NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE).

**Name of Institution**
University of Memphis

**Date of Review**
01/31/2008

**This report is in response to a(n):**
- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

**Program(s) Covered by this Review**
- BSE in Physical Education Teacher Education

**Program Type**
- First Teaching License

**Award or Degree Level(s)**
- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's

**PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION**

SPA Decision on NCATE Recognition of the Program(s):
- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation [See Part G]
- Not nationally recognized

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)
The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Not able to determine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comment:**

The program reports 22 completers in the past three years (2004-2007 with a 95% pass rate). In Assessment 1 Attachment B the program reports that a minimum passing score of 152 on the PRAXIS 0091 Physical Education Content Knowledge exam is required of candidates to be admitted to student teaching. Thus, clarification is needed regarding the reported passing rates in Assessment 1, Attachment C (data table). The data table reports 19 of 20 candidates passed the exam. The program notes the difference between test takers (i.e. program completers) and the number passing is because test takers did not report their scores to the University. Additionally, the program does not report the mean and range of scores for the most recent year (2006-2007) or the mean and range of scores for the sub-scores on the PRAXIS II 0091 test.

**Summary of Strengths:**

1. Required coursework

2. Candidates participate in 120 hours of pre-student teaching field experiences. The field experiences are in urban, suburban and rural settings and reflect the diverse student population the program serves.

3. Faculty are professionally active and have experience teaching in public schools.

4. The program shows strong alignment with the College of Education through the conceptual framework while still demonstrating the ability to develop instruments specifically related to physical education.

---

**PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS**

**Standard 1. Content Knowledge.** Physical education teachers understand physical education content and disciplinary concepts related to the development of a physically educated person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

(Assessment 1) A passing score on the PRAXIS II – 0091 is widely accepted as a valid test of foundational and physical education content knowledge. According to the program report (i.e., Assessment 1, Attachment B) passing scores are required for admission to student teaching. However, two program completers' scores are not included for analysis. This discrepancy must be clarified. The program does not report the most recent year’s mean score and range of scores. Additionally, the mean and range of sub-scores are not reported, which does not allow the reviewers to verify evidence of teacher candidates meeting this standard.

(Assessment 2) The program uses one generic rubric to evaluate the 10 NASPE standards. Expectations for each individual standard must be developed. Descriptors such as “directly related, related, and unrelated/indirectly related” and "strong understanding, sufficient understanding, clear understanding"
are too vague to distinguish candidates' levels of performance.

(Assessment 3) One item from the unit plan is identified as aligning with Standard 1. The rubric is too vague to distinguish between candidates' levels of performance. For example in the "extend, refine knowledge lesson element," the descriptor "students had multiple opportunities" or "students had some opportunities" is a contributing factor to determining a target/acceptable rating. Additionally, it is unclear if the unit plan is evaluated solely on the planning aspect or if the plans are actually implemented.

(Assessment 4) This is a comprehensive Unit-wide instrument. The program identifies 4 performance standards from 2 domains as aligning with NASPE Standard 1. Within each performance standard, rubrics detailing "target, acceptable and unacceptable performance" are explicitly described. The program identifies NASPE Standard/Outcomes 1.1, 1.4 & 1.5. Note: although 1.2 focuses on psychomotor competency it is not addressed in either assessment.

(Assessment 5) The use of a written candidate survey of perceived competence does not provide a valid measure of candidates' knowledge.

(Assessment 7) The use of a written candidate survey to assess the quality of the program does not address candidates' knowledge.

The Standard is Not Met

**Standard 2. Growth and Development.** Physical education teachers understand how individuals learn and develop and can provide opportunities that support their physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

Assessments 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8 are identified by the program as evidence of candidates meeting Standard 2.

(Assessment 1) Clarification is necessary regarding all program completers' PRAXIS II 0091 tests results. While 24% of the 0091 exam focuses on fundamental movements, motor development and motor learning; without the means and ranges of the sub score report it is impossible to determine if candidates meet Standard 2.

