Procedure for Reviewing Option C Program Reports[[1]](#footnote-1)

1. First, determine whether the overall decision in the prior report was full CEC program recognition and whether there were any required changes in the prior program review report.

If the answer is yes, the report can be reviewed for as an Option C data only.

1. Next, determine whether the overall decision in the prior report was full CEC program recognition and whether there are no voluntary changes in alignments and assessments by comparing Charts II and III from the prior Program Report with the current Program Report.

If the answer is yes, the Program Report can be reviewed for data alone.

1. If there are required or voluntary significant changes in either assessments or alignments, determine whether the program report has identified these changes as significant, and has included the appropriate narrative and documentation in the current report.

If the answer is yes, the Program Report can be reviewed for both alignments and data.

1. If there are significant changes in the assessment or alignments that the Program Report does not identify or does not include the appropriate narrative and documentation determine whether there is sufficient information in the current Program Report to conduct a review of all of the changes.

If the answer is yes, then conduct a full review of ALL required and voluntary significant changes. In the program review report indicate that the current program report did not identify all significant changes, the basis for this determination, and then add the review determinations of the alignments, assessments, and data.

1. If there is insufficient information in the Program Report to conduct a review of ALL of the required and voluntary significant changes, contact Kathlene and Richard to make a collective decision and work with NCATE if we determine we will not review it as an Option C[[2]](#footnote-2).

Special Note

Option C program reports are based on a prior program report that was recognized without conditions. Some program reports reviewed under an earlier review rubric present a dilemma because CEC had allowed reviewers to determine full program recognition even with changes needed to one or two program assessments. CEC has changed to a clearer program review rubric requiring all CEC Content Standards be met to grant a full program recognition.

In these situations program reviewers will review program report submitted under Option C from the perspective it was developed, i.e. the earlier program report was fully recognized. However, it is collegially important to make the program faculty aware of the context and dilemma. In these situations, the following language is suggested for Part E of the Program Review Report.:

The program faculty in good faith submitted the present report as an Option C and it is from this perspective that CEC reviews the program report. However, faculty should be aware that one or more CEC Content Standards were found to be “not met” in the prior report. If the alignments of the assessments and rubrics to the major elements of the CEC Content Standards were not sufficiently clear and convincing in the prior report, the data in the present report based on those assessments cannot be convincing in establishing that the program candidates are mastering the major elements of the CEC Content Standards.

Based on the implementation of the Option C and its own learning, CEC has modified the program review rubric used when this program report was earlier reviewed. The present program review rubric requires clear and convincing evidence of alignment of program assessments with the major elements of the all the CEC Content Standards as informed by the appropriate specialty set(s).

1. The term “significant” is used to mean changes of 30% or more to each of the program assessments and scoring guides that are used to address the major elements of a CEC Content Standard. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For Option C Program Reports note on the CEC Assignment Chart in the "Decision/Notes" column whether it was a data only review, a review of identified significant changes and data, a review of all found significant changes and data, or insufficient information of review. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)