Purpose:
The purpose of annual assessment reporting by programs is to demonstrate how we are monitoring candidate learning in order to demonstrate the extent to which candidates are achieving the goals that we have set for them. Program annual assessment reports provide information that allows faculty to make decisions about candidate learning needs and our own pedagogical effectiveness in order to be able to make appropriate changes. As per its constitutional charge, the NCE Assessment Council’s role in reviewing NCE program assessment reports is to provide feedback and support to programs on their assessment processes and to encourage continuous improvement in moving their candidates and programs forward.

Directions:
This document includes the 2011-12 Annual NCE program assessment template and rubric that NCE programs will use in completing this year’s report.

NCE Program Assessment Report Template (2011-2012):
Although the same overall format is used as in previous year’s reports, the language and directions of the template have been revised to provide more detail to better assist you in including comprehensive information and data related to your candidates and your program. It is recommended that you use the template as it is designed as the framework for writing your report.

NCE 2011-2012 Rubric for Reviewing Program Assessment Reports:
The rubric is used by NCE Assessment Council reviewers in reviewing annual assessment reports as the means for providing written feedback to programs. It is highly recommended that programs use the rubric while writing annual assessment reports as a guide for incorporating an appropriate amount and level of detail and completeness so that outside reviewers can fully understand the program and its assessment system. In addition to revisions to the language of this year’s rubric as a means to ensure a more direct alignment to the report template, there is one new additional category that provides feedback on the overall organization and writing of the report. You will find it as the last component of the rubric – Report Writing and Organization.

Due Date:
Program assessment reports must be completed and emailed as a .doc or (.docx) file to Daniel Sloyan (Daniel.Sloyan@nl.edu) no later than June 30, 2012 to assist in our NCATE visit that is scheduled for early fall 2012.

Need Further Assistance?
If you have questions regarding the process, the template or accompanying rubric, please contact your department’s NCE Assessment Council representative or the co-chairs of the Council for assistance.
Section I: Program Overview

This section provides an overview into your program’s candidates and completers. The data needed to complete this chart will be provided to your program’s identified contact person from the Office of Institutional Research by June 15, 2012.

2011-2012 (September 1, 2011 – December 31, 2012) Number of Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Alternative Programs (AUSL, TFA, etc.)</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Admitted to the Program</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Enrolled in the Program</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If deemed helpful, a brief overview of the program can be provided to assist reviewers in understanding the framework, philosophy and key elements of the program.

Section II: Relationship of Assessments to Program Outcomes and Standards

Please complete the following two charts below. In the first chart, show the alignment of the program’s assessments to the NCE Conceptual Framework/Outcomes. In the second chart, show the alignment of the program’s assessments to the program outcomes and other professional standards.

In addition, a narrative description of the alignment in these charts to supply further description can be provided.

Alignment of Program Assessments to NCE Conceptual Framework/Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCE Conceptual Framework/Outcomes</th>
<th>Program Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Envision, articulate and model democratic and progressive education</td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design powerful learning environments that integrate appropriate technologies</td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design powerful learning environments that utilize multiple meaningful assessments</td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design powerful learning environments that enable self-directed learning</td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively in diverse communities and with diverse learners to achieve learning goals</td>
<td>5, 7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for democratic values, equity, access and resources to assure educational success for all</td>
<td>5, 6, 7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate curiosity and excitement for learning in themselves and others</td>
<td>5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and learn from other peoples, cultures, and points of view</td>
<td>5, 7, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demonstrate a caring attitude in recognizing the needs of others and acting to promote their growth  5, 7

Act with confidence and self-knowledge to assume professional leadership roles and responsibilities  5, 7

Use information from self and others to continuously improve  5, 7, 8, 9

Alignment of Program Assessments to Professional Standards and Program Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Professional Standards</th>
<th>Program Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning instruction from the platform of Second language acquisition</td>
<td>Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practice</td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Standards into Curriculum</td>
<td>Integration of Standards into Curriculum</td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Students</td>
<td>Assessment of Student Competency in Languages and Culture</td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Dispositions</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section III: Key Program Assessments

Using the chart below, indicate the name, type, and administration point for each of the assessments that the program uses to assess candidate learning and evaluate program effectiveness. Refer to the specific requirements of the program’s SPA (if any) to ensure that the program is meeting these standards. For non-SPA programs, only one content knowledge assessment domain is necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Domain</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment (Note if assessments are different for Undergraduate, Graduate, Alternative Programs or Online)</th>
<th>When the Assessment Is Administered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Content Knowledge I (i.e., Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment) *Note: Non-SPA programs do not have state content tests)</td>
<td>ICTS – state licensure exam; content-area tests in specific languages to be taught. OPI – Advanced-Low minimum rating required for admission to program</td>
<td>Prior to admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Content Knowledge II</td>
<td>Transcript Review</td>
<td>Prior to admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Professional Knowledge (Pedagogical content knowledge)</td>
<td>APT</td>
<td>Term 1, 2, or 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IV: Assessment Tools and Data Analysis

In this section, to provide a complete picture of each assessment and its findings, include information for the components listed below for each individual assessment. Note: If the program does not use an assessment for any of the required assessment domains in Section III (Content Knowledge, Professional/Pedagogical Knowledge, Field Experience, Impact on Student Learning, Dispositions, Diversity and Technology), in section V below you will be asked to provide a description of how the program is working toward developing an assessment for that category or a rationalization for why it is not applicable to the program.

