

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Preparation of Special Educators (2001 Standards)

NCATE 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

Eastern Mennonite University

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

02 / 01 / 2012

This report is in response to a(n):

- ☐ Initial Review
- ☐ Revised Report
- ☐ Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Special Education General Curriculum

Grade Level⁽¹⁾

K-12

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

Program Type

Special Education general Curriculum K-12

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 NCATE 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 an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not applicable
- ☐ Not able to determine

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

The state of Virginia does not require the Praxis II for licensure, However, Eastern Mennonite University (EMU) does require candidates to take the Praxis II for the state in which the candidate will transfer his/her license or candidates must take 0353. The program does meet the 80% pass rate. EMU is commended for holding candidates to standards that exceed state requirements.

Summary of Strengths:

Eastern Mennonite University has presented sufficient evidence to document that candidates are being evaluated on the essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to the CEC Standards.

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:

Since 2007, no significant changes have been made in field experiences. However, there are proposed changes in field experiences that would reduce the number of hours required by candidates. The program assures that even with the reduction, candidates will still be exceeding state requirements for field experience hours.

Standard 1. Foundations. Special educators understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based **principles and theories**, relevant **laws and policies**, diverse and **historical** points of view, and **human issues** that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs both in school and society. Special educators understand how these **influence professional practice**, including assessment, instructional planning, implementation, and program evaluation. Special educators understand how **issues of human diversity** can impact families, cultures, and schools, and how

these complex human issues can interact with issues in the delivery of special education services. They understand the **relationships of organizations of special education** to the organizations and functions of schools, school systems, and other agencies. Special educators use this knowledge as a ground upon which to construct their own personal understandings and philosophies of special education.

Beginning special educators demonstrate their mastery of this standard through the mastery of the CEC Common Core Knowledge and Skills, as well as through the appropriate CEC Specialty Area(s) Knowledge and Skills for which the program is preparing candidates.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
-----	---------------------	---------

⌋	⌋	⌋
---	---	---

Comment:

The program cited assessment #1 (Praxis II) and #2 (foundational portfolio) as evidence of Standard 1. No significant changes were reported between the 2007 and 2011. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, Standard 1 is met. The Praxis II does provide solid evidence of Standard 1, and the foundational portfolio is aligned to CEC Standards, measures candidates' knowledge, and has performance levels that are conceptually informed by the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skills. The program is encouraged in the next submission to examine the performance levels within the rubric for the foundational portfolio and try to further qualify the difference in candidate performance by putting the focus on defining terms like thorough, some, incomplete, well-supported. Data are aggregated, reported by rubric element, and are aligned to the CEC standards.

Standard 2. Development and Characteristics of Learners. Special educators know and **demonstrate respect** for their students first as unique human beings. Special educators understand the **similarities and differences in human development** and the characteristics between and among individuals with and without exceptional learning needs (ELN). Moreover, special educators understand how **exceptional conditions** can **interact** with the domains of human development and they **use this knowledge to respond to the varying abilities and behaviors of individual's** with ELN. Special educators understand how the experiences of individuals with ELN can impact families, as well as the individual's ability to learn, interact socially, and live as fulfilled contributing members of the community.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
-----	---------------------	---------

⌋	⌋	⌋
---	---	---

Comment:

The program cited assessment #1 (Praxis II) and #2 (foundational portfolio) as evidence of Standard 2. No significant changes were reported between the 2007 and 2011. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, Standard 2 is met.

The Praxis II does provide solid evidence of Standard 1, and the foundational portfolio is aligned to CEC Standards, measures candidates' knowledge, and has performance levels that are conceptually informed by the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skills. The program is encouraged in the next submission to examine the performance levels within the rubric for the foundational portfolio and try to further qualify the difference in candidate performance by putting the focus on defining terms like thorough, some, incomplete, well-supported. Data are aggregated, reported by rubric element, and are aligned to the CEC standards.

