

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

Eastern Michigan University

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

02 / 01 / 2010

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

Language, Literature, & Writing for Teachers

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 **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

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

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

- Yes

- jn No
- jn Not applicable
- jn Not able to determine

Comment:

Summary of Strengths:

The program explains the interrelatedness among standards well. The program also provides clear descriptions of the relationships of state and NCTE standards. The narratives are thorough and illustrate communication and cooperation among the many faculty and supervisors involved in candidates' path to becoming professionals. The program includes strong and valuable requirements for cooperating teachers: 3 years experience, a Masters degree, administrator recommendation, demonstrated classroom success, and a commitment to help candidates develop as teachers.

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
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The program of study seems rigorous and thorough. Candidates are expected to have broad content knowledge.

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
jn	jn	jn

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
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The data from Assessment #3 are based on candidates' reflection on their own teaching and learning,

which seems more subjective. The data from Assessments #5 and #8 are based on observations and assessments by candidates' supervisors, which is more objective.

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
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

As illustrated by the narrative in Assessment #8, collaboration is an important part of the program.

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

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

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

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

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
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

Assessment #5 seems to provide more objective evidence of meeting this standard.

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
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

--

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

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j _n	j _n	j _n

Comment:

Oral and visual literacy is not addressed in Assessment #1, but it is addressed briefly in Assessment #5 and more in depth in Assessment #7.

Standard 3.3. Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of reading processes.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j _n	j _n	j _n

Comment:

--

Standard 3.4. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of different composing processes.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j _n	j _n	j _n

Comment:

--

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

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j _n	j _n	j _n

Comment:

Assessment #6 provides strong evidence of this standard.

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
j _n	j _n	j _n

Comment:

Assessment #5 barely addresses this where the standard is aligned with the rubric. However, the last section of the rubric aligns with Standard 4 which seems to address this standard. Assessment #1 addresses this standard, but NCTE is wary of how effectively a standardized test can assess a candidate's skills. This standard is minimally met.

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

language arts.

Met Met with Conditions
jn jn

Not Met
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
jn jn

Not Met
jn

Comment:

Data from Assessments #3 and #4 imply that candidates examine and select resources for instruction, but more evidence would be better. This standard seems to be addressed but is based indirectly on the wording used for the rubric points aligned with this particular standard.
The report indicates that this standard is evaluated through an essay and through student teaching, but a reference in the report to when and how candidates are asked to evaluate the various texts and media they will incorporate into their lessons is not apparent.

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
jn jn

Not Met
jn

Comment:

This standard seems to be addressed but is based indirectly on the wording used for the rubric points aligned with this particular standard. There is no mention of how curriculum and teaching strategies promote student work.

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

Met Met with Conditions
jn jn

Not Met
jn

Comment:

This standard seems to be addressed but is based indirectly on the wording used for the rubric points aligned with this particular standard. Assessment #3 is the only assessment that addresses this standard.

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
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

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
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

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

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

Assessments #3 and #5 do not seem to provide direct evidence that the standard is being met.

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
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

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

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

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
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

--

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:

Unit plan requires the integration of assessment.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates’ knowledge of content

With Assessment #1, the program shows alignment between NCTE standards and MTTC items well. The pass rate is much higher than the required 80%, demonstrating the success of the program in teaching content knowledge. Assessment #2 provides evidence mainly in the area of linguistics. Assessment #6, the literature portfolio, also adds important evidence of content knowledge.

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

Assessment #3, which is used as evidence for most of the standards listed above, seems more subjective because candidates self-assess. Assessment #4, the Student Teaching Unit, provides evidence of the candidates' ability to pre-assess, teach, and then assess students. The reflective component of this assessment enables candidates to consider their role in student learning and analyze their effectiveness while exploring the possibility of redesigning instruction.

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

While Assessment #5 should provide primary evidence for candidate effect on student learning, this assessment does not; it focuses on candidates' performance rather than students' performance.

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 implemented regular meetings among faculty members, and as indicated, the program has begun making changes in course requirements and assessment criteria as they look ahead to future assessment.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

Assessment #3 is relied on quite heavily throughout the report for multiple standards. However, this assessment uses candidates' self-evaluation of their own knowledge and skills to demonstrate standards are met and, even though candidates must support their claims, it may not reflect the objectivity of an experienced and well-trained supervisor.

Incorporation of more explicit instruction about how to develop interdisciplinary instruction, especially regarding the arts and humanities, would enhance the program.

Greater focus on the skill set teachers need to evaluate classroom resources is necessary. It's possible that this work is being done in courses, and it's just not highlighted in the report.

Stronger evidence of how candidates are being initiated into professional communities is needed. There was a suggestion that "most" of the candidates attended a professional conference, but it didn't seem clear how that experience was integrated into the program.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Labeling the attachments with the number of the assessment would make it much easier to sort through the information.

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

None.

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- Program is nationally recognized. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation. *Please note that once a program has been nationally recognized, it may not submit a revised report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns.*

Please click "Next"

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