Required components to include for each assessment tool:

Program Assessments

1. A narrative description of the assessment including:
   - why it was developed and what it assesses,
   - how and when it is implemented (i.e. where is it administered in the program, the course in which it is a part of, etc.)
   - how and when it is evaluated, and
   - who evaluates the assessment.

2. A blank sample of the assessment.

3. A blank sample of the scoring guide/rubric that is used to assess the tool.

Assessment Data

1. Annual data collected from the tool.

2. A narrative interpretation of what the data means to your program in terms of candidate learning and performance.
Assessment #1  ILLINOIS CERTIFICATION TESTING SYSTEM (ICTS)

1. **Narrative description of this assessment.**

   The Illinois Certification Testing System (ICTS) offers tests in Spanish, French, German, Italian, Hebrew, and Mandarin Chinese, which are administered by the Educational Testing Service. The content area tests for these languages are based on the Illinois professional teaching and content standards. With the exception of the Chinese exam, they consist of both multiple-choice questions (67% of the test score) and constructed response questions (33% of the test score). The Chinese exam is composed of constructed response items only. The content of the test is organized into the sub areas of listening, reading, language structures and language acquisition, cultural knowledge, written and oral expression and includes recorded content. Within each sub area, the questions are designed to reflect the examinee’s mastery of the skills, knowledge and understanding necessary to teach effectively in Illinois classrooms. The state reports all test scores using a range from 100 to 300 with a total test score of 240 or higher required for passing.

   The Master’s program requires candidates to pass these licensure examinations prior to admission to the core sequence of courses that lead to certification. Ensuring that MAT candidates have the level of content knowledge required to perform satisfactorily continues to be a challenge as these candidates have a limited time frame in which to complete training. Thus, the purpose of the test is to help programs recognize and select candidates who have sufficient competency in their content specific fields before entry into the MAT program. The ICTS examinations and scoring rubrics are not available in their entirety to the public or institutions; however, study guides with sample test questions are available for practice purposes on the ICTS website. The link to the website is http://www.ictsw.nesinc.com/

   The table contained below details the alignment of the ICTS Foreign Language Tests to ACTFL Standard I: Language, Linguistics, and Comparisons; Standard 2: Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts; and Standard 3 Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices. For each language, listening comprehension items assess candidates’ language proficiency (1a), as well as their knowledge of linguistic elements of the target language system (1b). The reading comprehension section addresses the two aforementioned standards and assesses candidates’ capacity for identifying similarities and differences of English and the target language (1c). In addition, reading comprehension items test candidates’ cultural understanding (2a), with attention to literary and cultural texts (2b). The Language Structures and Acquisitions subtest assesses candidates’ understanding of linguistics (1b), awareness of similarities and differences of languages (1c) and an understanding of language acquisition as it pertains to classroom environment and strategies for learners’ active engagement in learning (3a). The cultural knowledge subtest assesses candidates’ awareness of similarities and differences of languages (1c), general cultural knowledge (2a), and understanding of literary and cultural texts.
2. **Blank sample of this assessment.**

The test is not available for preview.

3. **Scoring guide and rubric.**

**Illinois Certification Testing System**

**SCORE REPORT EXPLANATION**

**Foreign Language Content-Area Tests (French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Latin, Russian, Spanish)**

Your score report provides information regarding the foreign language content-area test you took at the recent administration of the Illinois Certification Testing System (ICTS). The report includes information regarding your Pass/Did Not Pass status for that test, your performance for the test as a whole, and your performance on the major subareas of the test. Your scores are reported to you, to the Illinois State Board of Education, and to the institution(s) you indicated during the registration process.

The tests each contain 100 multiple-choice test questions as well as 2 constructed-response assignments.

**Total Test Scores**

Scores for the foreign language content-area tests are reported on a scale from 100 to 300. A total test scaled score of 240 or above is required to pass these tests. Candidates with a total test score below 240 do not pass the test. Your scaled total score for the French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Latin, Russian, and Spanish content-area tests is based on your performance on the entire test, including the number of multiple-choice questions you answered correctly and the scores you received on the two constructed-response assignments. For all of the above tests, except Latin, the multiple-choice section represents 67 percent of your total test score and the constructed-response assignments combined represent 33 percent of your total test score. For the Latin test, the multiple-choice section represents 90 percent of your total test score and the constructed-response assignments combined represent 10 percent of your total test score.