3. Individual Learning Differences. Special educators understand the **effects that an exceptional condition** can have **on an individual's learning** in school and throughout life. Special educators

understand that the beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures can affect relationships among and between students, their families, and the school community. Moreover, special educators are **active and resourceful in seeking to understand how primary language, culture, and familial backgrounds interact with the individual's exceptional condition** to impact the individual's academic and social abilities, attitudes, values, interests, and career options. The understanding of these learning differences and their possible interactions **provides the foundation** upon which **special educators individualize instruction** to provide meaningful and challenging learning for individuals with ELN.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

The program cited assessments #2 (foundational portfolio) and #6 (employer/alumni survey) as evidence of Standard 3. No significant changes were reported between the 2007 and 2011. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, Standard 3 is met.

It is unclear why the program did not cite the Praxis II as addressing Standard 3 as it can provide solid evidence of Standard 3. Although the program did not articulate it, the Praxis II is being used as evidence of Standard 3. Assessment #2 (foundational portfolio) is aligned to CEC Standards, measures candidates' knowledge, and has performance levels that are conceptually informed by the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skills. The program is encouraged in the next submission to examine the performance levels within the rubric for the foundational portfolio and try to further qualify the difference in candidate performance by putting the focus on defining terms like thorough, some, incomplete, well-supported. Data are aggregated, reported by rubric element, and are aligned to the CEC standards.

In addition, the program should replace assessment #6 (employer/alumni survey) with a stronger assessment. Although required for NCATE for the unit review, this type of assessment is an indirect measure of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. A more direct measure like some of the other assessments the program has articulated in the Section II chart would be more appropriate.

4. Instructional Strategies. Special educators possess a repertoire of evidence-based **instructional strategies to individualize instruction** for individuals with ELN. Special educators select, adapt, and use these instructional strategies to promote **positive learning results in general and special curricula** and to appropriately modify learning environments for individuals with ELN. They enhance the **learning of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills** of individuals with ELN, and increase their self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem. Moreover, special educators emphasize the **development, maintenance, and generalization** of knowledge and skills across environments, settings, and the lifespan.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

The program cited assessments #4 (student teaching evaluation), #5 (student learning project), and #6 (employer/alumni survey) as evidence of Standard 4. No significant changes were reported between the 2007 and 2011. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, Standard 4 is met. Assessment #4 (student teaching evaluation) is an exceedingly strong assessment for addressing Standard 4. Candidate performance levels and reflective questions are aligned to the CEC Standards and informed by a number of various knowledge and skill sets. Given the licensure area is mild-moderate, the program should be using the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skill set. Assessment #5 (student learning

project) is not substantially aligned to Standard 4. However, the project could be further aligned and this would strengthen the evidence toward Standard 4. Data are aggregated, reported by rubric element, and are aligned to the CEC standards.

In addition, the program should replace assessment #6 (employer/alumni survey) with a stronger assessment. Although required for NCATE for the unit review, this type of assessment is an indirect measure of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. A more direct measure like some of the other assessments the program has articulated in the Section II chart would be more appropriate.

5. Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Special educators actively **create learning environments** for individuals with ELN that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and **active engagement** of individuals with ELN. In addition, special educators **foster environments in which diversity is valued** and individuals are taught to live harmoniously and productively in a culturally diverse world. Special educators shape **environments to encourage the independence**, self-motivation, self-direction, personal empowerment, and self-advocacy of individuals with ELN. Special educators **help their general education colleagues integrate individuals** with ELN in regular environments and engage them in meaningful learning activities and interactions. Special educators use **direct motivational and instructional interventions** with individuals with ELN to teach them to respond effectively to current expectations. When necessary, special educators can safely **intervene with individuals with ELN in crisis**. Special educators coordinate all these efforts and **provide guidance and direction to paraeducators and others**, such as classroom volunteers and tutors.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

The program cited assessments #4 (student teaching evaluation), #5 (student learning project), #6 (employer/alumni survey), and #8 (Behavior Intervention Plan) as evidence of Standard 5. No significant changes were reported between the 2007 and 2011. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, Standard 5 is met.

Assessments #4 (student teaching evaluation), #5 (student learning project), and #8 (Behavior Intervention Plan) are strong assessments for addressing Standard 5. Candidate performance levels are aligned to the CEC Standards and informed by a number of various knowledge and skill sets. Given the licensure area is mild-moderate, the program should be using the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skill set. In the next submission, the program is encouraged to consistently focus on measuring candidates' skills (ex. Candidate designs the learning environment) as opposed to the product (ex. Candidate's learning environment is) Data are aggregated, reported by rubric element, and are aligned to the CEC standards.