(Assessment 2) No direct evidence is linked to Standard 2. The use of one generic rubric for all 10 standards does not provide specific evidence of teacher candidates meeting each standard. The descriptors used in the generic rubric do not convey to the reviewers what is being evaluated.

(Assessment 5) The assessment does not address this standard.

(Assessment 7) The Teacher Preparation Program Reflections Exit Survey does not provide evidence that teacher candidates have met Standard 2. The survey appears to only ask teachers candidates' opinion regarding the quality of the program.

(Assessment 8) The proposed Adapted Physical Education Case Study may be an effective assessment of the candidates’ ability to design or select developmentally appropriate activities that will ensure a safe learning environment. The rubric presented—with the exception of outcome 2.2, which is paraphrased—is the sample rubric published in the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards. The program needs to develop a rubric that identifies and delineates the expectations they have for teacher candidates in their own program. The assessment is not scheduled for implementation until spring 2008; therefore, no data is available as evidence of teacher candidates meeting Standard 2.

The Standard is Not Met

**Standard 3. Diverse Students.** Physical education teachers understand how individuals differ in their approaches to learning, and create appropriate instruction adapted to these differences.
Comment:

(Assessment 1) While the data reported for 19 of the 22 program completers confirm candidates have a strong foundational and physical education content knowledge, without the means and ranges of the sub score report it is impossible to determine if candidates meet Standard 3. Additionally, the program must clarify the issue of missing data for 2 teacher candidates. The generic rubric presented does not discern between teacher candidates' levels of performance. Assessment 2 does not provide evidence of candidates meeting Standard 3, refer to previous comments regarding the use of a generic rubric and the ability to distinguish between candidates' levels of performance. Assessment 5 and 7 do not provide evidence of candidates meeting Standard 3. (Assessment 4) Domain I - Planning Indicator C and associated performance standards are aligned with Standard 3. It is unclear whether data presented are from the university supervisor, cooperating teacher or both. The program developed an addendum to the assessment to address elements that are tailored to the physical education setting. However, Standard 3 is not addressed in that addendum. The program has not provided sufficient information in the narrative for the reviewers to determine if candidates meet Standard 4. Assessment 8 is a well-developed assignment that shows a direct link to Standard 3. The rubric presented--with the exception of outcome 2.2, which is paraphrased--is the sample rubric published in the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards. The program needs to develop a rubric based directly on their assessment/assignment and within the context of their own program. The assessment is not scheduled for implementation until spring 2008; therefore, no data is available as evidence of teacher candidates meeting Standard 3.

**Standard 4. Management and Motivation.** Physical education teachers use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a safe learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

Assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 are identified as providing evidence of candidates meeting Standard 4. Please refer to the reviewer’s previous comments regarding Assessments 1, 2, 5 and 7 in Standards 1, 2, and 3. (Assessment 3) From the unit plan assessment, the program identifies the “motivation” element as aligned with Standard 4. The information provided in the unit plan is not sufficient to determine what is being evaluated. The unit planning form simply states "Introduction to unit (motivation)." It is not clear what is expected. The corresponding rubric discerns between target, acceptable and unacceptable, respectively, based on the following descriptions: “clearly attempts to motivate students in creative ways,” "design of the lesson had adequate motivation built into them” and “the design of lessons did not reflect attention to student motivation.” The descriptions are insufficient to distinguish between teacher candidates' levels of performance. (Assessment 4) The program identifies two performance standard indicators from Domain 4 - Learning Environment in the Unit-wide assessment as aligning with NASPE Standard 4. The first indicator is "reflects on teaching practice through careful examination of classroom evaluation and assessments." The second indicator is "creates a classroom culture that develops student intellectual capacity in the content area." The Unit-wide assessment aligns with NASPE 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4. The proposed addendum...
to the Unit-wide assessment identifies Outcomes 4.1 and 4.5. The reviewers did not find evidence in either the Unit-wide assessment or the proposed addendum that addresses "motivation." Refer to the reviewers' comments in Standard 3 regarding concerns with the data collection, analysis and interpretation of the data. Based on the primary evidence from Assessments 3 and 4, teacher candidates do not meet Standard 4.