**Subarea Scores**

The scores listed in the "Subarea" section are also reported on a scale from 100 to 300 and are intended to provide you with feedback on your performance in the major subareas of the foreign language content-area tests. This information is descriptive only and will help you assess your areas of strength and weakness. You do not have to "pass" each subarea or section of the test—there are no "passing" scores associated with individual subareas.

Subareas with more objectives receive more coverage on the test and thus contribute more to your total test score. It is therefore not possible to average your performance across subareas to arrive at the total test score. Your total test score is **not** the average of your subarea scores.
Multiple-Choice Scores
Your performance on the multiple-choice test section is based on the number of test questions answered correctly; you do not "lose" any points for wrong answers. Each multiple-choice test question counts the same toward the total score.

Constructed-Response Scores
Each of the responses to the two constructed-response assignments for the foreign language content-area tests is scored by at least two qualified educators. Scorers are unaware of the identity of the individuals whose responses they score. Scorers receive extensive orientation in standardized scoring procedures and take a qualifying assessment to ensure that they are ready to score. A score is assigned to each response based on a four-point scale that describes various levels of performance. Scorers judge the overall effectiveness of each response while focusing on a set of performance characteristics that have been defined by Illinois educators as important. An examinee's response should demonstrate adequacy across all of the performance characteristics. A high level of performance in only one or two of the performance characteristics will likely not result in a high score. Scorers are oriented to provide an overall judgment, not to indicate specific errors.
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If the number of examinees for a foreign language content-area test is large for a given test date, each response is read and scored independently by two scorers. If the two scores differ by more than one point, the response is scored by a third reader. The sum of the two scores is the examinee's total score on that response.

If the number of examinees for a foreign language content-area test is small for a given test date, each scorer is given a copy of each examinee's response. The score for each assignment is reached through group discussion in reference to the performance characteristics and scoring scale. The group arrives at a consensus decision on the examinee's score for each response.

See the Illinois Certification Testing System foreign language content-area test study guides for an explanation of the performance characteristics and for further information on how the responses are scored. Study guides are available on the ICTS Web site at www.icts.nesinc.com.

Passing Scores
The passing scores for the ICTS were established by the Illinois State Board of Education based on recommendations from panels of Illinois educators.

Rescore of Your Test
All answer documents for the multiple-choice test section are scored by computer and, as such, are virtually error free. However, if you think an error has been made on your multiple-choice test score(s), you may request a rescore of your multiple-choice answer document. The fee for resoring a foreign language content-area test multiple-choice answer document is $35. Payment must be made by personal check, cashier's check, or money order only. A request for resoring a foreign language content-area test multiple-choice answer document must be made in writing. The written request and appropriate payment made out to Evaluation Systems must be mailed and postmarked within three months of the score report date.

All constructed-response assignments are scored according to standardized procedures. As part of the scoring process, each examinee's responses are scored by multiple scorers who are oriented to standardized scoring procedures and continuously monitored by experienced scoring facilitators. Scorer consensus is attained for the scores assigned to all examinee responses with the guidance and focus on the scoring procedures and scoring scale. All written and oral responses to the constructed-response assignments are scored by multiple scorers and are automatically resored; therefore, no additional resorse service is available.

If you have questions regarding PROGRAM POLICIES or WHICH TEST(S) you must take, contact your college advisor, certification officer, or a regional office of education or visit the Illinois State Board of Education Web site at www.isbe.net/teachers.htm.

4. Assessment Data and interpretation.

A minimum score of 240 on the ICTS is required for admission to the certification program. NLU confirms with evidence of a passing score candidates’ appropriate proficiency in the content that each individual candidate will teach. Slight variations in scores are reflected across years and subtest categories, but achievement demonstrated at the pass level of 240 assures that candidates have met minimal functional competencies as reflected in ACTFL standards 1, 2, and 3 (see response #2 above). The on-going analysis of teaching faculty of test scores allows for differentiation in projects that can strengthen areas of lower performance by individual candidates.

Small numbers of students and varying numbers from year to year make thematic analysis difficult
and may advise differentiation by instructors to provide individual student support in areas of needed growth in subject-area content and the practice of language skills. Scores for the 4th subtest – Cultural Knowledge – are slightly lower across languages and indicate the need for attention for assignments that support candidates’ continued development in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Narrative description of this assessment.**

Prior to admission, all teacher candidates are required to take the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Oral Proficiency Interview (ACTFL OPI) prior to admission to the MAT program. The OPI is administered by Language Testing International (LTI), the exclusive licensee of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. LTI arranges ACTFL language proficiency assessments in 50+ languages for corporations, government agencies, academic institutions and individuals.

