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

University of Louisiana at Monroe

Date of Review

MM	DD	YYYY
02	01	2009

This report is in response to a(n):

ȷ␑ Initial Review

ȷ␑ Revised Report

ȷ␑ Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

BA in English Education

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)

ȷ␑ Baccalaureate

ȷ␑ Post Baccalaureate

ȷ␑ Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

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

ȷ␑ Nationally recognized

ȷ␑ Nationally recognized with conditions

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

ȷ␑ 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 early field experiences.

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:

The curriculum as submitted is limited, with no young adult literature or literary theory and criticism in the content program of study. It seems that there is also no methods class targeted for English language arts candidates, although there are assessments that seems to reflect such a course.
All of the required documents have not been submitted for Assessment 3 (assignment given to candidates) and Assessment 4 (actual tool used with candidates). None of the data from the assessments have been disaggregated by standard cited as required by NCATE.

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:

It is possible that this standard is met by more than one assessment, but the program did not indicate this. Assessment 6 provides only supplemental evidence for this standard.

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:

It is possible that this standard is met by more than one assessment, but the program did not indicate this. Assessment 6 provides only supplemental evidence for this standard.

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

ʝn   ʝn   ʝn

Comment:

It is possible that this standard is met by more than one assessment, but the program did not indicate this. Assessment 6 provides only supplemental evidence for this standard.

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

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ʝn   ʝn   ʝn

Comment:

It is possible that this standard is met by more than one assessment, but the program did not indicate this. Assessment 6 provides only supplemental evidence for this standard.

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

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ʝn   ʝn   ʝn

Comment:

It is possible that this standard is met by more than one assessment, but the program did not indicate this. Assessment 6 provides only supplemental evidence for this standard.

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

ʝn   ʝn   ʝn

Comment:

It is possible that this standard is met by more than one assessment, but the program did not indicate this. Assessment 6 provides only supplemental evidence for 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

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

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:

NCTE does not recognize a sufficient alignment of Praxis II topics with its content standards. Assessment 2 does not reflect the range and depth required to meet this standard. Assessments 3 and 4, also cited, do not provide evidence of the specific knowledge required by this standard.

Standard 3.3. Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of reading processes.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

Standard 3.4. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of different composing processes.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

NCTE does not recognize a sufficient alignment of Praxis II topics with its content standards. Assessment 2 does not reflect the range and depth required to meet this standard. Assessments 3 and 4, also cited, do not provide evidence of the specific knowledge required by this standard.

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:

NCTE does not recognize a sufficient alignment of Praxis II topics with its content standards. Assessment 2 does not reflect the range and depth required to meet this standard. Assessmentss 3 and 4, also cited, do not provide evidence of the specific knowledge required by 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

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

NCTE does not recognize a sufficient alignment of Praxis II topics with its content standards. Assessment 2 does not reflect the range and depth required to meet this standard. Assessments 3 and 4, also cited, do not provide evidence of the specific knowledge required by this standard.

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:

NCTE does not recognize a sufficient alignment of Praxis II topics with its content standards. Assessment 2 does not reflect the range and depth required to meet this standard. Assessments 3 and 4, also cited, do not provide evidence of the specific knowledge required by this standard.

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

  j   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

  j   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

  j   jn   jn

Comment:

Insufficient evidence was 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

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

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

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

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

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

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

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

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

jn   jn   jn

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:

>

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

> Assessment 1 - Praxis II - English (0041) NCTE does not recognize an alignment of the test topics with its program standards for content. The test does not provide evidence of the depth and range of knowledge required in Category 3.0.
> Assessment 2 - Thematic Teaching Unit. This assessment does not reflect the range and depth required to measure the program standards for content. The alignment is too general to determine if any of the cited standards are totally met. Given that this is only a seven-day unit, there is only limited time to demonstrate a wide range of standards. Especially lacking was evidence for Standards 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, and 3.7. Data from the assessment were not disaggregated by standard as required.

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

> Assessment 3 - Teacher Work Sample. The actual assignment given to candidates was not submitted as required. Alignment within the rubric does not demonstrate adequately that the standards cited are met. Data from the assessment were not disaggregated by standard as required.
> Assessment 4 - Student Teaching Final Assessment. Described as a unit-wide rubric with an English language arts addendum, only the addendum was submitted. No information about how the addendum fits with the unit assessment was submitted. Levels of performance definitions are highly limited. Data from the assessment were not disaggregated by standard as required.
> Assessment 6 - Classroom Management Project. Generic in scope, providing some supplementary evidence for the standards cited. Data from the assessment were not disaggregated by standard as required.

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

> Assessment 5 - Impact on Student Learning. The rubric is generally aligned with cited standards. The assessment provides supplementary evidence for the standards cited. Data from the assessment were 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)

There seems to be a data-driven system, but the program does not disaggregate data by standard, so it is difficult to determine that the assessment results are used as required.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

See Part C for areas for consideration regarding each assessment. Assessments should be revised as indicated.
If there is an English language arts methods course, provide that information in the program of study.
Provide the required number of years of candidate completers, along with the requisite information concerning the pass rate on Praxis II.

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 Board of Examiners:

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

j⋆ 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

j⋆ **Further Development Required.** 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.