

**NATIONAL COUNCIL for the SOCIAL STUDIES  
Summary Report of Program Review Decisions**

**Date of Review:** Fall, 2003

\_\_\_ Initial review  
  X 2<sup>nd</sup> review  
\_\_\_ 3<sup>rd</sup> review

**Coordinator of Reviews:** Robert M. Toepper

**Institution Submitting Program**

**State**

Southern Connecticut State University

CT

**Program(s)**

**Degree Level**

Initial teaching license:  
Middle and Secondary School Social Studies, gr. 7-12

Baccalaureate  
Post-Baccalaureate  
Master's

**Decision**

Program(s) that merit(s) national recognition: NONE

Program(s) not approved for national recognition:

Middle and Secondary School Social Studies, gr. 7-12

**Standards Met or Not Met**

Met:           3.1 and 3.2

Not Met:      1.1 – 1.10, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4

**Summary of Overall Program Strengths**

The programmatic evidence is adequate for Standards 1.1 - 1.7, 1.9 and 1.10.

Although overwhelming and not concisely summarized, testing evidence for Standards 1.1 – 1.7, 1.9, and 1.10 was considered adequate.

If there actually is a Middle and Secondary History licensure program, the programmatic and testing evidence for it is adequate.

Standard 3.1 is now considered met.

**Summary of Overall Program Weaknesses**

The organization of the report is still quite confusing. Data was often difficult to locate due to a mass of useless material. The pages of the appendices were not numbered. In Fall, 2002, the University listed only what the NCSS calls “Broad Field Social Studies” as a program being reviewed. In Fall 2003, no “Rejoinder Cover Sheet” was included with the document for review which would have stated what programs were seeking review, but Standard 2.1 was submitted giving the impression that a Middle and Secondary School History program is also part of the University’s licensure program. Or, does the University actually offer a Broad Field Social Studies licensure program with a history major? If the latter is true, which appears so from various contexts within the report, it is not necessary to complete Standard 2.1.

It still appears to the reviewers that the person or people who prepared the report do not understand performance data. No entries were made in the performance evidence entries for Standards 1.1 through 1.10 and 2.1.

For Standard 1.8, the units or aspects of courses where Science, Technology, and Society are emphasized were not described as programmatic evidence and the assessments of these various units or aspects were not described as testing evidence. The two courses listed appear to be only elective possibilities.

Please note: For Standards 3.1 through 3.4, only programmatic evidence is expected.

Standard 3.2 was met in Fall 2002.

In the description for Standard 3.3, the two methods course professor’s credentials were not listed; however, they are briefly described in the listing of history faculty earlier in Standard 3.3.

For Standard 3.4, the criteria for or credentials of cooperating teachers were not listed.

### **Comments on Introductory Information**

Please include a “Rejoinder Cover Sheet” at the beginning of the next rejoinder report.

### **Explanation and Rationale for Not Met Decisions for Each Standard**

This section of the program reviewers’ report includes a synopsis of the rationale and recommendations for each standard NOT MET. The report follows the order and format of the professional specialty association standards. Standards not listed are assumed MET.

### Standard 1.7: Programmatic and Testing Evidence

For this standard, emphasizing Science, Technology, and Society, it would be advised that the University report the units or aspects of various courses, probably more than the two electives listed, where this topic is emphasized.

### Performance Evidence: Standards 1.1 – 1.10 (and 2.1)

Performance evidence is, by far, the most crucial aspect of the next rejoinder report. (Responding to the other three Not Met criteria should take less than five total pages.)

A summary of at least cooperating teacher assessments of candidates' abilities to teach real students in real classrooms the content applicable to each of the ten NCSS standards are required here. The format for performance evidence would include adding at least the following to your institution's more generic student teaching assessment instrument:

- the title of each standard;
- possibly, a brief description of the content included in each standard;
- a rubric similar to the rubric for the generic student teaching assessment form by which each cooperating teacher assesses his or her student teacher's ability to teach content applicable to each standard.

An example of performance evidence rubrics is available on the NCSS website ([www.ncss.org](http://www.ncss.org)).

The overall data could be placed in a data array in an Appendix and a summary chart applicable to each standard could be explained in each standard description.

### Standard 3.3

Could more be said about the credentials of the two methods course instructors?

### Standard 3.4

Briefly, what are the credentials of cooperating teachers and how are they selected?

### The rejoinder process

If the faculty chooses to submit a rejoinder to the Summary Report of Program Review Decisions, it is suggested that they consult the NCSS web page for the appropriate documentation. The NCSS sponsors a standards clinic each November one day before the annual conference. Workshops and consultant services are also scheduled upon request of the Coordinator of NCSS Social Studies Teacher Education Program Reviews.

In rejoining, the faculty should submit TWO copies of the rejoinder. The rejoinder should consist of the cover page; a copy of this Summary Report of Program Review Decisions; the required introductory institutional context data; the COMPLETE matrix for all Not Met standards; and, in an Appendix, any data necessary to explain, clarify, elaborate, or reinforce descriptions presented in the matrices. It is NOT necessary to include standards already met.

NCATE rejoinder deadlines are September 15 and April 15 of each year. However, NCSS has no requirement that a rejoinder be submitted within a specific time after an institution's initial review. Institutions are NOT encouraged to submit a rejoinder by the next deadline if the conditions that led to a program's not being approved for national recognition have not yet been adequately addressed.

If additional information is necessary in order to submit a successful rejoinder, please contact Robert M. (Bob) Toepper, Ph.D., Coordinator of NCSS Social Studies Teacher Education Program Reviews, at 708-447-8218 (home), 630-624-0279 (cell), or [crftoepper@curf.edu](mailto:crftoepper@curf.edu) (email).