The ACTFL OPI is a standardized procedure for the global assessment of functional speaking ability, and is a key component for National-Louis University’s MAT in Foreign Languages program because the program prepares foreign language teachers to conduct communicative classrooms, i.e. input-rich, immersion or near-immersion classes in the target languages at all levels of instruction. In order to conduct such classes, teachers must demonstrate working fluency in the target languages. Advanced-Low is the minimal level recommended by NCATE/ACTFL.
for Spanish, French, German, Hebrew and Italian; Intermediate Low is considered acceptable at this time for Chinese and Arabic.

National-Louis University applicants set up an appointment through the Office of the Dean at the Wheeling campus for a telephonic interview between a certified ACTFL tester and the applicant. The OPI determines how well a person speaks a language by comparing his or her performance of specific communication tasks with the criteria for each of ten proficiency levels described in the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines-Speaking (Revised 1999) – see Attachment … The ten proficiency levels, lowest to highest, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the ACTFL OPI is an assessment of functional speaking ability, independent of any specific curriculum, ACTFL considers it irrelevant when, where, why and under what conditions the candidate acquired his/her speaking ability in the language.

The ACTFL OPI takes the form of a carefully structured conversation between a trained and certified interviewer and the applicant whose speaking proficiency is being assessed. The interview takes place under a monitor; a telephone and place is assigned on the NLU campus, and applicants are given an appointment time. Applicants have their i.d. checked by NLU staff, and then call in for their interview. The interview is interactive and continuously adapts to the speaking abilities of the individual being tested. The topics that are discussed during the interview are based on the interests and experiences of the test candidate.

Through a series of personalized questions, the interviewer elicits from the test candidate examples of his or her ability to handle the communication tasks specified for each level of proficiency in order to establish a clear ‘floor’ and ‘ceiling’ of consistent functional ability. Often candidates are asked to take part in a role-play. This task provides the opportunity for linguistic functions not easily elicited through the conversational format.

2. **Blank sample of this assessment.**

As a certified test, the OPI itself is unavailable for public review. The OPI exam addresses ACTFL Standard 1.a (Language Proficiency). _ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines – Speaking_ details the differences between levels of speaking proficiency as assessed by ACTFL’s OPI and provides a summary table of language tasks reflective of each competency level: [http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3349](http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3349)

3. **Brief analysis of data findings.**

Candidates demonstrate through the impartial ACTFL oral proficiency rating a level of language ability that correlates with the ability to guide and direct students in the second language classroom. All candidates who have been admitted to the program have met the minimum oral proficiency level of Advanced-Low – evidence of meeting ACTFL Standard 1a – Language Proficiency.
Assessment #3  TRANSCRIPT REVIEW

1. Narrative description of this assessment.

Students are required to have 32 semester credit hours in content courses completed with a grade of C or higher at one or more institutions. All World Languages certification candidates must satisfy content background requirements that address the ACTFL and state content standards. There are many ways in which a candidate can satisfy a proficiency in the pre-determined areas of subject mastery; however, for the purposes of this report, NLU will focus on the transcript review process. When candidates are accepted into the MAT program for World Languages, a transcript analysis is performed on all of their undergraduate and graduate content coursework in language study. If candidates have successfully completed courses that satisfy a competency, they are given credit for fulfilling the required criteria. Successful completion is determined by examining the following categories: major, designated course, course title, grade-specific evidence of meeting criteria.

Students’ university coursework and overall/major GPA serve as evidence that teachers understand and are able to articulate the knowledge and practices of world language learning. Students’ coursework and GPA serve as predictors of the quantity and quality of students’ content knowledge and point out any insufficiencies in their education, which must be satisfied prior to full acceptance into the program. Alignment to Standard I: Language, Linguistics, and Comparisons is supported by candidates’ coursework (8 semester hours) in beginning and intermediate foreign language basic skills. 6 semester hours in grammar, composition, literature, and culture support Standard 1: Language, Linguistics, and Comparison and Standard 2: Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts. 9 additional semester hours in topics such as phonetics, phonology, culture, civilization, literature, business language, and applied language studies support the first three ACTFL Program Standards: 1 -- Language, Linguistics, and Comparisons; 2 -- Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts; and 3 -- Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices.

