

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
INITIAL PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO
SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES (2009)

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (2009 Standards)

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

University of Puerto Rico at Cayey

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

02 / 01 / 2015

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

Secondary Education with a Major in English

Grade Level⁽¹⁾

7-12

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

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Endorsement only

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

- 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 an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

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

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

Average passing rate of the licensure results for three consecutive years from 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 (reported with passing rates of 64%, 95%, and 83%) . Was 80.67% (rounded to 81%)?, the passing rate of 2011-2012 was too low.

Summary of Strengths:

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Domain 1 – Language. Candidates know, understand, and use the major theories and research related to the structure and acquisition of language to help English language learners’ (ELLs’) develop language and literacy and achieve in the content areas.

Issues of language structure and language acquisition development are interrelated. The divisions of the standards into 1.a. language as a system, and 1.b. language acquisition and development do not prescribe an order.

1a. Language as a System. Candidates demonstrate understanding of language as a system, including phonology, morphology, syntax, pragmatics and semantics, and support ELLs as they acquire English language and literacy in order to achieve in the content areas.

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

Comment:

The program report claims that Assessments 1, 2, and 4 satisfy this standard. Documentation in Section IV of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 5 and 6 satisfy this standard as well. The information provided in Sections III and IV should not vary. Although candidate performance on the state licensure exam (Assessment 1), grades on the program curriculum (Assessment 2), performance in the clinical experience (Assessment 4), performance on the Teacher Work Sample (Assessment 5), and information collected in the Portfolio (Assessment 6) will likely satisfy the standard, the evidence supplied in Section IV is not adequate. Assessment 1 PCMAS is a combination of 3 exams with 9

content areas. The report provides alignment of all content areas to TESOL Standards, but only INGL 4335; 3225; 4011; 3515; 3265 are aligned to TESOL Standards. No description of test questions in each content area or sub-content areas is included to determine the alignment of the content areas and sub-content areas to the said TESOL Standards. Assessment 1 PCMAS, in addition, states to be aligned to TESOL Standards 2 and 3, which is not checked in the checklist.

The documentation of Assessment 1 does not provide a discussion of the content of the PCMAS specialty test for English; therefore it is not able to demonstrate alignment of test content to the standards. Test data, as discussed in comments on the test in Part A of this review, should be presented so that the reviewer can easily see how candidates performed on the assessment as a whole and on sections of the assessment align to various standards. (The documentation of Assessment 1 focused on courses in the curriculum. That information, if relevant, should be moved to the discussion of Assessment 2.) Tables on Assessment 1 should be labeled clearly; the content of the table that shows standard deviations should be reworked to include information about the range of possibles, cut scores for performance levels, and minimum acceptable performance levels.

The documentation of Assessment 2 should focus on courses that all candidates take, so that the reviewer can see that every candidate is being educated on every standard. This documentation does not have to cover every course in the curriculum; in fact, it would be better to focus on courses that address the standards directly. Courses that serve the NCTE standards for English majors do not necessarily need to be included. Typical learning tasks for each course, grading policies and procedures, minimum acceptable performance levels for candidates, and candidate score ranges, should be provided in addition to mean scores and pass rates. Once the program addresses these issues, it is likely that Assessments 1 and 2 will provide adequate evidence for satisfaction of this standard.

The documentation for Assessments 4 and 5 is not complete; thus, satisfaction of the standard through those assessments is not possible. Documentation should follow the guidelines set.

1b. Language Acquisition and Development. Candidates understand and apply theories and research in language acquisition and development to support their ELLs' English language and literacy learning and content-area achievement.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

The checklist indicates that Assessments 2 and 4 measure this standard. Documentation in Section IV of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 3, 5, and 6 satisfy this standard as well. See comments above on the limitations of the documentation provided with Assessments 2, 4, 5, and 6.

Assessment 2 Grades: Listed required courses for candidates in the program with course descriptions and passing scores for each course. However, 1) not all courses listed have a course description; 2) the course alignment is not consistent with the checklist; and 3) most importantly, no specific coursework or grading rubric is included for any of the courses. In addition, scores are reported as percentages of passing, not disaggregated data that provides information as to number of candidates not meeting, meeting, or exceeding the standard.

