

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of English Language Arts Teachers (2012 Standards)

National recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Clarion University, PA

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

08 / 01 / 2018

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

B.S.Ed. in Secondary English Education

Grade Level⁽¹⁾

7-12

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA decision on national recognition of the Program(s):

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation OR Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds SPA benchmarked licensure test data requirement, if applicable:

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

Summary of Strengths:

The program has considered the NCTE standards and elements when revising rubrics as per the conditions of the previous report.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes literature and multimedia texts as well as knowledge of the nature of adolescents as readers.

Element 1: Candidates are knowledgeable about texts—print and non-print texts, media texts, classic texts and contemporary texts, including young adult—that represent a range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different genders, ethnicities, and social classes; they are able to use literary theories to interpret and critique a range of texts.

Element 2: Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents read texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

No data nor analysis for the Standard have been provided.
The rubric for Assessment 7, which is aligned to this standard appears questionable considering the broad nature of the categories. See Part C.

STANDARD 2: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes language and writing as well as knowledge of adolescents as language users.

Element 1: Candidates can compose a range of formal and informal texts taking into consideration the interrelationships among form, audience, context, and purpose; candidates understand that writing is a recursive process; candidates can use contemporary technologies and/or digital media to compose multimodal discourse.

Element 2: Candidates know the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics); they understand the concept of dialect and are familiar with relevant grammar systems (e.g., descriptive and prescriptive); they understand principles of language acquisition; they recognize the influence of English language history on English Language Arts content; and they understand the impact of language on society.

Element 3: Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

No data nor analysis for the Standard have been provided.

STANDARD 3: CONTENT PEDAGOGY: Planning Literature and Reading Instruction in English Language Arts

Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for reading and the study of literature to promote learning for all students.

Element 1: Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences utilizing a range of different texts—across genres, periods, forms, authors, cultures, and various forms of media—and instructional strategies that are motivating and accessible to all students, including English language learners, students with special needs, students from diverse language and learning backgrounds, those designated as high achieving, and those at risk of failure.

Element 2: Candidates design a range of authentic assessments (e.g., formal and informal, formative and summative) of reading and literature that demonstrate an understanding of how learners develop and that address interpretive, critical, and evaluative abilities in reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and presenting.

Element 3: Candidates plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences in reading that reflect knowledge of current theory and research about the teaching and learning of reading and that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and a variety of reading strategies.

Element 4: Candidates design or knowledgeably select appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about student interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes.

Element 5: Candidates plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language—structure, history, and

conventions—to facilitate students’ comprehension and interpretation of print and non-print texts.

Element 6: Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

No data nor analysis for the Standard have been provided.
The rubric for Assessment 3, which is aligned to this standard appears questionable considering the broad nature of the categories. See Part C.

STANDARD 4: CONTENT PEDAGOGY: Planning Composition Instruction in English Language Arts
Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for composing texts (i.e., oral, written, and visual) to promote learning for all students.

Element 1: Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant composing experiences that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and contemporary technologies and reflect an understanding of writing processes and strategies in different genres for a variety of purposes and audiences.

Element 2: Candidates design a range of assessments for students that promote their development as writers, are appropriate to the writing task, and are consistent with current research and theory. Candidates are able to respond to student writing in process and to finished texts in ways that engage students’ ideas and encourage their growth as writers over time.

Element 3: Candidates design instruction related to the strategic use of language conventions (grammar, usage, and mechanics) in the context of students’ writing for different audiences, purposes, and modalities.

Element 4: Candidates design instruction that incorporates students’ home and community languages to enable skillful control over their rhetorical choices and language practices for a variety of audiences and purposes.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

No data nor analysis for the Standard have been provided.

STANDARD 5: LEARNERS & LEARNING: Implementing English Language Arts Instruction
Candidates plan, implement, assess, and reflect on research-based instruction that increases motivation and active student engagement, builds sustained learning of English language arts, and responds to diverse students’ context-based needs.

Element 1: Candidates plan and implement instruction based on English Language Arts curricular requirements and standards, school and community contexts, and knowledge about students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Element 2: Candidates use data about their students’ individual differences, identities, and funds of knowledge for literacy learning to create inclusive learning environments that contextualize curriculum and instruction and help students participate actively in their own learning in English Language Arts.

Element 3: Candidates differentiate instruction based on students’ self-assessments and formal and informal assessments of learning in English language arts; candidates communicate with students about their performance in ways that actively involve them in their own learning.

