



## Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Report for Accredited Programs

(updated 9/19/23)

Program Type: **Accredited Program**

Program Name: English Language Arts

Submitted By: Melissa Ames

Email: mames@eiu.edu

Submission Date: 8-28-2024

Review Cycle:

- **Even Year (Round A)**
- Odd Year

### Review Round and Instructions

- **Round A (Associate Dean review):** Submit this cover sheet and a copy of the annual (or periodic) report most recently submitted to the accrediting agency; your accreditation report should address assessment.
- **Round B (Associate Dean + VPAA review):** Submit this cover sheet and the following:
  - evidence of ongoing accreditation (document confirming accreditation status, which could be a letter from the accrediting agency)
  - annual (or periodic) accreditation report submitted to agency
  - this SLO report, which provides a summary of the program's collection and evaluation of its annual assessment data\*
  - an optional cover memo (not to exceed one page), which briefly describes any information or highlights the department believes would be important to demonstrate academic excellence and program quality

*\*If your program completed a significant review (accreditation application and/or the full 8-year IBHE report) in the last calendar year, then you may, with permission from the VPAA or designee, substitute either of these major reports for your typical Student Learning Outcomes report, in "Round B." **To be approved, these documents must substantively discuss assessment, outcomes, and data, and have been prepared and submitted within the same calendar year.***

All SLO reports are archived here: <https://www.eiu.edu/assess/majorassessment.php>

DUE: **October 15<sup>th</sup>** to your Associate Dean or designee

**Dean Review and Feedback**

Per VPAA, the English Dept. submitted its recently completed NCTE Conditions Assessment Report (attached) in lieu of the standard EIU SLO template; the NCTE document contains essentially all of the same information. NCTE standards require an array of measures that sync with these standards (which are essentially the SLOs). Measure administration times as given are clear and logical. The National Recognition Report (also attached) states that all standards have been met, and that National Recognition of the program has been once again granted as of January 2024. Provided also is a comprehensive statement of how assessment results are being used to improve the program, which indicates a dynamic and robust assessment on the local level. All of this, of course, is highly commendable.



Dean or designee

12/6/24  
Date

**VPAA Office Review and Feedback (for "Round B" SLO report only)**

VPAA or designee

Date

**Response to Conditions Assessment Report for the  
Preparation of English Language Arts Teachers**  
National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)  
2012 Standards – Option 1

**SECTION I— CONTEXT – not required for Response to Conditions Assessment Report**

**SECTION II— LIST OF ASSESSMENTS**

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the NCTE standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.<sup>1</sup>

1. Please provide the following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters in each field)

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment Is Administered
1	<b>Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content- based assessment (required)</b>	ELA Content Exam  Content Certification Exam	Before Student Teaching*  <small>*Due to COVID-19, the State of Illinois allowed candidates to student teach prior to taking the content exam during the 2021-2022 &amp;</small>

<sup>1</sup> Note: all items marked in green throughout refer to additional assessment data files submitted as a part of this report submission to NCTE. Since these are not required per the criteria for EIU's Round A guidelines, in order to facilitate easier navigation through this bi-annual report, this material has been omitted but is available upon request.

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment Is Administered
			2022-2023 academic years
2	<b>Assessment #2: Content knowledge in English (required)</b>  Student Teaching Approval Portfolio  File Name: Assessment #2-Student Teaching Approval Portfolio-2023	Comprehensive Portfolio	Before Student Teaching
3	<b>Assessment #3: Candidate ability to plan instruction (required)</b>  Unit Plan  File Name: Assessment #3 Unit Plan-2023	Unit Plans submitted through Live Text	In three content methods courses: English 3401 (Composition Methods), English 3402 (Literature Methods), English 4801 (Integrating the English Language Arts)
4	<b>Assessment #4: Student Teaching or Internship (required)</b>  Student Teaching Evaluation  File Name: Assessment #4 - Student Teaching Evaluation-2023	Student Teaching Evaluations through Live Text	After Student Teaching
5	<b>Assessment #5: Candidate effect on student learning (required)</b>  Impact on P-12 Assessment	Impact On P-12 Student Learning Assessment	During Student Teaching

Submitted Fall 2023 by Eastern Illinois University ELA Program

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment Is Administered	
	<p>File Name: Assessment #5 – Impact on P-12 Assessment-2023</p>	through Live Text		
6	<p><b>Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses NCTE Standards (required)</b></p>	<p>Pedagogy Reflection (Clinical Experience) Essay</p> <p>File Name: Assessment #6 – Pedagogy Reflection Clinical Experience Essay-2023</p>	Clinical Experience Essays	<p>In three content methods courses: English 3401 (Composition Methods), English 3402 (Literature Methods), and 4801 (Integrating the English Language Arts)</p>
7	<p><b>Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards (optional)</b></p>	<p>Dispositions Evaluation</p> <p>File Name: Assessment #7 – Dispositions Evaluation-2023</p>	Dispositions Assessment	<p>In three content methods courses (English 3401, English 3402, English 4801) and During Student Teaching</p>

- (10) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.
- (11) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).
- (12) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

**SECTION III—RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS**

1. For each NCTE standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple NCTE standards.

NCTE STANDARDS	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II			
<p><b>1. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</b> 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.</p>				
<p><i>Element 1:</i> 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.</p>	<p><b>X#1</b> <b>X#5</b></p>	<p><b>X#2</b> <input type="checkbox"/> #6</p>	<p><b>X#3</b> <input type="checkbox"/> #7</p>	<p><b>X#4</b></p>
<p><i>Element 2:</i> Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents read texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.</p>				
<p><b>2. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</b> 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</p>				
<p><i>Element 1:</i> 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 <u>contemporary technologies and/or digital media to compose</u> multimodal discourse.</p>	<p><b>X#1</b> <b>X#5</b></p>	<p><b>X#2</b> <input type="checkbox"/> #6</p>	<p><b>X#3</b> <input type="checkbox"/> #7</p>	<p><b>X#4</b></p>
<p><i>Element 2:</i> 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 <u>impact of language on society</u>.</p>				
<p><i>Element 3:</i> Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.</p>				

<b>NCTE STANDARDS</b>	<b>APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II</b>
<b>3. CONTENT PEDAGOGY</b> 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.	
<i>Element 1:</i> 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.	<p style="text-align: center;"> <b>X#1    X#2    X#3    X#4</b>  <b>X#5    X #6    □#7</b> </p>
<i>Element 2:</i> 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.	
<i>Element 3:</i> 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.	
<i>Element 4:</i> Candidates design or knowledgeably select appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about student interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes.	
<i>Element 5:</i> Candidates plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language—structure, history, and conventions—to facilitate students’ comprehension and interpretation of print and non-print texts.	
<i>Element 6:</i> Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials.	
<b>4. CONTENT PEDAGOGY</b> 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.	

<b>NCTE STANDARDS</b>	<b>APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II</b>
<i>Element 1:</i> 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.	<p><b>X#1    X#2    X#3    X#4</b>  <b>X#5    □#6    □#7</b></p>
<i>Element 2:</i> 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.	
<i>Element 3:</i> 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	
<i>Element 4:</i> 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.	
<p><b>5. LEARNERS &amp; LEARNING</b>  <b>Implementing English Language Arts Instruction</b> 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.</p>	
<i>Element 1:</i> 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.	<p><b>□#1    □#2    X#3    X#4</b>  <b>X#5    X#6    □#7</b></p>
<i>Element 2:</i> 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.	
<i>Element 3:</i> 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.	



