

# Program Report for the Preparation of English Language Arts Teachers National Council of Teachers of English(NCTE)

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

## COVER SHEET

### 1. Institution Name

Eastern Michigan University

### 2. State

Michigan

### 3. Date submitted

MM DD YYYY

09 / 15 / 2009

### 4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:

W. Douglas Baker

Phone:

Ext.

(734) 487-4220

E-mail:

douglas.baker@emich.edu

### 5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:

Shawn Quilter

Phone:

Ext.

(734) 487-2035

E-mail:

squilter@emich.edu

### 6. Name of institution's program

Language , Literature & Writing for Teachers

### 7. NCATE Category

English Education

**8. Grade levels<sup>(1)</sup> for which candidates are being prepared**

6-12

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

**9. Program Type**

First teaching license

**10. Degree or award level**

Baccalaureate

Post Baccalaureate

Master's

Post Master's

Specialist or C.A.S.

Doctorate

Endorsement only

**11. Is this program offered at more than one site?**

Yes

No

**12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered**

**13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared**

Secondary Provisional Certificate

**14. Program report status:**

Initial Review

Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required, Recognition with Probation, or Not Nationally Recognized

Response to National Recognition With Conditions

**15. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:**

**NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section IV. Does your state require such a test?**

Yes

No



## SECTION I - CONTEXT

### 1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of NCTE standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

In the state of Michigan, the only state in the union that has demanded dual certification, teacher candidates for secondary teaching certification (grades 6-12) may earn subject area endorsements by completing a major or minor in a given subject area. Although the state recently (December 2008) decided to require only single certification, Eastern Michigan University and universities across the state require certification in major and minor areas--a deeply rooted tradition and expectation. For each subject area, whether pursuing a major or minor, all teacher candidates at EMU must complete the appropriate methods course(s) in which they are earning an endorsement, earn a passing score on the state licensure test, and complete student teaching (clinical experience) in their major subject area. In addition to student teaching, candidates must complete and document clock hours of pre-student teaching field experiences in their major and minor subject areas.

For English ("Language, Literature and Writing for Teachers" is the name of the program), candidates earning a major or minor complete nearly the same program of study, including the secondary methods course (see attachment, "Program of Study"). The six credit hour difference represents one additional literature course and an elective for the major; in fact, during this assessment cycle, the minor was bolstered by adding required courses in methods and adolescent literature in order to provide faculty opportunities to assess all candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge in the range of areas that NCTE standards demand. (Other changes made in order to strengthen the program and to meet NCTE standards are described in Section V.) All candidates must also complete a writing methods course, and through that class they participate in field experiences with local English teachers (and National Writing Project fellows) and their students.

Students enter this program as pre- or post-baccalaureate candidates; however, all candidates are held to the same requirements and expectations, including criteria for program admission, coursework, field experiences, and program completion. Across the unit at EMU, post-baccalaureate candidates make-up approximately 16% of the current teacher candidate population--in English the number is about 10%. Post-baccalaureate candidates must complete nearly all of the same assessments, and they earn only certification after completing the program. English Education faculty, in conjunction with the College of Education, interviews each post-baccalaureate candidate in order to determine whether or not courses taken at other universities meet requirements and criteria of the Language, Literature and Writing for Teachers program (including earning a grade of "C" or higher in relevant courses). All candidates must complete the content area methods course (ENGL 409, Methods of Teaching English--see Assessments #3 & #8), complete field experiences at EMU (see Assessments #4-5), and pass the state licensure exam (see Assessment #1). There are no differences in the program for pre- or post-baccalaureate candidates; therefore, post-baccalaureate candidates are considered as part of the undergraduate certification program.

Finally, EMU has a large and diverse teacher and professional educator preparation and licensure program. The College of Education is the center of the unit and the subject areas for secondary certification are housed in the disciplines. The English department is the home of Language, Literature and Writing for Teachers, which is the shared certification major and minor among programs of English Education, Linguistics, Literature and Writing. Therefore, careful and vigorous articulation and actions across colleges and departmental programs have contributed to the construction of the assessment plan that follows.

### 2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the

**number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)**

Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences (where the English department is located) and the College of Education, and the clinical faculty in partner schools, participate in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's and candidates' field and clinical experiences. These partners work together to help teacher candidates develop their pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions over the course of the program.

All pre-clinical teacher candidates complete a minimum of 100 clock hours of field experiences ("FETE") in FETE 201, 302 and 402 prior to student teaching (see attachment: "Program of Study," pp. 5-6). Pre-clinical field experiences are completed prior to student teaching in multiple and diverse settings. These field experiences are arranged between clinical faculty in partner schools and pre-clinical teacher candidates and are taken concurrently with curriculum (CURR 305) and reading courses (RDG 311) in the College of Education, thus enabling teacher candidates to integrate current theory and methodology to practice with real life students and situations.

