

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Preparation of Educators of Gifted Children

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC)/Council for Exceptional Children (NAGC/CEC).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

University of Louisiana at Monroe

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

02 / 01 / 2009

This report is in response to a(n):

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

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Special Education -- Gifted

Program Type

Advanced Teaching

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 [See Part G]

jm Not nationally recognized

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

jm Yes

jm No

jm Not applicable

jm Not able to determine

Comment:

The relationship between test passage rates of 80% or better and the program is implied in the program's response to Item 15 on the Cover Sheet. The information supplied in Assessment #1, however, indicates that the Praxis Exam 0357 in Gifted Education has been recently adopted by the state. Data do not yet appear to be available.

Summary of Strengths:

A good first attempt for a new (2006) advanced program, this document is well organized, hence enhancing its interpretability for reviewers. There is evidence of teaching important pedagogical content in gifted education, especially in the area of creativity. The report lists descriptions of its assessments in a standard-by-standard fashion.

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

jm

jm

jm

Comment:

Field experiences are mentioned in Item 4 of the conceptual framework discussion, and the description sheet impressively lists 12 different core course experiences listed by Portals in a sequential manner and with clock hours for each. Explicitly, Portals VI, VII, and VIII include the following assignment descriptions, yet the rubrics attached to those assignments are missing so it is not possible to determine how they are assessed:

1) SPED Internship 577 Gifted and Talented Practicum

Internship Portfolio: Instruction – a) Lesson plans from conceptual, thematic unit with reflections and artifacts, b) Teach and videotape of one lesson from that unit, c) Self-Assessment and Instructor Assessment of teaching, d) log documenting hours, and e) documentation of how the unit addressed affective issues;

2) Internship Portfolio Assessment -- Summary Report for 2 students (includes 2 curriculum-based rubrics and one formal assessment instrument with narrative report), one report for a “strong” student and one report for a student requiring more support.

The assessments clearly include collaboration efforts in EDLE 505 and diversity is implied in CURR 545. 1

Standard 1. Foundations. Educators of the gifted 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. These perspectives continue to influence the field of gifted education and the education and treatment of individuals with gifts and talents both in school and society. They recognize how foundational influences affect professional practice, including assessment, instructional planning, delivery, and program evaluation. They further understand how issues of human diversity impact families, cultures, and schools, and how these complex human issues can interact in the delivery of gifted and talented education services.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jñ

jñ

jñ

Comment:

Assessments 1, 2, and 7

Praxis in Gifted Education 0357 is used, and passing scores are required for licensure. The information available from the ETS Table of Specifications is presented, but the alignment chart would benefit from additional detail clearly labeling the 10 Standards by topic (e.g. Foundations) rather than by number only (e.g. Standard 1) to explicate the alignment between the Praxis 0357 and the NAGC/CEC Standards. Assessment 2's content exam is another multiple choice examination, but because the program describes this measure as being under development, it is not possible to ascertain the degree to which candidates' acumen in philosophies, principles, theories, programs, historical perspectives, and other critical foundations is assessed. Finally, Assessment 7 embraces a compare and contrast PowerPoint in SPED 575 to illustrate issues and perspectives, yet does not appear to be included in the rubric. The Assessment 7, professional portfolio, should be revised to include a dimension on the rubric related to the power point.

Standard 2. Development and Characteristics of Learners. Educators of the gifted know and demonstrate respect for their students as unique human beings. They understand variations in characteristics and development between and among individuals with and without exceptional learning needs and capacities. Educators of the gifted can express how different characteristics interact with the domains of human development and use this knowledge to describe the varying abilities and behaviors of individuals with gifts and talents. Educators of the gifted also understand how families and communities contribute to the development of individuals with gifts and talents.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jñ

jñ

jñ

Comment:

Assessments 1, 2, 7, and 8

The Praxis exam, the content test, professional portfolio, and creativity portfolio are believed by the program to address this Standard. The first two may adequately align with this standard, although the content test is not yet developed. The program should make clear how this Standard is being met through the professional and creativity portfolios. Both of these assessments, Assessment 7 and 8, need to have stronger rubrics organized in a way that clearly identifies each component of the assignment which provides the assessment. The criteria need to be simplified and made clear so candidates know definitively what is expected. Assessment 2 provides discussion of affective and cognitive characteristics, yet it is not clear how this SPED 575 final exam assesses knowledge of developmental understandings between and among individuals and with and without exceptional learning needs. The link between assignments with the assessments and then how those align with the Standard is not explicated.