<b>NCTE STANDARDS</b>	<b>APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II</b>
<i>Element 4:</i> 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.	
<b>6. PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS</b> 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.	
<i>Element 1:</i> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #7
<i>Element 2:</i> 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.	
<b>7. PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS</b> 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.	
<i>Element 1:</i> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #7
<i>Element 2:</i> 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.	

## SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

**DIRECTIONS:** The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. Taken as a whole, the assessments must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. The key assessments and data reported should be required of all candidates. Assessments, scoring guides/rubrics and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements [each relating to specific SPA standard(s)], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a cumulative score.

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas to be aligned with the elements in CAEP's Standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare one document that includes the following items:

The responses for e, f, and g (above) should be limited to the equivalent of five text pages each, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides/rubrics may go beyond five pages.

Note: As much as possible, combine all of the files for one assessment into a single file. That is, create one file for Assessment 4 that includes the two-page narrative (items a – d above), the assessment itself (item e above), the scoring guide (item f above), and the data chart (item g above). Each attachment should be no larger than 2 mb. Do not include candidate work or syllabi. There is a limit of 20 attachments for the entire report so it is crucial that you combine files as much as possible.

Please name files as directed in the Guidelines for Preparing an NCATE Program Report found on the NCATE web site at the following URL: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur>

1. Data licensure tests for content knowledge in English language arts. (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV  
A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)  
File Name: Assessment #1-ELA Content Exam-2023
2. Assessment of content knowledge in English language arts.(13) (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s):  
File Name: Assessment #2-Student Teaching Approval Portfolio-2023

(13) For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance,

the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included

3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom-based instruction. (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #3 Unit Plan-2023

4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #4 Student Teaching Evaluation-2023

5. Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning. (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #5 – Impact on P-12 Assessment-2023

6. Additional assessment that addresses NCTE Standards (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #6 – Pedagogy Reflection Clinical Experience Essay-2023

7. Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards. (Optional) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #8 – Dispositions Evaluation-2023

8. Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards. (Optional) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

N/A

## **SECTION V—USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM**

Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

The assessment data from the current and previous review cycles have contributed to program changes, as well as forthcoming updates, at the department level. Although our candidates have continued to meet all standards, attention to our lowest mean scores across the seven assessments have prompted changes relating to Content Knowledge; Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions; and Student Learning goals.

### **1. Content Knowledge**

We are currently in the process of revising our major and assessment data from the previous and current review cycle will factor into many of our decisions (as it has in the past). As we revise our ELA curriculum we will be aligning to the updated 2021 NCTE Standards, the revised Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (which must be implemented by 2025), and the recently passed Illinois Culturally Responsive Teaching Standards. One major change anticipated in this revision is the elimination from the core of two courses (English 2950: Transatlantic Literary History I and English 2960: Transatlantic Literary History II) which we originally created in hope that they would help to expand candidates' knowledge of literary history/movements and the impact of language on society (NCTE 1.1, 2.1). These survey courses focus on an expansive range of pre- and post-1800 texts and were intended as a foundation for the upper-division literature course candidates would take after them. However, data from recent focus group studies have indicated that these courses are not valued by students and evidence from upper-division courses does not reveal the foundational knowledge transfer we had expected. While overall our candidates are meeting the standard in terms of "knowledge of, and uses for, an extensive range of literature" (NCTE 1.1), this round of assessment shows some conflicting levels of success among the three assessments that track this standard. For example, it was one of candidates' lower scoring performance areas (e.g. subarea score 2, literary and informational texts) on Assessment #1 - ELA Content Exam, but fell into the middle-level meets area on Assessment #3 - Unit Plan Assessment, and was one of the higher performance areas Assessment #4 - Student Teaching Portfolio. As we develop the curriculum, and possibly courses, that will take the place of these eliminated requirements we will have to do so with candidates' mastery of this standard in mind.

One other curricular thing of note since the last review cycle has been the revival of a special topics pedagogy course, English 4906: Issues in the Teaching of English. It has been taught with a focus on social justice pedagogy (NCTE 6.1), media literacy (NCTE 1.2), adaptation (NCTE 1.1), and teaching English as a second language (NCTE 2.2, 5.1). As of now this class is available as an elective for our teacher candidates to take and we are discussing the value of potentially requiring this course in the future. One additional benefit of doing so is it is a cross-listed graduate course that often is taken by active secondary English teachers completing our online masters of arts program. The opportunity for mentorship relationships to be formed between these two educational cohorts is exciting. If this class was to become a required course in our curriculum the English Education Committee has discussed the potential of using program assessment data to guide the focus areas for special topics that we offer.

## **2. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions**

During this assessment cycle candidates showed strong mastery of NCTE 2.1 (“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”), as reflected in data on Assessment #2 – Student Teaching Portfolio, Assessment #4 – Student Teaching Evaluation, and Assessment #5 – Impact on P-12 Assessment. One contributing factor may have been a revision to English 3401: Methods of Teaching Composition. In the past candidates had completed a research-based essay exploring composition pedagogy areas in this course. However, this assignment was replaced with one wherein candidates complete a rhetorical analysis of one of their own essays from a past course. This assignment has them considering their own writing practices, and considering the choices they made based on the genre, intended audience, context, and goals of the piece. This activity has proven to be a good scaffold for candidates to consider how to guide their future students through thinking about these same things as they move through the composition process and complete various writing tasks.

In terms of a potential area for growth, in this review period, as in past ones, our candidates have met, but performed lower comparatively, on performance tasks tied to NCTE 2.2 “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.” (For this set of data, this was the weakest area for Assessment #2 - Student Teaching Portfolio). In the past we

focused on improving their ability to teach skills related to grammar and the history of language (as noted in our **2021 Assessment NCTE Report's** discussion of the implementation of Grammar and Language Mini-Lessons in English 3401: Methods of Teaching Composition). However, during this review period we decided to look more holistically at candidates' needed growth areas and allow that combined data to inform our approach forward. Slightly lower "meets" scores (in the lower 3.0 range on a 5.0 scale or the lower 2.0 range on a 3.0 scale) appeared in the following related standards: "candidate demonstrates a commitment to customizing instruction to draw upon students' home and community language, cultural backgrounds, individual differences, and literacy levels to create inclusive learning environments that contextualize curriculum and help students participate actively in their own learning in ELA" (**NCTE 5.1**), as seen in the Assessment #6 - Pedagogy Essay data, and "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" (**NCTE 6.2**), as seen in the Assessment #7 - Dispositions Evaluation data (formerly Assessment #8). These combined needed growth areas encouraged us to focus our efforts in increasing candidates' mastery of **NCTE 2.2** by focusing more on cultural linguistics and language study from a social justice orientated perspective. In Spring 2023 we hosted a reading and pedagogy workshop led by Dr. April Baker-Bell, author of *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy*. These events, as well as readings from her book, were integrated into our two methods courses running that semester. Since we are only now making this shift in our curriculum to focus more on cultural linguistics we have not decided how best to modify existing assessments or craft new ones that will best measure the impact this focus may be having on our candidates' growth in terms of these standards.

Some exciting changes happening within our department may also be able to play a role in potentially helping students grow in these areas. We are currently in the process of passing a new minor in our department: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. We also will be offering a new course, English 3902: Foundations of Second Language Acquisition, a linguistics course focused on principles and dynamics of second language acquisition and literacy of children and adults with an emphasis on putting these principles in practice. As discussed above in regard to English 4906: Issues in Teaching English, as we revise our major there will be discussion about whether this new course will remain just a highly encouraged elective (and minor) that our candidates can take or if we will integrate the course into our requirements.