Beyond these institutional pre-clinical requirements, all candidates in Language, Literature and Writing for Teachers participate in field experiences during ENGL 408, Writing for Writing Teachers (a required course), by interacting with students in classrooms of local National Writing Project teachers. Since all English Education faculty direct and coordinate the Eastern Michigan Writing Project, an NWP site, they have generated a network of participating teachers and Writing Project fellows. This field experience focuses on students' writing and candidates' responses to it and to the students. The specifics of these interactions are negotiated between the ENGL 408 instructor and the school teacher.

Each fall and winter semester, candidates across the unit are placed as student teachers in more than 85 school districts and more than 250 schools. These districts form a large geographic circle with EMU at its center--approximately a one-hour radius, bounded by Flint, MI in the north, Jackson in the west, Detroit and its suburbs in the east, and Adrian and Monroe in the southeastern part of the state (although some candidates are granted permission to student teach at much further destinations). Candidates can request placement in approved districts but are limited to three choices, and their first choice district is honored when possible. Candidates complete one fifteen-week, full-time student teaching placement, totaling 600 hours. Therefore, 700 hours of classroom experiences are completed by each teacher candidate during field and clinical placements.

Placements for student teaching are made through the collaboration of university supervisors and the districts, either through a central office where required, or through individual contacts with building principals and cooperating teachers. This collaboration matches candidates and cooperating teachers in a productive process, particularly since supervisors who work in the same districts each year are able to build a strong collaborative cohort of master cooperating teachers.

All cooperating teachers are required to have a minimum of three years teaching experience, a Master's degree, and a recommendation from a building principal or department head; furthermore, they must have demonstrated success as classroom teachers, hold current certification in the subject area of supervision, and state a commitment to help candidates develop as teachers.

During clinical practice, candidates are assessed through a minimum of four observations completed by the university supervisor, and the student teacher is provided with written and oral feedback on strengths of his or her teaching and on areas that need improvement. The cooperating teacher completes a formal written midterm evaluation of the candidate's progress, as well as a final evaluation at the completion of student teaching. To promote and encourage self-reflection, the program expects the candidate to submit a mid-semester self-evaluation. Finally, the university supervisor, in conjunction with the cooperating

teacher, completes a formal written midterm evaluation of the student teacher's progress as well as a final evaluation at the completion of student teaching.

**3. Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)**

For the unit at EMU, in order to be admitted to teacher candidacy a student must have completed 56 credit hours, passed the Michigan Teacher for Teacher Certification Basic Skills test, and have earned a grade of "C" or higher in specific courses (i.e., lab science, writing, speech, and mathematics). In addition, each student must demonstrate an overall GPA of 2.50 and a major GPA of 2.50. Finally, in order to be program-admitted, the student must have a satisfactory health status (i.e., TB, speech, and hearing screenings), must not be on any kind of probation with the university, and must be free of criminal conviction issues that would preclude state licensure. Once admitted, teacher candidates must maintain all of the aforementioned academic, financial, and ethical and moral standards. Teacher candidates are required to earn a "C" grade or higher in all professional education courses.

There are four gateways in the initial teacher preparation program: (1) Admission to Program; (2) Admission to Student Teaching; (3) Completion of Student Teaching; and (4) Teacher Certification. All candidates must meet particular gateway standards in order to progress. At each of the four gateways, multiple measures are designed to determine that candidates have the appropriate levels of content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. For example, key assessments for English candidates that lead to Admission to Student Teaching--and connect the unit to candidates' particular subject area programs--include the Evaluation of Professional Behaviors (or Dispositions) (see Assessment #8 in Sections II and IV), an observation form with a list of expected behaviors or dispositions that candidates must meet and that methods faculty assess. Candidates must also successfully complete courses in the College of Education (see attachment, "Program of Study, pp. 5-6) and pedagogy or content area courses and assessments, e.g., in English: English Education (see Assessment #3); Linguistics (see Assessment #2); Literature (see Assessment #6); and Writing (see Assessment #7).

Similarly, candidates must perform well in meeting unit criteria (e.g., 22 unit benchmarks and outcomes that have been adapted from INTASC--see Section I.4 for more description of this) and earn passing scores for the Student Teaching Unit and Student Teaching Evaluations (see Assessments #4-5), and on the subject area MTTTC (the state licensure test--see Assessment #1) to earn certification.

One more relevant point in terms of the candidates EMU serves: the EMU teacher preparation program attracts and works with many non-traditional candidates, particularly in terms of socio-economic status; therefore, most candidates work and cannot complete their program of study in the more traditional five years. This fact provides challenges to assessing candidates in a sequential way in consecutive semesters, i.e., candidates follow their program of study (see attachment, "Program of Study") but may have to leave school for a semester or year, or enroll in a reduced amount of coursework during their program. However, the English program (Language, Literature and Writing for Teachers) works closely with the unit and faculty in the College of Education to assess candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge throughout their certification program.

