, a rationale was provided for listing the same site based performance activities for all grade spans on pages 4, 5 and 6. Form 9 for Middle Grades 4-8 (page 5) shows a secondary grades focus on Learning Modules 1-4. <i>Please verify if this is accurate.</i></p>
<p><b>3. Practitioner Teacher Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach - Grades 6-12 (English, Mathematics, Biology, Chemistry, General Science, Physics, Social Studies)</b></p>	<p><i>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</i></p> <p><i>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</i></p> <p>Form 9 for Secondary Grades 6-12 (page 6) shows a Middle School 1-8 focus on Learning Modules 5 and 6. <i>Please verify if this is accurate.</i></p>

## LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY

### I. SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION

Evaluators examined the overall quality of the proposed programs and developed the following section.

#### A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

TYPE(S) OF PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>1. <b>Master of Arts in Teaching Alternate Program – General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach</b></p>	<p>a. <b>Grades 1-5</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</i></p> <p>b. <b>Grades 6-12 (Content Areas: Mathematics, Social Studies, General Science, and English)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</i></p>

#### B. STRENGTHS

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty members collaborate and team teach classes, providing models of collaboration for their students. Each course has a diverse group of faculty who were involved in its development and some of these faculty members are involved in the delivery of the course content. Others in the group serve as consultants or resources to the instructors.</li> <li>• In the telephone interview, it was mentioned that every course has a steward who is responsible for ensuring leadership is provided for student evaluation. This is a clever strategy for ensuring program evaluation.</li> <li>• In the telephone interview, school and community representatives were outspoken in their support of Louisiana Tech University and the faculty’s responsiveness to the Parish’s inclusion needs.</li> <li>• There appears to be considerable commitment to and cooperation about providing candidates with an opportunity to see classroom settings other than their own. Candidates use their planning periods and their personal leave time for professional development. There are many professional development opportunities in the summer.</li> </ul>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

1. On page 13 there is a brief discussion of the redesigned program, but insufficient details are provided about how faculty have designed and conceptualized their program. During the telephone interview, the faculty spoke of the vision and understandings they have regarding their merged programs. They also described strategies they use to differentiate their instruction for the teacher candidates at various levels, but that information is not included in the description. *Please provide specific information about the vision and strategies for developing and maintaining an integrated to merged program as well as how courses are staffed.*
2. Course descriptions do not contain specific information about the assessment of objectives. Behavioral objectives are listed and aligned with appropriate standards, but the strategies for assessing these objectives are general (e.g., performance-based activity). TaskStream will be used as a depository for portfolio assessment data. Signature assessments exist, but they are not described clearly in the proposal. *Please identify specific assignments, activities and the signature assessments that will be used to assess achievement of candidates' knowledge and skills and cross referenced them with the standards.*

**D. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<i>None</i>

**SECTION II: CERTIFICATION EVALUATION**

Staff of the Louisiana Department of Education examined each program to determine if it would meet certification requirements established by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and prepared this section.

<b>AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<b>1. Master of Arts in Teaching Alternate Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach - Grades 1-5</b>	<i>Does Meet Certification Requirements</i>

**SECTION II: CERTIFICATION EVALUATION (CONT'D.)**

<b>AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<b>2. Master of Arts in Teaching Alternate Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach- Grades 6-12 (English, Math, General Science, Social Studies)</b>	<i>Does Meet Certification Requirements</i>

**MCNEESE STATE UNIVERSITY**

**I. SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

Evaluators examined the overall quality of the proposed programs and developed the following section.

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>1. Master of Arts in Teaching Alternate Program – General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach</b>	<b>a. Grades 1-5</b>  <i>Not Recommended for Approval</i>

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program courses are aligned with LCET and CEC common core standards.</li> <li>• A wide range of stakeholders from the university and the schools were listed as being involved in program redesign.</li> <li>• Many good ideas were presented for how to work with program completers.</li> <li>• Having an instrument to measure dispositions is a good step forward in understanding and measuring such a difficult construct.</li> <li>• An assessment system seems to be in place and to include specific and consistent assessment artifacts</li> </ul>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL
<p>1. This program needs to prepare teachers who are skilled and competent to teach in inclusive settings in both general and special education classrooms. In this proposal, the vision of how general education and special education are integrated is not clear and the primary reason for not being recommended for approval. <i>If submitting a proposal in the future, please have your faculty develop a clear vision and philosophy regarding inclusive practice in an integrated-merged program. Have your team members clearly articulate that vision and philosophy during the interview and within the written proposal.</i></p>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS (CONT'D.)**

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
2.	The descriptions of the four special education courses (SPED 545, SPED, 573, SPED 502, SPED 503) and two internship courses (SPED 510/SPED 511) provided in the proposal focus exclusively on special education content and issues, including the readings/resources listed, and show no evidence of addressing intersections with general education classrooms and teachers. Persons interviewed noted that the general education/special education intersections occur in courses without a SPED prefix (e.g., EDUC courses). The explanation about how SPED courses accomplish this linkage was unclear. <i>Please redesign the special education courses to show how special education content and issues link to general education where most students with mild/moderate disabilities spend much of their school day.</i>
3.	Several courses in special education (e.g., SPED 545) focus on K-12 special education rather than a targeted focus on grades 1-5. These courses do not appear to have been redesigned. <i>Please redesign the courses and experiences to show the targeted focus on grades 1-5.</i>
4.	The proposal speaks to the importance of using field sites that model exemplary integration of general and special education; however, more specific information is needed about the indicators the University looks for when deciding that a site is exemplary. <i>Please provide a specific list of indicators that the university expects to see to judge whether a field site is an exemplary site for inclusive practices. In addition, discuss the approaches to be used in selecting sites that are exemplary.</i>

**D. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<i>None</i>

**SECTION II: CERTIFICATION EVALUATION**

Staff of the Louisiana Department of Education examined each program to determine if it would meet certification requirements established by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and prepared this section.

<b>AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<b>1. Master of Arts in Teaching Alternate Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach - Grades 1-5</b>	<p><i>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</i></p> <p><i>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</i></p> <p>The special education courses were previously approved for the Mild/Moderate 1-12 certification. It does not appear that they</p>

**SECTION II: CERTIFICATION EVALUATION (CONT'D.)**

<b>AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<b>1. Master of Arts in Teaching Alternate Program in General-Special Education Mild/Moderate: An Integrated to Merged Approach - Grades 1-5 (Cont'd.)</b>	<i>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed (Cont'd.):</i>  have been redesigned for the Integrated to Merged Programs. <i>Please describe how these courses can be used to address the needs of students in grades 1-5.</i>