The following table describes the relationship of required-for-entry coursework to ACTFL teacher preparation program standards.
### Relationship of NLU Transcript Review and ACTFL Program Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NLU Transcript Review</th>
<th>ACTFL/NCATE Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 Semester Hours Foreign Language Basic Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Beginning Languages I and II | 1a, 1b, 1c  
| Intermediate Languages I and II | 1a, 1b, 1c  |
| **6 Semester Hours in the following areas:** |  
| FL Grammar and Composition | 1a, 1b, 1c  
| FL Introduction to Literature | 2b  
| FL Introduction to Culture | 2a, 2b, 2c  |
| **10 Semester Hours in the following areas with at 9 semester hours at the upper level** |  
| Phonetics and Phonology | 1b  
| Culture and Civilization | 2a, 2b, 2c  
| Literature | 2b  
| Business Language | 2a, 2b, 2c  
| Applied Language Studies | 3a  
| Undergraduate Seminar |  
| Senior Seminar |  
| Grammar Review | 1a, 1b, 1c  
| Study Abroad |  
| Special Topics |  |

All candidates who are admitted to the MAT SEC program have passed the transcript review in terms of meeting course content and maintaining a GPA content average of 2.5 or above in their fields of licensure.

2. *Blank sample of this assessment.*

The following sample grid is filled out for each candidate as a check for meeting the standards of
the assessment and identifying deficiencies that may exist.

4. **Interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards.**

Students’ grade performance on previous coursework serves as a reflection of the quality and quantity of content knowledge and as a predictor of the capacity to produce high quality work in the graduate teaching program. Since students must pass this transcript to be granted full admission into the program, evidence that they have met expectations as reflected in ACTFL standards 1, 2, and 3 – as detailed in the response to #2 above -- is documented. Gaps in learning can be thus identified and remediated within the structure of courses in the certification sequence. Overall, candidates routinely surpass minimal expectations of coursework and bring to their cohorts rich experiences that they have gained during undergraduate study.

An overview of newly admitted candidates into Secondary Education shows the following breakdown of previous academic grade performance. AUSL candidates. Traditional program entrants scored somewhat higher, and TFA candidates begin their studies at NLU with the highest marks in previous coursework.

![Graph showing Content GPA and Last 60 Hours GPA for AUSL, TFA, and Traditional candidates.](image)

**Assessment #4  ASSESSMENT OF PROFESSIONAL TEACHING (APT)**

1. **Description of this assessment.**

The APT test assesses candidates on professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Each APT test consists of 120 multiple-choice questions and 2 constructed-response assignments. Candidates for the World Languages program take Test 104, which aligns to certification for K-12 language teachers.
Each sub-area of the APT test correlates with one or more standards of ACTFL foreign language teacher preparation. The following chart describes the associations of the APT to ACTFL program standards.

Alignment of the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) to ACTFL Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APT Sub Area</th>
<th>ACTFL Program Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Foundations, Characteristics, and Assessments</td>
<td>4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Planning and Delivering Instruction</td>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Managing the Learning Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Collaboration, Communication, and Professionalism</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Language Arts</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Educational Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTFL Teacher Preparation Program Standards

- Standard 1: Language, Linguistics, and Comparisons
- Standard 2: Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts
- Standard 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices
- Standard 4: Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction
- Standard 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures
- Standard 6: Professionalism

2. Blank sample of this assessment.

The test is unavailable for public review.


During the 2010-2011 academic year, scored well above the minimum of 240 on the composite test and each of the sub-test areas. Distinctions from one subtest to the next are minimal,
The surpassing of the minimum standard for the composite and each of the subtests lends credence to candidates’ capacity for successful participation in the MAT Secondary Education program. Performance in subtest areas is typically robust in all areas; performance in ‘constructed-response assignments’ is consistently lower than other areas, which gives rise to the possibility of aligning classroom activities to the thinking and application demands of this testing type. Student entry into the program gives evidence that candidates’ proficiency in Standards 1-6 is met at a level that exceeds minimal competency:

- Standard 1: Language, Linguistics, and Comparisons
- Standard 2: Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts
- Standard 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices
- Standard 4: Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction
- Standard 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures
- Standard 6: Professionalism

**APT -- Academic Year 2011-2012 / World Languages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>COMPOS</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>268.5806</td>
<td>270.0323</td>
<td>275.4839</td>
<td>274.5161</td>
<td>278.4194</td>
<td>268.3548</td>
<td>276.6774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPOS</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>213.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>238.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>244.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>247.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>249.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>252.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>254.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>255.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>260.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>262.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>263.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>265.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>268.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>271.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>276.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>278.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>280.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>281.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Foundations, Characteristics, and Assessments (T1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>209.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>219.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>238.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>254.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>262.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>269.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>277.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning and Delivering Instruction (T2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>209.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>249.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Managing the Learning Environment (T3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>209.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>249.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Collaboration, Communication, and Professionalism (T4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>246.00</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language Arts (T5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>209.00</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Educational Technology (T6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>219.00</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Description of this assessment.**

By the third term of the certification sequence, candidates work for a minimum of ten weeks in a placement school assigned by the Office of School-College Relations. The student teaching experience is a significant and integral phase of the program and completes the State of Illinois Certification process. Its primary objective is to provide an opportunity for students to become actively involved in the teaching/learning process while working directly with an experienced teacher with three or more years of teaching experience. During the student teaching practicum, a university supervisor will visit and evaluate a candidate an average of four times using the Student Teaching Evaluation instrument. The supervisor works with the cooperating teacher to provide feedback and a final grade to the candidate.

