

# 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 / 2019

**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<sup>(1)</sup>**

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 offered evidence of strong individual attention to candidates.

**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:**

Data and analysis have been provided per the conditions of the previous report. Note comments in Part D.

**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:**

Data and analysis have been provided per the conditions of the previous report. Note comments in Part D.

**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:**

Data and analysis have been provided per the conditions of the previous report. Note comments in Part D.

**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:**

Data and analysis have been provided per the conditions of the previous report. Note comments in Part D.

**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:**

Data and analysis have been provided per the conditions of the previous report. Note comments in Part D.

**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:**

Data and analysis have been provided per the conditions of the previous report. Note comments in Part D.

**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:**

Data and analysis have been provided per the conditions of the previous report. Note comments in Part D.

## PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

### C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

See previous report.

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

Assessment 3: The program responded that it recognizes that the assessment is "packed" but reviewers feel they may have misinterpreted the comment from the previous report. It is not that the rubric is large in scale--large rubrics for this type of assessment are not uncommon. The trouble is that quite different expectations are measured with a single score. As an assessment tool, this eliminates the validity of the data, and even though candidate numbers are small, the rubric provides no data that can be used for tracing long-term trends. Reviewers realize that one-on-one interactions with candidates is vital, and the program is commended for such actions. However, not using a valid rubric begs a number of important questions: 1) How can the program be sure of consistency regarding individual candidates over time; 2) how can the program measure performance trends of individuals components within the Elements over the next seven year cycle (looking at a larger data set from that seven year period); 3) what happens with reliability of the next seven years if there is any turnover in faculty?

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

See previous report.

## 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 data by Standard/Element but not clearly aligned to the assessment pieces from which they were taken. Reviewers were able to go back and assemble the larger picture of--assessment to Standard to rubrics to assessment--but in future reports the program should combine these pieces together in order to provide a clearer assessment package. However, data have been provided per the conditions of the previous report.

## PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

### Areas for consideration

As noted in other places in this report, the program has provided evidence of addressing NCTE Standards, but moving forward the program is strongly encouraged to be more precise in measuring candidate performance on the individual components of the Standards/Elements in a way that provides credible data over time. NCTE understands that the 'n' may be small for a given application, but analysis of the data should be able to address trends over multiple years; thus, indeed analyzing a larger data set. With performance of diverse expectations captured by a single score, this type of analysis is impossible. Reviewers will expect to see this level of measure in the program's next recognition cycle.

## 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.** The program is recognized through the semester and year of the provider's next CAEP accreditation decision in 5-7 years. The Recognition Report will serve as program level evidence for the accreditation cycle it has been initiated. **To retain recognition and to gather new evidence for the next accreditation cycle, another program report must be submitted mid-cycle 3 years in advance of the next scheduled accreditation visit.** The program will be listed as Nationally Recognized through the semester of the next CAEP accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and CAEP. The institution may designate its program as Nationally Recognized by the SPA, through the semester of the next CAEP accreditation decision, in its published materials. *Please note that once a program has been Nationally Recognized, it may not submit another report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns cited in the recognition report.*

Please click "Next"

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