

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE  
EXTERNAL EVALUATORS**

**REDESIGNED TEACHER PREPARATION  
PROGRAMS:  
ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION &  
PRACTITIONER TEACHER PROGRAMS**

**Submitted to the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary  
and Secondary Education  
by:**

**Craig Frisby, Ph.D.  
University of Missouri**

**Martin A. Kozloff, Ph.D.  
University of North Carolina – Wilmington**

**Kathleen Madigan, Ph.D.  
National Council on Teacher Quality**

**Douglas McLeod, Ph.D.  
San Diego State University**

**January 16, 2002**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I:	INTRODUCTION .....	2
PART II:	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS FOR THE FIRST REVIEW CYCLE .....	3
PART III:	SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS ACROSS REPORTS .....	9
PART IV:	PROGRAM REVIEWS (LISTED ALPHABETICALLY)	
	Centenary College .....	15
	Dillard University .....	19
	Grambling State University .....	22
	Louisiana College .....	26
	Louisiana State University – Baton Rouge .....	30
	Louisiana State University – Shreveport .....	32
	Louisiana Tech University .....	33
	Loyola University .....	38
	McNeese State University .....	42
	Nicholls State University .....	46
	Northwestern State University .....	49
	Our Lady of Holy Cross College .....	53
	Southeastern Louisiana University .....	58
	Southern University – Baton Rouge .....	61
	Southern University – New Orleans .....	64
	University of Louisiana-Lafayette .....	65
	University of Louisiana – Monroe .....	68
	University of New Orleans .....	71
	Xavier University .....	74
PART V:	APPENDICES .....	82
	APPENDIX A: Louisiana Alternative Certification Program ...	83
	APPENDIX B: General Comments from the Louisiana Department of Education .....	91
	APPENDIX C: Summary of Recommendations of the External Evaluators .....	94

# **PART I: INTRODUCTION**

## INTRODUCTION

This document provides an overview of the evaluation of redesigned alternative certification programs proposed by all public and private universities in Louisiana. A team of external evaluators have examined the redesigned programs and identified programs that should be recommended for approval based upon their quality.

The alternative certification programs described in this document have been developed for individuals who already possess a bachelors degree in an area other than education and want to teach. Prior to entry into the programs, these individuals must be capable of passing the reading, writing, mathematics, and specialty content PRAXIS examinations required for state certification.

The following is a general description of the three state-approved certification structures used by universities to design the programs. A more thorough description of the Louisiana Alternative Certification Program can be found in Appendix A.

*Practitioner Teacher Program:* An 18-30 hour program designed for cohorts who participate in an intensive summer program, seminars during the fall and spring, and an internship while working full time as a teacher in a school.

*Master's Degree Program Alternative Path:* A 36-hour master's degree program designed for individuals who are teaching full time, attending the university full time, or attending the university part-time.

*Non-Master's/Certification-Only Program:* A program containing 15-hours of coursework and 6-12 hours of internship/student teaching designed for individuals who work full time in careers other than teaching and want to complete their coursework at a slower pace before entering student teaching and leaving their existing jobs.

All programs have also been examined by staff of the Louisiana Department of Education to ensure that they meet all state certification requirements.

A description of the process used to evaluate these programs is found in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of the document, and a Summary of Key Findings Across the Reports is located in Part III. Recommendations of the external evaluators can be found in Part IV under Program Reviews.

**PART II: DESCRIPTION OF THE  
PROCESS FOR THE FIRST  
EVALUATION CYCLE**

## **PART II: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS FOR THE FIRST EVALUATION CYCLE**

### **SECTION I: EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF PROGRAM QUALITY**

The Board of Regents (BoR) and State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) selected four external consultants to review and evaluate redesigned teacher preparation programs. The evaluators were charged with reviewing the teacher preparation redesign plans, providing feedback to universities regarding their proposals, and making recommendations to university system boards, BoR, and BESE relative to acceptance of the redesigned plans. The primary responsibility of the external evaluators was to identify quality programs that should be recommended for state approval and provide recommendations to universities to enhance the quality of all programs in the state.

#### **Submission**

All universities were required to submit redesign proposals that met specifications identified within a document entitled *Final Revision of Guidelines for Submission and Review of Redesigned Teacher Preparation programs (October 18, 2001)*. The guidelines identified the specific structure that universities were required to follow when presenting information within the proposals and specific questions that universities were required to answer when describing their programs. Universities were also required to follow new state certification requirements for the following three types of alternate certification structures: (1) Practitioner Teacher Program; (2) Master's Degree Program Alternative Path; and (3) Non-Master's/Certification-Only Program. See Appendix A for a description of the three certification structures. All universities were required to submit proposals by November 30, 2001 for each certification structure being proposed by the university.

#### **Review**

The review process was used as a first step to help create high quality teacher preparation programs across the state.

External evaluators used a two-stage review process to (1) assess written proposals and (2) conduct face-to-face interviews with key university administrators and faculty. Representative(s) from the University System Boards and Louisiana Association of Independent Colleges and Universities were invited to attend interviews to gain a comprehensive understanding of programs being proposed.

Prior to their arrival, the external evaluators were provided copies of proposals submitted by three universities to read in advance. Upon arrival in Baton Rouge, the four evaluators met on November 26-27 to validate the scoring process using the same three written proposals. The evaluators worked in teams to review proposals and identified questions to ask about the proposals during interviews. On November 28-29, the evaluators worked as two-member teams and conducted 45-minute interviews with university teams that included key university administrators, university faculty, and K-12 school partners. At the conclusion of the interviews, each proposal was evaluated based upon written information within the proposals and responses

during the interviews. Subsequent to the review of all proposals, the evaluators discussed their recommendations and stipulations to ensure that consistency existed across evaluators and across proposals. Joint consensus was reached by the external evaluators to determine final recommendations and areas in need of further development. The three recommendations were the following:

- *Recommended for Approval:* Programs that exhibited many strengths and had no stipulations.
- *Recommended for Approval with Stipulations:* Programs that were structurally sound but had areas in need of further development.
- *Not Recommended for Approval:* Programs that required structural changes and/or needed major program revisions.

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

**A. Program Recommendations**

Statements identifying the types of programs submitted and the recommendations of the external evaluators.

**B. Strengths**

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

**C. Program Stipulations**

A list of stipulations that must be addressed by the universities in order for the program(s) to be approved.

**D. General Recommendations for Future Improvement**

A description of common weaknesses observed across almost all programs by the evaluators. These weaknesses do not have to be addressed for approval of the alternate certification programs; however, they must be addressed when submitting future programs for review.

**E. Specific Recommendations for Future Improvement**

A list of recommendations for universities to consider when further developing the program. Universities are not required to address these recommendations for their programs to be approved.

## **SECTION 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 indicates if certification requirements were met for proposed programs. If certification requirements were not met, areas that must be addressed for program approval were identified. Appendix B provides general comments from the LDE regarding the certification areas.

## **SECTION III: WRITTEN DOCUMENTS**

All recommendations of the external evaluators and the Louisiana Department of Education have been provided within this report, *Recommendations of the External Evaluators – Redesigned Teacher Preparation Programs: Alternate Certification & Practitioner Teacher Programs*. The report has been placed on the Board of Regents web site (<http://www.regents.state.la.us>) under Teacher Education Initiatives/Redesign of Teacher Preparation Programs.

## **SECTION IV: APPROVAL PROCESS**

The approval process was established as a second step in establishing high quality teacher preparation programs within systems and across the state.

### **Public Universities**

For public universities, all programs that are (1) recommended for approval without stipulations and (2) found to have no certification problems are reviewed by the system boards and recommended by system boards to the Board of Regents for approval.

If programs are approved with stipulations or found to have certification problems, universities must address the areas cited and may submit a rejoinder to their system board to seek approval. Each system board reviews the rejoinder and determines if the program should be recommended to the Board of Regents for approval.

If not approved, universities may rewrite the proposals to address stipulations. Universities may submit revised proposals during the April 2002 second evaluation cycle or they may submit a rejoinder to their system board to request approval during the current evaluation cycle. Each system board reviews the rejoinders and determines if the programs should be recommended to the Board of Regents for approval.

Once system boards *submit the programs recommended for approval and rejoinders to the Board of Regents*, a BoR/SBESE/LAICU Program Review Subcommittee composed of staff from the Board of Regents, State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (Louisiana Department of Education), and LAICU reviews the external evaluators' recommendations, university system recommendations, and rejoinders to ensure that all proposed programs address certification requirements and evaluation stipulations.

Based upon the review of this subcommittee, recommendations are made to the Board of Regents and State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. If the BoR and/or BESE does not approve the new programs, universities may revise the documents and resubmit them by April 30, 2002, for the Second Evaluation Cycle.

## Private Universities

For private institutions, campus heads and chief academic officers review the recommendations of the external evaluators and determine if rejoinders should be developed to address stipulations that are identified or programs that are not approved. *All rejoinders are submitted to the Board of Regents for the BoR/BESE/LAICU Program Review Subcommittee.* This subcommittee reviews the external evaluators' recommendations, private university recommendations, and rejoinders to ensure that proposed programs address certification requirements and evaluation stipulations.

Based upon the review of this subcommittee, recommendations are made to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. If the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education does not approve the new programs, universities may revise the documents and resubmit them by April 30, 2002, for the Second Evaluation Cycle.

### SECTION V: EVALUATION PRIORITIES

A very thorough set of guidelines were developed to guide universities as they redesigned their teacher preparation programs. The primary areas that universities were required to address were the following: Program Design/Plan, Description of Courses (e.g., performance-based objectives, assessments, empirical bases, resources, differentiation, etc.); Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching Critical Skills, Description of Field Sites and Activities, Handbooks, and Assessment System and Program Evaluation.

As programs were reviewed by the evaluators, it was noted that many universities experienced similar difficulties in certain areas (e.g., performance-based objectives and assessments), and there were some areas (e.g., differentiated courses and curriculum) that were more critically important than other areas (e.g., handbooks) for development of a strong educational program. Therefore, a decision was made to only provide stipulations for areas that were considered to be critically important to the development of a strong program. In addition, a decision was made to provide professional development opportunities during 2002 to help universities in areas where weaknesses (e.g., performance-based assessments) were demonstrated across campuses and not identify those areas as stipulations during this evaluation cycle. Appendix C provides a chart that identifies the overall recommendations of the external evaluators and the Louisiana Department of Education.

### SECTION VI: REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For questions regarding the **Program Evaluation**, please email the following BoR staff:

Dr. Jeanne Burns at [burnsj@gov.state.la.us](mailto:burnsj@gov.state.la.us)

Ms. Stephanie Williamson at [swilliamson@regents.state.la.us](mailto:swilliamson@regents.state.la.us)

For questions regarding **Certification Requirements**, please email the following LDE staff:

Dr. Janet Williams at [jwilliams@mail.doe.state.la.us](mailto:jwilliams@mail.doe.state.la.us)

Dr. Mary Helen McCoy at [mhmccoy@mail.doe.state.la.us](mailto:mhmccoy@mail.doe.state.la.us)

**PART III: SUMMARY OF KEY  
FINDINGS ACROSS  
REPORTS**

## SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS ACROSS PROGRAMS

A diverse array of programs have been developed by Louisiana's universities that will create opportunities for individuals to obtain certification as teachers through alternate pathways. These programs have frequently made explicit and early commitment to content-focused, hands-on training. Programs demonstrated a commitment to preparing competent educators who have demonstrated teaching skill prior to completing their course of preparation. This is especially evident in those courses where assessment of candidates includes direct assessment of educational practice. The universities have included some substantive redesign efforts in which programs were devised to meet the unique needs of alternate certification candidates. Programs have typically given explicit consideration to the *Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (LCET)*. This is a crucial consideration given the *LCET*'s importance in Louisiana's first year teacher assistance and assessment program. Obviously, the collected proposals represent a substantive and substantial effort on the part of Louisiana's private and public universities.

Despite the many meritorious elements contained in many proposals, four major recurrent areas of concern were evident across the proposals. These concerns are described below.

### NON-MASTER'S/CERTIFICATION-ONLY PATHWAY

Across the Non-Master's/Certification-Only programs, external evaluators observed the consistent omission of any preparation in key areas of educational practice. For example, some programs that will prepare teachers of young children omitted any methodological preparation for teacher candidates in the content areas of English/language arts, science, and social studies. Obviously, all teachers need to have practical and adequate preparation to teach all content areas they will be called upon to teach within their area of certification. When the panel began attempting to craft stipulations for these programs, structural issues in the design of the Non-Master's/Certification-Only program became evident. Six credit hours devoted to methodology and teaching, as called for in the certification structure, appears inadequate to prepare teachers across the range of content areas they are called on to teach<sup>1</sup>. Faculty on university teams noted similar concerns during interviews when this issue was raised. Although it may be possible to design adequate preparation covering **all** content area methodologies, assessment, classroom management, diversity, and child development, the submitted programs did not demonstrate how this can be accomplished.

In considering the programs as a whole, the panel reached the conclusion that the crucial flaw did not lie with the university programs, which generally conformed to the certification requirements, but with the structure of the requirements. The challenge confronting the panel was how to provide the State with recommendations that conform to the certification structure

---

<sup>1</sup> The structure of the Practitioner Teacher Program naturally raises similar concerns. However, the extensive and continuing support, preparation, and assessment provided during the Internship year and the procedures to extend and complete preparation with a prescriptive plan lessened concerns for this type of program.

## NON-MASTER'S/CERTIFICATION-ONLY (CONT'D)

and are consistent with the panel's charge to focus on teacher quality and outcomes for PK-12 students. The panel felt that it was inappropriate to recommend programs for approval if those programs did not or could not provide sufficient breadth and depth of preparation. The panel is making the following recommendations for all programs submitted under this certification pathway to attempt to treat universities fairly and to assure that programs offered by Louisiana's colleges and universities provide teacher candidates with adequate preparation to be effective teachers.

