NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
Initial Preparation of English Language Arts Teachers

NCATE 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

Arkansas State University

Date of Review

MM   DD   YYYY

02   /   01   /   2009

This report is in response to a(n):

◯ Initial Review

◯ Revised Report

◯ Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

English Education

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)

◯ Baccalaureate

◯ Post Baccalaureate

◯ Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE Recognition of the Program(s):

◯ Nationally recognized

◯ Nationally recognized with conditions

◯ Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation [See Part G]

◯ Not nationally recognized

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

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

j◌ Yes

j◌ No

j◌ Not applicable

j◌ Not able to determine

Comment:

Summary of Strengths:

Strong focus for diverse settings in field experiences.
Program of study provides a sound background in content, with the exception of a perceived lack of non-Western literature.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. Candidates follow a specific curriculum and are expected to meet appropriate performance assessments for preservice English language arts teachers.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j◌	j◌	j◌

Comment:

All of the performance assessments except for course grades have a generic focus that the program has not revised to reflect the specifics of English language arts teaching. The rubrics are general, and the levels of performance are not adequately defined across Assessments 3-6.

Standard Category 2. Through modeling, advisement, instruction, field experiences, assessment of performance, and involvement in professional organizations, candidates adopt and strengthen professional attitudes needed by English language arts teachers.

Standard 2.1. Candidates create an inclusive and supportive learning environment in which all students can engage in learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j◌	j◌	j◌

Comment:

Standard 2.2. Candidates use ELA to help their students become familiar with their own and others' cultures.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j◌	j◌	j◌

Comment:

Course grades alone do not provide sufficient evidence for this standard. Other assessments cited are too

generic in scope to provide evidence concerning the use of English language arts.

Standard 2.3. Candidates demonstrate reflective practice, involvement in professional organizations, and collaboration with both faculty and other candidates.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ   ʝ

Comment:

Standard 2.4. Candidates use practices designed to assist students in developing habits of critical thinking and judgment.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ   ʝ

Comment:

Minimally met in cited assessments.

Standard 2.5. Candidates make meaningful connections between the ELA curriculum and developments in culture, society, and education.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ   ʝ

Comment:

Assessments cited are too generic in scope to provide evidence concerning the use of English language arts.

Standard 2.6. Candidates engage their students in activities that demonstrate the role of arts and humanities in learning.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ   ʝ

Comment:

Assessments cited are too generic in scope to provide evidence concerning the specifics of this standard, and Assessment 3, because it is not taught, cannot provide evidence of "engagement" with students.

Standard Category 3. Candidates are knowledgeable about language; literature; oral, visual, and written literacy; print and nonprint media; technology; and research theory and findings.

Standard 3.1. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of, and skills in the use of, the English language.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ   ʝ

Comment:

Minimally met in Assessments 2 and 3, although neither assessment provides a high level of acceptable evidence.

Standard 3.2. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the practices of oral, visual, and written literacy.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

No evidence in assessments cited of focuses on oral and visual literacy.

Standard 3.3. Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of reading processes.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Minimally met.

Standard 3.4. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of different composing processes.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Standard 3.5. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of, and uses for, an extensive range of literature.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Minimally meets indicator 3.5.1 but with no evidence of non-Western literature in the program of study. The program does not present sufficient evidence within Assessment 2 for the other elements of this standard, especially 3.5.2 and 3.5.4. Although Assessments 4 and 6 were also cited for this standard, no evidence specific to these elements was found. Assessment 1, PRAXIS II - English 0041, is not aligned with the range and depth of the NCTE Program Standards for content.

Standard 3.6. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the range and influence of print and nonprint media and technology in contemporary culture.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Insufficient evidence for range and influence of print and nonprint media in coursework. Other assessments cited do not focus on the specifics of this standard in their rubrics.

Standard 3.7. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of research theory and findings in English language arts.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

Standard Category 4. Candidates acquire and demonstrate the dispositions and skills needed to integrate knowledge of English language arts, students, and teaching.

Standard 4.1. Candidates examine and select resources for instruction such as textbooks, other print materials, videos, films, records, and software, appropriate for supporting the teaching of English language arts.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

Standard 4.2. Candidates align curriculum goals and teaching strategies with the organization of classroom environments and learning experiences to promote whole-class, small-group, and individual work.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

Standard 4.3. Candidates integrate interdisciplinary teaching strategies and materials into the teaching and learning process for students.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:
No evidence specific to this standard found in assessments cited.

Standard 4.4. Candidates create and sustain learning environments that promote respect for, and support of, individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

Standard 4.5. Candidates engage students often in meaningful discussions for the purposes of interpreting and evaluating ideas presented through oral, written, and/or visual forms.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

◯   ◯   ◯

Comment:

Must be met in a classroom situation (Assessments 2, 3, and 6 are not applicable). Other assessments cited do not provide evidence specific to the standard.

Standard 4.6. Candidates engage students in critical analysis of different media and communications technologies.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

◯   ◯   ◯

Comment:

Must be met in a classroom situation (Assessments 2, 3, and 6 are not applicable). Other assessments cited do not provide evidence specific to the standard.