Assessment 4 Clinical Experience Rubric: The scoring rubric needs to be more accurately aligned with the stated TESOL standards.

The documentation for Assessment 3, the teaching unit, is not complete: criteria for evaluating performance levels on the assessment are not provided, and the alignment information in Section III conflicts with the information provided in the Section IV document. Candidates do well on Assessment 3, in general, but the data provided in the report are limited to the number of candidates attempting the

assignment, the number passing, and the percent pass rate, per year. There is no analysis of student performance: this should be broken out by each standard that is addressed within the assignment. There is no differentiation of student performance beyond pass/fail: the evaluation criteria should be provided and explained. Evidence for satisfaction of this standard is not provided in this assessment. The assessments that most likely satisfy the standard are Assessment 2 (specifically, performance in the Second Language Acquisition Course) and Assessment 4, clinical experience. The documentation of these two assessments must be improved.

Domain 2 – Culture. Candidates know, understand, and use major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups to construct supportive learning environments for ELLs.

Standard 2. Culture as it Affects Student Learning. Candidates know, understand, and use major theories and research related to the nature and role of culture in their instruction. They demonstrate understanding of how cultural groups and individual cultural identities affect language learning and school achievement.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Section III of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 4, 5, 6, and 7 satisfy this standard. Documentation in Section IV of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 1, 2, and 3 satisfy this standard as well.

See comments above on the limitations of the documentation provided with Assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

None of these documents make explicit links with this standard, except for the descriptions of courses included in Assessment 2 that relate to literature. Literature courses may impart understanding of the nature and role of culture, but these courses are not focused on how culture affects language learning, and so the alignment is problematic. There don't seem to be any required courses focused on sociolinguistics or on culture and language learning. (Note: the program provided its curriculum in Spanish.) It is difficult to see where the program addresses research and theory relating to culture and language education.

The documentation of Assessment 7, the community service project, mentions an evaluative rubric but does not include the rubric. Alignment is claimed with this standard, but the document does not explain how the project conveys cultural knowledge, particularly with regard to how to integrate this knowledge while teaching ELLs. Candidate performance data is inadequate and no analysis is provided.

In order to satisfy this standard, the documentation must be elaborated and repaired where necessary.

Domain 3 – Planning, Implementing, and Managing Instruction. Candidates know, understand, and use evidence-based practices and strategies related to planning, implementing, and managing standards-based ESL and content instruction. Candidates are knowledgeable about program models and skilled in teaching strategies for developing and integrating language skills. They integrate technology as well as choose and adapt classroom resources appropriate for their ELLs.

3a. Planning for Standards-Based ESL and Content Instruction. Candidates know, understand, and apply concepts, research, and best practices to plan classroom instruction in a supportive learning environment for ELLs. They plan for multilevel classrooms with learners from diverse backgrounds using standards-based ESL and content curriculum.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Section III of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 3, 4, and 5 satisfy this standard. Documentation in Section IV of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 1, 2, and 6 satisfy this standard as well. See comments above on the limitations of the documentation provided with all of these assessments. It is likely that the methods course (part of Assessment 2), the unit-planning assignment (Assessment 3), the clinical experience (Assessment 4), and the Teacher Work Sample (Assessment 5) address this standard. Documentation must be elaborated and improved in order to satisfy this standard.

3b. Implementing and Managing Standards-Based ESL and Content Instruction. Candidates know, manage, and implement a variety of standards-based teaching strategies and techniques for developing and integrating English listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Candidates support ELLs' access to the core curriculum by teaching language through academic content.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Section III of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 3, 4, 5, and 7 satisfy this standard. Documentation in Section IV of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 1, 2, and 6 satisfy this standard as well. Documentation of Assessment 7 does not discuss alignment with this standard. See comments above on the limitations of the documentation provided with all of these assessments. It is likely that the unit-planning assignment (Assessment 3), the clinical experience (Assessment 4), and the Teacher Work Sample (Assessment 5) address this standard. Documentation must be elaborated and improved in order to satisfy this standard.