Standard 3. Individual Learning Differences. Educators of the gifted understand the effects that gifts and talents can have on an individual’s learning in school and throughout life. Moreover, educators of the gifted are active and resourceful in seeking to understand how language, culture, and family background interact with an individual’s predispositions to impact academic and social behavior, attitudes, values, and interests. The understanding of these learning differences and their interactions provides the foundation upon which educators of the gifted plan instruction to provide meaningful and challenging learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Assessments 1, 6, 7, and 8
 The Definitions, Development and Characteristics section of Praxis 0357 provides evidence of assessment for this Standard, but the bulk of this Standard is addressed through Assessment 7 (individual differences) and 8 (creativity) in the professional and creativity portfolios. The rubrics accompanying the portfolios should be revised for clarity and precision. In addition, a social-emotional portfolio in SPED 578 (Assessment 6) addresses this Standard, but the social-emotional portfolio's various components do not align with the rubric presented for this series of assignments. As a result, it is not clear how the social-emotional portfolio is assessed in a manner that aligns it with this Standard.

Standard 4. Instructional Strategies. Educators of the gifted possess a repertoire of evidence-based curriculum and instructional strategies to differentiate for individuals with gifts and talents. They select, adapt, and use these strategies to promote challenging learning opportunities in general and special curricula and to modify learning environments to enhance self-awareness and self-efficacy for individuals with gifts and talents. They enhance the learning of critical and creative thinking, problem solving, and performance skills in specific domains. Moreover, educators of the gifted emphasize the development, practice, and transfer of advanced knowledge and skills across environments throughout the lifespan leading to creative, productive careers in society for individuals with gifts and talents.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Assessments 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8
 The program states that 5 assessments address this standard. These include the three portfolios—social emotional (Assessment 6), professional (Assessment 7), and creativity (Assessment 8). All of these require revisions in alignment with the rubrics or vice-versa to reflect what is being taught in a clear, accessible manner so that the Standard can be assessed. Assessment 3 (lesson from thematic interdisciplinary unit) and Assessment 4 (description of assignments involved in the internship experience) also address this Standard. However, Assessment 3 does not include an assessment of the thematic unit and appears to rely on a rubric assessing one lesson. The rubrics need revision to provide clear assessment of each component. Meanwhile, Assessment 4, which is not labeled as such but, nevertheless, includes the internship description, does not include a rubric for evaluating instruction observed during the internship. Assessment 7 in SPED 575, a portfolio of tiered assignments focuses on teaching gifted children in the general education classroom, but there is no rubric provided for this assignment; developing a clear assessment in this regard would greatly strengthen alignment with the standard.

Standard 5. Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Standard 5. Learning Environments and Social Interactions. Educators of the gifted actively create learning environments for individuals with


gifts and talents that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well being, positive social interactions, and active engagement. In addition, educators of the gifted foster environments in which diversity is valued and individuals are taught to live harmoniously and productively in a culturally diverse world. Educators of the gifted shape environments to encourage independence, motivation, and self-advocacy of individuals with gifts and talents.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
		

Comment:

Assessments 3, 4, 6, and 7
While Assessment 3 in SPED 576 (thematic interdisciplinary unit) addresses affective abilities, the alignment of the assignment with the rubric and then with the Standard is not sufficiently explained. Meanwhile, Assessment 4 implies evidence obtained through the multiplicity of early field and clinical experiences, yet articulation of rubrics that distinctly respond to this Standard are missing. Assessment 6 in SPED 578’s professional portfolio specifies the unique social and emotional needs of gifted, but again how the candidates are assessed in a fashion that unmistakably ties the assignment to a clear rubric to the Standard is again left as guesswork. Finally, Assessment 7 in SPED 575 (portfolio case study) adheres to a rubric that addresses generalized areas and fails to distinguish a distinct link to the Standard.

Standard 6. Language. Educators of the gifted understand the role of language and communication in talent development and the ways in which exceptional conditions can hinder or facilitate such development. They use relevant strategies to teach oral and written communication skills to individuals with gifts and talents. Educators of the gifted are familiar with assistive technologies to support and enhance communication of individuals with exceptional needs. They match their communication methods to an individual’s language proficiency and cultural and linguistic differences. Educators of the gifted use communication strategies and resources to facilitate understanding of subject matter for individuals with gifts and talents who are English language learners.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
		

Comment:

Assessment 3
There is no evidence that Assessment 3 aligns with this Standard. The program document states that Assessment 3 addresses language, but there is no reference to language or communication in the assignment or in the rubric. Both the assignment and the rubric need to be revised to include this component.