Standard 4.7. Candidates engage students in learning experiences that consistently emphasize varied uses and purposes for language in communication.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

◯   ◯   ◯

Comment:

Must be met in a classroom situation (Assessments 2, 3, and 6 are not applicable). Other assessments cited do not provide evidence specific to the standard.

Standard 4.8. Candidates engage students in making meaning of texts through personal response.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

◯   ◯   ◯

Comment:

Must be met in a classroom situation (Assessments 2, 3, and 6 are not applicable). Other assessments cited do not provide evidence specific to the standard.

Standard 4.9. Candidates demonstrate that their students can select appropriate reading strategies that permit access to, and understanding of, a wide range of print and nonprint texts.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

◯   ◯   ◯

Comment:

Must be met in a classroom situation (Assessments 2, 3, and 6 are not applicable). Other assessments cited do not provide evidence specific to the standard.

Standard 4.10. Candidates integrate assessment consistently into instruction by using a variety of formal and informal assessment activities and instruments to evaluate processes and products, and creating regular opportunities to use a variety of ways to interpret and report assessment methods and results to students, parents, administrators, and other audiences.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Assessment 1 - PRAXIS II English Examinations (0041, 0042, 0043). Program provides evidence that their candidates exceed the 80% pass rate NCATE requires. It is unclear when these tests are required-- at exit? prior to student teaching? The program should clarify that. From the information submitted, one assumes that it is an exit from the program requirement, but nothing to that effect is stated.
Assessment 2 - Course Grades. Does not follow the required protocol for the course matrix [see Use of Grades on the NCTE/NCATE Connection web page of the NCTE web site (www.ncte.org/cee/ncate)], and the required grade range is not present in the data tables. Rather, the prgram has provided an aggregate for the three academic years. Standards that require "engagement" with students in a classroom (2.6, 4.5-4.9) cannot be met by coursework (EDEN - Methods). Data are not disaggregated by standard as required.
Assessment 6 - Portfolio. This assessment consists of different sections, including Assessment 3 materials. No specific rubric addressing levels of performance related to cited standards was submitted for any of the sections. It is difficult to ascertain that the depth required of non-engagement standards is met. Does not provide evidence for any of the engagement standards (2.6, 4.5-4.9) since these require classroom performance. Data are not disaggregated by standard as required.

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

Assessment 3 - Planning Instruction (three-week unit). The rubrics as submitted are too general to determine if the cited standards that require English language arts planning are met. This assessment, not taught, cannot be used to meet engagement Standard 2.6. Standard Category 1.0, while cited, is met through the context narrative and the full range of performance assessments, not in any one assessment. Data are not disaggregated by standard as required.
Assessment 4 - Student Teaching - Summative. This assessment is too generic in scope to provide adequate evidence for the cited standards. This could be remedied with an addendum or a more focused overlay for the standards specific to English language arts teaching. Data are not disaggregated by standard as required.

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

Assessment 5 - Teacher Research Project. This assessment provides only a broad alignment, not specific enough for evidence related to English language arts teaching. The levels of performance are not adequately defined. No scoring rubric was submitted. Data are not disaggregated by standard as required.

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)

Except for Assessment 1, the program seems to have a mostly narrative evaluation system with anecdotal evidence from interviews with candidates and faculty. Standards require that the program work with the unit to develop a more targeted, data-rich system for evaluating the program in all areas.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

See Part C for specifics regarding Assessments 2-6 and the NCTE/NCATE requirements for rubrics and presentation of data. As submitted, most of the program's assessments are too general to provide adequate evidence for those standards specifically focused on English language arts teaching.
Also the program did not submit the proper faculty information. All faculty who supervise and/or teach key courses in English and in education should be listed.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

It is highly recommended that the program consult with the NCTE/NCATE program coordinator before beginning any revisions. Also, it is recommended that the program use the documents provided on the NCTE/NCATE Connection web page (www.ncte.org/cee/ncate/program)

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

◯ The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

PROGRAM DOES NOT MEET SPA REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED

Terms and Subsequent Actions

◯ **National Recognition with Probation:** The program does not satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. The program has **up to two opportunities** to submit revised reports addressing unmet standards and other concerns noted in the recognition report. The range of possible deadlines for these reports are April 15, 2009 (with a response due back from the SPA by 9/1/09); September 15, 2009 (with a response due back from the SPA by 2/1/10); and February 1, 2010 (with a response due back by 7/15/10). **Note that the opportunity to submit two revised reports is only possible if the first revised report is submitted by the April 15, 2009 deadline. However, the program should NOT submit a Revised Report until it is confident that it has addressed all of the unmet standards and any other critical concerns cited in this recognition report.** If no reports are submitted by 2/1/10, program status will revert to not recognized. After 2/1/10, NCATE will not accept a revised report. However, the institution may submit a new program report (rather than a revised report) addressing all standards, at either Feb. 1 or Sept. 15 of a calendar year (submission

dates for new program reports). In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

Comment on decision:

Please click "Next"

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