In addition, the program should replace assessment #6 (employer/alumni survey) with a stronger assessment. Although required for NCATE for the unit review, this type of assessment is an indirect measure of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. A more direct measure like some of the other assessments the program has articulated in the Section II chart would be more appropriate.

6. Language. Special educators understand **typical and atypical language development** and the ways in which exceptional conditions can interact with an individual's experience with and use of language. Special educators use individualized strategies to **enhance language development and teach communication skills** to individuals with ELN. Special educators are familiar with **augmentative**,

alternative, and assistive technologies to support and enhance communication of individuals with exceptional needs. Special educators match their communication methods to an individual's language proficiency and cultural and linguistic differences. Special educators provide **effective language models** and they use communication strategies and resources to **facilitate understanding of subject matter for individuals with ELN whose primary language is not English.**

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

The program cited assessments #4 (student teaching evaluation), #5 (student learning project), #6 (employer/alumni survey), and #7 (Assistive Technology Project) as evidence of Standard 6. No significant changes were reported between the 2007 and 2011. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, Standard 6 is met.

Assessment #7 (Assistive Technology Project) is a strong assessment for addressing Standard 6. The assessment, rubric, and data are substantially aligned to CEC Standard 6. Assessment #4 (student teaching evaluation) also provides some evidence of Standard 6. However, it is unclear how assessment #5 (student learning project) relates to Standard 6. In the next submission, the program is encouraged to consistently focus on measuring candidates' skills specific to enhancing the language development of learners with mild-moderate exceptional learning needs.

In addition, the program should replace assessment #6 (employer/alumni survey) with a stronger assessment. Although required for NCATE for the unit review, this type of assessment is an indirect measure of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. A more direct measure like some of the other assessments the program has articulated in the Section II chart would be more appropriate.

7. Instructional Planning. Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice. Special educators develop **long-range individualized instructional plans** anchored in both general and special curricula. In addition, special educators systematically translate these individualized plans into carefully selected **shorter-range goals and objectives** taking into consideration an individual's abilities and needs, the learning environment, and a myriad of cultural and linguistic factors. Individualized instructional plans emphasize **explicit modeling** and **efficient guided practice** to assure acquisition and fluency through maintenance and generalization. Understanding of these factors as well as the implications of an individual's exceptional condition, guides the special educator's selection, adaptation, and creation of materials, and the use of powerful instructional variables. Instructional plans are **modified based on ongoing analysis of the individual's learning progress.** Moreover, special educators facilitate this instructional planning in a **collaborative context** including the individuals with exceptionalities, families, professional colleagues, and personnel from other agencies as appropriate. Special educators also develop a variety of **individualized transition plans**, such as transitions from preschool to elementary school and from secondary settings to a variety of postsecondary work and learning contexts. Special educators are comfortable using **appropriate technologies** to support instructional planning and individualized instruction.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

The program cited assessments #3 (math unit), #4 (student teaching evaluation), #5 (student learning project), and #6 (employer/alumni survey) as evidence of Standard 7. No significant changes were reported between the 2007 and 2011. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, Standard 7 is met.

Assessments #3 (math unit), #4 (student teaching evaluation), and #5 (student learning project) are strong assessments for addressing Standard 7. Candidate performance levels are aligned to the CEC Standards and informed by a number of various knowledge and skill sets. Given the licensure area is mild-moderate, the program should be using the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skill set. In the next submission, the program is encouraged to consistently focus on measuring candidates' skills (ex. Candidate designs lessons that..) as opposed to the product (ex. Candidate's lessons contain....) Data are aggregated, reported by rubric element, and are aligned to the CEC standards.

In addition, the program should replace assessment #6 (employer/alumni survey) with a stronger assessment. Although required for NCATE for the unit review, this type of assessment is an indirect measure of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. A more direct measure like some of the other assessments the program has articulated in the Section II chart would be more appropriate.

8. Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and special educators use **multiple types of assessment** information for a variety of educational decisions. Special educators use the results of assessments to help identify exceptional learning needs and to develop and implement individualized instructional programs, as well as to adjust instruction in response to ongoing learning progress. Special educators understand the **legal policies and ethical principles of measurement and assessment** related to referral, eligibility, program planning, instruction, and placement for individuals with ELN, including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Special educators understand **measurement theory and practices** for addressing issues of validity, reliability, norms, bias, and interpretation of assessment results. In addition, special educators understand the **appropriate use and limitations** of various types of assessments. Special educators collaborate with families and other colleagues to assure **non-biased, meaningful assessments and decision-making**. Special educators conduct **formal and informal assessments** of behavior, learning, achievement, and environments to design learning experiences that support the growth and development of individuals with ELN. Special educators use assessment information to **identify supports and adaptations** required for individuals with ELN to access the general curriculum and to participate in school, system, and statewide assessment programs. Special educators **regularly monitor the progress** of individuals with ELN in general and special curricula. Special educators **use appropriate technologies** to support their assessments.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

The program cited assessments #4 (student teaching evaluation), #5 (student learning project), #6 (employer/alumni survey), and #8 (Behavior Intervention Plan) as evidence of Standard 8. No significant changes were reported between the 2007 and 2011. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, Standard 8 is met.

Assessments #4 (student teaching evaluation), #5 (student learning project), and #8 (Behavior Intervention Plan) are strong assessments for addressing the informal assessment concepts related to Standard 8. Candidate performance levels are aligned to the CEC Standards and informed by a number of various knowledge and skill sets. Given the licensure area is mild-moderate, the program should be using the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skill set. In the next submission, the program is encouraged to consistently focus on measuring candidates' skills (ex. Candidate designs the learning environment) as opposed to the product (ex. Candidate's learning environment is). Further, it will be expected in the next submission that concepts related to formal assessment are strengthened. Data are aggregated, reported by rubric element, and are aligned to the CEC standards.

In addition, the program should replace assessment #6 (employer/alumni survey) with a stronger assessment. Although required for NCATE for the unit review, this type of assessment is an indirect measure of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. A more direct measure like some of the other assessments the program has articulated in the Section II chart would be more appropriate.

9. Professional and Ethical Practice. Special educators are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards. Special educators practice in multiple roles and complex situations across wide age and developmental ranges. Their practice requires ongoing attention to **legal matters** along with serious professional and **ethical considerations**. Special educators engage in **professional activities** and participate in learning communities that benefit individuals with ELN, their families, colleagues, and their own professional growth. Special educators view themselves as **lifelong learners** and regularly reflect on and adjust their practice. Special educators are aware of how their own and others attitudes, behaviors, and ways of communicating can influence their practice. Special educators understand that culture and language can interact with exceptionalities, and are **sensitive to the many aspects of diversity** of individuals with ELN and their families. Special educators actively plan and engage in activities that foster their professional growth and keep them **current with evidence-based best practices**. Special educators know their own limits of practice and practice within them.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

The program cited assessments #4 (student teaching evaluation) and #6 (employer/alumni survey) as evidence of Standard 9. No significant changes were reported between the 2007 and 2011. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, Standard 9 is met.

Assessments #4 (student teaching evaluation) provides the strongest evidence for addressing the knowledge and skills related to Standard 9. Candidate performance levels are aligned to the CEC Standards and informed by a number of various knowledge and skill sets. Given the licensure area is mild-moderate, the program should be using the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skill set. In the next submission, the program is encouraged to consistently focus on measuring candidates' skills (ex. Candidate designs the learning environment) as opposed to the product (ex. Candidate's learning environment is). Data are aggregated, reported by rubric element, and are aligned to the CEC standards. Although not cited assessment #5 (student learning project) lends some evidence to candidates' skills in reflection.

In addition, the program should replace assessment #6 (employer/alumni survey) with a stronger assessment. Although required for NCATE for the unit review, this type of assessment is an indirect measure of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. A more direct measure like some of the other assessments the program has articulated in the Section II chart would be more appropriate.

10. Collaboration. Special educators routinely and effectively **collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways**. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with ELN are addressed throughout schooling. Moreover, special educators embrace their special role as advocate for individuals with ELN. Special educators promote and advocate the learning and well being of individuals with ELN across a wide range of settings and a range of different learning experiences. Special educators are viewed as specialists by a myriad of people who actively seek their collaboration to effectively include and teach individuals with ELN. Special educators are a **resource to their colleagues** in understanding

the laws and policies relevant to Individuals with ELN. Special educators use collaboration to **facilitate the successful transitions** of individuals with ELN across settings and services.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

The program cited assessments #4 (student teaching evaluation), #6 (employer/alumni survey), and #8 (Behavior Intervention Plan) as evidence of Standard 10. No significant changes were reported between the 2007 and 2011. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, Standard 10 is minimally met.

