

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

Millikin University, IL

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

07 / 12 / 2008

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

English Education

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

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

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation [See Part G]
- Not nationally recognized

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

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

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

Comment:

Summary of Strengths:

Positive initiatives towards integrating NCTE/NCATE goals into required course work in both education and English courses (demonstrated most effectively in tools such as Assessment #8); strong emphasis on writing and publishing in required course work; attention given to basic content knowledge in visual and nonprint literacies.

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:

Standard 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:

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:

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:

No evidence provided within Assessments #3, #4, or #5 to support this standard. (Also, there is an inconsistency within the program report, which indicates that this standard is addressed in Assessment #3, but Standard 2.6 is not included in the Assessment #3 documentation.)

Standard 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:

Met with conditions in relation to substandard 3.1.2. All other 3.1 subareas are addressed, particularly in Assessment #8. Substandard 3.1.2 does not appear to be a focus of Assessment #8, however. In

Assessments #2 and #5, candidates appear to provide evidence of content knowledge for Standard 3.1, but it is less clear if they are also able to provide evidence that they can draw upon this knowledge as a basis for designing appropriate learning activities that promote student learning.

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:

While a variety of learning experiences and assessments address all aspects of oral, visual, and written literacies, it is less clear if candidates are also able to demonstrate how they draw upon this knowledge in their teaching and not just in their own coursework.

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:

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:

While this standard is addressed in Assessment #1 and Assessment #2 (particularly through the creation of a Web portfolio in EN 305), it is less clear if candidates are also able to demonstrate how this knowledge is used to enhance students' composing processes, communication, and learning. In addition, the program report lists Assessment #3 as addressing this standard, but the Assessment #3

documentation does not reference Standard 3.6.

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

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

Comment:

Standard 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 _n	j _n	j _n

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 _n	j _n	j _n

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 _n	j _n	j _n

Comment:

This standard is listed on the program report as being addressed by Assessments #3 and #7, but there is no explicit evidence within these assessment documents that an integration of interdisciplinary teaching strategies and materials are required in candidates' performances. The documents submitted for Assessment #7 do not list this standard as being addressed within that assignment. The documents submitted for Assessment #4 claim that candidates demonstrate applications of all Standards 4.1 through 4.10 within this assignment, but there is no evidence to indicate that Standard 4.3 is addressed in Assessment #4 either.

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:

This standard is listed in the program report as being addressed by Assessments #3, #4, and #5. The documents submitted for Assessments #3 and #5 do not provide evidence that this standard is met within those assessments. Sections of the assessment tool for #4 suggest that some aspects of this standard are met, i.e. "Creates opportunities for students to use effective written, verbal, nonverbal and visual communications" and "Uses teaching and learning strategies that promote critical thinking, problem solving and creative performances," but it is not clear if this means that classroom students engage in critical analysis of different media and communications technologies.

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

jn jn jn

Comment:

This standard is indicated in the program report as being addressed by Assessments #4 and #5. While this standard seems implied in the assessment tool for #4 "Creates plans with a variety of activities appropriate to the discipline, curriculum goal and the learning needs and styles of students" and "Demonstrates knowledge of reading processes," these indicators do not explicitly require candidates to select appropriate reading strategies that permit access to, and understanding of, a wide range of print and nonprint texts. Does "Demonstrates knowledge of reading processes" also mean that a demonstration of the ability to apply that knowledge in a classroom is expected? In Assessment #5, knowledge and application of reading processes are implied within the criteria for a commendable performance, e.g. "numerous opportunities for children to show their knowledge in various domains," but are not explicitly stated as being required within the lessons submitted as part of the work sample.

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: Detailed and specific efforts have been made to demonstrate how the Illinois Certification Test in English Language Arts aligns with the NCTE/NCATE Standards. The actual passing score for the test as a whole and the number of questions per subarea would be helpful additional information. However, it is the responsibility of the program to provide a specific alignment chart that includes as much information about the examination as is appropriate.

Assessment 2: Efforts have been made to demonstrate the alignment between NCTE/NCATE Standards and the courses/GPA required for candidates. Some information regarding performance task requirements has been included (e.g., journal entries, lesson plans, Web portfolio) and two specific assignments (research essay for EN 232 and the statement of philosophy on teaching the English language for EN 275) are provided in detail as Assessments #7 and #8 for the program review. Such specific descriptions of assignments and criteria for demonstrating mastery of content knowledge are particularly helpful in supporting claims for candidate knowledge. Assessment #8 is exceptionally helpful in demonstrating candidate effectiveness in applying that knowledge to enhance student learning.

Assessment #7: Efforts have been made to demonstrate alignment between NCTE/NCATE Standards and the research essay assignment. Claims are appropriately modest for this assignment and scoring

guide. While it is clear that candidates are required to demonstrate certain aspects of content knowledge, it is less clear if candidates are able to demonstrate their ability to integrate this knowledge into their own teaching. In addition, it is not clear how this assignment addresses several of the substandards that fall under Standards 3.2, 3.5, and 3.7. For example, does this assignment also require candidates to analyze and discuss "visual images" and "nonprint text" (3.2.1, 3.2.5)? Also, because this assignment is specifically given in an American literature course, how does it address 3.5.1 and 3.5.3?

