

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of English Language Arts Teachers (2012 Standards)

National 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

Kutztown University of Pennsylvania

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

08 / 01 / 2019

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

English Education

Grade Level⁽¹⁾

7-12

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

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA decision on national 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 SPA benchmarked licensure test data requirement, if applicable:

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

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

Summary of Strengths:

New rubrics and rating categories are an improvement, and it is clear that the team has put program improvements into place.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes literature and multimedia texts as well as knowledge of the nature of adolescents as readers.

Element 1: Candidates are knowledgeable about texts—print and non-print texts, media texts, classic texts and contemporary texts, including young adult—that represent a range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different genders, ethnicities, and social classes; they are able to use literary theories to interpret and critique a range of texts.

Element 2: Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents read texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met

**Comment:****STANDARD 2: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes language and writing as well as knowledge of adolescents as language users.

Element 1: Candidates can compose a range of formal and informal texts taking into consideration the interrelationships among form, audience, context, and purpose; candidates understand that writing is a recursive process; candidates can use contemporary technologies and/or digital media to compose multimodal discourse.

Element 2: Candidates know the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics); they understand the concept of dialect and are familiar with relevant grammar systems (e.g., descriptive and prescriptive); they understand principles of language acquisition; they recognize the influence of English language history on English Language Arts content; and they understand the impact of language on society.

Element 3: Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met

**Comment:**

The addition of a grammar course to address some candidates' weaknesses in this area is strong. In addition, more opportunities to understand language acquisition for ESL students will enhance the program.

STANDARD 3: CONTENT PEDAGOGY: Planning Literature and Reading Instruction in English Language Arts
Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for reading and the study of literature to promote learning for all students.

Element 1: Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences utilizing a range of different texts—across genres, periods, forms, authors, cultures, and various forms of media—and instructional strategies that are motivating and accessible to all students, including English language learners, students with special needs, students from diverse language and learning backgrounds, those designated as high achieving, and those at risk of failure.

Element 2: Candidates design a range of authentic assessments (e.g., formal and informal, formative and summative) of reading and literature that demonstrate an understanding of how learners develop and that address interpretive, critical, and evaluative abilities in reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and presenting.

Element 3: Candidates plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences in reading that reflect knowledge of current theory and research about the teaching and learning of reading and that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and a variety of reading strategies.

Element 4: Candidates design or knowledgeably select appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about student interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes.

Element 5: Candidates plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language—structure, history, and conventions—to facilitate students’ comprehension and interpretation of print and non-print texts.

Element 6: Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

STANDARD 4: CONTENT PEDAGOGY: Planning Composition Instruction in English Language Arts
Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for composing texts (i.e., oral, written, and visual) to promote learning for all students.

Element 1: Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant composing experiences that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and contemporary technologies and reflect an understanding of writing processes and strategies in different genres for a variety of purposes and audiences.

Element 2: Candidates design a range of assessments for students that promote their development as writers, are appropriate to the writing task, and are consistent with current research and theory. Candidates are able to respond to student writing in process and to finished texts in ways that engage students’ ideas and encourage their growth as writers over time.

Element 3: Candidates design instruction related to the strategic use of language conventions (grammar, usage, and mechanics) in the context of students’ writing for different audiences, purposes, and modalities.

Element 4: Candidates design instruction that incorporates students’ home and community languages to enable skillful control over their rhetorical choices and language practices for a variety of audiences and purposes.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

STANDARD 5: LEARNERS & LEARNING: Implementing English Language Arts Instruction
Candidates plan, implement, assess, and reflect on research-based instruction that increases motivation and active student engagement, builds sustained learning of English language arts, and responds to diverse students’ context-based needs.

Element 1: Candidates plan and implement instruction based on English Language Arts curricular requirements and standards, school and community contexts, and knowledge about students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Element 2: Candidates use data about their students’ individual differences, identities, and funds of knowledge for literacy learning to create inclusive learning environments that contextualize curriculum and instruction and help students participate actively in their own learning in English Language Arts.

Element 3: Candidates differentiate instruction based on students’ self-assessments and formal and informal assessments of learning in English language arts; candidates communicate with students about their performance in ways that actively involve them in their own learning.

Element 4: Candidates select, create, and use a variety of instructional strategies and teaching resources, including contemporary technologies and digital media, consistent with what is currently known about student learning in English Language Arts.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

STANDARD 6: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how theories and research about social justice, diversity, equity, student identities, and schools as institutions can enhance students’ opportunities to learn in English Language Arts.

Element 1: Candidates plan and implement English language arts and literacy instruction that promotes social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society.

Element 2: Candidates use knowledge of theories and research to plan instruction responsive to students' local, national and international histories, individual identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender expression, age, appearance, ability, spiritual belief, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and community environment), and languages/dialects as they affect students' opportunities to learn in English Language Arts.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

STANDARD 7: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Candidates are prepared to interact knowledgeably with students, families, and colleagues based on social needs and institutional roles, engage in leadership and/or collaborative roles in English Language Arts professional learning communities, and actively develop as professional educators.

Element 1: Candidates model literate and ethical practices in English Language Arts teaching, and engage in/reflect on a variety of experiences related to English Language Arts.

Element 2: Candidates engage in and reflect on a variety of experiences related to English Language Arts that demonstrate understanding of and readiness for leadership, collaboration, ongoing professional development, and community engagement.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

No new information was provided for Assessments #1 and #2 as they were not part of the conditions imposed. Assessments #6-#8 include revised rubrics. It appears that all rubrics are now built on a three-point rating system of Target, Met, Not Met. This should make it easier for all evaluators to work with them. All indicators are more closely aligned to the appropriate NCTE Standards. There is some lingering concern that words such as "minimally," or "generally" are still not defined in any concrete way. It would help if a glossary of sorts were used for all the assessments so that everyone knows what these mean as well as what the primary categories mean.

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

All assessment rubrics have been updated and are more consistent with NCTE Standards language. All are now using the same three-point rating system.

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

See above.

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)

It is clear that the program has used this opportunity to respond to conditions to make changes to rubrics that associate with the assessments and to align them more directly with the NCTE Standards.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

Continue to think about what is meant by the individual element qualifiers. This is not, in this reviewer's opinion enough to not give recognition, but would demonstrate an ongoing commitment to the smallest details.

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 CAEP site visitors:

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- National Recognition.** The program is recognized through the semester and year of the provider's next CAEP accreditation decision in 5-7 years. The Recognition Report will serve as program level evidence for the accreditation cycle it has been initiated. **To retain recognition and to gather new evidence for the next accreditation cycle, another program report must be submitted mid-cycle 3 years in advance of the next scheduled accreditation visit.** The program will be listed as Nationally Recognized through the semester of the next CAEP accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and CAEP. The institution may designate its program as Nationally Recognized by the SPA, through the semester of the next CAEP accreditation decision, in its published materials. *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.