

**SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
SUMMARY REPORT OF PROGRAM REVIEW DECISIONS**

Date of Review: *November 2000*

Coordinator of Reviews: *Charles B. Myers*

Professional Organization Conducting Review

 x Initial review

 2nd review

 3rd review

National Council for the Social Studies

Institution Submitting Program

State

Loyola College in Maryland

MD

Program(s)

Degree Level

Secondary and Middle Level Social Studies

*Baccalaureate, Post-
Baccalaureate,
Masters*

Decisions

Program(s) that merits national recognition

None

Program(s) not approved for national recognition

Secondary and Middle Level Social Studies for all three degrees

Standards Met or Not Met

Standards Not Met:

Standards 1.1 – 1.10, 3.4

Standard Met with Weakness:

Standard 3.1

Standards Met:

Standards 3.2, 3.3

Summary of Overall Program Strengths

The Secondary Social Studies Methods course appears to be an exceptionally strong and exceptionally thorough course. The institution's use of the course from a neighboring institution is worthy of praise.

Summary of Overall Program Weaknesses

The program seems to be strong, but the evidence that is presented needs to be supplemented and to be tied to the NCSS standards more directly.

Status of Performance Assessment Transition

Not applicable for social studies program reviews.

Comments on Contextual Information

The contextual information is useful but rather brief.

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 NCSS standards. Standards judged to be Met are not listed.

Standards 1.1 – 1.10 are Not Met:

Programmatic evidence – Although there are well described course experiences for each standard, there is no assurance that candidates in the various majors take at least one of the courses listed for each standard. So, some candidates seem to miss all of the targeted courses under each standard.

Testing evidence – The problem noted above seems to apply here as well, except for DEDU 439, which seems to carry much of the responsibility for meeting the content knowledge of many standards. The assessments in DEDU 439 are exceptionally well developed and strong; however, one more type of testing evidence data is needed: How well did candidates who took the course recently perform on each of the assessments in terms of the standards for which the testing task is listed?

Performance evidence – Praxis II test data should be reported under testing evidence instead of performance evidence, and, when it is, it needs to be supplemented by additional testing evidence that is more specific to the individual standards than the Praxis II data are. Most of the performance evidence other than that concerning Praxis II is too general, not tied to specific performances, not tied to the specific standards, and does not include how candidates are evaluated or what grades they were assigned. In short, the performance evidence does not show how the institution sees in a candidate's performance as a teacher if he/she can teach the content of each theme.

Standard 3.1 is Met with Weakness because of the concern mentioned above under "programmatic evidence" for Standards 1.1 – 1.10.

Standard 3.4 is Not Met because the response is too brief and is not tied to social studies.

If Loyola College of Maryland chooses to submit a rejoinder, it might find information in the following documents useful: “Preparing An Institution’s Social Studies Program Review Document” (Available from the NCSS web site at no cost); Guidebook for Colleges and Universities Preparing Social Studies Teachers (NCSS, 2000). (Available from NCSS at a cost of \$20.00.)

If Loyola College submits a rejoinder to this critique, it should submit two copies of the rejoinder. The rejoinder should consist of the cover page, a copy of this critique, necessary introductory materials, the complete matrix for all Not Met standards, and attached documents necessary to explain, clarify, elaborate, or reinforce arguments made in the matrix.