**4. Description of the relationship <sup>(2)</sup> of the program to the unit's conceptual framework. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)**

At EMU, the College of Education is the center of the unit for teacher preparation, and its conceptual framework is accepted by and manifested in the subject areas housed in the disciplines: "Caring professional educators for a diverse and democratic society" (CPEDS). Associated with CPEDS are 22

performance-based outcomes that have been adapted from standards articulated by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). Candidates are introduced to the conceptual framework and the unit outcomes as they apply to the program, and they are assessed on the outcomes throughout the program, including in professional education courses and during student teaching (e.g., see Section IV, Assessment #4 – STU: Rubric for Student Teaching Unit). The unit’s goal is for candidates to understand and apply the embedded qualities of the frame (described below) as they strive to become teachers and educators:

"Caring educators are committed to all students’ learning within supportive learning communities. They are student-focused and persistent in pursuing high developmentally appropriate expectations for all students. Professional educators are knowledgeable regarding content and pedagogy, including developing technologies. They are reflective in their practice, taking into account a wide variety of factors in planning, implementing, assessing and modifying teaching. They demonstrate professional dispositions and communication skills. Educators for a diverse and democratic society celebrate diversity in schools and communities. They plan instruction to reflect a diverse society and work effectively with diverse students, parents and community members. They prepare students for active participation in a democracy by nurturing critical thinking, creative thinking and problem solving within communities" (CPEDS Manual for Students, pp. 4-5, <http://www.emich.edu/coe/tesd/resources.html>).

Building on this description of the unit’s framework, the English Education faculty, in collaboration with the contributing disciplinary programs (Linguistics, Literature, and Writing), created a mission statement for the Language, Literature and Writing for Teachers (LLWT) program, including a key link to the unit’s mission: “The English education program at EMU, in collaboration with programs in the department of English Language and Literature and the College of Education, is committed to developing and sustaining knowledgeable and reflective teachers of literacy in a diverse society.” The key link between the unit framework and program’s mission focuses on preparing teachers for a diverse society; and through the LLWT program, candidates explore diversity in pedagogy, language studies, literature, writing, and research.

Many of NCTE’s standards (e.g., 2.2, 2.5; 3.1.3, 3.1.4; 3.5.2; and 4.4) and the program’s eight gateway assessments (see Section II, III & IV) address this example integral and expansive concept (e.g., Assessments 3, 5 & 8; 1 & 2; 3 & 6; and 3 & 5, respectively). Furthermore, throughout the program, candidates have opportunities to develop the compassion and reflexive approach to teach all students literacy strategies and skills, particularly in sustained ways.

---

(2): The response should describe the program’s conceptual framework and indicate how it reflects the unit’s conceptual framework.

**5. Indication of whether the program has a unique set of program assessments and the relationship of the program’s assessments to the unit’s assessment system<sup>(3)</sup>. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)**

At EMU all teacher candidates in the unit are evaluated on 22 standards adapted from INTASC (see Section I. 4, above) through unit-level assessments, e.g., student teaching unit, student teaching evaluation, and professional behaviors. For candidates of secondary English, these example unit assessments are also linked to NCTE standards and gateway assessments of the Language, Literature and Writing for Teachers program (LLWT), e.g., Student Teaching Unit (Assessment #4); Student Teaching Evaluation (Assessment #5); and Evaluation of Professional Behaviors (Assessment #8). All secondary candidates in the unit also have unique assessments tied to their subject areas, e.g., in LLWT: assessments in Linguistics, Literature, Writing and English Education (see Section IV: LING 201;

LITR; ENGL 328; and ENGL 409). Therefore, secondary English candidates are assessed on NCTE standards through particular assessments shared by the unit and program.

The English Department is large and diverse, which created challenges in building a comprehensive, detailed assessment system: it contains 50 tenure track faculty and houses eight programs, including the four main contributors towards secondary certification in English—Linguistics, Literature, Writing and English Education. However, it was the disciplinary diversity of faculty and their willingness to engage with each other and faculty across departments and colleges that helped to develop an assessment plan that benefits candidates and the LLWT program.

Three of the strengths of the LLWT program became visible through this process: (1) nearly all upper level courses leading to completion of the content and methods courses towards certification are taught by tenure-track faculty in their areas of expertise; (2) faculty within and across these diverse disciplines meet regularly to analyze data and develop the assessment system; and (3) faculty continue to use NCTE/NCATE requirements and data to inform curricular decisions (e.g., an adolescent literature course was added to the major and minor; and, as described in Section I.1, the minor was bolstered to ensure that all candidates had opportunities to learn necessary content).