Assessment #8: This assessment tool has been designed to supplement other assessments aimed at assessing candidate's content knowledge. It appears to address effectively not only candidates' content knowledge in a broad range of language issues but also requires candidates to demonstrate ways to integrate such knowledge into their planning and instruction. This tool provides evidence that candidates are able to meet Standards 3.1, 3.2, and 3.7 in the target range.

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

Assessment #3: Program report preparers acknowledged that the data for this assessment are currently incomplete and superficial. It is also unclear how the total score for each candidate has been calculated in relation to the criteria of the rubric or on which assignment in which course (either EN 235 or EN 425) these scores are based.

As for the Unit Plan Assessment Rubric, there is evidence within the wording of the assessment to demonstrate how some of the unit requirements clearly align with specific NCTE/NCATE Standards. This is not the case for all standards that are listed as being addressed for this assignment, however (e.g., Standards 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, or 4.6).

Assessment #4: The data chart provided is not clear. Is this report based on all student teachers in the entire university program or just on the English education students? Also, it is not clear why the numbers for each category are different (30, 50, 45, 35). The interpretation of the data is unclear because the data seem to reflect student performance in the entire teacher education program and not just English education student performance. A strength, however, is that the assessment tool has been revised to reflect more subject-specific expectations for English education candidates. As with Assessment #3, some of the criteria on this form correspond clearly with the expectations within the NCTE/NCATE Standards (e.g., 2.1 and 2.5). It is less clear that the criteria on the assessment tool are specifically aligned with the expectations for Standards 3.1 and 3.4, however. While the assessment tool specifically states that candidates demonstrate knowledge of reading processes and different composing processes, the form does not yet specify that this knowledge must also be applied within planning, instruction, and assessment. The expectation of application of such knowledge is worded more explicitly for skills in the use of the English language and uses for an extensive range of literature, however.

Assessment #6: This tool clearly helps candidates integrate their understandings of theory into actual pedagogical practices. A number of NCTE/NCATE standards are aligned with this assignment. However, it is less clear if this journal assignment requires candidates to develop and teach plans or engage in authentic applications of pedagogical content knowledge (Standards 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, and 4.10). Therefore, while this assessment tool does address candidates' abilities to demonstrate their own emerging understandings of writing theories and analyze how another instructor integrates theories into practice, it is less clear if candidates are required to demonstrate integration of this knowledge into their own interactions with students.

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

Assessment #5: It is clear that this assessment requires candidates to engage in analysis of and reflection

upon their planning and instruction processes and their students' learning, in response to the candidate's pedagogical actions. The assessment tool is not explicitly aligned with the NCTE/NCATE Standards, however, since it is a generic form used across multiple content areas during student teaching. The accompanying description of this assignment states that this assessment is aligned with all of the NCTE standards, but many of these standards are implied rather than explicitly required in this assessment tool.

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)

Specific efforts have been made to compare course requirements, assignments, and assessment tools with the expectations of NCTE/NCATE standards. This has led to the addition of required courses and to revisions in specific courses and assignments, with a clear movement toward assignments and assessments that require evidence that candidates are meeting an increasing number of standards as well as providing evidence that they can integrate content knowledge into practice.

Report preparers also acknowledge that data for some instruments are still incomplete or superficial (e.g. Assessment #3). Ongoing revisions are being made to the tools and procedures for assessing professional and pedagogical knowledge, including ways to align assessment forms even more explicitly with NCTE/NCATE standards (e.g., Assessment #4).

The introduction of teacher inquiry groups appears to be a promising initiative in relation to candidates' impact on student learning.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

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:

- Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM DD YYYY

07 / 15 / 2010

Subsequent action by the institution: To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below.

The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period.

If the program is submitting a Response to Conditions Report **for the first time**, the range of possible deadlines for submitting that report are 9/15/08, 2/1/09, 9/15/09, or 2/1/10. *Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 9/15/08 submission date. However, the program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this recognition report.*

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a **second** Response to Conditions Report, the range of possible deadlines for submitting that report are 9/15/08, 2/1/09, or 9/15/09.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM DD YYYY

02 / 01 / 2010

The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (or within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued). See above for specific date.

1. Address unmet standards (2.6 and 4.3) as well as standards met with conditions.
2. Continue to revise assessment tools so that there is a clear and explicit alignment between criteria/indicators and NCTE/NCATE standards, particularly in generic forms used across multiple content areas.
3. Continue to revise assessments, especially those that address Standards 3.1 and 3.7, to document not only candidates' content knowledge but also their ability to integrate that content knowledge into planning and instruction.

Please click "Next"

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