**Standard 5. Communication.** Physical education teachers use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to enhance learning and engagement in physical activity settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![image]</td>
<td>![image]</td>
<td>![image]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Assessment 1 is candidates’ scores on the PRAXIS II 0091 Content Knowledge exam. The assessment does not align with Standard 5. Standard 5 focuses on teacher candidates' communication skills primarily in P-12 settings.

Similarly, Assessments 5 and 7 are written surveys completed by teacher candidates. Neither Assessment 5 nor 7 align with Standard 5.

(Assessment 2) Please refer to the reviewers’ comments regarding Assessment 2 in Standards 1, 2, and 3.

(Assessment 4) The program identifies one performance standard indicator (i.e. communication) from Domain 6 in the Unit-wide assessment as aligning with NASPE Standard 5. The Unit-wide assessment focuses on written and oral communication, but is limited to addressing 5.1. The breadth of Standard 5 is not addressed (5.2, 5.3, 5.4). The proposed addendum does not address Standard 5.

The Standard is Not Met

**Standard 6. Planning and Instruction.** Physical education teachers plan and implement a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to develop physically educated individuals, based on state and national (NASPE K-12) standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![image]</td>
<td>![image]</td>
<td>![image]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

The program identifies Assessment 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 as aligning with Standard 6. Refer to the reviewers' previous comments regarding Assessment 2 in Standards 1 and 2.

Assessment 5 does not provide evidence of candidates meeting Standard 6. The use of a written teacher candidate survey of perceived competence does not address planning and instruction. (Assessment 7)

The use of a written teacher-candidate survey focusing on the quality of the preparation program does not provide evidence of meeting Standard 6.

(Assessment 3) The program identifies 5 of the 7 elements in the unit plan as evidence. The unit plan assessments focus solely on planning; there is no specific evidence of the unit plans being implemented. In the narrative, the program states unit plans must be submitted prior to the end of each student teaching placement for review by the university supervisor, but there is no mention of the university supervisor observing/evaluating the implementation of any of the unit plans. There is no mention in Assessment 3 that the plans are actually implemented and evaluated. The rubric presented needs further development to clearly identify the desired teacher candidate expectations and behaviors as well as the descriptors used to distinguish between teacher candidates’ levels of performance.

(Assessment 4) The program identifies one Domain – Planning--from the Unit-wide assessment as
providing evidence of teacher candidates meeting Standard 6. Within the Planning Domain, 3 performance standard indicators are identified as aligning with Standard 6. The focus of the 3 standard performance indicators and accompanying rubrics do not address the specificity, depth and breadth required in NASPE Standard 6. Lessons developed in Assessment 3 would tie the planning aspect of Standard 6 to implementation. The proposed addendum does provide evidence of alignment with Outcomes 6.6, 6.8 and 6.9. However, no data are available at this time.

The Standard is Not Met

**Standard 7. Student Assessment.** Physical education teachers understand and use assessment to foster physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of students in physical activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**
Assessments 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 are identified by the program as providing evidence of candidates meeting Standard 7.
Assessment 1 does not provide evidence of Outcomes 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4. Each of those outcomes requires candidates to implement assessments in P-12 settings.
(Assessment 2) Refer to the reviewer's previous comments regarding Assessment 2 in Standard 1 and 2.
(Assessment 4) The program identifies Domain 3--Assessment and Evaluation--and 3 performance Standard indicators (A, B, and C) as providing evidence of teacher candidates meeting Standard 7. The Unit-wide assessment tool aligns with Outcomes 7.2 and 7.4. The proposed addendum does not include evidence related to Standard 7. Refer to the reviewer's previous comments related to data collection, analysis and interpretation of the data.
Assessments 5 and 7 do not align with Standard 7. The focus of Assessment 5 is on teacher candidates' perceived competence. The focus of Assessment 7 is on teacher candidates evaluating the preparation program.
The Standard is Not Met