3c. Using Resources and Technology Effectively in ESL and Content Instruction. Candidates are familiar with a wide range of standards-based materials, resources, and technologies, and choose, adapt, and use them in effective ESL and content teaching.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Section III of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 3, 4, 5, and 7 satisfy this standard. Documentation in Section IV of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 1, 2, and 6 satisfy this standard as well. Documentation of Assessment 5 does not discuss alignment with this standard. See comments above on the limitations of the documentation provided with all of these assessments. There is almost no discussion of ELL materials selection, adaptation, and development in the materials submitted by the program for review, although the general curriculum contains a course called Introduction to Educational Technology (TEED 3008). However, it is likely that the unit-planning assignment (Assessment 3), the clinical experience (Assessment 4), and the Teacher Work Sample (Assessment 5) address this standard. Documentation must be elaborated and improved in order to satisfy this standard.

assessment and use standards-based procedures with ELLs

4a. Issues of Assessment for English Language Learners. Candidates demonstrate understanding of various assessment issues as they affect ELLs, such as accountability, bias, special education testing, language proficiency, and accommodations in formal testing situations.

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

Section III of the Program Report indicates that Assessments 3, 4, and 5 satisfy this standard. Section IV cautions that Assessments 3, 4, and 5 may not be used as evidence for this standard. Documentation in Section IV of the Program Report does not discuss alignment of of Assessments 3, 4, or 5 with this standard.
Documentation of Assessment 6 claims alignment with "all standards" but does not discuss alignment with this standard.
See comments above on the limitations of the documentation provided with all of these assessments. There is no course in the curriculum of the English/TESOL concentration where the knowledge outlined in this standard would logically be presented. It is possible that one course in the general curriculum, EDFU 3017, is meant to cover all assessment concepts, though it is unlikely to address the ELL issues addressed in this standard (and alignment of this course to the standard is not claimed in the program report). The practical teaching experiences are not designed to impart this knowledge. Given that there is no explicit discussion of how these aspects of assessment knowledge are addressed in any of the documentation provided, this standard is not met.

4b. Language Proficiency Assessment. Candidates know and can use a variety of standards-based language proficiency instruments to show language growth and to inform their instruction. They demonstrate understanding of their uses for identification, placement, and reclassification of ELLs.

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

Section III of the Program Report indicated that Assessments 3, 4, and 5 satisfied this standard. Documentation in Section IV of the Program Report does not discuss alignment of of Assessments 3, 4, or 5 with this standard.
Documentation of Assessment 6 claims alignment with "all standards" but does not discuss alignment with this standard.
See comments above on the limitations of the documentation provided with all of these assessments. No coursework seems to cover this. Given that there is no explicit discussion of how these aspects of assessment administration and use are addressed in any of the documentation provided, this standard is not met.

4c. Classroom-Based Assessment for ESL. Candidates know and can use a variety of performance-based assessment tools and techniques to inform instruction in the classroom.

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

Section III of the Program Report indicated that Assessments 4, 5, and 6 satisfied this standard. Documentation in Section IV of the Program Report does not discuss alignment of of Assessments 4 or 5 with this standard. Documentation in Section IV of Assessment 6 claims alignment with "all standards" but does not discuss alignment with this standard. Section IV cautions that Assessments 5 and 6 may not be used as evidence for this standard. See comments above on the limitations of the documentation provided with all of these assessments. The practical teaching and community service experiences that are part of this program are usually designed to foster the active aspects of professionalism evaluated in this standard. In order to satisfy this standard, the documentation must be elaborated. Alignment of Assessment 7 might be considered.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Weaknesses in the documentation of all assessments submitted as evidence of program effectiveness are described in Parts A and B above. Assessment 1 documentation does not describe the licensure exam. The alignment table in Section III of the Program Report often does not match the alignments listed in the assessment documentation. Alignment evidence is weak. Candidate performance data are incomplete and are not broken out by standard, making evaluation of program effectiveness difficult. Interpretations and analyses of performance data are largely absent. In addition, only one rubric (for assessment 6) has been provided. Rubrics need to be provided for all assessments that are scored. In addition, disaggregated data for each assessment needs to be provided to indicate the percentage of candidates not meeting, meeting, or exceeding the respective standards.

