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Disclaimer

This presentation was produced under U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Award No. H325A120003. Bonnie Jones and David Guardino serve as the project officers. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or polices of the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service, or enterprise mentioned in this presentation is intended or should be inferred.
Several CEEDAR states are engaged in the process of revising SE licensure (including CA, NH, and FL)

We’ve entertained several requests for information about what other states are doing
Purpose

✧ Describe current special education licensure structures
✧ Compare current structures with those described by Geiger, Crutchfield, & Mainzer (2003)
✧ Assess the impact of licensure structure on SET shortage, service delivery, and student outcomes
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
How SE Licenses Are Differentiated

- Disability Categories
- Levels of Severity
- Grade Bands
- Absence of Differentiation: Generalist
The Current Landscape of SET Licensure
Data Gathering

- Electronic search in Google
- State Department of Education websites
  - Certification areas
  - Age and grade bands
  - Endorsement areas
- Two independent state certification databases
Data Vetting

- Compared the independent databases
- Verified by phone and email contact with each state
- We were able to vet 47 of the 50 states
Data Organization

平整

- Matrix in Excel
- We coded each state by:
  - Number of certificates
  - Certification areas
  - Age and grade bands
  - Severity
  - Endorsements
- Reached inter-rater agreement
Exclusions

Certificates excluded from our analysis:
- Early Childhood N= 38
- Visually Impaired N= 44
- Hearing Impaired N= 45

P-12 and VI/HI endorsements
Disability Categories

✧ 9 states use categories
  – Strictly categorical N= 1
  – With generalist N= 6
  – With severity N= 2
✧ Example: Michigan
  – Cognitive Impairment
  – Physical or Other Health Impairment
  – Emotional Impairment
  – Learning Disabilities
  – Autism Spectrum Disorder
Grade Bands

✧ 19 states use grade bands
  – 2 grade bands N= 11
  – 3 grade bands N= 8
✧ Grade bands and generalist K-12
  – N= 10
-Generalist

- 20 States have purely non-categorical licensure structures
  - With grade bands N= 6
  - With no grade bands N= 14
- With categorical distinction
  - With grade bands N= 5
  - With no grade bands N= 4
- With severity distinction
  - With grade bands N= 1
  - With no grade bands N= 2
Examples of Generalist

✧ With categorical distinction: Wyoming
  – Generalist
  – Learning Disability
  – Cognitive Disability
  – Behavioral and Emotional Disability
  – Physical and Health Disability

✧ With severity distinction: Ohio
  – Generalist
  – Mild/Moderate
  – Moderate/Intensive
Other Dimensions

✧ Curriculum
  – General versus Adapted
  – Special Needs Vocational

✧ Professional roles
  – Consultant
  – Strategist
  – Inclusion/Collaboration

✧ States in which special education certificate must be added on to a general certificate N= 5
  – i.e., no stand alone special education certificate
21 states differ on the basis of severity

- With grade bands N= 9
  - Mild/Moderate only N= 7
  - Severe/Profound N= 2
- With No grade bands
  - N = 12
Examples of Severity and Grade Bands

şıLouisiana
- Mild/Moderate
  • Grades 1-5, 4-8, 6-12
- Significant Disabilities
  • Grades 1-12

şıHawaii
- Mild/Moderate
  • Grades PK-12, K-6, 6-8, 6-12, K-12
- Severe/Profound
  • Grades PK-12, K-6, 6-8, 6-12, K-12
How Has SET Licensure Changed Since 2000?
State Level Change

✧ Most states have changed licensure structure since 2000
  – Only 16 state licensure structures are unchanged or largely unchanged

✧ 15 states eliminated differentiation on the basis of disability category
  – One state added 3
  – Several states demoted category to endorsement
General Comparisons

- 2000: Many more states used disability categories
- 2000: Many more states have generic certificate as well as categorical structure
- No substantial difference between 2000 and 2016 in use of grade bands or severity levels
Example: New Hampshire

2000

✧ K-12 Licenses in
  – MR
  – ED
  – OI
  – SLD
  – Generic Special Education

2016

✧ K-12 Generalist License
✧ K-12 Endorsements in
  – EBD
  – Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities
  – Physical and Health Disabilities
  – SLD
State Level Change

✧ 8 states added age/grade bands
  – Although 3 states eliminated them
✧ 5 states added differentiation on the basis of severity
Examples

Louisiana: Age/Grade Bands

✧ 2000
  – Mild/Moderate K-12
  – Severe/Profound K-12

✧ 2016
  – Significant Disabilities 1-12
  – General/Mild/Moderate 1-5
  – General/Mild/Moderate 4-8
  – General/Mild/Moderate 6-12

Nevada: Levels of Severity

✧ 2000
  – 3-21 years in MR, ED, OI, A, OHI, and SLD
  – K-12 Generalist Mild/Moderate Needs (LD, ED, MR)

✧ 2016
  – Generalist Resource Room K-12
  – Intellectual Disabilities (moderate to intense) K-12
  – Autism 3-21 years (retained)
Does Licensure Structure Make a Difference?
Does Licensure Structure Make a Difference? (cont.)