Continuing on to other areas of possible improvement, in tasks that ask candidates to demonstrate that they use assessments and data about their students to inform their instructional planning choices, candidates often struggle (as seen in Assessment #3 – Unit Plan). Therefore, **NCTE 3.4** ("candidates design or knowledgably select

appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about students interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes”) is an area we would like to monitor going forward. (In the next section below there is a possible new Assessment Simulation assignment we would like to implement that may be able to help students grow in this area).

### 3. Student Learning

During this period, we did make minor revisions to our methods courses that we find are reflected positively in this assessment data. For example, English 4801: Integrating the English Language Arts is a course that focuses heavily on media literacy and social justice pedagogy. We adopted new textbooks, integrated new resources, and expanded our focus areas to include more discussion on current digital technologies and multimodal composing practices, trauma informed pedagogy, and social emotional learning. These changes likely played a role in high scores on various assessments scores aligned with **NCTE 5.4** (“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”) and **NCTE 6.1** (“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”).

One area of growth that we have noted through our data analysis is related to candidates’ abilities to gather and analyze assessment data themselves. While this surfaces more abstractly in assessments that feature their instructional planning documents, the clearest indicator of this need for additional training is seen in *Assessment #5 – Impact on P-12 Assessment*, which is completed at the end of their student teaching experience. In this assessment the candidates discuss the actual assessments they created for their students in the field and then they are tasked with analyzing data to discuss student growth and learning patterns across different student populations. While they can often craft impressive assessments and discuss them quite clearly, it is the latter, the analysis of actual student learning outcomes evident from those assessment tools, that is lacking. Therefore, in order to help candidates reach mastery of standards such as **NCTE 5.3** (“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”), the English Education Committee has discussed creating a new assignment to put into our capstone methods course that would simulate a professional development session wherein candidates would disaggregate and analyze assessment data.

Finally, it should be noted that we are continuing on with some promised work noted in our last assessment report. In the last assessment cycle candidates received slightly lower scores on performance indicators tied to using “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” (NCTE 5.2), as well as NCTE 5.3. The College of Education completed the process of creating matrixes aligning all of their professional education courses required of secondary education teacher licensure candidates with the Illinois Culturally Responsive Teaching Standards. The English Education Committee then began the process of doing the same for its curriculum and recently completed the process. With that process complete and curricular revisions forthcoming, we still are now determining the best space in our program to target increasing candidates’ skills in this area.

## **SECTION VI—RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORT**

Directions: Describe what changes or additions have been made in the report to address the conditions and concerns raised in the original SPA Recognition Report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. In responding to the SPA’s decision of “National Recognition with Conditions,” the program should focus on the conditions specified in **Part G** (Decisions) of the prior SPA Recognition Report (report that the program receives notifying the SPA’s decision on National Recognition). If a program can meet the conditions listed in Part G through evidence presented in the Response to Conditions Report, it should be eligible for National Recognition. Comments provided in **Part B** (Status of Meeting SPA Standards), **Part C** (Evaluation of Program Report Evidence), **Part D** (Evaluation of the Use of Assessment Results), and **Part E** (Areas for Consideration) of the prior SPA Recognition Report may also provide valuable information on ways to address the conditions stated in Part G.

In response to the feedback provided on the Original SPA Recognition Report, we have made the following changes:

- 1) **All assessment rubrics have been realigned with the NCTE Standards so that each performance indicator is tied to only one single NCTE Standard and individual element.** In their previous format, the assessments were comprehensive in noting all possible standards that each assessment could potentially meet; however, the feedback helped us realize that we were, indeed, swimming in assessment data and that to truly be able to assess standards/elements clearly they must stand alone with separate assessment rubric criteria. We are now assessing much fewer standards/elements per assessment tool. However, most elements are still assessed by at least two assessments, if not three, allowing for triangulation of data.
- 2) **Minor revisions have been made to rubric language to help with clarity and alignment with standards.** For example, on Assessment #2 – Student Teaching Portfolio, Criterion #6 has been reworded to more accurately describe the intended goal and to better mirror its linked NCTE Standard.



- 3) **Additional examples and emphasis added to showcase alignment of standards on assessment data documents.** Feedback pertaining to Assessment #1 – ELA Content Exam included some misinformation (unless some of our files did not upload properly in the original submission). The feedback states that the content test was not aligned to the NCTE Standards and that subscore data was not provided. However, the 2021 file titled **Assessment #1 – ELA Content Exam** did, indeed, contain this information. Part I, B listed the NCTE Standards that the exam aligned to and then provided four specific examples of NCTE Standards/Elements that aligned with numbered Objectives from each subarea of the Content Exam. Then below those four examples was a chart that listed all of the exam’s objectives in four columns (organized by the test’s four subareas). At the top of each column the aligned NCTE Standards appeared again. In Section C-D, averages were provided for subarea scores. In Section G, a table housed candidate test scores in columns and presented their raw scores broken down by subareas. Therefore, we believe we did, indeed, have that test information properly submitted and analyzed in the last report. However, to improve further, we did list additional examples of aligned NCTE Standards/Elements and Test Objectives in Part B and we highlighted the NCTE Standards in the alignment chart. The subarea scores are still present for candidates in Section G, but for this submission we opted to use candidates’ initials instead of full names to protect their identities.
- 4) **Minor revisions have been made to assessment language/directions.** For example, on Assessment #2 – Student Teaching Portfolio, the reviewer feedback suggested that “candidates might be asked to gather artifacts and provide a written defense of how the artifact speaks to their competency in some or all Standard or Element.” The original assessment submitted in 2021 included a required Portfolio Reflection described as a “1-2pg single-spaced essay reflecting on portfolio contents, highlighting at least three artifacts within that showcase your teaching philosophy/strengths.” In this 2023 submission this descriptor has been revised to read “1-2pg single-spaced essay reflecting on portfolio contents, highlighting at least three artifacts within that showcase your teaching philosophy/strengths, as well as professional growth and readiness for the field.” While we feel the original descriptor was already aligned with **NCTE 7.1** (allowing students to “reflect on a variety of experiences related to English Language Arts”), hopefully the revision makes this more explicit. Also, it should be noted that the portfolio contains a Literacy Narrative that requires candidates to reflect on their reading history, gaps in knowledge, need for professional development, and how those might impact their future teaching (if not addressed). Since all assignment sheets for individual assignments found within the portfolio would obviously not be submitted in the last report, there is likely no way a reviewer would know those elements of that assignment, but we are including an excerpt from the prompt here:

*In this second section of the essay, you should analyze what impact your reading history (all that you discussed in Part I) may have on your future instruction. You should critique your literary breadth and depth (as evidenced through high school and college study), as well as your personal reading preferences, in order to determine how these could influence your teaching (your comfort-level/preferences for certain courses, authors, novels, genres, etc.). This is a place to honestly reflect upon your current strengths as well as your current weaknesses. You should specifically note any gaps in knowledge/training you currently have. As educators are always life-long learners in search for additional professional development, you should also note areas in which you plan to continue to study (formally or informally) in order to address these potentially problematic gaps in knowledge. Remember, no new teacher (or experienced teacher for that matter) has read everything and is an expert in all literary areas. Being able to recognize our undeveloped areas of study shows responsible professional reflection.*

One other point of clarification that should be made about the Portfolio Assessment is that the “Checklist” is simply an item that they submit when turning in the portfolio because it is part of their Final Student Teaching Approval Process. The checklist simply lists program requirements for qualifying for student teaching, including the state requirement that they have a C or higher in all classes that will count for licensure. Their course grades, and the fact that they received a C or higher in all classes, are not actually factoring into this assessment and determining if they meet a particular NCTE Standards concerning content knowledge. Reviewers are assessing them based on the actual artifacts contained within the portfolio. This may be something we need to explain more clearly in future reports.