1. No programs based on the Non-master's/Certification-Only pathway are recommended for approval.
2. The panel suggests that the relevant policy making and advisory bodies reexamine this certification structure. It is recommended that a committee be formed to examine the existing Non-master's/Certification-Only structure and make recommendations to the State to improve the structure. The committee should be composed of effective practicing teachers, practicing principals, university personnel, and other individuals who possess an understanding of the needs of teachers in Louisiana's schools. Once the structure has been approved by the State, universities should be required to submit redesigned proposals for the revised Non-Master's/Certification-Only structure.
3. All universities that submitted Non-Master's/Certification-Only programs should be provided a short extension for operation of their existing alternate certification programs if it is determined that the needs of uncertified teachers will not be met in districts surrounding the universities. This extension should be short-term. Universities that have submitted new Practitioner Teacher Programs and new master's degree programs should be encouraged to focus their attention upon the implementation of their new programs instead of the continuation of the old programs since the continuation will be short-term. However, if it is determined that non-provision of an alternate route other than a Master's Degree program is a detriment to meeting existing needs of uncertified teachers in districts surrounding the universities, the existing non-master's alternate route should be extended until a new structure for the Non-Master's/Certification-Only Program has been developed.
4. During the rejoinder phase this spring, universities that submitted Non-Master's Degree/Certification-Only Programs under this certification structure should have the opportunity to revise them and resubmit them under one of the two stronger certification structures (Practitioner or Master's Degree). The combination of recommendations 3 and 4 should assure that alternate certification programs will be available at all universities, provided universities submit sufficiently strong program proposals.
5. Reviews of the Non-Master's/Certification-Only Program that were submitted during this evaluation cycle have not been included in this report. These reviews will be sent directly to individual institutions for feedback purposes only.

## **EMPIRICAL BASES**

Across the numerous proposals and course descriptions, it was evident that a clear consensus did not exist regarding the panel's request for a description of the empirical bases for courses contained within the alternate teacher preparation programs. In the empirical basis section, universities provided philosophical statements, reference to professional standards, references of ethical and philosophical works, and general reference to the work of eminent scholars (e.g., Bruner). Although all of these sources play an important role in preparing teachers, they are not what the panel intended to request. The intent of the section was for proposals to identify those crucial empirical sources that have demonstrated that the educational practices that teacher candidates are learning to use have been demonstrated to be effective. Given the brevity of the proposals, the panel anticipated that proposals would primarily reference major research syntheses (e.g., National Reading Panel's Report) and the major reviews of educational practice (e.g., meta-analyses published in peer reviewed educational journals).

Given the apparent lack of consensus regarding either what constitutes an empirical basis for professional practice or what it was the panel was asking for, the panel chose to give minimal consideration to this section in the current review. The panel hopes that time and resources will be available to clarify this issue prior to submission of proposals in the spring.

## **ASSESSMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM OUTCOMES**

Across a number of proposals, the descriptions of assessment of program outcomes and candidate competencies were primarily descriptions of the artifacts that will be collected. Description of the fuller range of assessment issues was frequently omitted. For example, information including a description of how those artifacts will be evaluated, what the standards or performance goals are, and how the data will be used to make decisions was not commonly provided.

The panel is aware that the absence of information regarding the evaluation of artifacts, goals, and decision making may be more reflective of the space limitations than the university's evaluation plans. This was apparent at times during the interview process. The panel requests that universities submitting redesign proposals for the spring review provide somewhat more detailed and specific descriptions of their assessment plans within courses that include at least a cursory description of the assessment plan beyond what artifacts will be gathered. Similarly, in numerous proposals a clear linkage between the course objectives and the assessment methods was absent. The panel requests that University's submitting proposals for the spring review clarify what assessments will be used to assess each course objective.

## **MASTER'S ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS**

In many instances alternate certification programs that lead to a master's degree did not appear to be uniquely tailored to the needs of alternate certification students. The programs and courses appeared to be more closely aligned with the needs of experienced teachers who would be returning to university study for advanced degrees. The panel's crucial concern in this regard is that individuals with no previous preparation in education who are seeking an alternate pathway into the teaching profession have very different needs from those of experienced educators pursuing advanced studies. Alternate certification candidates need practical preparation that covers a host of basic issues in education, development, pedagogy, management, and assessment.

These basic areas are precisely the areas in which experienced teachers may not need substantial additional preparation. If both groups participate in the same courses, it seems inevitable that the instruction will either be too advanced for the needs of the alternate students or too basic for the needs of the certified teacher who already possesses an education degree.

The panel recommends that universities convene a group of practicing teachers to discuss courses being proposed in the master's degree program in light of the needs of today's teachers. It is further recommended that these teachers work collaboratively with university faculty to tailor courses and opportunities to meet the unique needs of the candidates enrolled in them and to differentiate the design of these programs from traditional master's of education programs.

## **PART IV: PROGRAM REVIEWS**

**CENTENARY COLLEGE**

*Administrator and Coordinator: Dr. Sue Hernandez, Chair, Department of Education*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Master's Degree at 1-6 &amp; 7-12</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>
<i>Non-master's/Certification Only Alternative Pathway</i>	See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The university is working closely with their Professional Development School to provide quality field-based experiences for candidates.</li> <li>2. The university is using three individuals to observe prospective mentors and using a scoring procedure to identify effective mentors.</li> <li>3. Many field-based experiences have been created for candidates within the curriculum.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Grades 1-6</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Candidates are provided instruction in the use of assessment within the reading courses; however, it is not evident where students are exposed to other aspects of diagnostic assessment needed for the areas of language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. <i>Identify objectives to be added to courses that identifies assessment proficiencies that candidates will develop to address assessment for all academic areas. If courses listed for the program do not provide candidates with opportunities to develop this expertise, reexamine the curriculum and determine if more traditional courses (e.g., Theories of Learning, Curriculum. Etc.) could be replaced with a course pertaining to measurement and assessment. Provide a full course description if a different course is used for the grades 1-6 curriculum.</i></li> </ol>

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

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Grades 7-12</i>	<p>2. The proposed program does not appear to have a sufficient amount of methodology courses in the area in which the candidate will become certified to teach. Candidates are required to complete only one 3-hour secondary methods course as part of the proposed curriculum. Although they will complete EDUC 530 (Curriculum) and EDUC 531 (Innovative Curriculum), neither of these courses contain field-based components or provide opportunities to teach in field-based settings. <i>Reexamine the existing grades 7-12 program and determine if more traditional courses (e.g., Philosophy, Theories of Learning, etc.) could be replaced with another methodology course that would address specific methodologies in the content area the candidate will teach. If a change can be made, provide a full course description of the course. If a change cannot be made, identify how the candidate will be able to develop additional expertise to teach in the proposed courses within the program.</i></p>
<i>Both Levels</i>	<p>3. The program does not provide candidates with field-based experiences in different settings. As proposed, candidates complete all of their field-based experiences at one Professional Development School for the grades 1-6 program. Similar plans are being developed for candidates participating in the grades 7-12 program. Candidates should be exposed to diverse groups of students in more than one setting. <i>Identify more than one setting in which students will be able to observe and/or participate in field-based experiences and identify the courses in which that will occur.</i></p> <p>4. In some cases, attributes listed in the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix are not directly aligned with performance objectives within the courses. As an example, EDUC 577, EDUC 581, and EDUC 578 are listed in the matrix but there are no performance objectives listed for the courses. <i>Reexamine the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix and align each attribute with a specific performance objective in at least one course that clearly addresses the attribute.</i></p> <p>5. The Human Growth and Development course for teachers of grades 1-6 and 7-12 covers the full range of development from birth to adolescence. <i>Identify differentiation that will occur in this course to provide grades 1-6 candidates with instruction and assignments that focus on child development and grades 7-12 candidates with instruction and assignments that focus upon adolescent development.</i></p>

### C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Both Levels (Cont'd)</i>	6. Many of the courses within the program appear to be courses that have previously been offered for certified teachers who already have education degrees and are pursuing advanced master's degree in education. However, students enrolling in the alternate certification program will be individuals who have degrees outside of education and have not previously taught in classrooms. If both groups participate in the same courses, there is a concern that the instruction may be too advanced for the needs of the alternate students or too basic for the needs of the certified teacher who already possesses an education degree. <i>Identify any courses that will contain both alternate certification candidates and certified teachers in the same courses and identify how instruction will be provided to meet the basic needs of non-certified individuals who have no previous expertise in teaching and the needs of certified teachers who have a degree in education and are pursuing advanced knowledge.</i>

### D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT

GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION
See Part III: <i>Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

### E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Several of the courses did not have measurable performance objectives that clearly identified teacher proficiencies (e.g., what effective teachers should know or be able to do as a result of the course). For example, no measurable performance objectives were provided for EDUC 577, EDUC 581, or EDUC 578. Within EDUC 532, a course activity (e.g., critique 10 articles related to curriculum innovation) was listed as a proficiency. Reexamine the course descriptions and write measurable performance objectives for courses that currently lack objectives. In addition, rewrite objectives that describe activities instead of proficiencies.</li><li>2. The mathematics, science, social studies, and language arts course descriptions do not clearly identify how candidates will be provided instruction that will be appropriate for their needs as they work with young elementary students (grades 1-3) and instruction that will be more appropriate for students at the lower middle school levels (grades 4-6). When developing course syllabi for these and other courses, clearly identify how the needs of candidates will be addressed for these varying levels.</li></ol>

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT (CONT'D)**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
3. Full implementation of key courses (e.g., Classroom Management) will be dependent upon new hires. The university should examine resources to ensure that the program needs will be met before starting implementation.

**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 ADDRESSSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<i>Master's Degree at 1-6 &amp; 7-12</i>	<b>Meets Certification Requirements</b>

**SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**DILLARD UNIVERSITY**

*Administrator and Coordinator: Dr. Kassie Freeman, Dean,  
Division of Educational and Psychological Studies*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

<b>TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program for Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>
<i>Non-master's/Certification Only Alternative Pathway</i>	See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**B. STRENGTHS**

<b>OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. A variety of different types of school settings were provided for students to engage in field-based experiences.</li><li>2. The program linked information being taught within the university courses to new materials/resources being utilized in the schools.</li><li>3. The university is focusing upon the quality of program completers in a special education program instead of quantity due to the small size of the university.</li></ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The descriptions of the following three courses do not contain the required information specified within the guidelines for course descriptions: ED 492 Teaching Seminar - Fall; ED 492 Teaching Seminar – Spring; and ED 493 Internship. <i>Rewrite the course descriptions for ED 492 – Fall; ED 492 – Spring, and ED 493 Internship and address all of the areas specified for course descriptions within the document: Guidelines for Redesigned Teacher Preparation Program Proposals.</i></li></ol>

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

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
2.	It is not clear what specific resources and materials will be used to teach each course. As an example, the following is stated repeatedly: “Resources and materials will include the use of the university’s library, computer labs, Blackboard, e-mail accounts, and field sites.” No reference is made to specific textbooks and resources that will address content for special needs of students with mild/moderate disabilities, classroom management, behavior management, assessment and evaluation, methods/materials for students with mild/moderate disabilities, and vocational and transition services for students with mild/moderate disabilities. <i>Identify specific resources and materials that will address the content being taught in each of the areas cited.</i>
3.	In some cases, attributes listed in the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix are not directly aligned with performance objectives within the courses. As an example, ED 492 and ED 493 are listed in the matrix but there are no performance objectives listed for the courses. Additionally, the majority of the attributes are addressed in the one nine-hour summer course. <i>Reexamine courses listed in the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix and align each attribute with a specific performance objective in at least one course that clearly addresses the attribute. Determine if some of the attributes might be better addressed in the fall or spring seminars.</i>
4.	A general statement in the “Description of Field Sites and Activities” section indicated that candidates will “observe, tutor and/or implement lesson/behavior/classroom plans” but it is not clear within the description of ED 491 how students will be involved in field-based experiences and what they will be expected to do during those experiences. <i>Provide a more thorough description of the types of field-based experiences that students will participate in during ED 491 and what they will be expected to demonstrate while participating in those experiences.</i>
5.	A complete response was not provided for the section entitled “Assessment System and Program Evaluation.” The assessment of the teacher candidate is different from program evaluation. The program evaluation section needs to focus upon the program and not upon individual students. Information should be provided about type of data to be collected and how it will be analyzed in order to inform overall program content and design. It is not clear how the university will measure success once artifacts are submitted. In addition, it was not clear how faculty will use assessment data to improve the practitioner teacher program. <i>Rewrite the section entitled “Assessment System and Program Evaluation” and address all of the areas specified within the Guidelines for Redesigned Teacher Preparation Program Proposals.</i>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
1. The coursework in methods lacks specific information about effective reading and other academic instructional strategies. Since most of the mild/moderate special education students are referred for problems in reading and language arts, it would strengthen the expertise of candidates in these subject areas.