Standard 7. Instructional Planning. Curriculum and instructional planning is at the center of gifted and talented education. Educators of the gifted develop long-range plans anchored in both general and special curricula. They systematically translate shorter-range goals and objectives that take into consideration an individual’s abilities and needs, the learning environment, and cultural and linguistic factors. Understanding of these factors, as well as the implications of being gifted and talented, guides the educator’s selection, adaptation, and creation of materials, and use of differentiated instructional strategies. Learning plans are modified based on ongoing assessment of the individual’s progress. Moreover, educators of the gifted facilitate these actions in a collaborative context that includes individuals with gifts and talents, families, professional colleagues, and personnel from other agencies as appropriate. Educators of the gifted are comfortable using technologies to support instructional planning and individualized instruction.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
		

Comment:

Assessments 3, 4, and 7
 This Standard is described by the program to be assessed through the thematic interdisciplinary unit, the field and clinical experiences required for the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction (Special Education, Academically Gifted), and the professional portfolio. Unfortunately, these assignments do not include the necessary components that serve to determine mastery of instructional planning. While the rubric included in Assessment 3 includes some important points associated with lesson planning for the gifted, the rubric is not sufficiently precise to satisfy this Standard.

Standard 8. Assessment. Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of educators of the gifted as multiple types of assessment information are required for both identification and learning progress decisions. Educators of the gifted use the results of such assessments to adjust instruction and to enhance ongoing learning progress. Educators of the gifted understand the process of identification, legal policies, and ethical principles of measurement and assessment related to referral, eligibility, program planning, instruction, and placement for individuals with gifts and talents, including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. They understand measurement theory and practices for addressing the interpretation of assessment results. In addition, educators of the gifted understand the appropriate use and limitations of various types of assessments. To ensure the use of nonbiased and equitable identification and learning progress models, educators of the gifted employ alternative assessments such as performance-based assessment, portfolios, and computer simulations.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
		

Comment:

Assessments 4, 5, and 7
 Assessment 4 includes two assessments of teaching (self and instructor) as well as analysis and interpretation of test scores in EDLE 500, yet these activities have not been clarified adequately. They may not enable faculty to determine candidate performance. The alignment with this Standard in Assessment 4 is cloudy. The portfolio in Assessment 5 includes a synopsis of assessments of two students with an accompanying narrative and candidate-made rubrics, but there is no explanation about how the rubrics are applied, what the nature of the other testing may be, or how the narrative brings together assessment of candidate skills and knowledge that would satisfy this Standard.

Standard 9. Professional and Ethical Practice. Educators of the gifted are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards. They practice in multiple roles and complex situations across wide age and developmental ranges. Their practice requires ongoing attention to professional and ethical considerations. They engage in professional activities that promote growth in individuals with gifts and talents and update themselves on evidence-based best practices. Educators of the gifted view themselves as lifelong learners and regularly reflect on and adjust their practice. They are aware of how attitudes, behaviors, and ways of communicating can influence their practice. Educators of the gifted understand that culture and language interact with gifts and talents and are sensitive to the many aspects of the diversity of individuals with gifts and talents and their families.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
		

Comment:

Assessments 4, 7, and 8

Each of the Assessments lacks a related rubric that is adequate. An adequate rubric in each Assessment would first enable faculty to assess directly candidates' knowledge and skills in professional and ethical practice and second would alert candidates so that they would understand precisely what they need to do to demonstrate competence. Specifically, 1) Assessment 4 in SPED 575 (portfolio) includes a log of professional activities but it needs clarity as to what it measures and an appropriate rubric to measure the specific areas; 2) Assessment 7 in SPED 575 (professional affiliation log and professional development plan with a generalized description) needs specificity, an exact rubric, and alignment with the Standard; 3) Assessment 8 in SPED 574 links to a rubric that supports hands-on professional development and reflection to guide professional growth, but again linkage among the assignment, the rubric, and the Standard is weak.

Standard 10. Collaboration. Educators of the gifted effectively collaborate with families, other educators, and related service providers. This collaboration enhances comprehensive articulated program options across educational levels and engagement of individuals with gifts and talents in meaningful learning activities and interactions. Moreover, educators of the gifted embrace their special role as advocate for individuals with gifts and talents. They promote and advocate for the learning and well being of individuals with gifts and talents across settings and diverse learning experiences.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jm

jm

jm

Comment:

Assessments 5, 6, and 7

Assessment 5 in SPED 577 (assessment portfolio) addresses collaboration and advocacy in a broad sense, but it is neither decisively assessed through a strong rubric nor strongly connected to the Standard. Similarly, Assessment 6 (social-emotional portfolio) is an assignment that provides for developing the knowledge that can help candidates become better collaborators. While the document states that all candidates achieved mastery on NAGC/CEC Standards 3, 4, 5, 7 and 10 in this assignment, the criteria for this portfolio are unknown. Moreover, the rubric provided is not matched with the description of the assignments and assessments included in the portfolio.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content. NAGC/CEC performance-based standards addressed in this entry could include (but are not limited to) Standards 1-3. Information from Assessments #1 and #2 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on content knowledge.)