- 5) **Reduced Number of Program Assessments.** As noted in the last assessment report, the state of Illinois suspended the use of the edTPA pedagogy licensure exam during Covid-19 and as of the end of this period of assessment data they had not yet reinstated it. They just recently announced that they will no longer be using this exam, but may look for a substitute. When we re-aligned our assessments to meet the NCTE Standards we did so with the plan to move forward with just seven program assessments in the future. However, there were many current/potential assignments noted within the report above that we would like to implement or continue on with. If we feel these are successful tools at measuring NCTE Standards we have struggled in the past to reach, one of these may be able to move into the vacant eight assessment position.
- 6) **Reviewed Assessment Best Practices & Created an Updated Assessment Review Procedures.** Since the last report we went back to basics in some regard in terms of considering how we were doing assessment in our program, although we know we have quite a bit of revision still ahead of us. For example, we went through some norming sessions to discuss how we were using the assessment tools just within our own program. Based on a “recommended best practices” session from an Assessment Symposium, we also decided that rather than review all assessment data annually, we would instead take a targeted approach to analyzing data. We decided that at the end of the Fall and Spring

semester we will analyze accumulated data for two program assessments (on a rotating basis). For example: Fall 2023 (Assessment #2 & #3), Spring 2024 (Assessment #4 & #5), Fall 2024 (Assessment #6 & #7), Spring 2025 (Assessment #2 & #3). The English Education Director will still review exam data as it comes in throughout the year and all assessment data at the end of each semester in case any significant patterns arise that need to be addressed outside of the scheduled analysis schedule. The Director will also present a brief at-a-glance overview of what the latest round of assessment data reveals about candidate performance in select standards/elements the committee has decided to monitor more closely.

Feedback provided from the last report also expressed some concerns about two of our assessments that we did not decide to revise/abandon at this time: Assessment #6 – Pedagogy Reflection Essay and Assessment #7 – Dispositions Evaluation (formerly Assessment #8). In our 2021 Report one of our findings was that our candidates’ greatest strengths were tied to **NCTE 7.1** and **NCTE 7.2**. We concluded that our spiral curriculum and assessment program that finds candidates regularly engaging in reflective practices is contributing to their success in these areas. Therefore, we felt strongly about maintaining these as part of our assessment plan. For the Dispositions Evaluation we agreed with the feedback that some of the alignment with the NCTE standards was too indirect and so half of the rubric is more accurately tied to **NCTE 7.1** alone instead of stretching to also reach other more loosely related standards. The concern for the Pedagogy Reflection Essay was that without clear instruction such reflective writing would be too subjective to be useful for program assessment. We were surprised by this feedback because when this assessment was first added to our program assessment it was met with great enthusiasm by reviewers and at that time it was a purely reflective essay focused on the candidates’ experience observing in the field. Since then we have made it a much more robust and directive essay, asking students to incorporate research and connect course materials to their observations in the field. Below is an excerpt from the assignment prompt:

*This reflection piece allows you to “test” the pedagogy and best practices covered in this class (as presented through the assigned readings, our class discussions, and your individual research), as well as from your other education classes, against real world application. Therefore, it is required that you integrate research into this reflective essay, citing specific texts, theories, scholars, strategies, and so forth into the essay. This a space to reflect on how to successfully integrate the various aspects of Language Arts and how to create and sustain a learning environment that allows all students to succeed (one that engages students, fosters critical thinking skills, engages with cultural diversity, etc.) This essay also documents your ability to think critically about the profession and your role within it (how you will work with others to develop professionally and how you will draw upon classroom experiences to inform your teaching).*

Therefore, we opted to leave these two assessments in place for the time being, hoping that the realigned standards and clarity concerning their goals more accurately showcase their value.

Other issues that were noted in the report concerned confusion on the coversheet about faculty member credentials. The three English methods instructors (Ames, Binns, Tacke) are not trained zoologists; however, other College of Education faculty members – who do have diverse disciplinary backgrounds and teach required professional education courses that our candidates take – were listed in the cover sheet; that distinction may have not been clear.

Finally, an important issue that was raised was concern over our program completion rate. To address this we conducted a review of completion rates for the six-year period between summer 2016 and spring 2022 which resulted in a pool of 151 students who had, in that period of time, been enrolled originally as an ELA major. Their status at the time of this data collection is housed in the below table. At first the same concern may rise: the completion rate seems rather low. In this period of time only 15 students graduated as English teaching majors, 10% of the total pool of students, but making up 39% of the students who graduated during this time period. (Data from Spring 2023 can share that 9 of those listed at that time as “Enrolled English teaching” went on to graduate successfully and 4 are currently student teaching). However, it is useful to consider larger patterns. Typically, 50-60% of students in our department start off by declaring ELA as their major as most students do not know that there are other paths available for them if they would like to pursue an English degree. We have an early mentorship class that provides students with knowledge about the various areas of English Studies (which include the different concentrations available for those who pursue a traditional English BA degree: literary & cultural studies, professional writing, and creative writing). Some students learn of their options early on and change into the regular English major. This may explain why there are an additional 33 students listed as being enrolled or having graduated from the regular major. (The number of combined ELA and regular English majors in this period represents 87% of the pool that graduated). It is also important to note that besides for the 1-credit mentorship class noted above, students typically take primarily general education courses their freshman year so they are not often enrolled in actual English courses until their sophomore or junior year. Many of the students listed as not having graduated did not make it to a single class in our major, therefore, any retention initiatives we have in place at the departmental level could not help them. It is also worth noting that not all of this data is necessarily problematic. For example, if two students continued on to graduate as teachers in another field because their passion for education took them in a slightly different direction, that should not necessarily reflect poorly as a program weakness. Together combined then, from the those who graduated only 8% left English or education and did something completely different from the degree they originated in.

Did not graduate English nonteaching	8
Did not graduate English teaching	23
Did not graduate other education	2
Did not graduate other noneducation	4
Enrolled English nonteaching	15
Enrolled English teaching	48

Enrolled other education	5
Enrolled other noneducation	8
Graduated English nonteaching	18
Graduated English teaching	15
Graduated other education	2
Graduated other noneducation	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>151</b>

As for the 37 students who did not graduate, which makes up 25% of this dataset, that is a troubling figure. However, broader context about Eastern Illinois University and the population we serve may help to explain this figure. Student demographic data for this group was analyzed to account for gender, race, first generation student status, and Pell Grant eligibility (a proxy for whether or not the student fell into a lower SES bracket). Of the 37 students who did not graduate in this period of time, 49% were first generation students and 41% were Pell Grant eligible. This indicates that outside factors may have played a role in their college outcome. Analysis of the data in terms of gender and race provided no conclusive findings. Sadly, another factor that may have also contributed to lower completion rates in recent years compared to past review cycles is that Eastern Illinois has lowered admission criteria at the same time that it has eliminated some support programs for at-risk student populations.