**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>	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<p><b>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</b></p> <p>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The seminars are not described other than “will address their immediate needs.” There should be some delineation of topics, and the seminars should be treated as one three-hour seminar during the fall and a different three-hour seminar during the spring. In addition, students must complete a three-hour internship.</li> </ol>

**SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**GRAMBLING STATE UNIVERSITY**

*Administrator: Dr. Augusta A. Clark, Interim Dean of Teacher Education  
Coordinator: Mrs. Elaine Foster, Assistant Professor*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 4-8, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<p align="center"><b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b></p> <p><b>Note: A PK-3 program is not an option for the Practitioner Teacher Program.</b></p>

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal integrates assessment pervasively throughout the program in a way that may contribute to both formative and summative evaluation. This integration relies heavily on electronic resources for data keeping and management (e.g., PASS-PORT and <i>Pathwise Assessment Wizard</i>).</li> <li>2. Program evaluation includes assessment of 1-12 student learning gains.</li> <li>3. The program proposes to devote two of its three didactic summer courses to teaching methodology. If done well, this plan could make wise use of limited instructional opportunities.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is not sufficient differentiation in materials and plans to prepare candidates to teach grades 1-12. Materials for the two teaching methods courses (ED 526 and ED 556) were inadequate to cover the range of learner needs and content. For example, no texts devoted specifically or extensively to reading, mathematics, or English/language arts instruction are included. Similarly, the primary content text cited (Eggen &amp; Kauchak, 2001) deals with content instruction at a global level rather than at the</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program</i>	<p>1. (Cont'd)</p> <p>level of specificity necessary to differentially prepare a second grade teacher to teach social studies versus a tenth grade teacher to teach biology. <i>Document specific materials that will be used within each area of certification. The response should be sufficiently detailed that it is clear that the design of these two critical courses is adequate to cover all content areas at all levels of certification offered with enough specificity to prepare candidates to teach these subjects.</i></p> <p>2. The proposed program does not appear to provide adequate content focus in methodology courses. <i>Reexamine course offerings. Cite courses that candidates take to develop instructional expertise in content areas or propose changes in the program to provide this instruction.</i></p> <p>3. The mapping of the LCET planning domain on to ED 535 Special Workshops was confusing to the panel. The content of this workshop rotates and may not have anything to do with planning dependent upon the topic. More globally, the inclusion of a rotating topics course in a teacher practitioner program did not seem to fit with the general design of the fast track approach to preparation. Inclusion of this course means that some candidates will receive preparation in one of the topics such as classroom management, development, or assessment, while others will not. It would appear more appropriate to design a standardized course that would cover core knowledge and skills that all new teachers would possess rather than a rotating topics course in this type of program. <i>Clarify the rationale for including a rotating topics course as one of the three didactic courses in the program. Alternatively, the faculty might choose to consider how to structure the course so that it is consistently designed to address crucial topics that all new teachers will need.</i></p> <p>4. Although the overall plan for field experiences appears adequate on its surface, the courses with field experience components do not state what the time/contact hour expectations associated with these courses are. <i>State the contact hour expectations for each course and document that these expectations are sufficient to meet the state preparation goals of that course. In addition, the panel recommends that faculty describe the field sites that will be employed in conjunction with the summer courses.</i></p>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

**GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

See *Part III: Summary of Findings* for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

**SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

1. Some objectives were not clearly stated nor were they measurable (e.g., “create an environment,” “demonstrate knowledge of and commitment to their students,” or “design coherent instruction”). This global level of specification prevented the panel’s ability to clearly identify where and how candidates’ proficiency with specific course objectives or LCET attributes would be assessed. In future proposals provide a specific plan that includes criteria for success to assess students’ proficiencies.
2. Future proposals can be greatly strengthened by providing greater specificity in the program evaluation measures. For example, in two instances, the description references assessment of student learning gains, a crucial program outcome. However, the proposal did not clarify how specific learning gains will be measured. Also, applying a planned systematic collection of data relevant to learning gains rather than anecdotal evidence would strengthen this section.
3. Given the pervasive importance of the *Pathwise* materials to the proposal, provision of an appendix that briefly describes these materials would have been helpful. It would have been particularly helpful to have more information about the measures, how the materials are aligned with the research literature on effective instruction, and the extent to which it is consistent with LCET.
4. The domains in which the program is planning to assess potential mentor teachers are excellent and comprehensive. Future proposals would be strengthened if the description clarified how potential mentor teachers will be assessed in these domains.

**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><i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 4-8, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i></p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</b></p> <p>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Describe seminars and content to be included for the six hours credit total;</li> <li>2. Limit the Internship to 3 semester hours, only ONCE;</li> <li>3. Summer coursework must be specific to grade levels offered in the program, with differentiation for content areas.</li> </ol> <p>In addition, Grambling proposed offering a PK-3 Practitioner Teacher Program, but this certification level cannot be offered through a Practitioner Teacher Program.</p>

**SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

## LOUISIANA COLLEGE

*Administrator and Coordinator: Dr. Joe W. Aguillard, Chair, Division of Education*

### SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION

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

#### A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>

#### B. STRENGTHS

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The faculty demonstrates a great deal of commitment and devotion towards the Practitioner Teacher Program and the preparation of quality teachers.</li><li>2. An effective use of school-based materials and experts in the field are evident within this program to address practical needs of teachers within schools.</li><li>3. The program evaluation system that is already being used with the Pilot Practitioner Teacher Program to being used to improve the quality of the proposed Practitioner Teacher Program.</li></ol>

#### C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. A clear differentiation does not exist between the grades 1-6, 7-12, and special education practitioner teacher programs. As an example, the same course objectives, assessments, resources, and faculty are listed within all three courses for all three programs. The nine-hour summer course entitled The Professional Teacher does include additional objectives and additional resources for special education practitioner teachers; however, the practitioner teachers are still expected to meet all of the same objectives as the grades 1-6 and 7-12 teachers and use the same resources. It is not clear how a special education practitioner teacher will be able to acquire all of the specialized knowledge necessary to teach mild/moderate special education and all of the same objectives listed for grades 1-6 and 7-12. It was also not clear how some of the resources listed (e.g., Play Dough) would be relevant for all grade level</li></ol>

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

#### STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

1. (Cont'd)

programs (e.g., grades 7-12). During the interview it was stated that practitioner teachers complete specific modules as a total group and break into smaller groups to address content specific needs. In addition, it was stated that experts from the field are used to provide instruction in specialized areas. However, that was not specified in the written program description. *For each of the three programs and courses within the programs, identify the process and structure that is used within each course to provide practitioner teachers with the necessary instruction to teach effectively at the varying grade levels in the specialized content areas (e.g., Elementary, English, Science, Social Studies, Mathematics, Special Education, etc.). Identify the types of content specific texts, resources, and materials that are used when practitioner teachers meet as smaller groups in their specialized areas.*

2. It appeared that practitioner teachers were not being exposed to field-based experiences that were appropriate for the grade levels that they would be teaching. As an example, the proposal indicated that grades 1-6 practitioner teachers were being provided field-based experiences in 8<sup>th</sup> grade LEAP remediation classes and an internship in a secondary classroom setting. It was unclear regarding the field-based experiences for special education students. It appeared that they would be working with special education students but under the direction of regular classroom teachers instead of special education teachers. A description of an internship for secondary practitioner teachers was provided in the proposal instead of a description of an internship for special education practitioner teachers. *Reexamine information within course descriptions for all field-based experiences for practitioner teachers of grades 1-6, 7-12, and Special Education and rewrite them to reflect the field-based needs of the grades 1-6, 7-12, and Special Education practitioner teachers participating in the program. In addition, provide more information pertaining to the types of teaching experiences that they will have while participating in ED 470A, ED470B, and ED470C.*

3. Due to the fact that the seminars during the Fall and Spring semesters should serve a different purpose than the internship, the assessments for the two seminars should be different than the assessment for the internship. Yet, the assessment in the proposal for the internship is the same as the assessment for the two seminars. Also, it did not appear that observations were identified as a form of assessment for the internship. *Reexamine the assessment for the seminars and internship and either write new assessments for the seminars and use the seminar assessments for the internship or write new assessments for the internship. In addition, include observation of the practitioner teachers as part of the assessment for the internship.*

## D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
--

See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.
--

## E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
---

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Specify within the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix what course will address the creation of an IEP.</li><li>2. Although this was discussed during the interview, the program description does not clearly indicate that students are being exposed to a balanced reading approach or that the university is using Louisiana's literacy guidelines or empirical research from the National Reading Panel. Although this was discussed during the interview, the use of a balanced reading approach needs to be reflected within the course descriptions. Identify objectives/statements to be added to a course description that clearly indicates that students will be exposed to a balanced reading approach.</li><li>3. Since the program uses guest speakers and outside experts to teach courses, the university needs to provide a set of competencies that all students achieve – no matter who is invited to be the guest speaker or outside expert. This will be essential to provide consistency of quality and assurances that just because a different person serves as a speaker, students will still achieve the proficiency.</li><li>4. Strengthen faculty connections to disciplines (e.g., mathematics, science, etc.) and related resources (e.g., math education expertise around the state). The existing faculty demonstrate a great deal of devotion toward the program. However, the proposed program could weaken rapidly if faculty devotion to the program diminishes in the future.</li><li>5. Identify ways in which gains in K-12 student achievement can be measured when conducting program evaluation.</li><li>6. Clearly identify the process that will be used to screen and train individuals who will serve as mentors for practitioner teachers.</li></ol> |
|--|

**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>	
<i>PractitionerTeacher Program at 1-6, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Meets Certification Requirements</b>

**SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY—BATON ROUGE**

*Administrator: Dr. Robert C. Lafayette, Professor and Chair, College of Education  
Coordinator: Dr. Nancy Nelson, LeBlanc Professor of Education*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Master's Degree at 7-12</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval</b>

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Candidates maintain a portfolio throughout the program.</li> <li>2. Proposed resources and materials are good.</li> <li>3. Field work is embedded across courses. Cohorts appear to be a solid “learning community” of high quality students who matriculate through the program in large and small cohorts.</li> <li>4. Students are involved in classroom settings at the beginning of the school district’s academic year instead of the university’s academic year.</li> <li>5. The proposal contains an excellent description of specific field sites and activities.</li> <li>6. The program involves students in a full practicum experience during the fall semester and a different practicum experience during the spring semester. The program requires candidates to be in the field on a daily basis throughout the semester.</li> <li>7. Students are provided fellowships with the stipulation that they teach in Louisiana schools for two years once they complete their programs.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Master's Program</i>	<b>No Stipulations.</b>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
1. Panelists were unclear about the preparation of candidates in the area of classroom management. References are included throughout the document about classroom or behavior management, but no in depth learning in this area was evident. In future proposals, expand descriptions of candidates' preparation in the area of classroom management.
2. The assessment portion of some courses needs to be more specifically linked to the LCET components. Attributes listed in the MATRIX should be assessed in terms of actual teaching performance to ensure that candidates are as well prepared in understanding theoretical aspects of teaching as demonstrating application of concepts.

**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 ADDRESSSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<i>Master's Degree at 7-12</i>	<b>Meets Certification Requirements</b>

**SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY—SHREVEPORT**

*Administrator and Coordinator: Dr. David Gustavson, Chair, Department of Education*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

<b>TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Non-master's/Certification Only Alternative Pathway at 1-6, 7-12, and Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<i>See Part III: Summary of Findings for Comments</i>

**B. STRENGTHS**

<b>OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)</b>
1. Materials have been identified to assist the university in developing an assessment system to measure student performance. 2. The program proposes the creation of a Professional Development School that will focus on improved learning of at-risk students.

**C. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<i>See Part III: Summary of Findings for comments.</i>

**SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY

Administrator: Dr. Jo Ann Dauzat, Dean, College of Education  
Coordinator: Dr. David Gullatt, Chair, Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Leadership

SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION

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

A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Master’s Degree at PK-3, 1-6, 4-8, 7-12, and Mild/Moderate Special Education, Teaching Blind Students</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b> Note: Teaching Blind Students cannot be submitted at this time.
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 4-8, &amp; 7-12</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>
<i>Non-master’s/Certification Only Alternative Pathway</i>	See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments

B. STRENGTHS

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is generally a good range of objectives that are usually nicely tied to LCET.</li> <li>2. There is a very good description and rationale for the master’s degree program. The document is well conceived and designed.</li> </ol>

### C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preparation in classroom management appears weak. For example, the objectives provided for EDCI 430 (offered during the fall) states that candidates will “develop proficiency in classroom management through practice, feedback, and mentoring strategies appropriate to the school setting.” It is not evident where the summer coursework prepares candidates to do this. <i>Please describe how the program prepares candidates with this expertise or revise the program to include significant instruction in this area</i></li> <li>2. One of the field experiences listed on page 14 states that candidates will “analyze standardized test data.” It was not evident where this preparation will occur. <i>Please provide this information.</i></li> </ol>
<i>Both Programs</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The meaning of “proposed resources and materials” was apparently misunderstood. The guidelines were referring to materials that were being proposed for use in the course rather than those “needed” for the course. <i>Please reexamine all course descriptions and provide examples of specific resources and materials that will be used to support instruction in courses.</i></li> <li>4. The differentiation of coursework for the various levels of certification is not evident. For example, EDCI 438, Instructional Design, Strategies, and Assessment, is proposed for all levels of certification; however, reference to differentiation appears only in the Field Experiences section, which states that candidates will participate in “classrooms in the grade levels in which they are seeking certification.” <i>Please provide more detailed information about the differentiation of coursework to ensure that candidates will be prepared to teach at all levels of certification.</i></li> <li>5. Methodology courses do not appear to be content-focused with regard to instructional strategies. For example, the literacy/reading courses, EDCI 431 (p. 22), EDCI 403 (p. 23), EDCI 437 (p.28), and EDCI 420 (p. 35) do not appear to teach much actual reading instruction. EDCI 420 proposes to teach students to “support reading instruction.” In addition, the courses do not appear to be consistent with the Louisiana Literacy Standards, which includes the Report of the National Reading Panel that emphasizes that teachers must know a wide range of skills—both constructivist/whole language and explicit instruction. These courses do not have sufficient assessment of teacher instructional behavior. <i>Please describe how these courses will provide significant instruction in content-focused methodologies and instruction on actual teaching or rewrite existing course descriptions to address these areas.</i></li> </ol>

#### **D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
--

See *Part III: Summary of Findings* for comments.

#### **E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
---

1. Several courses are stated as constructivist and inquiry-based in orientation (e.g., EDCI 438). Including a particular approach as part of a course is very justifiable, however, no one approach adequately prepares students to perform all that is required (e.g., assessment, planning design, and instruction in all subjects for all learners). For future proposals revise courses that are oriented around a single approach to teach students (1) that there are other approaches that address the same subjects, (2) how to use other approaches as needed, and (3) about the larger framework within which different approaches may be viewed as elements.
2. While the description of field sites is very good, more information on the description of activities as well as screening and training of mentors would have been helpful.
3. The assessment section states that “LCET score data” will be used. Panelists were unsure of the meaning of this information.
4. In general, there is little assessment of practical (teaching) knowledge. Ensure that all objectives that can be translated into performances are so translated, with as many of these as possible assessed as performances (e.g., actual teaching).