✧ Three outcome measures
  – % of HQ SETs (ideadata.org)
  – Placement (ideadata.org)
  – Student outcomes (NCES, NAEP data)

✧ T-Test to compare:
  - Generalist Vs. Other
  - Categorical Vs. Other
  - Severity Vs. Other

• All 50 states were included
% of Highly Qualified SETs - 2013

GENERALIST VS OTHER

GENERALIST (N=19) 90.31
OTHER (N=31) 93.63

SEVERITY VS OTHER

SEVERITY (N=20) 92.83
OTHER (N=30) 92.06

CATEGORICAL VS OTHER

CATEGORICAL (N=15) 95.03
OTHER (N=35) 91.22
Placement

Generalist Vs Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalist (N=19)</th>
<th>Other (N=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.82</td>
<td>63.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Severity Vs Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity (N=20)</th>
<th>Other (N=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.13</td>
<td>64.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Categorical Vs Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical (N=15)</th>
<th>Other (N=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.65</td>
<td>63.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No significant difference between the groups on Grade 8 Math, Grade 4 Math and Grade 4 Reading NAEP Scores

Significant difference in mean on Reading Grade 8 (p<.05) in favor of states that have Categorical licenses.

-Interpret with caution
Data Analysis Methods - Severity

• Two-Way ANOVA
  • Main Effects for Severity and Grade Bands
  ○ Interaction Effects: Severity by Grade Bands

• 43 states were included
Severity by Grade Bands Distribution

- Severity & No Grade Bands: N=14
- Severity & Grade Bands: N=11
- No Severity & No Grade Bands: N=13
- No Severity & Grade Bands: N=5
Average % of Highly Qualified SETs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEVERITY &amp; GRADE BANDS</th>
<th>SEVERITY &amp; NO GRADE BANDS</th>
<th>NO SEVERITY &amp; NO GRADE BANDS</th>
<th>NO SEVERITY &amp; GRADE BANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average % of SWDs Fully Included

- Severity & Grade Bands: 64.56%
- Severity & No Grade Bands: 64.49%
- No Severity & No Grade Bands: 60.73%
- No Severity & Grade Bands: 68.25%
AVERAGE NAEP MATH SCORES 2015

Grade 8

Grade 4
AVERAGE NAEP READING SCORES 2015

SEVERITY & GRADE BANDS

Grade 8: 228.28
Grade 4: 180.25

SEVERITY & NO GRADE BANDS

Grade 8: 223.56
Grade 4: 186.79

NO SEVERITY & NO GRADE BANDS

Grade 8: 226.05
Grade 4: 180.72

NO SEVERITY & GRADE BANDS

Grade 8: 226.46
Grade 4: 182.33
Key Findings

✧ No significant main effect for:
  ◦ Severity on all outcomes
  ◦ Grade bands on all outcomes

✧ No significant interaction effects on all outcomes
How Do “Effective” States License SETs?
Procedures

✧ Ranked states on three criteria
  - % SETs HQ (ideadata.org, 2013)
  - % of SWDs in inclusive placements (ideadata.org, 2013)
  - NAEP 8th grade reading (NCES)

✧ Identified states that ranked in the top 10 in at least two categories and no lower than top 20 in the third

✧ Examined SE licensure structure and asked: Are they licensing SETs in the same way?
Effective States

✧ Small, New England: Generalist with categorical endorsements
  - Generalist K-12
  - 4 Categorical Endorsements, K-12

✧ Northern Prairie: Gen Ed Anchor, SE Endorsements
  - ED, ID, SLD, and Strategist endorsements to...
  - early childhood, elementary, middle, or secondary education license
Effective States (cont.)

✧ Great Plains State:
Generalist with Age/grade band
- Generalist K-12
- Generalist K-6
- Generalist 7-12
- Also: functionally defined endorsements

✧ Southern State:
Severity only
- Learning and Behavior Disorders K-12
- Moderate and Severe Disabilities K-12
Concluding Thoughts

✧ There are several ways of licensing SETs to produce...
  – Low % of out-of-field teachers
  – High % of inclusive placements for SWDs
  – High performance on NAEP assessments

✧ If your state is undergoing licensure reform...
  – Don’t let shortage drive the conversation
  – Advocate for the important distinctions you see a need for from your perspective as a teacher educator