As noted in the last report, once students are actively taking courses in our program, we have a multi-tiered system in place where we seek feedback from faculty about the candidates' progress and we work with candidates to create a student success plan if remediation is needed. Our program continues to be invested in students' success and very much would like to report higher completion rates in future reports. (And being that within the last two academic years we had 15 candidates graduate, equaling the number in the six-year period analyzed above, it is quite likely we will be able to do so.)

# 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**

Eastern Illinois University

**Date of Review**

MM DD YYYY

01 / 29 / 2024

**This report is in response to a(n):**

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

**Program Covered by this Review**

English Language Arts Option for Teacher Certification/English with Teacher Certification

**Grade Level<sup>(1)</sup>**

9-12

(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:**

The program has strengthened rubrics to help ensure candidates are successful with the NCTE Standards upon completion of the program.



## 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:

---

**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

Assessments provide evidence of candidates' knowledge of content.

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

Assessments provide evidence of candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

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

Assessments provide evidence of candidate effects on p-12 student learning.

## 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)**

The program demonstrates its ability to evaluate assessment results to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program.

## 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 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"

**Response to Conditions Assessment Report for the  
Preparation of English Language Arts Teachers**  
National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)  
2012 Standards – Option 1

**SECTION I— CONTEXT – not required for Response to Conditions Assessment Report**

**SECTION II— LIST OF ASSESSMENTS**

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the NCTE standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program. <sup>1</sup>

1. Please provide the following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters in each field)

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment Is Administered
1	<b>Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content- based assessment (required)</b>	ELA Content Exam  <small>File Name: Assessment #1-ELA Content Exam- 2023</small>	Content Certification Exam  Before Student Teaching*  <small>*Due to COVID-19, the State of Illinois allowed candidates to student teach prior to taking the content exam during the 2021-2022 &amp;</small>

<sup>1</sup> Note: all items marked in **green** throughout refer to additional assessment data files submitted as a part of this report submission to NCTE. Since these are not required per the criteria for EIU's Round A guidelines, in order to facilitate easier navigation through this bi-annual report, this material has been omitted but is available upon request.

Submitted Fall 2023 by Eastern Illinois University ELA Program

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment Is Administered
2	<b>Assessment #2: Content knowledge in English (required)</b>	Comprehensive Portfolio	2022-2023 academic years Before Student Teaching
3	<b>Assessment #3: Candidate ability to plan instruction (required)</b>	Unit Plan <small>File Name: Assessment #3-Student Teaching Approval Portfolio-2023</small>	Unit Plans submitted through Live Text In three content methods courses: English 3401 (Composition Methods), English 3402 (Literature Methods), English 4801 (Integrating the English Language Arts)
4	<b>Assessment #4: Student Teaching or Internship (required)</b>	Student Teaching Evaluation <small>File Name: Assessment #4 - Student Teaching Evaluation-2023</small>	Student Teaching Evaluations through Live Text After Student Teaching
5	<b>Assessment #5: Candidate effect on student learning (required)</b>	Impact on P-12 Assessment	Impact On P-12 Student Learning Assessment During Student Teaching

Submitted Fall 2023 by Eastern Illinois University ELA Program

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment Is Administered
	<p>File Name: Assessment #5 – Impact on P-12 Assessment-2023</p>	through Live Text	
6	<p><b>Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses NCTE Standards (required)</b></p> <p>Pedagogy Reflection (Clinical Experience) Essay</p> <p>File Name: Assessment #6 – Pedagogy Reflection Clinical Experience Essay-2023</p>	Clinical Experience Essays	In three content methods courses: English 3401 (Composition Methods), English 3402 (Literature Methods), and 4801 (Integrating the English Language Arts)
7	<p><b>Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards (optional)</b></p> <p>Dispositions Evaluation</p> <p>File Name: Assessment #7 – Dispositions Evaluation-2023</p>	Dispositions Assessment	In three content methods courses (English 3401, English 3402, English 4801) and During Student Teaching

(10) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

(11) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

(12) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

**SECTION III—RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS**

1. For each NCTE standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple NCTE standards.

<b>NCTE STANDARDS</b>	<b>APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II</b>
<p><b>1. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</b> 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.</p>	
<p><i>Element 1:</i> 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.</p>	<p><b>X#1   X#2   X#3   X#4</b> <b>X#5   □ #6   □ #7</b></p>
<p><i>Element 2:</i> Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents read texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.</p>	
<p><b>2. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</b> 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</p>	
<p><i>Element 1:</i> 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.</p>	<p><b>X#1   X#2   X#3   X#4</b> <b>X#5   □ #6   □ #7</b></p>
<p><i>Element 2:</i> 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.</p>	
<p><i>Element 3:</i> Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.</p>	

<b>NCTE STANDARDS</b>	<b>APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II</b>
<b>3. CONTENT PEDAGOGY</b> 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.	
<i>Element 1:</i> 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.	<p style="text-align: center;"> <b>X#1    X#2    X#3    X#4</b>  <b>X#5    X #6    □#7</b> </p>
<i>Element 2:</i> 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.	
<i>Element 3:</i> 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.	
<i>Element 4:</i> Candidates design or knowledgeably select appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about student interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes.	
<i>Element 5:</i> Candidates plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language—structure, history, and conventions—to facilitate students’ comprehension and interpretation of print and non-print texts.	
<i>Element 6:</i> Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials.	
<b>4. CONTENT PEDAGOGY</b> 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.	

<b>NCTE STANDARDS</b>	<b>APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II</b>
<i>Element 1:</i> 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.	<p><b>X#1    X#2    X#3    X#4</b>  <b>X#5    □#6    □#7</b></p>
<i>Element 2:</i> 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.	
<i>Element 3:</i> 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	
<i>Element 4:</i> 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.	
<p><b>5. LEARNERS &amp; LEARNING</b>  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.</p>	
<i>Element 1:</i> 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.	<p><b>□#1    □#2    X#3    X#4</b>  <b>X#5    X#6    □#7</b></p>
<i>Element 2:</i> 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.	
<i>Element 3:</i> 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.	

NCTE STANDARDS	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p><i>Element 4:</i> 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.</p>	
<p><b>6. PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS</b>            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.</p>	
<p><i>Element 1:</i> 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</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> #1    <input type="checkbox"/> #2    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #3    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4  <input type="checkbox"/> #5    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #7</p>
<p><i>Element 2:</i> 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.</p>	
<p><b>7. PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS</b>            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.</p>	
<p><i>Element 1:</i> 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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> #1    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #2    <input type="checkbox"/> #3    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #4  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #6    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #7</p>
<p><i>Element 2:</i> 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.</p>	



## SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

**DIRECTIONS:** The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. Taken as a whole, the assessments must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. The key assessments and data reported should be required of all candidates. Assessments, scoring guides/rubrics and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements [each relating to specific SPA standard(s)], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a cumulative score.

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas to be aligned with the elements in CAEP's Standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare one document that includes the following items:

The responses for e, f, and g (above) should be limited to the equivalent of five text pages each, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides/rubrics may go beyond five pages.

Note: As much as possible, combine all of the files for one assessment into a single file. That is, create one file for Assessment 4 that includes the two-page narrative (items a – d above), the assessment itself (item e above), the scoring guide (item f above), and the data chart (item g above). Each attachment should be no larger than 2 mb. Do not include candidate work or syllabi. There is a limit of 20 attachments for the entire report so it is crucial that you combine files as much as possible.