Assessment 1, the Praxis in Gifted Education (0357) assesses candidate knowledge across all the standards. Due to the recent development of this program, no data are reported for the Praxis Exam. The foundations standard is addressed in Assessment 2, the content exam, and candidates must secure 80% to pass this multiple choice test. The sources and research on which the test is based are not specified; perhaps worse, the program states that the "assessment is being developed." Thus, no data are reported for Assessment 2. The professional portfolio, Assessment 7, addresses foundations through the PowerPoint on issues and perspectives in gifted education, but it is not clear how and to what degree that assessment reliably and validly assesses candidates' content knowledge.

C.2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions. NAGC/CEC standards that could be addressed in this

assessment include but are not limited to Standards 4-10. Information from Assessments #3 and #4 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.)

Given the limited rubrics throughout the program, it is not possible to ascertain how the program differentiates among and between pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Although structures seem to be in place for teaching pedagogical and professional content, the assessments and especially the rubrics need to be refined to provide for clearly articulated expectations.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning. NAGC/CEC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 4-8. Information from Assessment #5 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on student learning.)

The following assessments have some relationship to linking candidates to P-12 effects: 1) Assessment 5 in SPED 577 (assessment portfolio measures summary report of two students for knowledge of assessment strategies, skill in their use and dispositions for advocacy and collaboration on behalf of gifted learners as primary evidence); 2) Assessment 6 in SPED 578 (candidates demonstrate proficiency through a variety of activities in social/emotional portfolio requiring presentations); 3) Assessment 7 in SPED 575 (candidates complete activities designed to give evidence of ability to analyze and engage gifted learners); 4) Assessment 8 in SPED 574 (indicates ability to integrate knowledge & skills in a variety of activities captured in a creativity portfolio). Unfortunately, there are no definitive data that document the relationship between candidates' work and P-12 classrooms. The lack of clearly articulated assignments, rubrics and other assessments not clearly associated with the Standards prevents establishing the P-12 link.

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)

This is a new program; hence, longitudinal assessment could not be applied to improvement of candidate performance. However, the assessment assignments should provide immediate feedback about each candidate's progress. This information will become more useful as the program increases its precision at stating expectations through various rubrics. At present, the rubrics contain language from some of the Standards while the origin of other language is unclear. As assignments and rubrics are revised and refined, the program will gain more exact information about the progress of candidates which will help make adjustments in program curricula and delivery.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

The new program has been in existence but a few years, but there are several important steps the program can undertake to enhance its overall development. First, rubrics must be carefully designed to match the assignments being evaluated, and the rubrics and assignments must align unequivocally with the Standards. Second, within each assignment, components need to be assessed clearly; at present, rubrics are imprecise, and assignments do not match them well. Finally, as data become available, make sure to demonstrate how those data are used to make decisions about candidates' progress through a series of decision points in the program.

The field/clinical practice standard is not included in the revised NAGC/CEC Standards (2006). It was not a factor in your recognition determination and will not be included in future program reports. However, NAGC/CEC program reviewers provided feedback on your documentation for this standard that you may wish to consider.

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:

- ☒ The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

PROGRAM DOES NOT MEET SPA REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL RECOGNITION

Terms and Subsequent Actions

- ☒ **National Recognition with Probation:** The program does not satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. The program has **up to two opportunities** to submit revised reports addressing unmet standards and other concerns noted in the recognition report. The range of possible deadlines for these reports are April 15, 2009 (with a response due back from the SPA by 9/1/09); September 15, 2009 (with a response due back from the SPA by 2/1/10); and February 1, 2010 (with a response due back by 7/15/10). **Note that the opportunity to submit two revised reports is only possible if the first revised report is submitted by the April 15, 2009 deadline. However, the program should NOT submit a Revised Report until it is confident that it has addressed all of the unmet standards and any other critical concerns cited in this recognition report.** If no reports are submitted by 2/1/10, program status will revert to not recognized. After 2/1/10, NCATE will not accept a revised report. However, the institution may submit a new program report (rather than a revised report) addressing all standards, at either Feb. 1 or Sept. 15 of a calendar year (submission dates for new program reports). In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

Comment on decision:

Please click "Next"

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