Faculty agreed that contributing disciplines should participate in the construction of the system, and each of the four disciplinary programs explored NCTE standards relevant to its component of the LLWT program and developed a gateway assessment around those standards. For example, Linguistic faculty examine candidates' content knowledge of language (3.1); Literature focuses on 3.5; Writing on 3.2 and 3.3; and English Education on 2.0 and 4.0. By building a comprehensive assessment system around the content aspects of the standards (and for English Education, pedagogy), faculty believed that candidates would benefit because each program would devise relevant assessments, examine data and processes of collection and analysis, and make informed decisions to improve their courses and the opportunities for candidates to learn.

The English Education faculty developed gateway assessments that begin to bridge knowledge of content and pedagogy with teaching. English Education faculty created opportunities in the methods course (see Assessments #3 - ENGL 409 and #8 - EPB) to assess candidates' pedagogical knowledge and how candidates design and prepare to teach particular content relevant to “English” to secondary school students. These two gateway assessments provide information about candidates' progress prior to student teaching.

In conjunction with the COE, English Education faculty assisted in the development of assessments of the Student Teaching Unit (see Assessment #4 - STU) and overall evaluation of student teachers of English (see Assessment #5 - STE). These two assessments, and the scores on the English subject area of MTTC, are part of the overall unit assessment system that seeks to integrate the assessment philosophy and practices of the unit and program.

---

(3) This response should clarify how the key assessments used in the program are derived from or informed by the assessment system that the unit will address under NCATE Standard 2.

**6. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.**

**7. Please attach files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles.**

**(This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)**

Program of Study.doc

See **Attachments** panel below.

### 8. Candidate Information

**Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.**

Program: Language, Literature and Writing for Teachers		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers <sup>(4)</sup>
2007-2008	297	54
2006-2007	323	69
2005-2006	410	94

(4) NCATE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

### 9. Faculty Information

**Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for key content and professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.**

Faculty Member Name	Baker, W. Douglas
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(5)</sup>	Ph.D., Teaching and Learning, University of California at Santa Barbara
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(6)</sup>	Faculty; Co-Director Eastern Michigan Writing Project (EMWP)
Faculty Rank <sup>(7)</sup>	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(8)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(9)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(10)</sup>	Baker, D., Green, J. L., & Skukauskaite, A. (2008). Video-enabled ethnographic research: A microethnographic perspective. In G. Walford (Ed.) London: Tufnell Press. Baker, D., Brockman, E., Bush, J., Richmond, K. J. (2007). Composition Studies/English Education Connection. The Writing Instructor. Baker, D. (Presenter & Author), NCTE, "Shifting Perspectives: Showing Students How to Read, Interpret and Respond to (Con)Texts," NCTE, San Antonio, TX. (November 22, 2008).
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(11)</sup>	"Beyond 'Doing' a Text" (in preparation). Drafting a book on guiding students to read, interpret and respond to assigned (con)texts in classrooms. Working with local teachers and NWP fellows. Officer, Vice President, Michigan Committee on English Education. (2008 - 2009). Co-Director, Eastern Michigan Writing Project.



	Summer Institute Coordinator 2008; 2009
--	---

Faculty Member Name	Fleischer, Cathy
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(5)</sup>	Ph.D., English and Education, University of Michigan
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(6)</sup>	Faculty; Co-Director EMWP
Faculty Rank <sup>(7)</sup>	Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(8)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(9)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(10)</sup>	Fleischer, C., Andrew-Vaughan, S. (2009). Writing Outside Your Comfort Zone: Helping Students Navigate Unfamiliar Genres. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Press. Blakeslee, A., Fleischer, C. (2007). Becoming a Writing Researcher. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Fleischer, C., Pavlock, K. (2008). The Family Literacy Initiative: Creating Outreach and Partnerships with Families. Language Arts Journal of Michigan, 23, 11-18.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(11)</sup>	"A Parent's Guide to Adolescent Literacy" (Writing Results) Designed for a parent audience, the book summarizes and analyzes various aspects of adolescent literacy, helping parents to understand the complexities of literacy and find ways of supporting their teens as readers and writers. Co-director, Eastern Michigan Writing Project. Working with local teachers on teacher research. Program Coordinator, Family Literacy Initiative, Ypsilanti, MI, 48197.

Faculty Member Name	Sipe, Rebecca Bowers
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(5)</sup>	Ed.D.; Leadership, Policy and Teacher Training, Boston University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(6)</sup>	Department Head, Department of English Language and Literature
Faculty Rank <sup>(7)</sup>	Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(8)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(9)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(10)</sup>	Sipe, R.B. (2009). Adolescent Literacy at Risk? The Impact of Standards. Urbana, IL: NCTE. Sipe, R.B. (2007). Purposeful Writing. Portsmouth: Heinemann. Sipe, R.B., et al. (2003). They Still Can't Spell: Understanding and Supporting Challenged Spellers in Middle and High School. Portsmouth: Heinemann. Member at large, Conference on English Leadership (NCTE).
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(11)</sup>	Taught at the secondary level for 10 years; directed literacy curriculum for major school district for 14 years. Currently, provides inservices and workshops for K-12 teachers through the Eastern Michigan Writing Project.