## 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><i>Master's Degree at PK-3, 1-6, 4-8, 7-12, and Mild/Moderate Special Education, Teaching Blind Students</i></p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</b></p> <p>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The program, "Teaching Blind Students," may not be submitted until Special Education redesign is addressed.</li> <li>2. Classroom management must be specific to grade levels of the certification area. For M/M, classroom management should address the needs of students in grades 1-12.</li> <li>3. The psychology requirement is Child or Adolescent, not Educational Psychology. If included in Educational Psychology, this must be reflected in the course narrative.</li> <li>4. In the M/M proposal, the Internship/Practicum shown as four hours must be a <b>minimum</b> of six-hours.</li> </ol>
<p><i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 4-8, &amp; 7-12</i></p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</b></p> <p>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seminars must be assigned three credit hours each.</li> <li>2. A narrative description of seminars is needed.</li> <li>3. The internship must be assigned three credit hours only once.</li> <li>4. Summer courses must be specific to grade levels of certification area. Differentiation must be clearly shown for the different certification level programs.</li> <li>5. The program allows for GENERIC certification ONLY at the middle school (4-8) level. Once certified, the candidate could add specialty area endorsements through PRAXIS or coursework.</li> <li>6. The psychology requirement is Child or Adolescent, not Educational Psychology. If included in Educational Psychology, this must be reflected in the course narrative.</li> </ol>

### **SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**LOYOLA UNIVERSITY**

*Administrator and Coordinator: Dr. Kevin Fall, Chairperson  
Division of Education and Counseling*

**SECTION 1: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

**External consultants examined the overall quality of the proposed programs and developed the following section.**

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Master's Degree at 1-6 &amp; 7-12</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>
<i>Non-master's/Certification Only Alternative Pathway</i>	See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A comprehensive evaluation process exists to examine the effectiveness of the teacher preparation program.</li> <li>2. The institution requires graduates of teacher preparation programs who leave the state to send their school evaluation forms to the institution for program evaluation purposes.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Master's Degree (Grades 1-6)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Courses within the program do not appear to provide teachers with the necessary instructional expertise to teach social studies, science, and language arts. As an example, candidates must complete two methodology courses in reading and one in mathematics; however, they are not exposed to any methodology courses for language arts, science, or social studies. <i>Reexamine the course offerings and provide descriptions of courses that candidates must take that will allow them to develop instructional expertise in the areas of language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, etc. that are</i></li> </ol>

### C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Master's Degree (Grades 1-6)</i>	<p>1. (Cont'd)</p> <p><i>important when instructing elementary students. If necessary, consider replacing traditional education courses (e.g., Philosophy of Education, Statistics, Educational Research, etc.) with courses pertaining to instructional strategies.</i></p>
<i>Master's Degree (Grades 7-12)</i>	<p>2. It is unclear when candidates will be exposed to instructional techniques that are appropriate for the content area they will be teaching. As an example, candidates working toward certification in biology/chemistry/physics need to be exposed to instructional techniques that are different than candidates working toward certification in English. Candidates complete EDGR A770 Instructional Design; however, this course does not appear to address instructional methodology that would be specific to content areas being taught. <i>Identify how students will possess the necessary knowledge and field-based experience to demonstrate expertise in selecting and using appropriate instructional techniques to teach the content area in which they will become certified to teach. If opportunities do not exist in the proposed curriculum, identify what course/courses will be added to enable students to develop this expertise. Provide complete descriptions of any new courses.</i></p>
<i>Both Programs</i>	<p>3. The descriptions of the following two courses do not contain the required information specified within the guidelines for course descriptions: EDGR 870 Practicum General and EDGR A886 Internship. In particular, performance-based objectives and assessments have not been identified for the two courses. <i>Rewrite the course descriptions for EDGR A870 and EDGR A886 and address all of the areas specified for course descriptions within the document: Guidelines for Redesigned Teacher Preparation Program Proposals.</i></p> <p>4. Students participating in the Master's Degree program developed for teachers of grades 1-6 are required to take 10 courses that are the same courses as those taken by teachers of grades 7-12. However, the course descriptions do not clearly differentiate how course content will differ to address the varying developmental needs of students in elementary grades as compared to secondary grades. Classroom management approaches appropriate for a teacher of twelfth grade students would vary significantly from approaches appropriate for a teacher of first grade students. <i>Prepare documentation to specify how each course will be differentiated to address the varying needs of teachers of grades 1-6 and teachers of grades 7-12.</i></p>

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

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<p><i>Both Programs (Cont'd)</i></p>	<p>5. Within the course descriptions and in the section pertaining to Field-Based Placements, it is not clear when the Directed Observation course will be taken or how the course content will relate to other courses taken within the program. In addition, it is not clear when candidates will be provided feedback from supervisors/mentors about their teaching during field-based experiences prior to the practicum/internship. <i>Prepare documentation to clearly identify how field-based teaching experiences are provided for students throughout the program to allow them to demonstrate teaching expertise prior to their internship/practicum. If additional courses pertaining to instructional strategies for science, social studies, language arts, etc. are added, identify how students will be exposed to field-based experiences in those courses.</i></p> <p>6. It is not clear what specific resources and materials will be used to teach each course. As an example, the same six-line general statement is used for all courses to describe resources and materials, and it is unclear how resources/materials for the reading courses will differ from resources/materials for the mathematics course. <i>Identify specific resources and materials that will address the content being taught in each of the courses.</i></p> <p>7. In some cases, attributes listed in the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix are not directly aligned with performance objectives within the courses. As an example, EDGR A870 and EDGR A886 are listed in the matrix but there are no performance objectives listed for the courses. <i>Reexamine courses listed in the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix and align each attribute with a specific performance objective in at least one course that clearly addresses the attribute.</i></p>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<p>See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.</p>

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>	
1.	The reading and mathematics course descriptions do not clearly identify how candidates will be provided instruction that will be appropriate for their needs as they work with young elementary students (grades 1-3) and instruction that will be more appropriate for students at the lower middle school levels (grades 4-6). When developing course syllabi for these and other courses, clearly identify how the needs of candidates will be addressed for these varying levels.
2.	Many of the courses listed (e.g., Advanced Child Psychology; Advanced Educational Psychology, Graduate Methods of Mathematics Teaching, etc.) appear to be courses that have previously been offered for certified teachers who already have education degrees and are pursuing advanced master’s degree in education. However, students enrolling in the alternate certification program will be individuals who have degrees outside of education and have not previously taught in classrooms. If both groups participate in the same courses, there is a concern that the instruction may be too advanced for the needs of the alternate students or too basic for the needs of the certified teacher who already possesses an education degree. Identify any courses that will contain both alternate certification candidates and certified teachers in the same courses and identify how instruction will be provided to meet the basic needs of non-certified individuals who have no previous expertise in teaching and the needs of certified teachers who have a degree in education and are pursuing advanced knowledge.

**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 ADDRESSSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<i>Master’s Degree at 1-6 &amp; 7-12</i>	<b>Meets Certification Requirements</b>

**SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**McNEESE STATE UNIVERSITY**

*Administrator and Coordinator: Dr. Phyllis Cuevas, Head, Department of Teacher Education*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Master's Degree Program at 1-6, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The program includes early and continuing field experiences across courses.</li> <li>2. Three complete handbooks have been developed that provide extensive information for candidates, student teachers, and cooperating teachers.</li> <li>3. Considerable attention has been devoted to assure that candidates in all three levels are prepared to teach reading.</li> <li>4. The process for selecting, preparing, and supporting mentor teachers is well developed.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Master's Degree Program</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The section regarding assessment procedures is missing for all courses. <i>A response should be submitted that clarifies how candidates' competencies will be assessed including the objective that is being assessed and the criteria that will be established for acceptable performance.</i></li> <li>2. Materials and objectives for teaching subjects other than reading are only modestly documented in the special education and 7-12 programs. For example, the Special Education certification program contains no materials that are specific to teaching mathematics, English/language arts, social studies, or science. A similar concern is evident in the 7-12 program for which it is unclear that the breadth of teaching methods needed to cover subjects as diverse as literature, biology, and mathematics is provided to students. A single teaching strategies seminar (EDC 678) using a single textbook appears to attempt to cover the full range of teaching methods.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Master's Degree Program</i>	<p>3. (Cont'd)</p> <p>This text does not include any chapters that are devoted to specific instructional issues in any content area. <i>Provide specific documentation regarding program elements that are in place to assure that special educators and 7-12 educators exiting this program are prepared to teach across the range of materials and subjects within their areas of certification.</i></p> <p>4. Course descriptions do not clearly differentiate how content in classroom management will differ to address the varying certification levels. Classroom management in twelfth grade classes differs greatly from that in first grade classes. <i>Prepare documentation that specifies how courses involving classroom management will address the varying needs of teachers in all certification levels.</i></p> <p>5. The mapping of the LCET attributes on to the courses is ambiguously developed. For example, all of the classroom management attributes will be assessed in one of the courses (SPED 576) across all three levels of certification. Unfortunately, that course contains only a ten-hour field component and appears to emphasize early acquisition of skills rather than performance of them. Similarly, the planning and instruction components appear to be assessed exclusively in methods courses in which students will teach a total of two lessons in each class. Across the courses through student teaching and internship a series of field-based learning experiences in which candidates can develop LCET attributes is described. <i>Field experiences should begin early and continue throughout the candidates' program and include assessment of actual teaching behaviors. If the program does provide significant preparation in the field with assessment on actual teaching, please describe. If not, please revise the design.</i></p>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<p>1. Course objectives across all three levels were primarily knowledge level objectives rather than skill or performance oriented. In some instances a course was identified as the context for attributes within an LCET domain, but contained no clear objectives that specified performance of the skills contained within that domain. For future proposals, prepare documentation for the specific performance or skill-based objectives in courses in which LCET objectives are assessed. Additionally, it may be helpful to specify the objectives that will be assessed in student teaching and internship as these may be key occasions in which the LCET competencies will be assessed.</p> <p>2. Many course objectives were stated as activities that would be completed rather than competencies that would be acquired. For example, the fifth objective on page 13 describes an activity that candidates will participate in rather than something they will learn. Some objectives are stated in a manner for which it would be difficult to devise an objective assessment (e.g., “Sensitivity to human needs and social problems,” page 36).</p> <p>3. For courses that are didactic in nature and contain no field experience component, briefly linking the field experiences to specific skills that candidates are to develop in the course would strengthen the proposal.</p> <p>4. Providing greater specificity could strengthen the program evaluation description. The program evaluation section does not clearly describe measurement of the impact of the program’s primary product—new teachers—on schools. Assessment of the candidates’ or new graduates efficacy in teaching does not appear to be assessed. Providing somewhat greater specificity of the plan would be helpful (e.g., what will be assessed in the alumni and employer survey and when will these data be collected).</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 ADDRESSSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<i>Master’s Degree Program at 1-6, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Meets Certification Requirements</b>

### **SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**NICHOLLS STATE UNIVERSITY**

*Administrator and Coordinator: Dr. Pat Caillouett, Associate Dean, College of Education*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 4-8, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>
<i>Non-master's/Certification Only Alternative Pathway</i>	<i>See Part III: Summary of Findings for comments</i>

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal is well conceived and precise in its presentation.</li> <li>2. The program includes assessment of teaching by direct observation by university faculty on multiple occasions.</li> <li>3. Field experiences occur early and continue throughout the program. Field training procedures are carefully described and appear to meet the program's training mission.</li> <li>4. The proposal includes consideration of student achievement as it relates to teacher candidates' preparation and program efficacy.</li> <li>5. LCET Domains, as well as other standards for professional practice, are clearly and pervasively integrated throughout the training program.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Throughout the proposal the description of the materials or resources that will be used to teach the courses are vague or absent. For example, PSYC 206 on page 18 does not describe materials such as books, manuals, software, videos, or other instructional aides that will be used to teach the course. The panel appreciates that for some of the seminars in which courses are team taught with district personnel that the materials will not be entirely static. <i>Please provide, at a minimum, core resources and materials that will be constant across cohorts and/or representative materials that will be used.</i></li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program</i>	<p>2. Program faculty should examine the adequacy of candidates' preparation to teach across diverse subject areas. Reliance on a single three-hour course followed by the internship places a high demand on the training program for efficient delivery of content-related methodology courses to assure that candidates are prepared across diverse content areas. The panel appreciates that this is the nature of the practitioner program design, but the minimal information that is provided concerning resources and materials raised this as an additional area of concern. <i>Reexamine course offerings with regard to a focus on content-related methodologies. If adequate preparation is provided through coursework and resources and materials, please describe where this occurs. If additional preparation is needed, describe where it could be included.</i></p>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<p>See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.</p>

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Describing who participates in the curriculum review process and how often this occurs could strengthen future proposals.</li> <li>2. Future proposals could be strengthened by more clearly linking assessments to specific objectives where possible.</li> </ol>

## 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.

AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 4-8, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Meets Certification Requirements</b>

## SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**NORTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA**

*Administrator: Dr. John Tollett, Dean, College of Education  
Coordinator: Dr. Linda Roach, Teacher Education Center*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
1. <i>Master's Degree Program at 1-6, 4-8, &amp; 7-12</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>
2. <i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 4-8, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>
3. <i>Non-master's/Certification Only Alternative</i>	See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Program revisions are thoughtful and well done.</li> <li>2. The document provides a good description of sites and sequences of objectives and experiences in the field as candidates move from observation to application. There is a very nice plan and description of intern and mentor training.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Both Programs</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Courses proposed for the program appear to neglect (1) teaching methodology that focuses on subject matter content and (2) classroom management. <i>Reexamine course offerings and either identify courses in the program that prepare teachers with expertise in teaching methodologies that focus on subject matter content and classroom management or rewrite the existing course descriptions to clearly identify performance-based objectives that address these areas.</i></li> <li>2. Panelists are concerned that there are not enough opportunities for actually teaching reading, mathematics, and science and strongly recommend</li> </ol>

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

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Both Programs (Cont'd)</i>	<p>2. re-examining all programs. Perhaps this learning is embedded in other courses. <i>If these courses do give significant instruction on actual teaching, please describe. If not, please add this instruction.</i></p> <p>3. The statement at the end of each course description declaring that activities and assignments “will be tailored to the content area/grade level for which certification is being sought” provides insufficient information as to how this will be accomplished. <i>Please provide more specifics regarding differentiation of courses for candidates seeking certification at various grade levels.</i></p>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<p>1. There is generally a very good range of objectives and these objectives are usually nicely tied to LCET; however, in future proposals, please examine courses to determine where objectives can be stated as a performance. Assessments should have more concrete opportunities for determining candidates’ progress on the components. If this is being done, please provide a more detailed description.</p> <p>2. Readings sometimes seem inadequate for coverage of objectives. Some courses (EDUC 5600, EDUC 5610, EDUC 5640, and EDUC 5630) use the same text, Schmaltz, K., &amp; Moliterno, A. (2001). Examine readings proposed for these courses to ensure that they are appropriate for the objectives of the course.</p> <p>3. Unless they are already doing so, training for mentors and supervisors should have a clear focus on LCET at the level of details. For example, rather than including a broad statement such as “demonstrates ability to communicate effectively with students,” provide details of such things as starting lessons, presenting examples, correcting errors, and reviewing.</p>

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
4. Program staff are to be congratulated for providing activities in field experiences that are moving closer to performance based assessments. To strengthen future proposals, provide samples of instruments for observing and coaching.