**Standard 8. Reflection.** Physical education teachers are reflective practitioners who evaluate the effects of their actions on others (e.g., students, parents/guardians, fellow professionals), and seek opportunities to grow professionally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**
The program identifies Assessments 2, 4, 5 and 6 as evidence of candidates meeting Standard 8.
(Assessment 4) The program identifies Domain five – Professional Growth Dispositions Indicator A--as aligning with Standard 8. This portion of the Unit-wide assessment focuses on maintaining a professional appearance, displaying poise, self-control in all interactions, and displaying proper work habits and following professional code of ethics. There is no alignment between Domain 5 Indicator A and Standard 8. While not identified by the program, there does appear to be alignment with Domain 3 Indicator C Performance Standard 3 (i.e., teacher candidate reflects on teaching practice through careful examination of classroom evaluation and assessments).
Assessment 4 does not provide sufficient evidence of teacher candidates meeting Standard 8.
Assessment 6 shows a strong, direct alignment with Standard 8. Teacher candidates are required to complete a reflective journal that includes a description, justification and critique of their teaching as well as constructing a plan for continued professional growth based on their teaching performance. The
rubric used is the sample rubric published in the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards. A rubric should be developed by the program to specifically evaluate teacher candidates' performances in relation to the assignment/assessment.

The Standard is Not Met

**Standard 9. Technology.** Physical education teachers use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**
The program identifies Assessments 2, 5, and 7 as providing evidence of teacher candidates meeting Standard 9. None of the assessments provides evidence of candidates meeting Standard 9. (Assessment 2) Refer to the reviewers' comments regarding Assessment 2 in Standard 1.

Assessment 5 requires teacher candidates to evaluate their perceived competence on Outcomes 9.1, 9.2, and 9.3 through a written survey. This does not provide evidence of candidates meeting Standard 9.

Assessment 7 requires teacher candidates to evaluate several aspects of their teacher preparation program through a written survey. This assessment does not provide evidence of teacher candidates meeting Standard 9.

The Standard is Not Met

**Standard 10. Collaboration.** Physical education teachers foster relationships with colleagues, parents/guardians, and community agencies to support students’ growth and well being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**
Assessments 2, 4, 5, and 7 are identified by the program as evidence of candidates meeting Standard 10. Assessments 2, 5, and 7 do not provide evidence. Refer to the reviewer's previous comments regarding these assessments.

In Assessment 4 the program identifies Domain five – Professional Growth Dispositions Indicator A--as aligning with Standard 10. This portion of the Unit-wide assessment focuses on maintaining a professional appearance, displaying poise, self-control in all interactions and displaying proper work habits and following professional code of ethics. There is no alignment with Standard 10. The proposed addendum does not address Standard 10. There is insufficient information provided by the program regarding the administration of the instrument, data collection and analysis.

The proposed Adapted Physical Education Case Study (Assessment 8) may be an effective assessment of the candidates’ ability to seek out community resources and establish meaningful relationships with students, parents and colleagues to support student growth and well-being. The rubric presented--with the exception of outcome 2.2, which is paraphrased--is the sample rubric published in the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards. The program should develop their own rubric. The assessment is not scheduled to be implemented until spring 2008; therefore, no data is available as evidence of teacher candidates meeting Standard 10.
content knowledge. Since 2004, 19 of the 20 teacher candidates have demonstrated a 95% pass rate; however, the program reports 22 teacher candidates having completed the program during 2004-2007. The program indicates the difference in the completers and data presented in the table is due to teacher candidates submitting their PRAXIS II 0091 test results to the Tennessee State Department rather than the University. Currently, the other assessments (2, 3, 4, 5, and 7) do not provide support that candidates have sufficient content knowledge. Assessment 2 and 3, are aligned with Standard 1 – Content Knowledge; however, sufficient quality to address content knowledge is lacking. Scoring guides need further development to differentiate candidates’ levels of performance. In Assessment 2, the use of generic scoring to address 10 standards does not provide adequate information. Assessments 5 and 7 are not appropriate measures of content knowledge.