Faculty Member Name	Staunton, John
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(5)</sup>	Ph.D., English; Fordham University; EdS., Language Education, Indiana University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(6)</sup>	Faculty; Co-Director EMWP
Faculty Rank <sup>(7)</sup>	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(8)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(9)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(10)</sup>	Staunton, J. (2008). Deranging English/Education: Teacher Inquiry, Literary Studies, and Hybrid Visions of English for 21st-century Schools. Urbana, IL:

Service <sup>(9)</sup> :List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(10)</sup>	NCTE. Staunton, J., Baker, D., Fleischer, C., Tucker, B. (June 2009). Conference on English Education, "Preparing Teachers to Teach Composition in a Globalized World," Chicago, IL. Co-Director of EMWP; grant writer and EMWP Site Facilitator for "Britton, Michigan Teacher Inquiry Community." National Writing Project TIC Minigrant. \$4500.00. (2009-2010). Funded
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(11)</sup>	EMWP Site Facilitator for Britton, Michigan Teacher Inquiry Community at Britton-Macon School. North Carolina Standard Professional License I (SPLI) (2005-2008) in English (Grades 9-12). Supervised student teachers, practicum, and early field experience students for k-12 English/Language Arts as Education faculty at Hanover College (Hanover, Indiana) 2001-2003.

Faculty Member Name	Tucker, William
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(5)</sup>	Ph.D., English, Boston College
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(6)</sup>	Faculty; Director of EMWP
Faculty Rank <sup>(7)</sup>	Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(8)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(9)</sup> :List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(10)</sup>	Tucker, William. "What do you say when you talk about student writing?" 2009 CEE Conference, Chicago, Illinois, June 20, 2009. Tucker, Bill. (2008). "The Interpretation not Taken," in Killing the Blues: Optimism Returns. Dexter, MI: Wordsmith Press. Tucker, William. (2006). "The Listener's Stance," Language Arts Journal of Michigan, 22 (1).
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(11)</sup>	Director, Eastern Michigan Writing Project (supports and helps coordinate all EMWP programs linked to local schools and teachers) Organized local conference for teachers and EMWP (October 2008)--also organizing similar conference for October 2009. High School English teacher, Brockton (Ma) High School (1973 - 1993)

(5) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.

(6) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

(7) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

(8) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.

Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

(9) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.

(10) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.

(11) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

## SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the NCTE standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

**1. Please provide following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters each field)**

--	--	--	--

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment (12)	Type or Form of Assessment (13)	When the Assessment Is Administered (14)
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	MTTC (Michigan Test for Teacher Certification-- subject area exam)	Standardized Test	End of program
Assessment #2: Content knowledge in English(required)	LING 201 (Introduction to Linguistics final exam)	Final Exam	Required, core course (middle of program)
Assessment #3: Candidate ability to plan instruction (required)	ENGL 409 (Methods course reflective essay)	Reflective Essay	Required course (prior to Student Teaching)
Assessment #4: Student teaching or internship (required)	STU (Student Teaching Unit)	Student Teaching Unit	During Student Teaching
Assessment #5: Candidate effect on student learning (required)	STE (Student Teaching Evaluation)	Student Teaching Evaluation	Conclusion of Student Teaching
Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards (required)	LITR (Literature assessment)	Literature Assessment	Required courses throughout middle of program
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards (optional)	ENGL 328 (Writing, Style and Technology course, reflective essay)	Reflective Essay	Required, core course (middle of program)
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards (optional)	EPB (Evaluation of Professional Behaviors)	Evaluation of Professional Behaviors (Dispositions)	Attached to required content area methods course (prior to Student Teaching)

(12) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

(13) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

(14) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

### SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

**1. For each NCTE standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple NCTE standards.**

**1.0 Structure of the Basic Program. Candidates follow a specific curriculum and are expected to meet appropriate performance assessments for preservice English language arts teachers. (Found in Section I, Context)**

**2. Attitudes for English Language Arts. 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..**

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
2.1 Candidates create an inclusive and supportive learning environment in which all students can engage in learning.	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3
2.2 Candidates use ELA to help their students become familiar with their own and others' cultures.	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2
2.3 Candidates demonstrate reflective practice, involvement in professional organizations, and collaboration with both faculty and other candidates.	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2
2.4 Candidates use practices designed to assist students in developing habits of critical thinking and judgment.	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2
2.5 Candidates make meaningful connections between the ELA curriculum and developments in culture, society, and education.	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
2.6 Candidates engage their students in activities that demonstrate the role of arts and humanities in learning.	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1

