PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Instituition
Grand Canyon University

Review Team Members
Beth Driscoll, NBCT, M.Ed, Dept. of Education
Jan Findley, Pima Community College
Martha Cocchiarella, Arizona State University
RaeAnn Rumery, NBCT

Arizona Department of Education
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

INTRODUCTION

Arizona State Board rule R7-2-604(A) states: The Board shall evaluate and may approve the professional preparation programs which request Board Approval. Rules R7-2-604 and R7-2-604.01 apply to all professional preparation programs in teacher, administrator, school guidance counselor, and school psychology programs that lead to certification. The Board may grant approval for a period not to exceed five years. A copy of Board rules governing the Professional Preparation Approval Process is attached to this document.

The professional preparation program review for Grand Canyon University Master in Education in Special Education was conducted on September 22, 2013 and October 24, 2013.

The Arizona State Board of Education and the Arizona Department of Education regard the approval process as a collaborative endeavor to maintain, improve, and ensure educator preparation quality in Arizona. Following are the findings of the review team.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name:	***Grand Canyon University Master in Education in Special Education***
Program Description:	The program is designed to educate and equip teacher candidates to teach students with exceptionalities in a variety of special education placements and educational settigns. The Master of Education in Special education isofferd at the traditional campus and through the online modality. The program spans 47 credit hours of instruction and field experiences.

Program/Course sequence (number of credit hours)	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	47 credits
Program Description	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Meets certification requirements	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013

- Commendations for the graphic showing the program flow.
- Commendations for the College of Education Promise- the promise to provide first year teaching assistance.
- Commendations on assessment system and philosophy.
- Some confusion on content delivery ground/online.
- Request more information on staff requirements and training.
- Clarify whether faculty supervisors must be Special Ed. certified.
- Clarify whether SEI courses are taken consecutively or simultaneously. Documents show both courses in block 1.

10/2013

- Clarification has been submitted regarding content delivery in ground vs. online.
- Staff requirements and training has been submitted.
- Clarification- verbiage added stating that faculty supervisors must be special education certified
- Clarification- .Although both SEI courses are in block 1, courses are taken consecutively.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards (InTASC, NETS)**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, **descriptions** of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Course description	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Topics/objectives, competencies clearly identified	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Competencies aligned to national standards (InTASC, NETS)	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013

- Syllabi aren't consistently aligned to InTASC at the indicator level.
- Statement on syllabi allowing faculty to change any assignment except field experience and benchmark assignments could result in inconsistency in content based on instructor. The syllabi submitted for review need to be taught with consistency to ensure that the approved program is the actual program students experience.
- SPD 570 Intro to Methods & Strategies of Teaching Students w/ Mild to Moderate Disabilities is primarily focused on math content and strategies. SPD 580 Advanced Methods & Strategies of Teaching Students w/ Mild to Moderate Disabilities is primarily focused on ELA instruction. Course titles don't reflect course content.

10/2013

- Syllabi have been revised and aligned to InTASC at the indicator level
- Statement allowing instructors to change assignments has been removed from syllabi
- Courses have been renamed SPD 570 *Methods & Strategies of Teaching Mathematics to Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities, SPD 580 Methods & Strategies of Teaching English Language Arts*

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Aligned with evidence on program matrix	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013

- Signature assignments are clearly identified and aligned with evidence on program matrix
- Confusion about statements on syllabi that imply signature assignments may or may not be required

10/2013

- Wording on syllabi has been change to clearly state that signature assignments are required

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

RUBRICS FOR SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Clearly identified criteria and performance levels	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013

- Signature assignments aren't aligned to the indictor level
- Signature assignments rubrics don't display specific criteria that relate to specific assignments

10/2013

- All rubric criteria have been reviewed and revised as needed to relate to the specific assignment
- Signature assignment criteria have been revised to the INTASC indicator level

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience") ARS R7-2-604. Meets certificate requirement of grade 1-8.	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone).	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Benchmark assignments related to field experiences are clearly identified.	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Aligned with evidence on program matrix	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013

- Documents require IVP fingerprint clearance in block 2, but block 1 lists field experience
- Field experience log appears to be an honor system. How is field experience verified?
- Commendation for the exposure to a variety of special education classroom environments
- Video based experiences cannot be identified as field experiences. They must be identified differently and not included in the field experience hours.
- Confusion with the difference between directed and focused field experiences

10/2013

- Clarification provided that Block 1 experiences are video based or observation.
- Documentation submitted that LEA staff must verify field experience and sign log
- Video experiences have been renamed experiential observations and have been removed field experiences references in submission documents
- Directed and focused field experiences have been clearly identified

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument(s) tied to national standards (InTASC, NETS)	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Clearly identified criteria and performance levels are evident in the evaluation instrument(s) for field experience.	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013

- Evaluation instruments are tied to national standards and have clearly identified criteria and performance levels

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

STUDENT TEACHING (CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE)

Requirements are clearly identified	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, signature assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013

- Student teaching requirements are clearly identified
- Alignment between course description, topics, competencies, signature assignments, and field experiences is present

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument(s) tied to national standards (InTASC, NETS)	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Clearly identified criteria and performance levels are evident in the evaluation instrument(s) for student teaching.	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013

- Student teaching evaluation is tied to national standards and with clearly identified criteria and performance levels

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

PROGRAM MATRIX (SEE RUBRIC)

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting national standards (InTASC, CEC, NETS) aligned with coursework, field experiences, student teaching, and assessments previously identified.	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Standard 1	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Standard 2	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Standard 3	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Standard 4	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Standard 5	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Standard 6	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Standard 7	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	
Standard 8	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013
Matrix includes program coursework, assessments, field experiences, and student teaching aligned to relevant standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, **field experiences** and capstone experience (student teaching) align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

ASSESSMENT DATA

Plan for collecting data to assess candidate's competency in meeting national standards (InTASC, NETS)	Met ☒	Unmet ☐	

Findings of the Team:

9/2013

- Continuous improvement model assessment system with formative and summative assessment data. Goals are outlined in the college of education Conceptual Framework. Individual program data is presented to in a formalized process and continually throughout the year as part of an ongoing program reflection process.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Three (3) Year Approval –new program***