**SECTION II. CERTIFICATION**

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>	
<i>Master's Degree Program at 1-6, 4-8, &amp; 7-12</i>	<p><b>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</b></p> <p>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Degree plans should clearly differentiate grade levels for the certification areas being treated in the program.</li> <li>2. Only nine hours are clearly specific to Learner and the Learning Environment and only six hours for Methodology and Teaching. There must be some specification about where the 12 hours of foundation coursework (research, philosophy, and statistics) fit into the required structure.</li> </ol>
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 4-8, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<p><b>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</b></p> <p>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the regular education programs (1-6, 4-8, 7-12) course descriptions should clearly differentiate grade levels for the certification area. Would seminar courses ever pull students together face-to-face for support as called for in the spirit of the program?</li> <li>2. Course narratives in the M/M section do not indicate provision of vocational and transition services for students with disabilities. Classroom/behavior management should be geared to students across all grade levels, 1-12.</li> </ol>

### **SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**OUR LADY OF HOLY CROSS COLLEGE**

*Administrator and Coordinator: Dr. Judy Miranti, Dean  
Division of Humanities, Education, & Counseling*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Master's Degree at 1-6 and 7-12</i>	<b>Not Recommended for Approval</b>
<i>Non-master's/Certification Only Alternative Pathway</i>	See Part III: <i>Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**B. STRENGTHS**

<b>OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. University students are expected to develop a professional improvement plan that extends beyond the point that they graduate from the teacher preparation program.</li> <li>2. Authentic collaboration is occurring between and among faculty teaching education courses and arts/sciences course.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students participating in the master's degree program developed for teachers of grades 1-6 are required to take 8 out of 9 courses (e.g., MAT 600, MAT 601, MAT 602, MAT 603, MAT 604/605, MAT 606/607, MAT 610/611, MAT 700) that have the same course descriptions as those taken by teachers of grades 7-12. The course descriptions do not clearly differentiate how course content will differ to address the varying developmental and educational needs of students in grades 1-6 as compared to students in grades 7-12. Classroom management approaches appropriate for a teacher of twelfth grade students would vary significantly from approaches appropriate for a teacher of first grade students. <i>Prepare documentation to specify how each course will be differentiated to address the varying needs of teachers of grades 1-6 and teachers of grades 7-12.</i></li> </ol>

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

#### STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

2. The Human Growth and Development course for teachers of grades 1-6 and 7-12 covers the full range of development from birth to adolescence. There does not appear to be a connection between what happens in schools and the course. *Identify differentiation that will occur in this course to provide grades 1-6 candidates with instruction that focuses on child development that will be differentiated from instruction provided for 7-12 candidates that focuses to a greater extent upon adolescent development. In addition, clearly indicate how this course connects to teaching within schools.*
3. The same textbooks and resources are used for candidates participating in 8 of the 9 courses in their programs despite the fact that some candidates are completing programs to be certified for grades 1-6 and others are completing programs to be certified in grades 7-12. As an example, students in MAT 604 (Elementary Curriculum) and MAT 605 (Secondary Curriculum) use the same textbooks (e.g., *Effective Teaching Strategies*) despite the fact that differences exist in the type of curriculum needed for students in grades 1-6 when compared to student in grades 7-12. Another example is the use of the textbook *Instructional Design* to teach both MAT 606 (Elementary School Instructional Techniques) and MAT 607 (Secondary School Instructional Techniques). Other than observing in different types of school settings, information taught in the courses appear to be identical. *Identify specific resources and materials that will address the content being taught in each of the courses.*
4. The Elementary Instructional Methodologies (MAT 610) and Secondary Instructional Methodologies (MAT 611) courses are six-hour courses that does not use role play, simulations, video tapes to instruct, assessment of students, or practice teaching in field-based settings. Limited opportunities are provided for candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the use of instructional methodologies. In addition, the experiences provided for teachers of grades 1-6 are the same as experiences provided for teachers of grades 7-12. *Reexamine the courses and identify ways to strengthen the courses and allow teachers to demonstrate proficiency within field-based settings.*
5. Candidates within the program appear to have limited opportunities to participate in field-based experiences that require them to teach students. The majority of the field-based experiences (e.g., MAT 603, MAT 604, and MAT 606/607) prior to the internship require candidates to observe in classrooms. Only one course (e.g., MAT 609 Teaching Reading in the Content Area: Advanced) for secondary majors requires candidates to work with students. It is unclear how candidates will receive feedback about their teaching prior to the internship. *Provide more specific information about the field-based experiences within courses and identify specific teaching skills that candidates will demonstrate prior to the point of the internship.*

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

#### STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

6. The Elementary Instructional Methodologies (MAT 610) and Secondary Instructional Methodologies (MAT 611) courses appear to be where candidates learn varying types of instructional methodologies that are appropriate for specific content areas. However, it appears that one professor will be teaching both elementary and secondary methodologies for all content areas (e.g., language arts, mathematics, social studies, biology, physics, chemistry, etc.). Few professors possess such a comprehensive understanding of methodologies for so many different content areas at both the grades 1-6 and 7-12 levels. Six hours of the Secondary Instructional Methodologies course might be appropriate for teachers of grades 7-12 who are learning appropriate methodologies for middle school and high school in a specific content area (e.g., English). However, the existing structure does not appear to be a solid one for grades 1-6 where candidates need to develop an understanding of varying methodologies that are unique to a wider range of content areas (e.g., mathematics, science, social studies, reading, language arts, etc.) being taught. *Reexamine the instructional methodologies course and identify ways to make the courses stronger to address the varying grade levels and varying content areas that will have to be taught. If a decision is made to offer different courses, provide a complete course description of the new courses.*
7. The description of MAT 700 Student Teaching/Internship (Elementary) indicates that candidates will be provided opportunities to teach full-time in the middle, junior high, or secondary school setting. In addition, the assessment does not indicate that the candidate will be observed and provided feedback about their teaching performance by a supervising teacher. *Provide a description that indicates that grades 1-6 candidates will teach full time within grades 1-6. In addition, indicate that interns will be observed and provided feedback about their teaching. If observations will not occur, identify how interns will be provided constructive feedback to improve their teaching in the classroom.*
8. In many cases, attributes listed in the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix are not directly aligned with performance objectives within the courses. As an example, the attribute “The teacher plans effectively for instruction.” is aligned with MAT 601 (Foundations of Multicultural Education/Advanced); however, this attribute is not addressed in any of the objectives listed for the course. Many of the course objectives are not measurable performance objectives that can be demonstrated by the candidate. *Reexamine courses listed in the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix and align each attribute with a specific performance objective in at least one course that clearly addresses the attribute. Rewrite existing objectives if they are not performance objectives that cannot be demonstrated by candidates.*
9. The proposal indicates that candidates will identify the schools and teachers that they will observe for field-based experiences. Since observation is the primary activity for most of the field-based experiences, it is important for candidates to observe effective teachers. *Identify a process that will be used to identify effective teachers for observations in field-based settings.*

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The program description indicates that a candidate must enroll as a full-time student for at least one semester prior to graduation. Since teachers are employed during the school year, it is assumed that full-time enrollment in the summer would meet the requirement. If this is true, teachers need to be informed. If this is not true, it may be necessary to reconsider this policy since it may be difficult for candidates to leave their positions for one semester during their first three years of teaching.</li> <li>2. The recommendations of the National Reading Panel should to be incorporated into the reading courses.</li> <li>3. Many of the courses listed (e.g., Foundations of Multicultural Education/Advanced, Classroom Management/Advanced, Methodologies in Reading/Advanced, etc.) appear to be courses that have previously been offered for certified teachers who already have education degrees and are pursuing advanced master’s degrees in education. However, students enrolling in the alternate certification program will be individuals who have degrees outside of education and have not previously taught in classrooms. If both groups participate in the same courses, there is a concern that the instruction may be too advanced for the needs of the alternate students or too basic for the needs of the certified teacher who already possesses an education degree. Identify any courses that will contain both alternate certification candidates and certified teachers in the same courses and identify how instruction will be provided to meet the basic needs of non-certified individuals who have no previous expertise in teaching and the needs of certified teachers who have a degree in education and are pursuing advanced knowledge.</li> </ol>

**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 MUYST BE ADDRESSSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<i>Master’s Degree at 1-6 and 7-12</i>	<b>Meets Certification Requirements</b>

### **SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY**

*Administrator and Coordinator: Dr. Martha Head, Interim Dean, College of Education*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Master's Degree for 1-6, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The evaluation instrument for student teaching is built around the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching.</li> <li>2. The creation of a dual program that integrates regular education and special education offers an innovative approach to the redesign of teacher preparation programs.</li> <li>3. Opportunities are built into the program to monitor student progress.</li> </ol>

**D. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

<i>Master's Degree</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Course descriptions do not include specific examples of proposed resources and materials. The generic statement on page 8, "For all courses, proposed resources and materials will be the required texts and other materials as determined by the instructors" is insufficient. Without specific information, it is difficult to evaluate whether candidates will be adequately prepared in areas such as (a) teaching methodologies focused on subject-matter content and (b) appropriate classroom management. <i>Please provide representative samples of proposed resources and materials for each course.</i></li> <li>2. Although dual certification appears to be a strength of the program, there are special considerations associated with novel approaches to redesign. In the context of dual certification for Elementary and Special Education, many courses blend the two areas, but do not</li> </ol>
------------------------	---

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

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Master's Degree (Cont'd)</i>	<p>2. (Cont'd)</p> <p>make adequate distinctions (within courses) between appropriate methods that apply uniquely to each area. Because the track is dual certification does not necessarily mean that there are no distinctions between regular and special education pedagogy. For example, there are no recent textbooks cited in learning disabilities, nor are there any solid references that specifically cover legal/ethical issues in special education. <i>Please describe how elementary and special education will be differentiated in this program.</i></p> <p>3. MAT 622 is prominently listed in the LCET matrix, however the course does not appear to provide actual opportunities for students to manage a class according to the competencies shown in the matrix. <i>Please describe if and when this occurs. If this component needs to be stronger, please revise the current plan.</i></p> <p>4. For MAT 631 (Assessment II: Elementary and Special Education), the course description states that standardized tests will be covered in addition to other forms of assessment. However, there are no texts or field experiences listed that give students exposure or experience with administering or interpreting scores from formal standardized tests. The references are heavily oriented towards portfolio assessment. How does MAT 630 (Assessment I: General and Special Education) differ from MAT 631? <i>Please provide a more explicit rationale for the differences. Additionally, the assessment portion of some courses needs to be more specifically linked to the LCET components. It is not always clear that all of the attributes listed in the MATRIX for each course are clearly being assessed in the courses in terms of actual teaching performance.</i></p>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
See Part III: <i>Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<p>1. The statement, on pages 8 and 33, that performance “will be evaluated by a variety of methods,” does not provide any specific information concerning what these methods will be. To strengthen future proposals, please provide more specific information regarding assessment of performance methods.</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>	
<p><i>Master’s Degree for 1-6, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i></p>	<p><b>Meets Certification Requirements at Grades 7-12.</b></p> <p><b>The Grades 1-6 program proposed as a dual program with Mild/Moderate Special Education (39-42 hours) appears to meet certification requirements. If this structure is acceptable to the Board of Regents, it would be approved.</b></p>

**SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY—BATON ROUGE**

*Administrator: Dr. Ivory Toldson, Dean, College of Education*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>
<i>Non-master’s/Certification-Only Alternative Pathway</i>	See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The clear course sequence that was provided at the beginning of every program strand and the format for program plans were organized and easy to follow.</li> <li>2. Measurable objectives were generally well done (e.g., SPED 300, CRIN 328).</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no specific information regarding Resources and Materials in any course description. Additionally no textbooks are listed for any class. Without this information it is difficult to determine whether candidates will be adequately prepared in (a) teaching methodologies focused on subject-matter content and (b) appropriate classroom management. <i>Please provide representative samples of resources and materials that will be used in each course to provide content-related teaching strategies and preparation in classroom management.</i></li> <li>2. The proposal is inconsistent with regard to courses being offered. For example, (1) three courses (SPED 306, 409, 410) are repeatedly cited in the MATRIX, but are not included in the list of courses on page 4 or in the course descriptions and (2) SPED 405 is referred to as “Classroom Management and Organization” on page 4 and “Methods of Teaching Academic Subjects to Children with Mild/Moderate Learning Problems”</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program (Cont'd)</i>	<p>2. (Cont'd)</p> <p>on page 28. The ambiguity of proposed coursework makes an accurate evaluation of the program difficult. <i>Please clarify course offerings for the program.</i></p> <p>3. “Form” and “Field Experience” sections in each course description contradict each other throughout the document. The Form section states that the course is “presented in lecture format;” however, the Field Experience section begins “This class is exclusively field-based, except for scheduled discussion forums...” It is difficult to determine when field experiences begin or whether candidates participate in meaningful experiences. <i>Please describe the sequence of field experiences throughout the program, what candidates will do, and how they will be assessed.</i></p> <p>4. The summer term appears to be two eight-week sessions (see p. 4) with a total of 12 credit hours. The timeline and credit hours are inconsistent with the guidelines for the Practitioner Teacher Program. <i>Please substantiate the discrepancy or modify the proposed program. In addition, examine the courses being proposed on page 4. Provide evidence that candidates will be prepared in content-related methodologies as they enter the classroom in the fall. This course appears to be proposed for the fall.</i></p>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<p>1. A clear linkage between course descriptions and assessment methods was omitted. In future proposals clarify what assessments will be used to assess which course objectives with focus on <i>demonstration</i> of teaching behaviors.</p> <p>2. Description of Field Sites and Activities need greater elaboration (see V.A, V.B, V.C on page 39).</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 REQUIRMENTS</b>	
<p><i>Practitioner Teacher Program for Mild/Moderate Special Education</i></p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</b></p> <p>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The design is faulty:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The program cites two eight-week summer sessions with six-hours per summer session. The actual program design calls for a nine-semester-hour summer session rather than twelve-semester-hours.</li> <li>b. The internship should be a separate three-semester-hour course and the two three-hour seminars should NOT be designed as courses. These should meet emerging and immediate needs of candidates.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Since Mild/Moderate Special Education spans grades 1-12, psychology of both the child and the adolescent should be provided.</li> <li>3. The document describes SPED 306 (Measurements and Evaluation of Atypical Children), but certification requirements do not include this as part of the Practitioner Teacher Program.</li> </ol>

**SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY—NEW ORLEANS**

*Administrator: Dr. Denise Charbonnet, Dean, College of Education  
Coordinator: Dr. Louise Kaltenbaugh, Associate Dean*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

<b>TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Non-master's/Certification Only Alternative Pathway</i>	<i>See Part III: Summary of Findings for comments</i>

**B. STRENGTHS**

<b>OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)</b>
1. The sets of objectives for courses are generally specific, measurable, linked to LCET, and relevant to the domain covered by the class. They cover a wide range of relevant skills and in most cases students' progress is measurable. 2. The field sites are clearly described and they provide diverse experiences. Selection and training of mentors seems adequate.

**C. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<i>See Part III: Summary of Findings for comments.</i>

**SECTION II: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA AT LAFAYETTE

*Administrator and Coordinator (Practitioner Teacher Program): Dr. William A. Rieck, Professor of Education*

*Administrator and Coordinator (Non-Master's): Dr. Gerald Carlson, Acting Dean, College of Education*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 7-12 &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>
<i>Non-master's/Certification Only Alternative Pathway at 1-6, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The document provides a good description of the program plans. Panelists note especially the attempt to link courses with certification requirements.</li> <li>2. Section VI provides an excellent description of specific field sites and activities.</li> <li>3. Differentiation at various certification levels is evident. For example, EDCI 450, Classroom Management and Instructional Design for Secondary Teachers, is different from the same course for elementary teachers.</li> <li>4. Program evaluation is well done.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Subject matter focus in secondary methodology courses is not adequately addressed throughout the document. For example, resources and materials as proposed for EDCI 402 are inadequate to prepare candidates with the expertise to teach mathematics and science as well as for the stated objectives in the course description. Additionally the field experience component proposed in this course is weak and inconsistent with Section VI on page 24. <i>Please describe specifically, for methodology courses, how candidates will be adequately prepared in teaching methodologies focused on subject matter content. Consider additional resources and materials that may serve as helpful references for candidates.</i></li> </ol>
--

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More explanation of the focus groups assessment on pages 27-28 would have been desirable, since this may prove to be an innovative practice for collecting evaluation data.</li> <li>2. For most courses, assessment of objectives is embedded within the objectives, but they are very general and do not provide explicit criteria for success. In future proposals, carefully examine measurable objectives being proposed. For each objective describe the assessment procedures that will be used and provide specific criteria for success</li> <li>3. Criteria for success in the assessment of field experiences are weak. For example, it is stated on page 7, “The field experience component for this course requires that each candidate visit and observe five teachers in the area of the candidate’s eventual certification. The candidate is required to submit a report on each observation.” How will success be determined?</li> <li>4. The assessment portion of some courses needs to be more specifically linked to the LCET components. It was not always clear that all of the attributes listed in the MATRIX for each course are clearly being assessed in courses in terms of actual teaching performance.</li> </ol>

**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 ADDRESSSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 7-12 &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Meets Certification Requirements</b>

### **SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA AT MONROE

*Administrator: Dr. Joyce Choate, Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies and Accreditation*  
*Coordinator: Dr. Glenda Holland, Instructional Leadership and Counseling Head*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

<b>TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Master's Degree at 1-6 and Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval</b>
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 7-12, and Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval</b>
<i>Non-Master's/Certification Only Alternative Pathway</i>	See <i>Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments

**B. STRENGTHS**

<b>OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The program description is clearly written and well conceived.</li><li>2. The coursework is generally very good with relevant and clearly stated objectives matched to assessment strategies and LCET components.</li><li>3. There is an excellent presentation of courses and field experiences shown in the table on page 60 of each document. Field experiences are tied to objectives.</li><li>4. The program provides an excellent process and description for screening and preparing mentors/supervisors.</li><li>5. The handbooks are attractive and comprehensive with cross-referenced subjects and a teacher warranty.</li></ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>
<b>No Stipulations.</b>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

**GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

See *Part III: Summary of Findings* for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

**SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

1. Although lack of differentiation is not characteristic of this proposal, the following courses do not adequately differentiate elementary and secondary: 500A and 500B, 545A and 545B, and 483A and 483B. The readings are identical, but the learners and audience are different. Please reexamine the materials for these courses.
2. While content focus in methods courses appears sufficient in the proposals submitted, continue to examine programs with an eye towards content focused methodology courses to ensure adequate preparation of candidates in this area.
3. UL-M should be congratulated for its close contact with area schools and establishment of field sites. The primary suggestion in this area is to add more teaching when possible to field experiences.

## 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.

AREAS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS	
<i>Master's Degree at 1-6 and Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Meets Certification Requirements</b>
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 1-6, 7-12, and Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<p><b>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</b></p> <p>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grades 1-6: The format of ELED 510 and ELED 511 should be structured as seminars to address emerging and immediate needs of candidates. The internship should be three credit hours only.</li> <li>2. Grades 7-12: The format of CURR 503 and CURR 556 should be structured as seminars to address emerging and immediate needs of candidates. The internship should be three credit hours only.</li> <li>3. Mild/Moderate Special Education: The format of SPED 502 and READ 502 should be structured as seminars to address emerging and immediate needs of candidates. The internship should be three credit hours rather than six credit hours.</li> </ol>

## SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS**

*Administrator: Dr. Gregory O'Brien, Chancellor  
Coordinator: Dr. Louis Paradise, Provost*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 4-8, 7-12 (Mathematics &amp; Science), and Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval</b>

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal describes a strong and innovative teacher education program with much potential.</li> <li>2. The proposal is clearly written and well conceived. The introductory section on background and context as well as the description of the program design and proposed faculty was very helpful to panelists.</li> <li>3. The program proposes innovative changes for the university as a whole. Redesign efforts have focused on adopting a seamless system that supports the teacher education program both at the graduate and undergraduate levels as well as for candidates who complete alternate certification programs or regular undergraduate programs.</li> <li>4. Technology is embedded throughout courses.</li> <li>5. The program proposes a collaborative partnership with university and “Partner Faculty” both in planning and implementation of the program. A list of “Partner Faculty,” teachers in the field with specialized expertise, have been included to teach specialized content in university courses with regular university faculty members. This is a real strength of the program.</li> <li>6. University support for the importance of teacher preparation is shown through the university’s approval of new tenure track faculty positions to support the objectives of the program, placing a heavy emphasis upon the hiring of Professors of Professional Practice. In each content area a research oriented faculty member is paired with a Professor of Professional Practice.</li> <li>7. Coursework is specific to and differentiated for content levels (mathematics and science) at the secondary level.</li> <li>8. There is a focus upon meaningful outcomes such as improved student learning of children being taught by university students.</li> <li>9. The program introduces behavior management in general coursework and then requires students to apply the concepts in courses and fieldwork that are specific to certification areas.</li> </ol>

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program</i>	<b>No stipulations.</b>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<i>See Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
Assessment was identified as a general weakness for all institutions in this review and was not included in stipulations. In future proposals, please focus on the <i>demonstration</i> of identified competencies, including the specific criteria for success.

**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><i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 4- 8, 7-12 (Mathematics &amp; Science), and Mild/ Moderate Special Education</i></p>	<p><b>Meets Certification Requirements in the Mild/Moderate Special Education Program.</b>  <b>Does not meet certification requirements at grades 4-8 and 7-12.</b></p> <p>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the 4-8 program, EDCI 4850 and EDCI 4MS3 should be designed as seminars rather than as regular coursework to better meet the ongoing and immediate needs of candidates.</li> <li>2. Stipulations for the 7-12 program are as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There is no provision for Adolescent Psychology; and</li> <li>b. EDCI 4ME2 and 4ME3 should be designed as seminars to address ongoing and immediate needs of students.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

**SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE**

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

**XAVIER UNIVERSITY**

*Administrator and Coordinator: Dr. Rosalind Hale, Chair  
Division of Education*

**SECTION I: PROGRAM EVALUATION**

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

**A. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS**

TYPE(S) OF PROPOSED ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM(S)	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Master's Degree at 1-6, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Recommended for Approval with Stipulations</b>
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at 7-12 (Science and Mathematics) &amp; Special Education</i>	<b>Not Recommended for Approval</b>

**B. STRENGTHS**

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)
1. The university is focusing its attention upon the preparation of high school teachers in the areas of mathematics and science.

**C. PROGRAM STIPULATIONS**

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<i>Master's Degree</i>	1. Candidates participating in the master's degree program developed for teachers of grades 1-6 are required to take 9 out of 12 courses that are the same courses as those taken by teachers of grades 7-12. Candidates completing programs for mild/moderate special education are required to take 9 out of 12 courses that are the same as teachers of grades 1-6. However, the course descriptions do not clearly differentiate how course content will differ to address the varying developmental and instructional needs of students in grades 1-6, 7-12, and special education. Classroom management approaches appropriate for a teacher of twelfth grade students would vary significantly from approaches appropriate for a

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

STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL	
<p><i>Master's Degree (Cont'd)</i></p>	<p>1. (Cont'd)</p> <p>teacher of first grade students. <i>If a decision is made to use all of these courses, prepare documentation to specify how each course will be differentiated to address the varying needs of teachers of grades 1-6, grades 7-12, and mild/moderate special education.</i></p> <p>2. The grades 1-6, grades 7-12, and mild/moderate special education courses do not appear to have sufficient methodology courses to fully address the needs of candidates who have had no prior exposure to education. As an example, the grades 1-6 program requires candidates to take two reading courses but no courses are provided to expose teachers to methodologies to teach language arts, science, social studies, mathematics, etc. At the grades 7-12 level, candidates are exposed to one course in secondary school curriculum; however, this is a general course and not specific to the content area a candidate might teach. At the mild/moderate special education level, the course entitled "Methods of Teaching Students with Learning and Behavioral Problems" provides little evidence in the objectives that students will have opportunities to design and implement instructional interventions. Given the large number of students referred to special education for problems in reading, it would seem to be a good idea to provide more emphasis in the program in assessment and instruction. <i>Reexamine the proposed curriculum for grades 1-6, 7-12, and mild/moderate and identify courses that would better address the needs of teachers in providing appropriate instruction for students in the specific content areas. Provide full course descriptions of courses that were not previously described.</i></p> <p>3. The Internship Seminars appear to be designed for the Practitioner Teacher Program and do not appear to be appropriate for the master's degree program. As an example, candidates are expected to already possess prior knowledge needed to develop and implement lessons and they are expected to take the course the first and second semester of their first full year of teaching. This would work for practitioner teachers who have completed 9-hours of coursework during the summer prior to teaching. This would not be appropriate for students entering the master's program in the fall and starting to teach in the fall. <i>Reexamine the use of Internship I and Internship II for the Master's Degree. Identify courses that would be more appropriate for the Master's Degree.</i></p>

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

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Master's Degree (Cont'd)</i>	<p>4. It is not clear why Student Teaching is listed as a requirement for the master's degree instead of Student Teaching or an Internship. It is assumed that many individuals pursuing a Master's Degree for alternate certification will have full time teaching positions. These individuals will need to complete their degree within a three year time period to maintain temporary certification. It may be difficult for these individuals to leave their teaching positions to complete Student Teaching. However, they could complete an Internship while working at their school and being supervised by the university. <i>Reexamine the description of the Student Teaching course and determine if candidates could be allowed to complete either Student Teaching or an Internship. If an Internship is added, provide a full course description of the internship.</i></p>
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program</i>	<p>5. The same courses are used for students participating in the Practitioner Teacher Program as students participating in the master's program. It is anticipated that the needs of the two groups will be quite different considering one group is completing the program as a cohort in one year and the other group may take one to three years to complete the degree. The proposed structure for the Practitioner Teacher Program does not expose practitioner teachers to the necessary content (e.g., Grades 7-12 content: adolescent development/psychology, the diverse learner, classroom management/organization, assessment, instructional design, and instructional strategies; Special Education content: special needs of the mild/moderate exceptional child, classroom management, behavioral management, assessment and evaluation, methods/materials for mild/moderate exceptional children, and vocational and transition services for students with disabilities). The program appears to be a combination of isolated courses instead of a cohesive program that addresses the unique needs of practitioner teachers. <i>Reexamine the courses being offered for the Practitioner Teacher Program and provide course descriptions that address all of the identified needs of practitioner teachers during summer, spring, and fall.</i></p> <p>6. The field-based experiences discussed in the proposal do not appear to be appropriate for practitioner teachers. As an example, EDCI 6042 Classroom Organization and Management indicates that "candidates are required to conduct observations in their respective classrooms. If a student is not currently teaching, then he/she will be assigned to an appropriate classroom setting." In that practitioner teachers will be taking this course during the summer prior to their teaching assignment, they will not have classrooms. <i>Reexamine the use of field-based experiences for practitioner teachers and identify appropriate experiences that will address the needs of candidates during the summer.</i></p>