Please name files as directed in the Guidelines for Preparing an NCATE Program Report found on the NCATE web site at the following URL: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur>

1. Data licensure tests for content knowledge in English language arts. (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV  
A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #1-ELA Content Exam-2023

2. Assessment of content knowledge in English language arts.(13) (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s):

File Name: Assessment #2-Student Teaching Approval Portfolio-2023

(13) For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance,

the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included

3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom-based instruction. (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #3 Unit Plan-2023

4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #4 Student Teaching Evaluation-2023

5. Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning. (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #5 - Impact on P-12 Assessment-2023

6. Additional assessment that addresses NCTE Standards (Assessment Required) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #6 - Pedagogy Reflection Clinical Experience Essay-2023

7. Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards. (Optional) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

File Name: Assessment #8 - Dispositions Evaluation-2023

8. Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards. (Optional) Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

A LINK to upload or manage your uploaded file(s)

N/A

## **SECTION V—USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM**

Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

The assessment data from the current and previous review cycles have contributed to program changes, as well as forthcoming updates, at the department level. Although our candidates have continued to meet all standards, attention to our lowest mean scores across the seven assessments have prompted changes relating to Content Knowledge; Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions; and Student Learning goals.

### **1. Content Knowledge**

We are currently in the process of revising our major and assessment data from the previous and current review cycle will factor into many of our decisions (as it has in the past). As we revise our ELA curriculum we will be aligning to the updated 2021 NCTE Standards, the revised Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (which must be implemented by 2025), and the recently passed Illinois Culturally Responsive Teaching Standards. One major change anticipated in this revision is the elimination from the core of two courses (English 2950: Transatlantic Literary History I and English 2960: Transatlantic Literary History II) which we originally created in hope that they would help to expand candidates' knowledge of literary history/movements and the impact of language on society (NCTE 1.1, 2.1). These survey courses focus on an expansive range of pre- and post-1800 texts and were intended as a foundation for the upper-division literature course candidates would take after them. However, data from recent focus group studies have indicated that these courses are not valued by students and evidence from upper-division courses does not reveal the foundational knowledge transfer we had expected. While overall our candidates are meeting the standard in terms of "knowledge of, and uses for, an extensive range of literature" (NCTE 1.1), this round of assessment shows some conflicting levels of success among the three assessments that track this standard. For example, it was one of candidates' lower scoring performance areas (e.g. subarea score 2, literary and informational texts) on Assessment #1 - ELA Content Exam, but fell into the middle-level meets area on Assessment #3 - Unit Plan Assessment, and was one of the higher performance areas Assessment #4 - Student Teaching Portfolio. As we develop the curriculum, and possibly courses, that will take the place of these eliminated requirements we will have to do so with candidates' mastery of this standard in mind.

One other curricular thing of note since the last review cycle has been the revival of a special topics pedagogy course, English 4906: Issues in the Teaching of English. It has been taught with a focus on social justice pedagogy (NCTE 6.1), media literacy (NCTE 1.2), adaptation (NCTE 1.1), and teaching English as a second language (NCTE 2.2, 5.1). As of now this class is available as an elective for our teacher candidates to take and we are discussing the value of potentially requiring this course in the future. One additional benefit of doing so is it is a cross-listed graduate course that often is taken by active secondary English teachers completing our online masters of arts program. The opportunity for mentorship relationships to be formed between these two educational cohorts is exciting. If this class was to become a required course in our curriculum the English Education Committee has discussed the potential of using program assessment data to guide the focus areas for special topics that we offer.

## **2. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions**

During this assessment cycle candidates showed strong mastery of NCTE 2.1 (“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”), as reflected in data on Assessment #2 – Student Teaching Portfolio, Assessment #4 – Student Teaching Evaluation, and Assessment #5 – Impact on P-12 Assessment. One contributing factor may have been a revision to English 3401: Methods of Teaching Composition. In the past candidates had completed a research-based essay exploring composition pedagogy areas in this course. However, this assignment was replaced with one wherein candidates complete a rhetorical analysis of one of their own essays from a past course. This assignment has them considering their own writing practices, and considering the choices they made based on the genre, intended audience, context, and goals of the piece. This activity has proven to be a good scaffold for candidates to consider how to guide their future students through thinking about these same things as they move through the composition process and complete various writing tasks.

In terms of a potential area for growth, in this review period, as in past ones, our candidates have met, but performed lower comparatively, on performance tasks tied to NCTE 2.2 “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.” (For this set of data, this was the weakest area for Assessment #2 - Student Teaching Portfolio). In the past we

focused on improving their ability to teach skills related to grammar and the history of language (as noted in our **2021 Assessment NCTE Report's** discussion of the implementation of Grammar and Language Mini-Lessons in English 3401: Methods of Teaching Composition). However, during this review period we decided to look more holistically at candidates' needed growth areas and allow that combined data to inform our approach forward. Slightly lower "meets" scores (in the lower 3.0 range on a 5.0 scale or the lower 2.0 range on a 3.0 scale) appeared in the following related standards: "candidate demonstrates a commitment to customizing instruction to draw upon students' home and community language, cultural backgrounds, individual differences, and literacy levels to create inclusive learning environments that contextualize curriculum and help students participate actively in their own learning in ELA" (**NCTE 5.1**), as seen in the Assessment #6 - Pedagogy Essay data, and "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" (**NCTE 6.2**), as seen in the Assessment #7 - Dispositions Evaluation data (formerly Assessment #8). These combined needed growth areas encouraged us to focus our efforts in increasing candidates' mastery of **NCTE 2.2** by focusing more on cultural linguistics and language study from a social justice orientated perspective. In Spring 2023 we hosted a reading and pedagogy workshop led by Dr. April Baker-Bell, author of *Linguistic Justice: Black Language, Literacy, Identity, and Pedagogy*. These events, as well as readings from her book, were integrated into our two methods courses running that semester. Since we are only now making this shift in our curriculum to focus more on cultural linguistics we have not decided how best to modify existing assessments or craft new ones that will best measure the impact this focus may be having on our candidates' growth in terms of these standards.

Some exciting changes happening within our department may also be able to play a role in potentially helping students grow in these areas. We are currently in the process of passing a new minor in our department: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. We also will be offering a new course, English 3902: Foundations of Second Language Acquisition, a linguistics course focused on principles and dynamics of second language acquisition and literacy of children and adults with an emphasis on putting these principles in practice. As discussed above in regard to English 4906: Issues in Teaching English, as we revise our major there will be discussion about whether this new course will remain just a highly encouraged elective (and minor) that our candidates can take or if we will integrate the course into our requirements.

Continuing on to other areas of possible improvement, in tasks that ask candidates to demonstrate that they use assessments and data about their students to inform their instructional planning choices, candidates often struggle (as seen in Assessment #3 – Unit Plan). Therefore, **NCTE 3.4** ("candidates design or knowledgeably select

appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about students interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes”) is an area we would like to monitor going forward. (In the next section below there is a possible new Assessment Simulation assignment we would like to implement that may be able to help students grow in this area).

### **3. Student Learning**

During this period, we did make minor revisions to our methods courses that we find are reflected positively in this assessment data. For example, English 4801: Integrating the English Language Arts is a course that focuses heavily on media literacy and social justice pedagogy. We adopted new textbooks, integrated new resources, and expanded our focus areas to include more discussion on current digital technologies and multimodal composing practices, trauma informed pedagogy, and social emotional learning. These changes likely played a role in high scores on various assessments scores aligned with **NCTE 5.4** (“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”) and **NCTE 6.1** (“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”).