**C.2. Candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions**

Assessment 3 scoring guides need further development to delineate teacher candidates’ levels of performance. Care must be taken in identifying and describing specific, critical components within each element. Currently, Assessment 3 focuses solely on planning. The program does not provide information in Assessments 3 or 4 verifying that teacher candidates implement instruction. This is critical since student teaching is the only means of documenting application of knowledge and skills in a P-12 settings. The program needs to clarify the data collection process and analysis in order for the data to be deemed meaningful.

Assessment 4 is a comprehensive Unit-wide assessment. In general, the assessment appears to align with the NASPE standards; however, as an instrument designed for multiple disciplines it lacks the flexibility to encompass the intent and specificity necessary to reflect competency in any particular discipline. In addition to identifying alignment between the Unit-wide assessment and NASPE Standards, the program should identify alignment of specific performance indicators with NASPE Standards/Outcomes. Due to the limitations discussed above it was impossible for the reviewers to determine the extent to which teacher candidates meet the standards.

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

No evidence is provided by the program that verifies teacher candidates’ impact on P-12 student learning. In Assessment 3--Unit Plan--the program includes Element F: Summary of Assessment/Evaluation Activities; however, the element is not included in the data table. A self-assessment such as the "Student Survey of Perceived Competence" (Assessment 5) is not a valid measure. Similarly, Assessment 7 is not a valid measure of the effects of teacher candidates on P-12 learning. Assessment 7 focuses on teacher candidates' perceptions of the quality of their preparation program.

**PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

The program identifies several plans of action to improve candidates' performance and strengthen the program. However, the majority of the plans are in the initial stages. Specific details as to how they will improve candidates' performances and/or strengthen the program are not provided.

The program reports that faculty regularly discuss PRAXIS II exams and that faculty have initiated a review of "PRAXIS II Practice" exams based on prior results. No information is given regarding programmatic changes or additions.
The program identifies the E-portfolio as a powerful tool for tracking candidates’ progress. The program uses the E-portfolio as an assessment tool, but also as a teaching resource. No further specifics were disclosed.

Based on assessment results, the program identified the need for stronger emphasis on a "professional growth plan" (Outcome 8.3). The following plans have been developed: (1) Explicit coverage of the professional growth plan in weekly student teaching meetings, (2) Candidates will be required to construct and share with their peers a plan for continued professional growth during the second student teaching placement, and (3) More emphasis will be exercised by faculty toward the professional growth plan when describing the student teaching journal assignment.

The program is piloting (Fall 2007) an addendum for Assessment 4 during student teaching. The addendum addresses elements tailored to the physical education setting. NASPE Outcomes include 1.4, 1.5, 4.1, 4.5, 6.3, 6.6, 6.8 and 6.9; as well as the development of content progressions (i.e., informing, extending, refining and applying tasks). Outcome 1.2 (demonstrating motor skills) is not included.

The program developed an addendum to the Assessment 3 unit plan that focuses on streamlining unit and lesson planning to improve candidates' planning. No specific information was provided by the program.

### PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

**Areas for consideration**

1. The number of candidates passing the PRAXIS II 0091 exam does not match the number of program completers in 2005-06 or 2004-05. Since a passing score on the PRAXIS is required for student teaching admission, the number of program completers should be equal to or less than the number of candidates passing the PRAXIS. This discrepancy must be clarified. The mean and range of scores for the most recent year's data and the mean and range for the sub-scores on the most recent year's data are not reported.

2. There are no assessments or data that provide evidence of student learning. An assessment must be created and implemented to meet Standard 7.

3. The program must develop rubrics/scoring guides that distinguish between teacher candidates’ levels of performance. The rubrics/scoring guides must define the essential behaviors, knowledge and dispositions the program expects from its teacher candidates. The program should consider the development of program-specific rubrics rather than simply using examples from the Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards.