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

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program (Cont'd)</i>	<p>7. It is not clear how grades 7-12 candidates will be provided opportunities to develop an understanding of methodologies that will be specific to the content area(s) (e.g., mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics, etc.) they will teach. In addition, it is unclear if candidates will have opportunities to receive feedback about their teaching as they work with students in field-based settings. The one course entitled Secondary School Curriculum indicates that practitioner teachers will “lead the class in teaching lessons they have researched and developed”; however, there is no indication that they teach lessons to students in field-based settings. <i>Identify how practitioner teachers will develop an understanding of methodologies that are specific to the content area they will teach and how they will participate in field-based placements when teaching students in their content area.</i></p> <p>8. The proposal indicates that practitioner teachers working with mild/moderate special education students will take the same Classroom Organization and Management course as practitioner teachers working with high school students. The needs of these two groups are different. The course as described lacks specific information for the special education teacher and has insufficient opportunities for candidates to apply skills. <i>Reexamine the use of this course for both groups and determine if the specialized needs of the two groups will be met in one course. Either identify an alternative course for one of the groups or identify how the course will be differentiated to address the specific needs of each individual group.</i></p> <p>9. The section entitled “Assessment of Program” was not included in the proposed Practitioner Teacher Program proposal. <i>Submit the “Assessment of Program” section and respond to all of the area identified for that section within the document: Guidelines for Redesigned Teacher Preparation Program Proposals.</i></p> <p>10. It is unclear how the university will determine if practitioner teachers are in need of further coursework. <i>Identify how a decision will be made regarding whether a practitioner teacher needs to take additional courses to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. In addition, identify the process that will be used to determine if improvement has been demonstrated.</i></p>

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

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Both Programs</i>	<p>11. Internship Seminar I and Internship Seminar II objectives are the same. It is not clear what will be taught in these courses or what new knowledge or skills will be gained or demonstrated as a result of this course. There is no differentiation between what an internship experience will be for a special education, grades 1-6, and grades 7-12 teacher. The lack of criteria suggests that there are no standards associated with the internship and they appear to be group reflection sessions. <i>Rewrite the course descriptions for Internship Seminar I and Internship Seminar II. Clearly identify performance-based objectives that are specific to each individual seminar.</i></p> <p>12. Field-based work is embedded in key courses; however the specific features regarding what the students are suppose to learn and how they will be evaluated is missing. Experiences will be more valuable if there are quality controls and candidates are monitored/supervised while actually teaching and working with students. <i>Reexamine the field-based experiences within the programs and clearly identify how candidates will be provided feedback about their teaching when provided opportunities to teach students in field-based settings prior to their student teaching /internship.</i></p> <p>13. The section entitled “Description of Field Sites and Activities” appears to be written for undergraduate programs instead of Practitioner Teacher Programs or Master’s Degrees. As an example, it indicates that all “education major candidates must complete a requirement of at least 80 hours of field experiences prior to their Student Teaching.” This does not fit the Practitioner Teacher Program requirements for practitioner teachers are not required to enroll in Student Teaching. <i>Reexamine information in the section entitled “Description of Field Sites and Activities” and rewrite it so that it addresses a Practitioner Teacher Program and a Master’s Degree Alternate Program.</i></p> <p>14. Attributes listed in the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix are not always directly aligned with performance objectives within the courses. As an example, the attribute “Manages and/or adjusts allotted time for activities planned.” is aligned with EDCI 5060 (Multicultural Education); however, this attribute is not addressed in any of the objectives listed for the course. <i>Reexamine courses listed in the Components of Effective Teaching Matrix and align each attribute with a specific performance objective in at least one course that clearly addresses the attribute. Rewrite existing objectives if they are not performance objectives that cannot be demonstrated by candidates.</i></p>

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

<b>STIPULATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL</b>	
<i>Both Programs (Cont'd)</i>	15. The Exceptional Student course does not appear to cover the breadth and depth of information necessary for a mild/moderate special education teacher. As an example, no mention is made of candidates possessing an understanding of law/litigation/compliance issues and no specialized assessment is provided beyond the basic tests and measurement course required of all candidates. <i>Examine the full range of needs of mild/moderate special education teachers and identify changes in existing courses and identify courses that should be included in the curriculum. Provide full course descriptions of any courses that were not previously described.</i>

**D. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

<b>GENERAL WEAKNESSES OBSERVED IN MOST PROPOSED PROGRAMS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>
<i>See Part III: Summary of Findings</i> for comments.

**E. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT**

**SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSSED WITHIN THE INSTITUTION WHEN FURTHER DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM(S) FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

1. Reexamine the process described to select mentors and supervisors for the Practitioner Teacher Program. The activities described do not appear to be appropriate for the Practitioner Teacher Program.
2. Reexamine the information provided for the mentor/supervisor handbooks. It appears to have been developed for another purpose and is not appropriate for a Practitioner Teacher Program.
3. The Vocational and Transitional Services course description states that students will have an opportunity to “deal first hand with individuals and facilities involved in transitional and vocational issues.” However, the objectives and assessments do not sufficiently indicate what students will learn from the “first hand experience”. Determine what should be learned and make sure that it is reflected in the performance-based objectives for the course.
4. Many of the courses listed (e.g., Advanced Educational Psychology; Advanced Adolescent Psychology, Practicum in Tests and Measurement, etc.) appear to be courses that have previously been offered for certified teachers who already have education degrees and are pursuing advanced Master’s Degree in education. However, students enrolling in the alternate certification program will be individuals who have degrees outside of education and have not previously taught in classrooms. If both groups participate in the same courses, there is a concern that the instruction may be too advanced for the needs of the alternate students or too basic for the needs of the certified teachers who already possesses an education degree. Identify any courses that will contain both alternate certification candidates and certified teachers in the same courses and identify how instruction will be provided to meet the basic needs of non-certified individuals who have no previous expertise in teaching and the needs of certified teachers who have a degree in education and are pursuing advanced knowledge.

## 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 MUYST BE ADDRESSED TO MEET STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<i>Master's Degree at Grades 1-6, 7-12, &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<b>Meets Certification Requirements</b>
<i>Practitioner Teacher Program at grades 7-12 (Science and Mathematics) &amp; Mild/Moderate Special Education</i>	<p><b>Does Not Meet Certification Requirements</b></p> <p>In order to meet certification requirements, the following must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Phase II of the design calls for two seminars; therefore, Secondary School Curriculum and Advanced Educational Psychology cannot be offered during the fall and spring semesters.</li> <li>b. The content of EDCI 5382 (grades 7-12) should be offered as part of the nine-hours during the summer to fulfill requirements to prepare candidates to enter the classroom during the fall.</li> <li>c. The content of EDCI 6055P (Special Education) should be offered as part of the nine-hours during the summer to fulfill the requirements to prepare candidates to enter the classroom during fall.</li> <li>d. A 3-hour internship should be offered that is different than the seminar.</li> </ol>

## SECTION III: APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS BY BOR & BESE

This review represents the first stage in the evaluation of alternative certification programs proposed by universities and colleges. The next stage is the Approval Process which is described in Part II (Description of the Process for the First Evaluation Cycle) of this document.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

## Louisiana Alternative Certification Program

### *Providing Alternative Paths to Teacher Certification*

(Approved for Notice of Intent - April 2001)

The Louisiana Alternative Certification Program provides opportunities for individuals with non-education degrees to become certified public school teachers. Individuals seeking teacher certification under the alternative certification program will follow one of three alternative certification paths: the ***Practitioner Teacher Program***, the ***Master's Degree Program***, or the ***Non-Master's/Certification-Only Program***.

Candidates for admission to any one of the programs must possess a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited university and must pass the Pre-Professional Skills Test on the PRAXIS and the content specific examinations for the PRAXIS. More detailed explanations relative to program admission requirements are explained within the description of each alternate certification path.

Individuals seeking certification under the ***Practitioner Teacher Program*** must submit an official transcript for evaluation to a Louisiana college or university with an approved teacher education program or to a state-approved private practitioner program provider. Individuals seeking certification under the ***Master's Degree Program*** or the ***Non-Master's/Certification-Only Program*** must submit an official transcript for evaluation to a Louisiana college or university with an approved teacher education program. [A list of Louisiana colleges and universities offering the ***Practitioner Teacher Program***, the ***Masters Degree Program***, and/ or the ***Non-Master's/Certification-Only Program*** is available from the Louisiana Department of Education, Division of Teacher Standards, Assessment, and Certification and on the Louisiana Department of Education's web site, [www.doe.state.la.us](http://www.doe.state.la.us). A list of private program providers offering the ***Practitioner Teacher Program*** is also available from these same sources.]

Universities offering alternative certification are required to begin implementation of the newly adopted paths on or before July 2002.

No students should be accepted into the "old" post-baccalaureate alternate certification program after January 2002. Candidates already in the "old" alternative certification program would be given until January 2005 to complete their programs.

---

## ***Practitioner Teacher Program*** Alternative Path to Certification

---

State-approved private providers and Louisiana colleges or universities with an approved teacher education program may choose to offer a Practitioner Teacher Program. Practitioner Teacher Programs may offer certification in Grades 1-6, Grades 4-8, or Grades 7-12 (regular or special education). The Practitioner Teacher Program is a streamlined certification path that combines intensive coursework and full-time teaching.

### *Admission to the Program*

To be admitted, individuals should:

1. Possess a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited university.
2. Have a 2.5 GPA on undergraduate work. Appropriate, successful work experience can be substituted for the required GPA, at the discretion of the program provider. However, in no case may the GPA be less than 2.0. (Note: State law requires that upon completion of the program the teacher candidate has a 2.5 GPA for certification.)
3. Pass the Pre-Professional Skills Test (e.g. reading, writing, and mathematics) on the PRAXIS.
4. Pass the content specific examinations for the PRAXIS
  - a. Candidates for Grades 1-6 (regular and special education): pass the *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination;
  - b. Candidates for Grades 4-8 (regular and special education): pass the *Middle School Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination;
  - c. Candidates for Grades 7-12 (regular and special education): pass the *content specialty examination(s)* (e.g. English, Mathematics, etc.) on the PRAXIS in the content area(s) in which they intend to teach.
5. Meet other non-course requirements established by the college or university.

### *Program Requirements*

1. Teaching Preparation (Summer)      9 credit hours (or equivalent 135 contact hours)

Grades 1-6, 4-8 and 7-12 practitioner teachers will complete courses (or equivalent contact hours) pertaining to child/adolescent development/psychology, the diverse learner, classroom management/organization, assessment, instructional design, and instructional strategies before starting their teaching positions.

Mild/moderate special education teachers will take courses (or equivalent contact hours) that focus upon the special needs of the mild/moderate exceptional child, classroom management, behavioral management, assessment and evaluation, methods/materials for mild/moderate exceptional children, and vocational and transition services for students with disabilities.

2. Teaching Internship & First Year Teaching 9 credit hours (or equivalent 135 contact hours)

Practitioner teachers will assume full-time teaching positions in districts. During the school year, these individuals will participate in two seminars (one seminar during the fall and one seminar during the spring) that address immediate needs of the Practitioner Teacher Program teachers and receive one-on-one supervision through an internship provided by the program providers. The practitioner teacher will also receive support from school-based mentor teachers (provided by the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program) and principals.

3. Teaching Performance Review (end of first year)

Program providers, principals, mentors, and practitioner teachers will form teams to review the first year teaching performance of practitioner teachers and determine the extent to which the practitioner teachers have demonstrated teaching proficiency. If practitioner teachers demonstrated proficiency, they will enter into the assessment portion of the Louisiana Teacher and Assessment Program during the next fall.

If weaknesses are cited, the teams will identify additional types of instruction needed to address the areas of need. Prescriptive plans that require from 1 to 12 credit hours (or 15 -180 equivalent contact hours) of instruction will be developed for practitioner teachers. In addition, the teams will determine if the practitioner teachers should participate in the new teacher assessment during the fall or if the practitioner teachers should receive additional mentor support and be assessed after the fall.

4. Prescriptive Plan Implementation 1-12 credit hours (15-180 contact hours)

Practitioner teachers who demonstrate areas of need will complete prescriptive plans.

5. Louisiana Assessment Program

Practitioner teachers will be assessed during the fall or spring of the second year of teaching depending upon their teaching proficiencies.

6. PRAXIS Review

Program providers will offer review sessions to prepare practitioner teachers to pass remaining components of the PRAXIS.

### *Certification Requirements*

Private Providers and colleges or universities will submit signed statements to the Louisiana Department of Education which indicate that the student completing the **Practitioner Teacher Program** alternative certification path met the following requirements:

1. Passed the PPST components of the PRAXIS. *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
2. Completed the program with an overall 2.5 or higher GPA.
3. Passed the specialty examination (PRAXIS) for their area(s) of certification.
  - a. Grades 1-6: *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
  - b. Grades 4-8: *Middle School Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
  - c. Grades 7-12: *Specialty content test in areas to be certified.* *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
  - d. Mild/Moderate Special Education 1-12: *Special Education*
4. Passed the *Principles of Learning and Teaching* examination (PRAXIS)
  - a. Grades 1-6: *Principles of Learning and Teaching*
  - b. Grades 4-8: *Principles of Learning and Teaching*
  - c. Grades 7-12: *Principles of Learning and Teaching*

---

## ***Master's Degree Program*** Alternative Path to Certification

---

A Louisiana college or university with an approved teacher education program may choose to offer an alternative certification program that leads to a master's degree. Alternative certification programs may be offered by a college or university only in those certification areas in which that institution has an approved teacher education program. The college or university may choose to offer the master's degree program as either a Master of Education or a Master of Arts in Teaching. Master's Degree Programs may offer certification in Grades PK-3, Grades 1-6, Grades 4-8, or Grades 7-12 (regular or special education).

