

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of Foreign Language Educators

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).

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):

- ☐ Initial Review
- ☐ Revised Report
- ☐ Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

French/Spanish 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:

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

Comment:

Summary of Strengths:

Candidates are required to spend over 500 hours in schools and are required to take a large number of diverse courses in the target language. The assessments chosen for documentation of meeting the standards are very focused, as opposed to using many assessments that each merely touch upon multiple standards. The report was well organized and the tables for clinical observation hours and course requirements were easy to read.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. Language, Linguistics, Comparisons.

Candidates (a) demonstrate a high level of proficiency in the target language, and they seek opportunities to strengthen their proficiency; (b) know the linguistic elements of the target language system, recognize the changing nature of language, and accommodate for gaps in their own knowledge of the target language system by learning on their own; and (c) know the similarities and differences between the target language and other languages, identify the key differences in varieties of the target language, and seek opportunities to learn about varieties of the target language on their own.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comment:

Assessments 1, 2, and 6 are cited as providing evidence of candidates meeting Standard 1.

Assessment 6 (OPI) is a required assessment. Advanced Low must be set as the target for candidate performance. The OPI has not been taken by any candidate to date; therefore no data is available. The program should now establish a remediation plan for candidates who do not meet the level of Advanced Low to help them achieve this target.

Additional: Assessment 1 (PRAXIS II) content exam is insufficient to prove that Standard 1 has been met. There is a 0% pass rate on the Spanish PRAXIS and no test results for any French candidate.

Assessment 2 is presented as the Content-area Exam. No assessment document is provided for future French candidates, and it is unknown whether Spanish & French exams require an equivalent level of content knowledge and have an equivalent level of sophistication. The report does not provide the reading selection from the exam, so the data is not credible; candidates are allowed to write an essay in English, so written facility in Spanish nor other information about how it is aligned with the Standards. In addition, the rubric does not provide enough detail or elaboration and can therefore not be determined to align with ACTFL Standard 1.

Standard 2. Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts.

Candidates (a) demonstrate that they understand the connections among the perspectives of a culture and its practices and products, and they integrate the cultural framework for foreign language standards into their instructional practices; (b) recognize the value and role of literary and cultural texts and use them to interpret and reflect upon the perspectives of the target cultures over time; and (c) integrate knowledge of other disciplines into foreign language instruction and identify distinctive viewpoints accessible only through the target language.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jñ

jñ

jñ

Comment:

Assessments 2 and 5 are cited as evidence of meeting Standard 2.

Assessment 2 (Content-area Exam) has been taken by 1 Spanish candidate; no assessment document is provided for future French candidates. The exam does not appear sufficient to prove competency: There is no description of the reading selection from the exam (is it a literary selection?); candidates are allowed to write a cultural essay in English, and the optional topics do not clearly relate to the framework of the PPP; nor do the culture identification items relate to PPP. The rubric should include greater detail and elaborated connections to the Standards and is not adequately aligned with ACTFL Standard 2. It also does not demonstrate how the candidates apply their knowledge of culture to their teaching.

Assessment 5 (Teacher Work Sample) is newly designed and no data are available as evidence that candidates meet Standard 2. The description of the TWS is that of a generic document, and there is no evidence of direct connection to FL or ACTFL standards. The rubric is generic with an addendum that aims to present ACTFL standards, however the descriptors for 4 of the 6 standards address only Standard 1 (i.e., the descriptors do not match the standard addressed); Standard 2 is not addressed in the addendum.

Standard 3. Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices.

Candidates (a) demonstrate an understanding of language acquisition at various developmental levels and use this knowledge to create a supportive classroom learning environment that includes target language input and opportunities for negotiation of meaning and meaningful interaction and (b) develop a variety of instructional practices that reflect language outcomes and articulated program models and address the needs of diverse language learners.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jñ

jñ

jñ

Comment:

Assessments 4 and 5 are cited as evidence of meeting Standard 3. Assessment 3 is not listed on the Section III chart, though the description of Assessment 3 states that it addresses Standard 3. There are no data to report.

The assessments do not provide adequate opportunities for candidates to demonstrate the degree to which they understand and apply language acquisition at various levels and use their knowledge to meet diverse learner needs in their educational settings.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Evaluation) The FL-specific addendum is newly designed and no data are available as evidence that candidates meet Standard 3. The description of the student teacher

evaluation instrument is that of a generic document, and there is no evidence of direct connection to FL or ACTFL standards. The primary rubric is generic and does not tie to FL teaching expectations.

Assessment 5 (Teacher Work Sample) is newly designed and no data are available as evidence that candidates meet Standard 3. The description of the TWS is that of a generic document, and there is no evidence of direct connection to FL or ACTFL standards. The primary rubric is generic.

Standard 4. Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction.

Candidates (a) demonstrate an understanding of the goal areas and standards of the Standards for Foreign Language Learning and their state standards, and they integrate these frameworks into curricular planning; (b) integrate the Standards for Foreign Language Learning and their state standards into language instruction; and (c) use standards and curricular goals to evaluate, select, design, and adapt instructional resources.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jñ

jñ

jñ

Comment:

Assessments 3, 4, 5, and 8 are cited as evidence of meeting Standard 4.