4. If the E-portfolio is to be used as an assessment, the development of specific rubrics addressing each standard will be necessary; as opposed to generalized rubric currently being used for all 10 NASPE standards.

5. Clarification regarding the implementation and evaluation of unit plans in student teaching; especially if student teaching is the only field-base experience used as evidence in the program report.

6. Clarification of the data collection and analysis process used in Assessment 4.
7. Use of an optional assessment that provides evidence of teacher candidates applying their knowledge and pedagogical skills in P-12 settings.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:
The context is well written and provides the required background information.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- Program is nationally recognized. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

- Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

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

PROGRAM DOES NOT MEET SPA REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL RECOGNITION

Terms and Subsequent Actions:

Further Development Required: The program does not satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. The program has **up to two opportunities** to submit revised reports addressing unmet standards and other concerns noted in the recognition report. The range of possible deadlines for these reports are April 15, 2008 (with a response due back from the SPA by 9/1/08); September 15, 2008 (with a response due back from the SPA by 2/1/09); and February 1, 2009 (with a response due back from the SPA by 7/15/09). Note that the opportunity to submit two revised reports is only possible if the first revised report is submitted by the April 15 deadline. If no reports are not submitted by 2/1/09, program status will revert to not recognized. After 2/1/09, NCATE will not accept a revised report based on this submission. However, the institution may submit a new program report (rather than a revised report) addressing all standards, at either Feb. 1 or Sept. 15 of a calendar year (submission dates for new program reports). In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

Further Development Required: The program does not satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. The program has **one more opportunity** to submit a revised report addressing unmet standards and other concerns noted in the recognition report. Deadline for this report is 4/15/08. After this date, NCATE will not accept a revised report based on this submission. However, the institution may submit a new program report (rather than a revised report) addressing all standards,
at either Feb. 1 or Sept. 15 of a calendar year (submission dates for new program reports). In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

**National Recognition with Probation:** The program does not satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. The program has **up to two opportunities** to submit revised reports addressing unmet standards and other concerns noted in the recognition report. The range of possible deadlines for these reports are April 15, 2008 (with a response due back from the SPA by 9/1/08); September 15, 2008 (with a response due back from the SPA by 2/1/09); and February 1, 2009 (with a response due back from the SPA by 7/15/09). Note that the opportunity to submit two revised reports is only possible if the first revised report is submitted by the April 15 deadline. If no reports are not submitted by 2/1/09, program status will revert to not recognized. After 2/1/09, NCATE will not accept a revised report based on this submission. However, the institution may submit a new program report (rather than a revised report) addressing all standards, at either Feb. 1 or Sept. 15 of a calendar year (submission dates for new program reports). In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

**National Recognition with Probation:** Program recognition is continued with probation. The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition; however, national recognition is retained from the previous review cycle. The program has **one more opportunity** to submit a revised report addressing unmet standards and other concerns noted in the recognition report. The deadline for this report is 4/15/08. If a report is not submitted by 4/15/08, program status will revert to not recognized. After this date, NCATE will not accept a revised report based on this submission. However, the institution may submit a new program report (rather than a revised report) addressing all standards, at either Feb. 1 or Sept. 15 of a calendar year (submission dates for new program reports). In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit. The program will continue to be listed as nationally recognized on the NCATE website until the end of the semester in which an accreditation decision is made for the unit. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized or nationally recognized with probation, based on the terms designated above, until the national recognition status of the program changes, or the institution loses or withdraws from accreditation.

**Not Nationally Recognized:** The program has failed to meet SPA requirements for national recognition, or conditions to national recognition, according to the expectations or time periods specified in previous national recognition report(s). A new program report may be submitted on either Feb. 1 or Sept. 15 of any calendar year; however, NCATE does not require the submission of another program report until one year before the next NCATE accreditation visit (requirement applicable only to institutions in certain states). If currently listed, the program will be dropped from the list of recognized programs on the NCATE website. Although the program’s status as a non-recognized program will not be made public, the information will be included in the BOE report and communicated to the appropriate state entity.

Comment on decision:

**Please click "Next"**

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