### *Admission to the Program*

To be admitted, individuals should:

1. Possess a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited university.
2. Have a 2.5 GPA, or higher, on undergraduate work.
3. Pass the Pre-Professional Skills Test (e.g. reading, writing, and mathematics) on the PRAXIS.
4. Pass the content specific examinations for the PRAXIS
  - a. Candidates for PK-3 (regular and special education): pass the *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* specialty exam;
  - b. Candidates for Grades 1-6 (regular and special education): pass the *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination;
  - c. Candidates for Grades 4-8 (regular and special education): pass the *Middle School Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination;
  - d. Candidates for Grades 7-12 (regular and special education): pass the *content specialty examination(s)* (e.g. English, Mathematics, etc.) on the PRAXIS in the content area(s) in which they intend to teach.
5. Meet other non-course requirements established by the college or university.

### *Program Requirements*

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Knowledge of Learner and the Learning Environment   | 15 credit hours      |
| <i>Grades PK-3, 1-6, 4-8, and 7-12: Child/adolescent development/psychology, the diverse learner, classroom management/organization, assessment, instructional design, and instructional strategies</i>  |                      |
| <i>Mild/Moderate Special Education 1-12: Special needs of the mild/moderate exceptional child, classroom management, behavioral management, assessment and evaluation, methods and materials for mild/moderate exceptional children, vocational and transition services for students with disabilities</i> |                      |
| 2. Methodology and Teaching  | 12 - 15 credit hours |
| Methods courses and field experiences  |                      |
| 3. Student Teaching or Internship  | 6 - 9 credit hours   |
| TOTAL:   | 33 - 39 credit hours |

### *Certification Requirements*

Colleges or universities will submit signed statements to the Louisiana Department of Education which indicate that the student completing the **Master's Degree Program** alternative certification path met the following requirements:

1. Passed the PPST components of the PRAXIS. *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
2. Completed all coursework (undergraduate and master's program) with an overall 2.5 or higher GPA.
3. Passed the specialty examination (PRAXIS) for their area(s) of certification.
  - a. Grades PK-3: *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* specialty exam *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
  - b. Grades 1-6: *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* specialty exam *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
  - c. Grades 4-8: *Middle School Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
  - d. Grades 7-12: *Specialty content test in area to be certified* *(Note this test was required for admission.)*
  - e. Mild/Moderate Special Education 1-12: *Special Education*
4. Passed the *Principles of Learning and Teaching* examination (PRAXIS)
  - a. Grades PK-3: *Principles of Learning and Teaching K-6*
  - b. Grades 1-6: *Principles of Learning and Teaching K-6*
  - c. Grades 4-8: *Principles of Learning and Teaching 5-9*
  - d. Grades 7-12: *Principles of Learning and Teaching 7-12*

---

**Non-Master's/Certification-Only Program** Alternative Path to Certification

---

A Louisiana college or university with an approved teacher education program may choose to offer a post-baccalaureate alternative certification program that does not lead to a degree. Alternative certification programs may be offered by a college or university only in those certification areas in which that institution has an approved teacher education program. Non-Master's/Certification-Only Programs may offer certification in **Grades PK-3**, Grades 1-6, Grades 4-8, or Grades 7-12 (regular or special education).

*Admission to the Program*

To be admitted, individuals should:

1. Possess a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited university.
2. Have a 2.5 GPA, or higher, on undergraduate work.
3. Pass the Pre-Professional Skills Test (e.g. reading, writing, and mathematics) on the PRAXIS.
4. Pass the content specific examinations for the PRAXIS
  - a. Candidates for PK-3 (regular and special education): pass the *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* specialty exam;
  - b. Candidates for Grades 1-6 (regular and special education): pass the *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination;
  - c. Candidates for Grades 4-8 (regular and special education): pass the *Middle School Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination;
  - d. Candidates for Grades 7-12 (regular and special education): pass the *content specialty examination(s)* (e.g. English, Mathematics, etc.) on the PRAXIS in the content area(s) in which they intend to teach.

*Program Requirements*

1. Knowledge of Learner and the Learning Environment 9 credit hours  
*Grades PK-3, 1-6, 4-8, and 7-12: Child/adolescent development/psychology, the diverse learner, classroom management/organization, assessment, instructional design, and instructional strategies*

*Mild/Moderate Special Education 1-12: Special needs of the mild/moderate exceptional child, classroom management, behavioral management, assessment and evaluation, methods and materials for mild/moderate exceptional children, vocational and transition services for students with disabilities*

2. Methodology and Teaching 6 credit hours  
Methods courses and field experience

3. Student Teaching or Internship 6 - 12 credit hours

TOTAL: 21 - 27 credit hours

### *Certification Requirements*

Colleges or universities will submit signed statements to the Louisiana Department of Education which indicate that the student completing the **Non-Degree/Certification-Only Program** alternative certification path met the following requirements:

1. Passed the PPST components of the PRAXIS. *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
2. Completed all coursework (undergraduate and certification program) with an overall 2.5 or higher GPA.
3. Passed the specialty examination (PRAXIS) for their area(s) of certification.
  - a. Grades PK-3: *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* specialty exam *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
  - b. Grades 1-6: *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
  - c. Grades 4-8: *Middle School Education: Content Knowledge* specialty examination *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
  - d. Grades 7-12: *Specialty content test in areas to be certified.* *(Note: This test was required for admission.)*
  - e. Mild/Moderate Special Education 1-12: *Special Education*
4. Passed the *Principles of Learning and Teaching* examination (PRAXIS)
  - a. Grades PK-3: *Principles of Learning and Teaching K-6*
  - b. Grades 1-6: *Principles of Learning and Teaching K-6*
  - c. Grades 4-8: *Principles of Learning and Teaching 5-9*
  - d. Grades 7-12: *Principles of Learning and Teaching 7-12*

Universities offering alternative certification options are required to begin implementation of the newly adopted paths on or before July 2002.

No students should be accepted into the "old" post-baccalaureate alternate certification program after January 2002. Candidates already in the "old" alternative certification program would be given until January 2005 to complete their programs.

## APPENDIX B

### GENERAL COMMENTS FROM LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. For the Non-Master's and the Master's Degree Programs, universities must have an approved undergraduate degree program in the certification area in order to offer an alternate degree program in that area. This pertains to M/M, PK-3, 1-6, 4-8, and all 7-12 certification areas.
2. Alternate program requirements (Learner and the Learning Environment) clearly state *Child and/or Adolescent Psychology*. (For M/M, it would be a combination of both, in order to address needs of students across grade levels 1-12.) Many of the proposals submitted specified only Educational Psychology, with course narratives that did not specify Child and/or Adolescent Psychology.
3. The Practitioner Program requirement for "Seminars" refers to a meeting held for an exchange of ideas in a particular area. As such, this should take on a format that is somewhat different from a regular course. Although prepared material could be addressed within the context of the seminar (e.g., enrichment/depth in an area already presented in the summer segment), there should also be allowance for discussion time that specifically addresses immediate and/or emerging needs of the practitioners on the job. For example, if practitioners were networked through an internet site, they could freely post messages asking for help or advice, discussing trials and triumphs in their classrooms, etc., and the dialogue could be used to prompt the material to be provided in the next scheduled seminar.
4. Since the Practitioner Teacher Program is new and innovative, LDE receives many inquiries about being admitted to such a program and where such a program is available in the state. To assist LDE in directing inquiries, providers will be asked to submit information indicating the specific areas included in their programs (e.g., 1-6, 4-8, and the specific 7-12 areas such as science, math, etc.). A master list will be built using the data provided.
5. Explanation of the New Alternate Programs:

#### **Practitioner Teacher Program**

- For candidates who wish to pursue certification on a full-time basis, while simultaneously working in a school setting
- The initial (summer) 9-hour segment should prepare candidates to enter the classroom
- The option for the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program (LaTAAP) must be available to the candidates during the school year, as it is an integral part of the program's Phase II requirements

### **Master's Degree Program**

- Provides certification as well as a Master's Degree in Education
- LaTAAP is not an integral part of this program
- Could be offered as either a full-time or a part-time option by the provider. Therefore, a candidate could be employed full-time, in either an educational or a non-educational setting, while taking night classes.

### **Non-Master's/Certification-Only Program**

- Serves same audience as the Master's Program, but these candidates do not take the GRE, as they do not pursue a master's degree in education—they are simply seeking certification
- LaTAAP is not an integral part of this program
- Could be offered as either a full-time or a part-time option by the provider. Therefore, a candidate could be employed full-time, in either an educational or a non-educational setting, while taking night classes.

6. Methodologies offered through a program should clearly differentiate by certification area/grade level.
  - For PK-3, focus should be on child development, reading/language development, and math to provide a solid foundation in reading/language arts and mathematics
  - For 1-6, focus should be on child development, reading/language development, and math, as well as on social studies and science
  - For 4-8, focus should be on the child/adolescent and across the four core content areas
  - For 7-12, focus should be on the adolescent and on specific subject area specialty
7. Since the new programs offer a minimal number of semester hours (usually 18-21), programs must focus on the practical knowledge individuals will need in order to be successful in classrooms. This may require the provision more practical courses that address immediate needs of candidates rather than some of the more theoretical courses formerly provided.
8. Required internship semester hours in the new alternate programs differ. For the Practitioner Program, 3 hours is the maximum allowed for the Internship. For the Non-Master's Program, the minimum/maximum specified for Student Teaching or Internship is 6-12 hours. For the Master's Program, the minimum/maximum specified for Student Teaching or Internship is 6-9 hours.

9. The new licensure structure allows a **MAXIMUM** of three years on a temporary license, which may drive a candidate's selection of an alternate program. For example, someone already in the schools would work on a temporary license. Because he/she would be forced to complete an alternate program within a three-year time period, he/she may not seek a Master's Degree program due to the increased number of required hours.

**APPENDIX C**

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATORS**

**REDESIGNED TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS:  
ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION & PRACTITIONER TEACHER PROGRAMS**

**LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM**

<b>Universities</b>	<b>Practitioner Teacher Programs</b>	<b>Master's Degree Alternate Certification</b>	<b>Non-Master's/ Certification-Only</b>
Louisiana State University – Baton Rouge		<i>7-12</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval <b>Certification:</b> Met	
Louisiana State University – Shreveport			Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure.
University of New Orleans	<i>4-8, 7-12 Math, 7-12 Science, &amp; M/M</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval <b>Certification:</b> Met (M/M Spec. Educ.) Not Met (4-8 & 7-12)		

**SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY SYSTEM**

<b>Universities</b>	<b>Practitioner Teacher Programs</b>	<b>Master's Degree Alternate Certification</b>	<b>Non-Master's/ Certification-Only</b>
Southern University - Baton Rouge	<i>M/M Spec. Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Not Met		Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure.
Southern University – New Orleans			Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATORS**

**REDESIGNED TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS:  
ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION & PRACTITIONER TEACHER PROGRAMS (CONT'D)**

**UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA SYSTEM**

<b>Universities</b>	<b>Practitioner Teacher Programs</b>	<b>Master's Degree Alternate Certification</b>	<b>Non-Master's/ Certification-Only</b>
Grambling State University	<i>1-6, 4-8, 7-12, &amp; M/M Spec. Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Not Met		
Louisiana Tech University	<i>1-6, 4-8, &amp; 7-12</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Not Met	<i>PK-3, 1-6, 4-8, 7-12, &amp; M/M</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Not Met	Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure.
McNeese State University		<i>1-6, 7-12, &amp; M/M Spec. Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Met	
Nicholls State University	<i>1-6, 4-8, 7-12, &amp; M/M Spec. Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Met		Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure
Northwestern State University	<i>1-6, 4-8, 7-12, &amp; M/M Spec. Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Not Met	<i>1-6, 4-8, &amp; 7-12</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Not Met	Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure
Southeastern Louisiana University		<i>1-6, 7-12, &amp; M/M Spec. Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Met	
University of Louisiana-Lafayette	<i>7-12, &amp; M/M Special Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Met		Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure
University of Louisiana-Monroe	<i>1-6, 7-12, &amp; M/M Special Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval <b>Certification:</b> Not Met	<i>1-6, 7-12, M/M Spec. Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval <b>Certification:</b> Met	Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATORS**

**REDESIGNED TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS:  
ALTERNATE CERTIFICATION & PRACTITIONER TEACHER PROGRAMS (CONT'D)**

**PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES**

<b>Universities</b>	<b>Practitioner Teacher Programs</b>	<b>Master's Degree Alternate Certification</b>	<b>Non-Master's/ Certification-Only</b>
Centenary College		<i>1-6 &amp; 7-12</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval -Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Met	Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure.
Dillard University	<i>M/M Spec. Educ</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Not Met		Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure.
Louisiana College	<i>1-6, 7-12, &amp; M/M Spec. Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Met		
Loyola University		<i>1-6 &amp; 7-12</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Met	Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure.
Our Lady of Holy Cross College		<i>1-6 &amp; 7-12</i> <b>Program:</b> Not Recommended for Approval <b>Certification:</b> Met	Recommendation to State to reexamine certification structure.
Xavier University	<i>7-12(Science &amp; Math) &amp; M/M Spec. Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Not Recommended for Approval <b>Certification:</b> Not Met	<i>1-6, 7-12, &amp; M/M Spec. Educ.</i> <b>Program:</b> Approval - Stipulations <b>Certification:</b> Met	