Assessment #4 (student teaching evaluation) provides the strongest evidence for addressing the knowledge and skills related to Standard 10. Candidate performance levels are aligned to the CEC Standards and informed by a number of various knowledge and skill sets. Given the licensure area is mild-moderate, the program should be using the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skill set. In the next submission, the program is encouraged to consistently focus on measuring candidates' skills (ex. Candidate designs the learning environment) as opposed to the product (ex. Candidate's learning environment is). Further, it will be expected in the next submission that concepts related to formal assessment are strengthened. Data are aggregated, reported by rubric element, and are aligned to the CEC standards. Assessment #8 (Behavior Intervention Plan) provides limited evidence, but with revision could present more substantial evidence of Standard 10. It will be expected in the next submission that collaboration is further strengthened in at least one additional assessment.

In addition, the program should replace assessment #6 (employer/alumni survey) with a stronger assessment. Although required for NCATE for the unit review, this type of assessment is an indirect measure of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. A more direct measure like some of the other assessments the program has articulated in the Section II chart would be more appropriate.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Candidates' knowledge of content is evident and clearly documented. Assessments, rubrics, and data are aligned to the CEC Standards. In the next submission, the program does need to attend to some inconsistencies in the assessment system. First, rubrics need to be consistently process-based as opposed to product-based. The assessments should focus on what candidates need to demonstrate (process) to complete the assessment instead of focusing on evaluating what the candidate produces (product). Some of the performance levels within the rubrics start with an "action word" which is a sign that the rubric is process-based. Second, it will be expected that program assure that assessments, rubrics, and data are consistently informed by the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skills. Finally, since the CEC Standards are being reorganized, and the program's next submission will be an Option A submission, the program will need to examine CEC Standard alignment. In some cases, the standard alignment was exceedingly stringent so the program may want to consistently document 3-4 assessments per CEC Standard to provide some leeway for error.

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 evident and documented. Assessments, rubrics, and data are aligned to the CEC Standards. In the next submission, the program does need to attend to some inconsistencies in the assessment system. First, rubrics need to be consistently process-based as opposed to product-based.

The assessments should focus on what candidates need to demonstrate (process) to complete the assessment instead of focusing on evaluating what the candidate produces (product). Some of the performance levels within the rubrics start with an "action word" which is a sign that the rubric is process-based. Second, it will be expected that program assure that assessments, rubrics, and data are consistently informed by the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skills. Finally, since the CEC Standards are being reorganized, and the program's next submission will be an Option A submission, the program will need to examine CEC Standard alignment. In some cases, the standard alignment was exceedingly stringent so the program may want to consistently document 3-4 assessments per CEC Standard to provide some leeway for error.

Changes that will be expected in the next submission is the replacement of assessment 6, strengthening of evidence related to concepts related to formal assessment, and substantially strengthening collaboration in at least one additional assessment.

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

Assessment #5 (Documentation of Student Learning Project) requires candidates to design, implement, evaluate, and reflect on instruction. The assessment is designed in a manner to demonstrate positive impact on K-12 learners with mild-moderate exceptionalities.

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)

The program is involved in continuous data collection and evaluation efforts at the program and unit level. because of small numbers, the program is attempting to triangulate data to establish data trends.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

1. The program will be expected to strengthen the evidence presented for Standard 8 specific to formal assessment and Standard 10 in collaboration.
2. Assessment #6 should be replaced with an assessment that more directly measures candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
3. Assure that all assessments are informed by the Individualized General Curriculum knowledge and skill set.

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 Board of Examiners:

--

PART G -DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- ☐ **National Recognition.** The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. **To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted mid-cycle (2 years in advance for a 5-year cycle and 3 years in advance for a 7-year cycle) before the next scheduled accreditation visit.** The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation. *Please note that once a program has been nationally recognized, it may not submit another report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns cited in the recognition report.*

Please click "Next"

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