Prior to the student teaching experience, cooperating teachers and university supervisors attend an orientation workshop to provide instruction on how to guide candidates through the observation process and how evaluators are to use the evaluation forms to gather data and provide feedback. The instrument consists of three parts: (1) general background information – items that capture the candidate’s program profile and document the cooperating teacher and supervisor names; (2) generic teacher education outcomes – items based on the 7 student teaching principles as described and defined in Attachment IV.6.1; and (3) ACTFL content standards – six standards identified for the initial preparation of foreign language teachers. The evaluation instrument has an accompanying rubric for each set of competencies. This instrument, the rubrics, and the philosophical underpinnings are provided to teacher candidates when they enter the program, and they appear in the MAT Secondary Education Student Teaching Manual that candidates received during their 3rd term. Competencies are assessed using the following scoring guide: accomplished, proficient, developing, limited evidence, and not applicable.

2. **Blank sample of this assessment.**

See Attachment IV.6.2

3. **Scoring guide and rubric.**

See Attachment IV.6.2

4. **Data tables and interpretations.**

The competency appraisal document was significantly altered after the initial submission of the NCATE document for program accreditation. Changes in that document allow the university to gather very specific judgments by our university supervisors of student teachers as their behaviors relate directly to ACTFL standards. The following table represents a Spring 2012 administration of the instrument.

---

World Languages Competency Appraisal- Performance on Standards 1 as rated by University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers
University supervisors and cooperating teachers give student teacher performance relatively strong ratings across 5 dimensions that are assessed with this evaluation instrument. Since the dimensions are closely related to the ACTFL standards, the likelihood of candidates possessing knowledge and skills necessary for successful performance is quite high. One area – Standard 2: Cultures, Literatures, Cross Disciplinary Concepts – has received in this second administration lower ratings from this sample of students. Faculty will want to review these ratings over time to determine trends and turn those recognitions into altered expectations for their own instruction and their candidates’ performance.

Detailed analyses of data collected on each Standard are presented below:

**Standard 1 - Language, Linguistics, Comparisons**

**Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relatively small sample sizes give reason for caution with interpretations of these findings. A multi-year sampling with much larger numbers of participants will yield meaningful insights that will assist university planners in the area of program improvement. At the very least, the need for attention to Standard 2 for teacher candidates is a point for careful consideration.
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Standard 2 - Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard2</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid .00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 3 -- Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard3</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard3</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 5 -- Assessment of Languages and Cultures

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard5</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid .60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 6 -- Professionalism

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard6</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard6</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid .00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All student teaching candidates are required to complete a Student Portfolio. The portfolio documents are designed to reflect candidates' growth through the sequence of the certification program. Instructors in SEC502 Methods and Materials for teaching at the Secondary Level, SEC510-524 Teaching "content area", and SEC590 Student Teaching Seminar assist candidates in creating and organizing the contents of the portfolio. Throughout the program, candidates will edit, share, and discuss their portfolio pieces. Candidates are required to maintain this portfolio electronically.

The purposes of students' creation of an electronic portfolio are many. The portfolio provides
instructors entry into the candidates' thinking about dispositions and practices; the portfolio conveys candidates' beliefs, attitudes, and values as a teacher; the portfolio provides a complex and comprehensive view of candidates' performance in a professional context; and the portfolio presents a purposeful and reflective collection of candidates' work across time.

The student portfolio contains three core sections: The first section, the Foreword, provides the reader with an autobiographical reflection on the candidates' paths toward becoming teachers, the candidates' educational philosophies, and a general table of contents. The second section, Learning/Teaching Experiences and Artifacts, is the heart of the collection. Candidates must include evidence and analysis of their planning, instruction, assessment, and evaluation. Candidates must also submit examples of ways in which they adapted lessons to meet the needs of individual students and visual representations and written discussion of how they addressed classroom management issues and organization. In addition, candidates are asked to address the area of professional growth and development by creating an annotated list of readings that have influenced their thinking about teaching and their own practice. Along with the reading list, candidates are required to submit a formal summary reflection about their student teaching experience, including such topics as: what they learned, what they did not learn that they wanted to, what was surprising, what was affirming, what was expected and how these contribute to professional goals. The last section allows candidates to choose their own artifacts that are particularly significant to their professional development. For instance, candidates may choose to include previous work experience, letters of recommendation or student teaching assessment forms in this section.

