

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of English Language Arts Teachers (2003 Standards)

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

Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

08 / 01 / 2013

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

Secondary Education English

Grade Level⁽¹⁾

7-12

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

Program Type

Initial 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
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

Summary of Strengths:

The program presents a thorough grounding in pedagogical knowledge; with a strong emphasis on continuous improvement through data analysis.

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 |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Comment:

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 |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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 |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Comment:

Evidence is still minimal that ELA is used by candidates as required by the standard. Assessment 4

addendum provides the more specific evidence, but the rubric choices include "no opportunity to observe," making it difficult to determine that the candidates are indeed sufficiently measured in terms of 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

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

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

Comment:

See comment regarding Assessment 4 in Standard 2.2. Standard is minimally met

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

Comment:

The program provides supplementary evidence found in Assessment 3 which does not have the teaching component required by this standard. See comment on Assessment 4 in Standard 2.2. Also, the program has cited the standard in Assessment 6, but the rubric item has no specific relationship to the role of arts and humanities in learning.

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

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

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

Standard 3.3. Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of reading processes.

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

Standard 3.4. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of different composing processes.

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

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

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

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

Comment:

The standard is minimally met. Changes in course requirements have transferred the range and depth of knowledge required to areas that contain many other emphases.

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

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

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

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

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

Comment:

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

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:

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

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

The standard minimally met by Assessment 4. See comment regarding this assessment in Standard 2.2 Assessment 6 contains supplementary evidence relevant to the standard. Other assessments cited do not involve a teaching situation required for this 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:

Standard is minimally met by Assessment 4. See comment regarding this assessment in Standard 2.2

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

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

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

Comment:

See comment for Standard 4.7

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

Comment:

Assessment 1 - Information submitted as required.

Assessment 2 - The data chart for this assessment could be organized by course with the number of candidates and the range of grades for ease of analysis.

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

Assessment 3 (changed). Because the assessment does not have a requirement for teaching the lesson, Standards 2.6, 4.6 and 4.7 cannot be measured.

Assessment 4 - The addendum for this assessment measures those standards specific to English language arts teaching; because one of the choices is "no opportunity to observe" with no obvious requirement that all the standards must be measured in either the first or second placement, it is not possible to determine that candidates are sufficiently measured across all standards cited.

Assessment 6 - Minimal evidence in this expanded "learning effects" assessment for Standards 3.6 and 4.6; Standard 2.6 is also cited but the assessment rubric does not provide an opportunity to observe and evaluate this standard.

Assessment 7 - The use of ELA as required of cited Standard 2.2 is not found in this assessment.

Assessment 8 - The assessment cites Standard 4.6, but since self-selected artifacts make up the portfolio, the teaching situation required for measuring the standard is not provided.

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

Assessment 5 - Sufficient updating was submitted.

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)

This is a strong area of the program. It is obvious that the faculty are evaluating the data concerning candidate performance and applying that to the strengthening of the program and the improvement of candidate performance.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

See comments on individual assessments in Part C.

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:

- ④ **National Recognition.** 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 mid-cycle (2 years in advance for a 5-year cycle and 3 years in advance for a 7-year cycle) before the next scheduled accreditation visit.** 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 another report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns cited in the recognition report.*

Please click "Next"

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