Assessment 3 (Teacher Work Sample). As stated in the commentary accompanying Standard 3, the TWS is a generic document, and there is no evidence of direct connection to FL or ACTFL standards. The primary rubric is also generic in nature. An addendum to the generic rubric aims to address ACTFL standards, but the descriptors are exactly the same for every level of performance and for every ACTFL Standard component except Professionalism. Descriptors do not align with the standard being assessed. Finally, there are no data collected or reported.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Evaluation) The foreign language specific addendum does not provide evidence that candidates meet Standard 4a, 4b, or 4c. The description of the student teacher evaluation instrument is that of a generic document, and there is no evidence of direct connection to FL or ACTFL standards. The primary rubric is generic, lacking important detail to tie it to foreign language teaching expectations

Assessment 5 (Teacher Work Sample) is newly designed and no data are available as evidence that candidates meet Standard 4. The description of the TWS is that of a generic document, and there is not adequate connection to foreign language or ACTFL standards. The primary rubric is generic. An addendum to the generic rubric attempts to present ACTFL standards, but the descriptors are exactly the same for every level of performance and for every ACTFL Standard component except Professionalism.

Assessment 8 (Lesson Planning) requires candidates to create a unit plan that reflects the national standards for K-12 learning. The brief description of the assessment suggests there is potential for collecting evidence of meeting Standard 4. However, the report does not include Attachment A, instructions to candidates about how to prepare the unit or daily plans. The rubric does not reflect the brief description of the assessment, but rather includes elements of other standards. Only one rubric component addresses Standard 4, and the level descriptors for that component are too vague to be able to see how it is aligned to the Standard.

Standard 5. Assessment of Language and Cultures.

Candidates (a) believe that assessment is ongoing, and they demonstrate knowledge of multiple ways of assessment that are age- and level-appropriate by implementing purposeful measures; (b) reflect on the

results of student assessments, adjust instruction accordingly, analyze the results of assessments, and use success and failure to determine the direction of instruction; and (c) interpret and report the results of student performances to all stakeholders and provide opportunity for discussion.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
		

Comment:

Assessment 7 is cited as evidence of meeting Standard 5. However, the instrument is newly designed and no data have been collected or reported. The assignment shows potential for gathering evidence of Standard 3 (Language. acquisition & practice), but NOT Standard 5 (Assessment). The rubric presented does not relate to Standard 5.
It is suggested that the program develop an assessment for Standard 5 that clearly demonstrates that a candidate can assess K-12 student learning in multiple ways. Such an assessment might include the lesson to be taught, pre- and post-teaching data, a reflection by the candidate on student learning, as well as how the full reflection cycle might be used to inform instruction.

Standard 6. Professionalism.

Candidates (a) engage in professional development opportunities that strengthen their own linguistic and cultural competence and promote reflection on practice and (b) know the value of foreign language learning to the overall success of all students and understand that they will need to become advocates with students, colleagues, and members of the community to promote the field.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
		

Comment:

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Evaluation) is cited as evidence of meeting Standard 6.
The FL-specific addendum to Assessment 4 is newly designed and no data are available as evidence that candidates meet Standard 6.
Although the primary rubric is generic, lacking important detail to tie it to FL teaching expectations, an addendum presents ACTFL standards for professionalism. There is no description of how documentation about the rubric category of Professionalism will be gathered, and it would seem that the kind of professional behavior and advocacy that the Standard describes is not something that can be observed directly in the instructional setting of the classroom.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates’ knowledge of content

There is not adequate evidence provided by the assessments in the program report to indicate that candidates have met Standards 1 and 2 in French or Spanish. There is no description of the plan to require the official OPI with a program target set at the Advanced Low level.
--

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

The program has begun to develop assessment instruments to gather evidence of candidates' pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions. However, the instruments are not yet adequately aligned with the ACTFL Standards and thus do not capture the level of teaching skills that are required of foreign language instructors; e.g., the instruments are generic and do not specifically reflect ACTFL standards. Although some rubrics have been created, they will require additional development and language-specific alignment.

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

There is no instrument that specifically addresses the candidates' impact on student learning in the foreign language classroom. The rubric for the STWS is not detailed nor clearly related to ACTFL standards. No data are available.

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)

Since the performance tasks and accompanying rubrics are not clearly aligned with the ACTFL Standards, no data are available for analysis. In addition, no results at this time can be used to inform program improvements. Steps need to be taken to improve candidates' content knowledge.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

The program should resubmit the report once the tasks and rubrics are refined and more data are available.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

The Context Statement is very general and not particularly helpful to understanding the status of the program and the plans that are in place for recruiting students, improving French and Spanish course content, or explaining how teacher certification in FL really works in Louisiana. No unique program assessments are identified and described; thus the program seems very generic. It is not clear which faculty are responsible for teaching the language methods courses or supervising foreign language student teachers. The license is identified as a K-12 license, but the only student teaching experience described is at the secondary level. A capstone course is mentioned, but never explained. In general, more attention needs to be paid to details in the report.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

PART G -DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

☒ The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

PROGRAM IS NOT NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED

Terms and Subsequent Actions

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.