**3. Knowledge of English Language Arts. Candidates are knowledgeable about language; literature; oral, visual, and written literacy; print and nonprint media; technology; and research theory and findings.**

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
3.1 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of, and skills in the use of, the English language.	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3
3.2 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the practices of oral, visual, and written literacy.	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1
3.3 Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of reading processes.	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3
3.4 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of different composing processes.	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1
3.5 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of, and use for, an extensive range of literature.	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3
3.6 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the range and influence of print and nonprint media and technology in contemporary culture.	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
3.7 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of research theory and findings in English language arts.	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3

**4. Pedagogy for English Language Arts. Candidates acquire and demonstrate the dispositions and skills needed to integrate knowledge of English language arts, students, and teaching.**

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
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.	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
4.2 Candidates align curriculum goals and teaching strategies with organization of classroom environments and learning experiences to promote whole-class, small-group, and individual work.	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
4.3 Candidates integrate interdisciplinary teaching strategies and materials into the teaching and learning process for students.	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3

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.	€	€	€	€	€	€	€
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.	€	€	€	€	€	€	€
4.6 Candidates engage students in critical analysis of different media and communications technologies.	€	€	€	€	€	€	€
4.7 Candidates engage students in learning experiences that consistently emphasize varied uses and purposes for language in communication.	€	€	€	€	€	€	€
4.8 Candidates engage students in making meaning from texts through personal response.	€	€	€	€	€	€	€
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.	€	€	€	€	€	€	€
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.	€	€	€	€	€	€	€

## SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

**DIRECTIONS:** The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. The assessments must be those that all candidates in the program are required to complete and should be used by the program to determine candidate proficiencies as expected in the program standards. Assessments and scoring guides should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards.

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas that are addressed in NCATE's unit standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare a document that includes the following items: a two page narrative that responds to questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 (below) and the three items listed in question 5 (below). This document should be attached as directed.

1. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
2. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.

3. A brief analysis of the data findings;
4. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording; and
5. Attachment of assessment documentation, including:
  - (a) the assessment tool or description of the assignment;
  - (b) the scoring guide for the assessment; and
  - (c) candidate data derived from the assessment.

It is preferred that the response for each of 5a, 5b, and 5c (above) be limited to the equivalent of five text pages, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

All three components of the assessment (as identified in 5a-c) must be attached, with the following exceptions: (a) the assessment tool and scoring guide are not required for reporting state licensure data, and (b) for some assessments, data may not yet be available.

**1. Data licensure tests for content knowledge in English language arts. NCTE standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to Standards 3.1-3.7. If your state does not require licensure tests in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. (Assessment Required)**

**Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

MTTC Narrative & Data.doc	MTTC & NCTE Standards.doc
---------------------------	---------------------------

See **Attachments** panel below.

**2. Assessment of content knowledge<sup>(15)</sup> in English language arts. NCTE standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to Standards 3.1-3.7. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, GPAs or grades<sup>(16)</sup>, and portfolio tasks<sup>(17)</sup>. (Assessment Required)**

**Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

LING 201 Narrative & Tools.doc	Ling 201 Semester Analysis.xls
--------------------------------	--------------------------------

See **Attachments** panel below.

---

(15) Content knowledge in early childhood professional preparation includes knowledge of child development and learning (characteristics and influences); family relationships and processes; subject matter knowledge in literacy, mathematics, science, social studies, the visual and performing arts, and movement/physical education; as well as knowledge about children's learning and development in these areas.

(16) If grades are used as the assessment or included in the assessment, provide information on the criteria for those grades and describe how they align with the specialty standards.

(17) For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included

**3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom-based instruction. NCTE standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standard Categories 2 and 4. Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates' abilities to develop lesson or unit plans, individualized educational plans, needs assessments, or intervention**

**plans. (Assessment Required)**

**Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

ENGL 409 Narrative & Tools.doc	ENGL 409 Rubric.doc
ENGL 409 Semester Analysis.xls	

See **Attachments** panel below.

**4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. NCTE standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standard Categories 2,3 and 4. An assessment instrument used in student teaching should be submitted. (Assessment Required)**

**Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

STU Narrative & Tools.doc	STU Semester Analysis.xls
---------------------------	---------------------------

See **Attachments** panel below.

**5. Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning. NCTE standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standard Category 4. Examples of assessments include those based on samples of children's work, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys. (Assessment Required)**

**Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

STE Narrative & Tools.doc	STE Data Tables.doc
STE Semester Analysis W07-W08.xls	

See **Attachments** panel below.