One area of growth that we have noted through our data analysis is related to candidates’ abilities to gather and analyze assessment data themselves. While this surfaces more abstractly in assessments that feature their instructional planning documents, the clearest indicator of this need for additional training is seen in Assessment #5 – Impact on P-12 Assessment, which is completed at the end of their student teaching experience. In this assessment the candidates discuss the actual assessments they created for their students in the field and then they are tasked with analyzing data to discuss student growth and learning patterns across different student populations. While they can often craft impressive assessments and discuss them quite clearly, it is the latter, the analysis of actual student learning outcomes evident from those assessment tools, that is lacking. Therefore, in order to help candidates reach mastery of standards such as **NCTE 5.3** (“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”), the English Education Committee has discussed creating a new assignment to put into our capstone methods course that would simulate a professional development session wherein candidates would disaggregate and analyze assessment data.

Finally, it should be noted that we are continuing on with some promised work noted in our last assessment report. In the last assessment cycle candidates received slightly lower scores on performance indicators tied to using “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” (NCTE 5.2), as well as NCTE 5.3. The College of Education completed the process of creating matrixes aligning all of their professional education courses required of secondary education teacher licensure candidates with the Illinois Culturally Responsive Teaching Standards. The English Education Committee then began the process of doing the same for its curriculum and recently completed the process. With that process complete and curricular revisions forthcoming, we still are now determining the best space in our program to target increasing candidates’ skills in this area.

## SECTION VI—RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORT

Directions: Describe what changes or additions have been made in the report to address the conditions and concerns raised in the original SPA Recognition Report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. In responding to the SPA’s decision of “National Recognition with Conditions,” the program should focus on the conditions specified in **Part G** (Decisions) of the prior SPA Recognition Report (report that the program receives notifying the SPA’s decision on National Recognition). If a program can meet the conditions listed in Part G through evidence presented in the Response to Conditions Report, it should be eligible for National Recognition. Comments provided in **Part B** (Status of Meeting SPA Standards), **Part C** (Evaluation of Program Report Evidence), **Part D** (Evaluation of the Use of Assessment Results), and **Part E** (Areas for Consideration) of the prior SPA Recognition Report may also provide valuable information on ways to address the conditions stated in Part G.

In response to the feedback provided on the Original SPA Recognition Report, we have made the following changes:

- 1) **All assessment rubrics have been realigned with the NCTE Standards so that each performance indicator is tied to only one single NCTE Standard and individual element.** In their previous format, the assessments were comprehensive in noting all possible standards that each assessment could potentially meet; however, the feedback helped us realize that we were, indeed, swimming in assessment data and that to truly be able to assess standards/elements clearly they must stand alone with separate assessment rubric criteria. We are now assessing much fewer standards/elements per assessment tool. However, most elements are still assessed by at least two assessments, if not three, allowing for triangulation of data.
- 2) **Minor revisions have been made to rubric language to help with clarity and alignment with standards.** For example, on Assessment #2 – Student Teaching Portfolio, Criterion #6 has been reworded to more accurately describe the intended goal and to better mirror its linked NCTE Standard.

- 3) **Additional examples and emphasis added to showcase alignment of standards on assessment data documents.** Feedback pertaining to Assessment #1 – ELA Content Exam included some misinformation (unless some of our files did not upload properly in the original submission). The feedback states that the content test was not aligned to the NCTE Standards and that subscore data was not provided. However, the 2021 file titled **Assessment #1 – ELA Content Exam** did, indeed, contain this information. Part I, B listed the NCTE Standards that the exam aligned to and then provided four specific examples of NCTE Standards/Elements that aligned with numbered Objectives from each subarea of the Content Exam. Then below those four examples was a chart that listed all of the exam’s objectives in four columns (organized by the test’s four subareas). At the top of each column the aligned NCTE Standards appeared again. In Section C-D, averages were provided for subarea scores. In Section G, a table housed candidate test scores in columns and presented their raw scores broken down by subareas. Therefore, we believe we did, indeed, have that test information properly submitted and analyzed in the last report. However, to improve further, we did list additional examples of aligned NCTE Standards/Elements and Test Objectives in Part B and we highlighted the NCTE Standards in the alignment chart. The subarea scores are still present for candidates in Section G, but for this submission we opted to use candidates’ initials instead of full names to protect their identities.
- 4) **Minor revisions have been made to assessment language/directions.** For example, on Assessment #2 – Student Teaching Portfolio, the reviewer feedback suggested that “candidates might be asked to gather artifacts and provide a written defense of how the artifact speaks to their competency in some or all Standard or Element.” The original assessment submitted in 2021 included a required Portfolio Reflection described as a “1-2pg single-spaced essay reflecting on portfolio contents, highlighting at least three artifacts within that showcase your teaching philosophy/strengths.” In this 2023 submission this descriptor has been revised to read “1-2pg single-spaced essay reflecting on portfolio contents, highlighting at least three artifacts within that showcase your teaching philosophy/strengths, as well as professional growth and readiness for the field.” While we feel the original descriptor was already aligned with NCTE 7.1 (allowing students to “reflect on a variety of experiences related to English Language Arts”), hopefully the revision makes this more explicit. Also, it should be noted that the portfolio contains a Literacy Narrative that requires candidates to reflect on their reading history, gaps in knowledge, need for professional development, and how those might impact their future teaching (if not addressed). Since all assignment sheets for individual assignments found within the portfolio would obviously not be submitted in the last report, there is likely no way a reviewer would know those elements of that assignment, but we are including an excerpt from the prompt here:



*In this second section of the essay, you should analyze what impact your reading history (all that you discussed in Part I) may have on your future instruction. You should critique your literary breadth and depth (as evidenced through high school and college study), as well as your personal reading preferences, in order to determine how these could influence your teaching (your comfort-level/preferences for certain courses, authors, novels, genres, etc.). This is a place to honestly reflect upon your current strengths as well as your current weaknesses. You should specifically note any gaps in knowledge/training you currently have. As educators are always life-long learners in search for additional professional development, you should also note areas in which you plan to continue to study (formally or informally) in order to address these potentially problematic gaps in knowledge. Remember, no new teacher (or experienced teacher for that matter) has read everything and is an expert in all literary areas. Being able to recognize our undeveloped areas of study shows responsible professional reflection.*

One other point of clarification that should be made about the Portfolio Assessment is that the “Checklist” is simply an item that they submit when turning in the portfolio because it is part of their Final Student Teaching Approval Process. The checklist simply lists program requirements for qualifying for student teaching, including the state requirement that they have a C or higher in all classes that will count for licensure. Their course grades, and the fact that they received a C or higher in all classes, are not actually factoring into this assessment and determining if they meet a particular NCTE Standards concerning content knowledge. Reviewers are assessing them based on the actual artifacts contained within the portfolio. This may be something we need to explain more clearly in future reports.