2. *Blank sample of this assessment.*

See Attachment IV.7.2

3. *Scoring guide and rubric for this assessment.*

See Attachment IV.7.2

4. *Data tables and interpretations.*

Attachments IV.7.3 and IV.7.4 display the findings of this small sample of world languages candidates. Although university supervisors rate candidates consistently as 'competent' or 'outstanding', the areas of *use of technology* and *differentiation of instruction* emerge as those that merit the attention of the faculty.

**Assessment #6 SEC 590-592 SEMINAR COURSE PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT**

**SEC 590-592 Seminar Course Portfolio Assessment/Spring 2012**

All student teaching candidates are required to complete a Student Portfolio. The portfolio documents are designed to reflect candidates' growth through the sequence of the certification program. Instructors in SEC502 Methods and Materials for teaching at the Secondary Level, SEC510-524 Teaching "content area", and SEC590 Student Teaching Seminar assist candidates in...
creating and organizing the contents of the portfolio. Throughout the program, candidates will edit, share, and discuss their portfolio pieces. Candidates are required to maintain this portfolio electronically.

The purposes of students' creation of an electronic portfolio are many. The portfolio provides instructors entry into the candidates' thinking about dispositions and practices; the portfolio conveys candidates' beliefs, attitudes, and values as a teacher; the portfolio provides a complex and comprehensive view of candidates' performance in a professional context; and the portfolio presents a purposeful and reflective collection of candidates' work across time.

The student portfolio contains three core sections: The first section, the Foreword, provides the reader with an autobiographical reflection on the candidates' paths toward becoming teachers, the candidates' educational philosophies, and a general table of contents. The second section, Learning/Teaching Experiences and Artifacts, is the heart of the collection. Candidates must include evidence and analysis of their planning, instruction, assessment, and evaluation. Candidates must also submit examples of ways in which they adapted lessons to meet the needs of individual students and visual representations and written discussion of how they addressed classroom management issues and organization. In addition, candidates are asked to address the area of professional growth and development by creating an annotated list of readings that have influenced their thinking about teaching and their own practice. Along with the reading list, candidates are required to submit a formal summary reflection about their student teaching experience, including such topics as: what they learned, what they did not learn that they wanted to, what was surprising, what was affirming, what was expected and how these contribute to professional goals. The last section allows candidates to choose their own artifacts that are particularly significant to their professional development. For instance, candidates may choose to include previous work experience, letters of recommendation or student teaching assessment forms in this section.

2. **Blank sample of this assessment.**

   See Attachment IV.7.2

3. **Scoring guide and rubric for this assessment.**

   See Attachment IV.7.2

4. **Data tables and interpretations.**

---

**Rubric: PART I: Teacher Candidate’s Effects on Student Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outstanding (4 pts)</th>
<th>Competent (3 pts)</th>
<th>Need Improvement (2 pts)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1 pts)</th>
<th>No Evidence (0 pts)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Stdev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge and Pedagogy (i.e., unit plan lessons and/or lesson plans taught, guidelines for assignments/projects, samples of activities, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement and Inquiry (i.e., unit plan lessons and/or lesson)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Integration of Technology (i.e., unit plan lessons and/or lesson plans taught, guidelines for assignments/projects, samples of activities, samples of students’ work, etc.)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meeting the needs of individual students: Methods of Differentiation (i.e., unit plan lessons and/or lesson plans taught, guidelines for assignments/projects, samples of activities, samples of students’ work, etc.)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Two Best Lessons (i.e., unit plan lessons and/or lesson plans taught, guidelines for assignments/projects, samples of activities, etc.)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance-Based Rubric (i.e., unit plan lessons and/or lesson plans taught, guidelines for assignments/projects, samples of activities, samples of students’ work, etc.)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Formative Assessment (i.e., quiz, performance-based rubric, etc.)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summative Assessment (i.e., quiz, performance-based rubric, etc.)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Formative Assessment: Data/Results

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summative Assessment: Data/Results

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Formative Assessment: Modifications

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summative Assessment: Modifications

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit: Written Reflection

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assignments/projects, samples of activities, samples of students’ work, etc.)

Two Best Lessons (i.e., unit plan lessons and/or lesson plans taught, guidelines for assignments/projects, samples of activities, etc.)

Performance-Based Rubric (i.e., unit plan lessons and/or lesson plans taught, guidelines for assignments/projects, samples of activities, etc.)

Formative Assessment (i.e., quiz, performance-based rubric, etc.)

Summative Assessment (i.e., quiz, performance-based rubric, etc.)