**6. Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio projects, licensure tests not reported in #1 and follow-up studies. (Assessment Required)**

**Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

LITR Narrative & Tools.doc	LITR Semester Analysis.xls
----------------------------	----------------------------

See **Attachments** panel below.

**7. Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio projects, licensure tests not reported in #1 and follow-up studies. (Optional)**

**Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

ENGL 328 Narrative & Tools.doc	ENGL 328 Semester Analysis.xls
--------------------------------	--------------------------------

See **Attachments** panel below.

**8. Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio projects, licensure tests not reported in #1 and follow-up studies. (Optional)**

**Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

EPB Narrative & Tools.doc	EPB Semester Analysis.xls
---------------------------	---------------------------

See **Attachments** panel below.

**SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM**

**1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.**

**(Response limited to 12,000 characters)**

With eight different disciplinary programs and fifty tenure track faculty, the English Department at EMU is diverse and complex; and the major and minor programs--Language, Literature and Writing for Teachers (LLWT)--leading to certification reflect these qualities. With subject areas of the institutional unit housed within the disciplines, communication and consensus among colleges, departments, and disciplinary programs are critical for coordination of an assessment system, which we began building in 2006. However, the vibrancy of the LLWT certification program derives from the diligence of faculty, administrators, and staff and from the intellectual diversity of the contributing disciplinary programs (English Education, Linguistics, Literature and Writing). Although we have made tremendous progress, developing a comprehensive and detailed assessment system that evaluates teacher candidates' progress in meeting NCTE's multilayered standards continues to be a challenge for multiple reasons, including intellectual backgrounds of faculty, different disciplinary assumptions about assessment, and institutional size. NCTE and NCATE demands, including implicit theoretical presumptions about evaluating candidates on performance, add to this challenge.

The NCTE/NCATE standards consist of criteria designed to contribute to and underlie a program's evaluation of teacher candidates of English; however, to demonstrate compliance and success in preparing candidates, certification programs are encouraged to unpack complex, multilayered standards and create assessments that evaluate content and pedagogical knowledge, AND how well candidates through the intersection of this knowledge influence students. Furthermore, programs, regardless of size and complexity, are encouraged to adopt common assessments, develop a data collection system that



covers all layers of the standards, distinguish candidates' knowledge through scaled criteria, perpetually analyze data based on these premises, act decisively on findings, and prove these efforts to multiple bodies.

These demands suggest epistemological assumptions about the role of particular assessment practices in learning, e.g., that common assessments can be effectively employed across classrooms and instructors to determine candidates' knowledge of complex topics and processes. The expectations of this type of system challenges more traditional roles of faculty and their ability to employ disciplinary-based evaluations or to assign grades—both of which are expectations of the larger institution. Consequently, these issues and challenges have generated contentious, although productive, discussions among faculty towards creating the assessment system described in this report.

Faculty in the English department, with support from administrators and colleagues across the unit, have strived to create an assessment system that reflects the complexity of the LLWT program and intellectual diversity and integrity of the contributing faculty and their disciplinary programs. Most importantly, the objectives of the system include enhancing structures to assess candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge and strengthening opportunities for candidates to meet the NCTE standards and learn what they need to know as teachers. Furthermore, faculty have strengthened articulation across the unit, particularly in efforts to contribute and participate in field experiences and to assess candidates' knowledge in areas relevant to these.

The choice and implementation of a data collection system (LiveText) was challenging, yet it has enormously helped us collect and analyze data. The fruit of analyzing available data across disciplinary programs and colleges, as described in Section IV, included (re)examination of assessment tools, of candidates' responses to these tools and efforts towards meeting NCTE standards, and of the efficacy of instructional methods—including the employment of the gateway assessments.

**Data Analysis.** In coordination with the department's NCATE coordinator—and through the assistance of a technology liaison (John Shubsda) between the College of Education and the English department, faculty gathered in groups of contributing disciplinary programs (English Education, Linguistics, Literature, and Writing) to analyze, discuss, and interpret data. These sessions, held formally at least once each semester and informally countless times, guided faculty to reflect on the development of the assessment system and on the progress of candidates' efforts in learning content and pedagogical knowledge, particularly in preparation for student teaching.

Initially, the discussions and analyses focused on development and progress of the assessment system. Increasingly, as faculty grew more comfortable with the data collection system (LiveText), they raised concerns about the assumptions of the assessment system, including the constraints of the data collection software, the apparent devaluation of grades, and the expectations of a uniformed scoring system. However, faculty began to answer these questions and concerns and to envision and employ ways to strengthen the assessment system, including how to use available data to inform necessary changes to the LLWT certification program.

