

# NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

## Initial Preparation of Foreign Language Educators

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

### COVER PAGE

#### Name of Institution

Southeastern Louisiana University

#### Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

01 / 28 / 2008

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

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

#### Program(s) Covered by this Review

Foreign Language Education (French & Spanish)

#### Program Type

First teaching license

#### Award or Degree Level(s)

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's

### PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

#### SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):

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

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

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

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

**Comment:**

Scores on the PRAXIS II exams are presented for one year and for one language.

**Summary of Strengths:**

The program uses multiple field experiences throughout the candidates' years of study, and the sites include diverse settings and populations.

The FL department has faculty who are certified OPI raters and who interview foreign language students in-house. A recent decision requires Advanced-low proficiency as the minimum for both language and language-education students to exit the programs

Study abroad is highly encouraged and the university sponsors several programs for both French and Spanish students.

**PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS**

**Standard 1. Language, Linguistics, Comparisons.**

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

Met jn	Met with Conditions jn	Not Met jn
-----------	---------------------------	---------------

**Comment:**

The university has certified OPI testers on the faculty and it appears that double-rated official OPIs are now being required (rather than encouraged). It should be clarified as to whether the taped interviews done on campus receive a second blind rating (this can be done through an Academic Upgrade through LTI so that there is no conflict of interest). A requirement that candidates demonstrate Advanced-low oral proficiency is in place, but there is no mention of a plan of remediation for the few candidates who have difficulty meeting the target.

Assessments 2 and 7 measure written and oral presentational language use as part of a content assessment; the rubrics assess language performance at two different levels of the candidates' curriculum.

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

Candidates (a) demonstrate that they understand the connections among the perspectives of a culture and its practices and products, and they integrate the cultural framework for foreign language standards into their instructional practices; (b) recognize the value and role of literary and cultural texts and use them to

interpret and reflect upon the perspectives of the target cultures over time; and (c) integrate knowledge of other disciplines into foreign language instruction and identify distinctive viewpoints accessible only through the target language.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

**Comment:**

Evidence from state licensure exam minimally questions candidates' knowledge of cultural facts, the PRAXIS II is not aligned to ACTFL/NCATE Standard 2 relative to the 3Ps.

In the narrative for Assessment 2, it is stated that the target courses (SP / FR 314) are required for education majors. However, the program of study indicates that another option--SP 324/FR 324 is available; to be a valid assessment tool, all candidates must complete the same task and be evaluated by the same rubric. It is important to clarify this issue for any future review but this issue does not preclude the meeting of this the standard.

The tasks for Assessment 2 are well defined and the rubrics are able to assess the content areas included in Standard 2 and the language used to support the conveyance of knowledge. Reviewers do raise a question as to whether the assessment tasks produce candidate performance at a level consistent with that described in the rubrics. For example, a half-page essay and a full page essay may not be sufficiently rich to measure components in the rubric that address cultural or language. It is recommended that faculty continue to refine tasks as they work with the rubric over time. Analysis of culture does align with the ACTFL/NCATE Standards in having candidates pursue tasks with a degree of independence of topic but within a set of guidelines.

Assessment 7 is commendable because it requires candidates to interact with native speakers and ask questions about cultural topics, and it shows evidence of development as this is an assessment at the lower division level.

**Standard 3. Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices.**

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

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

**Comment:**

The Portfolio project submitted as Assessment 3 lists a series of artifacts for observing, planning, teaching. This list identifies relevant ACTFL/NCATE standards. Likewise the rubric identifies those standards and performance levels. What is missing is an indication of which artifacts are assessed for which performance elements. By selecting or highlighting appropriate artifacts that provide evidence of planning or of theory/practice linkage and the rubric elements applied, it will be clearer as to how candidates meet Standard 3.

The generic student teaching evaluation instrument does not measure candidates' implementation of Standard 3, though the proposed addendum shows promise for gathering data in the future. It is not clear that candidates receive preparation for FLES and secondary methods nor that they have clinical practice

in FLES classrooms, though the state license is designated K-12.

#### **Standard 4. Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction.**

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

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

#### **Comment:**

The key assessment for Standard 4 is the Student Teaching Evaluation form. The relevant ACTFL/NCATE standard has been identified for each observational behavior which is a positive step. Without further specificity of foreign language actions or activities, the evaluation does not provide the candidate with feedback on what to improve. Neither does it assure that there is consistent evaluation between university supervisor / cooperating teacher for example.