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

Weaknesses in the documentation of all assessments submitted as evidence of program effectiveness are described in Parts A and B above, and in C1. These weaknesses mean that evidence of the candidates' abilities to apply their knowledge is limited.

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

Evidence provided does not show candidate effects on P-12 student learning. Assessment 4, the clinical experience, does not address the evaluation of student learning. Candidate performance rubrics are not provided, so it is not clear how or whether student performance data are examined systematically during student teaching.

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 report describes the positive performance of the candidates' performance in the program but does not provide a detailed description of the exact changes made nor the assessment data as being an impetus for program change. This section must explain how the results of the assessments are used by the unit in order to improve the program and to improve candidate performance. A detailed description is necessary.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

A systematic alignment of the assessments to the TESOL Standards is needed. The NCTE standards must be omitted from this report.

Evidence that the program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on the state licensure exam (Assessment 1) should be presented for all three years. Passing rate for 2011-2012 was too low.

Alignment to standards on the grid showing the relationship of assessment to standards (Section III of the Program Report) must match the alignments claimed within the documentation of each of the seven assessments; each claimed alignment must be documented and explained, providing rubrics that are aligned with TESOL standards and providing disaggregated data for candidates' performance on each standard.

Each of the seven assessments provided in the Program Report must be presented according to the Program Report instructions: see Section IV, "Evidence for Meeting Standards."

Assessment 5 must demonstrate candidates' teaching effect on student learning; examination of student learning data should be an explicit part of this Assessment.

The program should ensure that Standard 3c, in the domain of Planning, Implementing, and Managing Instruction, Standards 4a, 4b, and 4c, in the Domain of Assessment, and Standards 5a and 5b, in the Domain of Professionalism, are addressed within the curriculum of the Teacher Preparation (TESOL) Program. Not enough evidence for meeting these standards is provided.

Presentation of course grades is fine but all candidates need to take those courses. The courses should be related to the TESOL curriculum and aligned to the TESOL standards. In addition, demonstrating how these grades are constituted is critical.

Assessment 5 should clearly explain and show how candidates evaluate the effectiveness of their instruction on ELL student learning.

Section V, Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program, must be organized around 1) content, 2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and disposition, and 3) student learning.

For each of the standards, there should be at least one assessment that fully addresses it. Ten of the eleven standards must be fully met for national recognition.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

None

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

The review team is concerned that there are just too many problems with how this program provided evidence and how the assessments are aligned to the TESOL Standards. The program needs to more carefully connect some key assessments to the standards and consider using fewer assessments to meet a few standards. They're trying to do too much with each assessment and evidence is not enough.

Primarily, the lack of the following: rubrics for evaluating candidate performance of assessments, the actual assessments being used (not simply descriptors), and disaggregated data indicating the number of candidates not meeting, meeting, and exceeding the standard.

PART G -DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- Program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

PROGRAM DOES NOT MEET SPA REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL RECOGNITION

- Ⓢ **National Recognition with Probation** The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition; however, national recognition is retained from the previous review cycle. The program has **up to two opportunities** to submit a Revised Report addressing unmet standards and other concerns noted in this recognition report. The possible deadlines for submitting a Revised Report are 3/15/15, 9/15/15, or 3/15/16. *Note that the opportunity to submit two Revised Reports (if needed) is only possible if the first Revised Report is submitted on or before the 9/15/15 submission deadline; however, the program should NOT submit a Revised Report until it is confident that it has addressed all of the unmet standards and any other critical concerns cited in this recognition report.* If no reports are submitted by 3/15/16, program recognition status will revert to Not Recognized. After 3/15/16, NCATE will not accept a revised report; however, the institution may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review. In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit. The program will continue to be listed as nationally recognized on the NCATE website until the end of the semester of the accreditation decision. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

Comment on decision:

Please click "Next"

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