As mentioned, one of the key challenges in analyzing data is that NCTE standards are complex and multilayered. Therefore, particular standards are divided among two or three assessments to evaluate candidates' knowledge or action embedded in the different layers. For example, the target criteria for NCTE standard 3.3 demands that candidates demonstrate knowledge of interpretive strategies, including eliciting background knowledge, culture, etc. and designing similar opportunities for students. Therefore, the content knowledge of this standard is largely assessed in Assessment 3 (ENGL 409) and Assessment 1 (MTTC)—and in Assessment 6 (LITR), but the field part of the standard is evaluated through Assessment 5 (STE). Consequently, to examine candidates' demonstrated knowledge towards meeting

this standard demands triangulating data. This time intensive process provides more information, although this type of analysis raises interesting questions since many of these standards are so complex and multifaceted they must be bundled with other standards (or sub-indicators). How to disaggregate data in order to examine one standard, or sub-indicator of a standard, becomes only one of the challenges.

**Summary of Principal Findings.** Three key findings provide an overview of how these objectives described above are guiding us to develop a perpetual assessment system. First, increased participation of faculty in all parts of the assessment system demonstrate that this diverse faculty (including colleagues from the College of Education) understands the needs and potential value of developing the system and assessing candidates in more conscious and performance-based ways. This finding became evident as the numbers of faculty participating in the data collection system rose over time, thereby raising numbers of candidates assessed and generating a larger pool to examine. For example, Literature (a program that initially challenged the efficacy of the assessment system) increased the number of contributing faculty from one during Winter 2007 to a sustained eight in each semester of the past school year (2008-09).

Second, data analysis meetings among each disciplinary program's faculty led to keener understandings of that program's assessments, including discussions of validity and reliability and how to improve both. For example, English Education faculty met twice in Fall 2008 to analyze the process of assessing reflective essays and making claims about candidates' performances towards meeting selected standards (e.g., NCTE 3.1). These sessions generated an awareness for the need of a more consistent approach among all English Education faculty to analyzing the candidates' written discourse and how particular statements can be construed as evidence towards meeting certain standards. Significantly, the candidates benefited through increased discussions with faculty about the approach to writing (and evaluating) the reflective essay, and the role these types of assessments play in instruction--in other words, candidates began to participate in the discussions of multi-tiered assessments and how different institutional bodies might inform these.

Finally, faculty across disciplinary programs have pointed to standards or interpretations of data to suggest or make informed changes and improvements to the LLWT program or assessment tools. In all four contributing disciplinary (and departmental) programs, faculty made changes informed by the demands of the NCTE standards or interpretation of collected data. The main objective for these changes was to enhance the learning opportunities for candidates. For example, programs of English Education, Literature, and Children's Literature agreed that a course on Adolescent Literature was essential in order to better prepare candidates in this growing field and to meet NCTE standards (e.g., 3.5.3). Therefore, CHL 455, Adolescent Literature, was instituted as a required course for the major and minor; and this course will become a site for a gateway assessment that includes sub-indicators that candidates will be more aggressively evaluated on, e.g., 3.6, than they were in this initial cycle.

In another change to the LLWT program, the Literature program shifted restricted electives to ensure that all candidates are guaranteed to take a course in American Literature. The Literature program is in the process of making two further changes: (1) create a five-point scoring system, instead of three, in order to create more nuanced assessments of candidates' knowledge in meeting standards of selected sub-indicators; and, (2) to create an assessment in the initial required course (ENGL 300), which all candidates take early in the major or minor.

Linguistics, as noted in Section IV, observed and discussed a need to revamp the number of questions on the final exam (which is devoted to six sub-indicators of NCTE standard 3.1) in order to more accurately weigh the value of each test item according to time spent in class on that particular topic. In order to improve candidates' opportunities to read and compose in nonprint texts on technologically related

platforms, faculty in the Writing program continue to discuss how to create assignments and flexible assessments towards these objectives; in turn this effort will strengthen the over all program's objective of meeting NCTE 3.6, which is only adequate at this point, as previously mentioned.

English Education faculty and colleagues across the unit (particularly in the College of Education and among subject area methods instructors in the College of Arts and Sciences) are working to improve the field opportunities and assessments of candidates in these. For example, although the Student Teaching Evaluation form (see Assessment 5 – STE) contains links to specific NCTE standards, the English Education faculty continue to discuss with the student teaching coordinator in the College of Education how to enhance the approaches of the supervisors and cooperating teachings in assessing candidates' development in the particular areas expected by aspects of NCTE standards. Similarly, for the Student Teaching Unit (Assessment 4 – STU), English Education faculty are working to implement more specific criteria in order for candidates to address theory and practice relationships; in other words, evaluating how well candidates incorporate the content and pedagogical knowledge learned in initial coursework with the curricular opportunities they provide students.

Overall, developing the assessment system has been invigorating and produced substantive changes that help energize faculty as they turn towards the next cycle.

## **SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY**

**1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in response to issues cited in the previous recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report or a response to condition report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4> (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)**

**Please click "Next"**

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