Formative Assessment: Data/Results

Summative Assessment: Data/Results

Formative Assessment: Modifications

Summative Assessment: Modifications

Unit: Written Reflection

Rubric: PART II: Teacher Candidate's Growth and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Goals and Evidence</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Need Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>No Evidence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Stdev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience: Written Reflection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-Long Learner: Staying Current in Field</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment #7 DISPOSITIONS

1. **Description of this assessment.**

   1. **Description of this assessment.**
The faculty of Secondary Education acknowledges the important that teacher preparation candidates develop and maintain appropriate dispositions for their work. The seven dimensions that both the candidates and their instructors will assess during Term 1, Term 2, and Term 3 are the following: professional; creative; leader; courageous; enthusiastic; open-minded; and culturally responsive.

2. Blank sample of this assessment.

See Attachment IV.8.1

3. Scoring guide/rubric for this assessment.

See Attachment IV.8.1

4. Data table and interpretations.

Secondary Education Department faculty conducted exit interviews during each term of the 2011-2012 academic year as a basis for learning about the process and anticipating issues of implementation. As the 2012-2013 year begins, the faculty will establish specific procedures for common assessments of dispositions and should be ready a year from now to report out findings for our annual NCE report.

Assessment #8 WORLD LANGUAGES UNIT PLAN

1. Description of this assessment.

The faculty of World Languages has redesigned the focal point of the methods course – the Unit of Instruction – to demonstrate greater alignment with ACTFL standards. In particular, attention is given in the unit overview to focus on a 5-C orientation to the lesson design. An attention to learning styles and differentiation for diverse learners is included as well. Support materials and assessments (formative and summative) that target three modes of communication are the centerpiece of the new design.

2. Blank sample of this assessment.

See Attachment IV.9.1

3. Scoring guide/rubric for this assessment.

See Attachment IV.9.1

4. Data tables and interpretations.

Ratings from methods instructors are consistently high – candidates are reported to perform at the ‘competent’ and ‘outstanding’ level.
Assessment #9  SEC 510-524 METHODS COURSE PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT

1. Brief description of the assessment and its use in the program.

Methods course instructors complete a portfolio assessment at the conclusion of Term 2 to give candidates specific feedback on a number of areas related to their professional development in the certification program. The rubric assesses candidates specifically on (1) development of a philosophy of education that reflects attention to issues of diversity, (2) growing academic knowledge and pedagogical skill, (3) candidates’ capacity to engage in professional relationships with colleagues, students, and their families, (4) professional and ethical behavior, (5) use of technology to support classroom learning, and (6) degree of commitment to reflective professional practice.

2. Blank sample of this assessment.

See Attachment IV.10.1

3. Scoring guide/rubric for this assessment.

See Attachment IV.10.1

4. Data tables and interpretations.

See Attachment IV.10.2
For the data-gathering periods, candidates received uniformly high summative ratings by their methods instructors. Further trend analysis will be helpful for the faculty to check the sensitivity and accuracy of their ratings.

### Section V: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

1. The program faculty has reviewed at adjunct meetings the outcomes of assessments of world languages candidates. Our focus as a faculty is firmly trained on aligning our instructional and assessment practices to the standards and rubrics espoused by our SPA: the American Council on Teaching of Foreign Languages. We find that there is a lack of discrimination of our candidates’ ultimate performance, partially due to the mid-course instructional corrections enacted by faculty committed to the success of all learners. That said, we are eager for opportunities to ‘norm up’ on our views of assessments so that they may in fact become more discriminating over time.

2. We have used last year’s feedback to gain more clarity regarding the way we discuss our instruction and assessment and interpret the outcomes that we experience.

3. Returning to the NLU conceptual framework is an activity that strengthens our commitment to program of well-coordinated, triangulated objectives.

---

**Rubric: SEC 510-524 Methods Course Portfolio Assessment Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers develop, practice, articulate, and maintain a philosophy of education based on critical self-reflection.</th>
<th>Does Not Meet</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers differentiate instruction with respect for individual and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers possess and demonstrate effective academic content knowledge and pedagogical skills.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers collaborate as partners with colleagues, parents, families, and/or the larger community to support student learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers exhibit professionalism, leadership, and ethical behavior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers use current technology creatively and effectively to improve classroom instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers continue their professional growth through a commitment to reflection and learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For your program can be located on the I drive. Follow this pathway: **Councls and Committees folder, Assessment Council folder, 2011-2012 folder, Program Assessment Reports 2010-11 folder, 2010-11 Assmt. Report Reviews folder.**

3. Describe how the assessment data inform the program of candidate achievement related to the NCE Conceptual Framework/Outcomes.

4. Based on the program’s 2011-12 candidate and program data, describe recommendations or changes the program could/will make related to the program’s assessment system and curriculum.
4. Rubrics for benchmark projects will be refined to achieve a compelling body of evidence that candidates have met our standards.