#### **Standard 5. Assessment of Language and Cultures.**

Candidates (a) believe that assessment is ongoing, and they demonstrate knowledge of multiple ways of assessment that are age- and level-appropriate by implementing purposeful measures; (b) reflect on the results of student assessments, adjust instruction accordingly, analyze the results of assessments, and use success and failure to determine the direction of instruction; and (c) interpret and report the results of student performances to all stakeholders and provide opportunity for discussion.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

#### **Comment:**

Assessment 5, to be valid, must require that all candidates complete the same task and be evaluated by the same rubric; the data here presented come from an optional service-learning course. Even then only 2 (of 8) candidates were required to demonstrate the development of assessment tools and analysis strategies which are the focus of Standard 5. The course will become mandatory in the 2008-09; additional data are necessary. The attendant instructions to candidates currently include none of the specifics needed to complete the assignment ("guidelines will be provided") and the attachments are mis-labeled. Although the 'instructions' refer to a portfolio of materials, neither the existing rubrics (journal self-assessment and performance evaluation) nor the data table refer clearly to portfolio artifacts.

The generic student teaching evaluation instrument does not adequately describe candidates' implementation of ACTFL/NCATE standards, though the section on "Assessment" lists appropriate standards. Adding language-specific descriptors that delineate the meaning of scores (1-4) will provide needed information.

#### **Standard 6. Professionalism.**

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

with students, colleagues, and members of the community to promote the field.

Met Met with Conditions

Not Met

j<sup>n</sup>

j<sup>n</sup>

j<sup>n</sup>

**Comment:**

Assessment 8 provides candidates with a sequence of ways of participating in professional development. The rubric encourages students to go beyond the listing of organizations in the portfolio to participation in conferences and membership to meet the expectations.

**PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE**

**C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content**

Significant improvements have been made to create assessments and rubrics to provide evidence that candidates have acquired Advanced-level knowledge and skills in the target languages. Assessments also address cultural content (inc. literature and cross-disciplinary topics) in ways to measure students ability to pursue and present their own investigations. Faculty should continue to observe, however, whether the tasks are challenging enough to provide evidence of the performances targeted in the rubrics. The oral proficiency data presented are weakened since candidates have been interviewed and rated by university faculty only and have not had a second blind-rating.

The program is commended for its plans to require additional literature coursework. This will provide opportunities to develop assessment(s) more focused on Standard 2b.

The expected performance level on the OPI has been taken to Advanced Low as required but it is unclear whether the ratings are official (i.e., double-rated).

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

The generic student teaching evaluation instrument--on which the data for the report are based--identifies where each ACTFL/NCATE standard could be measured. There is no description of the performances that result in a rating of 1, 2, 3, etc.

Again, all assessments used to verify attainment of the standards must be required of all candidates in order to collect useful data. When the course related to Assessment 5, for example, becomes required, that assessment instrument shows promise for gathering data in the future.

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

Assessment 5 is presented as the primary evidence that candidates impact pupil learning, yet not all candidates complete the assessment assignment. Until data are collected on all program candidates, reviewers cannot judge the program in this regard.

**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 is commended for taking very seriously the charge to develop assessment tools, to collect data, and to use data for the purpose of program improvement. Steps are already being taken to revise the foreign language education curriculum and to require additional content-area courses in literature, film, and conversation. The student teaching evaluation process will be enhanced by the addition of

observations from language faculty who can respond to a new assessment tool directly aligned to specific ACTFL/NCATE standards. New/additional field experiences are also planned for inclusion in the FL methods course. The service-learning experience will become a requirement of the program, as well.

## PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

### Areas for consideration

Continue to monitor the task/level fit for content assessments.

## PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Although a table of field experiences is included, more detail in the context statement would clarify what seem to be contradictions. For example, it is reported that FL candidates complete 270 hours in all-day, all-semester student teaching, and the Program of Study indicates that students enroll in EDUC 486 for student teaching; however, the Field Experience Chart describes that course as Elementary Student Teaching in grades K-5. More details about the course EDUC 490 (Special Methods in HS Subjects), where candidates teach for 4 weeks, would also be helpful.

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

## PART G -DECISIONS

### Please select final decision:

- Program is nationally recognized. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.
- Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.
- The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

## NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

### The program is recognized through:

MM DD YYYY  
02 / 10 / 2010

**Subsequent action by the institution:\*** To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below. The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period. The range of possible deadlines for submitting reports are 4/15/08, 9/15/08, 2/1/09, 4/15/09, or 9/15/09. *Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 2/1/09 submission date.*

\*Note: for this semester only, programs who have been cited as Recognized with Conditions for a second time have been given one more opportunity to submit another Response to Conditions report. The report may be submitted April 15, 2008; Sept. 15, 2008, or Feb. 1, 2009.

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

MM DD YYYY  
09 / 15 / 2009

**The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (see above for specific date):**

1. Clarify that interviews of candidates who take the OPI with certified testers on campus undergo a second blind rating (an Academic Upgrade).
2. For the scoring guides for assessments 4 and 5 provide more specific information that delineate different levels of performance. This will help ensure that all evaluators (cooperating teacher, university supervisor) are using the same criteria and that the assessment provides useful feedback to the candidates.

**Please click "Next"**

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