- 5) **Reduced Number of Program Assessments.** As noted in the last assessment report, the state of Illinois suspended the use of the edTPA pedagogy licensure exam during Covid-19 and as of the end of this period of assessment data they had not yet reinstated it. They just recently announced that they will no longer be using this exam, but may look for a substitute. When we re-aligned our assessments to meet the NCTE Standards we did so with the plan to move forward with just seven program assessments in the future. However, there were many current/potential assignments noted within the report above that we would like to implement or continue on with. If we feel these are successful tools at measuring NCTE Standards we have struggled in the past to reach, one of these may be able to move into the vacant eight assessment position.
- 6) **Reviewed Assessment Best Practices & Created an Updated Assessment Review Procedures.** Since the last report we went back to basics in some regard in terms of considering how we were doing assessment in our program, although we know we have quite a bit of revision still ahead of us. For example, we went through some norming sessions to discuss how we were using the assessment tools just within our own program. Based on a “recommended best practices” session from an Assessment Symposium, we also decided that rather than review all assessment data annually, we would instead take a targeted approach to analyzing data. We decided that at the end of the Fall and Spring

semester we will analyze accumulated data for two program assessments (on a rotating basis). For example: Fall 2023 (Assessment #2 & #3), Spring 2024 (Assessment #4 & #5), Fall 2024 (Assessment #6 & #7), Spring 2025 (Assessment #2 & #3). The English Education Director will still review exam data as it comes in throughout the year and all assessment data at the end of each semester in case any significant patterns arise that need to be addressed outside of the scheduled analysis schedule. The Director will also present a brief at-a-glance overview of what the latest round of assessment data reveals about candidate performance in select standards/elements the committee has decided to monitor more closely.

Feedback provided from the last report also expressed some concerns about two of our assessments that we did not decide to revise/abandon at this time: Assessment #6 – Pedagogy Reflection Essay and Assessment #7 – Dispositions Evaluation (formerly Assessment #8). In our 2021 Report one of our findings was that our candidates' greatest strengths were tied to NCTE 7.1 and NCTE 7.2. We concluded that our spiral curriculum and assessment program that finds candidates regularly engaging in reflective practices is contributing to their success in these areas. Therefore, we felt strongly about maintaining these as part of our assessment plan. For the Dispositions Evaluation we agreed with the feedback that some of the alignment with the NCTE standards was too indirect and so half of the rubric is more accurately tied to NCTE 7.1 alone instead of stretching to also reach other more loosely related standards. The concern for the Pedagogy Reflection Essay was that without clear instruction such reflective writing would be too subjective to be useful for program assessment. We were surprised by this feedback because when this assessment was first added to our program assessment it was met with great enthusiasm by reviewers and at that time it was a purely reflective essay focused on the candidates' experience observing in the field. Since then we have made it a much more robust and directive essay, asking students to incorporate research and connect course materials to their observations in the field. Below is an excerpt from the assignment prompt:

*This reflection piece allows you to “test” the pedagogy and best practices covered in this class (as presented through the assigned readings, our class discussions, and your individual research), as well as from your other education classes, against real world application. Therefore, it is required that you integrate research into this reflective essay, citing specific texts, theories, scholars, strategies, and so forth into the essay. This a space to reflect on how to successfully integrate the various aspects of Language Arts and how to create and sustain a learning environment that allows all students to succeed (one that engages students, fosters critical thinking skills, engages with cultural diversity, etc.) This essay also documents your ability to think critically about the profession and your role within it (how you will work with others to develop professionally and how you will draw upon classroom experiences to inform your teaching).*

Therefore, we opted to leave these two assessments in place for the time being, hoping that the realigned standards and clarity concerning their goals more accurately showcase their value.

Other issues that were noted in the report concerned confusion on the coversheet about faculty member credentials. The three English methods instructors (Ames, Binns, Tacke) are not trained zoologists; however, other College of Education faculty members – who do have diverse disciplinary backgrounds and teach required professional education courses that our candidates take – were listed in the cover sheet; that distinction may have not been clear.

Finally, an important issue that was raised was concern over our program completion rate. To address this we conducted a review of completion rates for the six-year period between summer 2016 and spring 2022 which resulted in a pool of 151 students who had, in that period of time, been enrolled originally as an ELA major. Their status at the time of this data collection is housed in the below table. At first the same concern may arise: the completion rate seems rather low. In this period of time only 15 students graduated as English teaching majors, 10% of the total pool of students, but making up 39% of the students who graduated during this time period. (Data from Spring 2023 can share that 9 of those listed at that time as “Enrolled English teaching” went on to graduate successfully and 4 are currently student teaching). However, it is useful to consider larger patterns. Typically, 50-60% of students in our department start off by declaring ELA as their major as most students do not know that there are other paths available for them if they would like to pursue an English degree. We have an early mentorship class that provides students with knowledge about the various areas of English Studies (which include the different concentrations available for those who pursue a traditional English BA degree: literary & cultural studies, professional writing, and creative writing). Some students learn of their options early on and change into the regular English major. This may explain why there are an additional 33 students listed as being enrolled or having graduated from the regular major. (The number of combined ELA and regular English majors in this period represents 87% of the pool that graduated). It is also important to note that besides for the 1-credit mentorship class noted above, students typically take primarily general education courses their freshman year so they are not often enrolled in actual English courses until their sophomore or junior year. Many of the students listed as not having graduated did not make it to a single class in our major, therefore, any retention initiatives we have in place at the departmental level could not help them. It is also worth noting that not all of this data is necessarily problematic. For example, if two students continued on to graduate as teachers in another field because their passion for education took them in a slightly different direction, that should not necessarily reflect poorly as a program weakness. Together combined then, from the those who graduated only 8% left English or education and did something completely different from the degree they originated in.

Did not graduate English nonteaching	8
Did not graduate English teaching	23
Did not graduate other education	2
Did not graduate other noneducation	4
Enrolled English nonteaching	15
Enrolled English teaching	48

Enrolled other education	5
Enrolled other noneducation	8
Graduated English nonteaching	18
Graduated English teaching	15
Graduated other education	2
Graduated other noneducation	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>151</b>

As for the 37 students who did not graduate, which makes up 25% of this dataset, that is a troubling figure. However, broader context about Eastern Illinois University and the population we serve may help to explain this figure. Student demographic data for this group was analyzed to account for gender, race, first generation student status, and Pell Grant eligibility (a proxy for whether or not the student fell into a lower SES bracket). Of the 37 students who did not graduate in this period of time, 49% were first generation students and 41% were Pell Grant eligible. This indicates that outside factors may have played a role in their college outcome. Analysis of the data in terms of gender and race provided no conclusive findings. Sadly, another factor that may have also contributed to lower completion rates in recent years compared to past review cycles is that Eastern Illinois has lowered admission criteria at the same time that it has eliminated some support programs for at-risk student populations.

As noted in the last report, once students are actively taking courses in our program, we have a multi-tiered system in place where we seek feedback from faculty about the candidates' progress and we work with candidates to create a student success plan if remediation is needed. Our program continues to be invested in students' success and very much would like to report higher completion rates in future reports. (And being that within the last two academic years we had 15 candidates graduate, equaling the number in the six-year period analyzed above, it is quite likely we will be able to do so.)

# 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**

Eastern Illinois University

**Date of Review**

MM DD YYYY

01 / 29 / 2024

**This report is in response to a(n):**

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

**Program Covered by this Review**

English Language Arts Option for Teacher Certification/English with Teacher Certification

**Grade Level<sup>(1)</sup>**

9-12

(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:**

The program has strengthened rubrics to help ensure candidates are successful with the NCTE Standards upon completion of the program.

## 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:

**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

Assessments provide evidence of candidates' knowledge of content.

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

Assessments provide evidence of candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

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

Assessments provide evidence of candidate effects on p-12 student learning.

## 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)

The program demonstrates its ability to evaluate assessment results to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program.

## 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 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"