Element 4: Candidates select, create, and use a variety of instructional strategies and teaching resources, including contemporary technologies and digital media, consistent with what is currently known about student learning in English Language Arts.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

No data nor analysis for the Standard have been provided.

STANDARD 6: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how theories and research about social justice, diversity, equity, student identities, and schools as institutions can enhance students’ opportunities to learn in English

Language Arts.

Element 1: Candidates plan and implement English language arts and literacy instruction that promotes social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society.

Element 2: Candidates use knowledge of theories and research to plan instruction responsive to students' local, national and international histories, individual identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender expression, age, appearance, ability, spiritual belief, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and community environment), and languages/dialects as they affect students' opportunities to learn in English Language Arts.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

No data nor analysis for the Standard have been provided.

STANDARD 7: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Candidates are prepared to interact knowledgeably with students, families, and colleagues based on social needs and institutional roles, engage in leadership and/or collaborative roles in English Language Arts professional learning communities, and actively develop as professional educators.

Element 1: Candidates model literate and ethical practices in English Language Arts teaching, and engage in/reflect on a variety of experiences related to English Language Arts.

Element 2: Candidates engage in and reflect on a variety of experiences related to English Language Arts that demonstrate understanding of and readiness for leadership, collaboration, ongoing professional development, and community engagement.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

No data nor analysis for the Standard have been provided.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Assessment 7: Student Teaching Performance Profile--as with Assessment 3, it's difficult to understand how the rubric will provide valid data for analysis. For instance, one data point is purported to represent eleven different categories of texts, experiences, and theory. The program will need to explain in its analysis from the rubric how the data from the Standard 1/Element 1 line differentiates among all these components.

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

Assessment 3: Thematic Unit Plan--the program has provided a revised rubric that is aligned to Standard 3 Elements. It's difficult to see, however, how such broad categories on the rubric can produce quality data for analysis. For instance, a single data point is purported to reflect candidate mastery of planning for ELA learners AND special needs students AND diverse backgrounds AND high-achieving students AND at-risk students, all at the same time. It is unclear how a single score can reflect all of this in a specific and meaningful way. The program will need to explain this in their data analysis.

Assessment 4: Student Teaching Performance Profile and Action Research Report--the program has provided an aligned rubric supporting Standard 7.

Assessment 6: Writing Unit Plan--the program has provided an aligned rubric addressing Standard 4.

Assessment 8: Student Teacher Performance Profile and Reflection Report--the program has provided an aligned rubric for this assessment.

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

Assessment 5: Action Research Plan--the program has provided an aligned rubric addressing Standard 5.

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 has provided rubrics but no data nor analysis as required by the conditions of the previous report.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

The program has made efforts to include the Elements of the Standards within their rubrics, but there are some considerable questions as to how the data from those rubrics will be valid enough for programmatic reflection and improvement. The Standards/Elements were conceived to be broad in order to provide programs flexibility in how they choose to address them. Because of this broad spectrum of expectations, even at the level of the Element, NCTE does not suggest pasting them as whole units with a rubric for the reasons state in Part C of this report.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the CAEP site visitors:

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- National Recognition with Conditions. The program has received a decision of conditional national recognition. See below for details.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM DD YYYY
08 / 01 / 2019

Subsequent action by the institution: Programs will have a maximum of two opportunities to resubmit a report with revisions to receive National Recognition. A report addressing the conditions must be submitted in accordance with the dates provided on the National Recognition Report. A program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it has the required data and is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this Recognition Report. If no reports are submitted by the noted date, the program's recognition status will expire and revert to Not Recognized. In case the status expires, the program will not be able to submit a Response to Conditions Report, but may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review if time permits for the current CAEP accreditation cycle. Otherwise, the program may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review for the next CAEP accreditation cycle, three years before the site visit.

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a second Response to Conditions Report, the next report must be submitted by the date below. Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM DD YYYY
03 / 15 / 2019

The following conditions must be addressed within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued. See above for specific date.

Provide no less than one application of data and analysis for Assessments 3-8. Candidate mastery of all of the components must be included in the analysis. The program is also strongly encouraged to provide an explanation as to how it maintains reliability and validity of single data points on such broad rubric categories, especially but not limited to, Assessments 3 & 7. See Part C for further details.

Please click "Next"

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