



A GUIDE FOR PREPARING THE NCTE/NCATE PROGRAM REPORT FOR THE PREPARATION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHERS

Introduction

Institutions that offer initial English language arts preparation programs for secondary teachers of English (grades 7–12) must respond to the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards if they are in an institution seeking NCATE accreditation and wish to have their programs considered for “National Recognition” by NCTE and NCATE. The response must be submitted in an electronic report using the template developed by NCATE. This document explains how to prepare the report and describes the type and kind of evidence reviewers expect to see.

NCTE/NCATE Program Standards can be found at
<http://www.ncte.org/cee/ncate/program>

The NCATE Program Report Templates for English Language Arts can be found at
<http://www.ncate.org/Standards/ProgramStandardsandReportForms/tabid/676/Default.aspx#NCTE>

A separate program report must be submitted for each program to be reviewed unless all requirements and assessments are identical for the programs. The degree or level for a program may be at the baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, or master’s level. Regardless of the degree or level, the program submitted for review must address only initial licensure.

NCTE has not developed standards for advanced programs or for middle schools.

**Revised
January 2011**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topics	Page
Initial Steps for Preparing the Option A Program Report for English	3
Who Reviews the Report?	4
The Program Report Form	4
Section I: Context Narrative	5
Section II: Assessments and Related Data	8
Section III: Standards Assessment Chart	10
Section IV: Evidence for Meeting Standards	11
Section V: Use of Assessment Results	12
Guidelines for Assessments and Related Data	13
Assessment 1 – Content (State Required Examination if appropriate) - <i>Required</i>	14
Assessment 2 – Content - <i>Required</i>	14
Assessment 3 – Planning Instruction - <i>Required</i>	15
Assessment 4 – Implementing Instruction (Field or Clinical Experience) – <i>Required</i>	16
Assessment 5 – Effect on Student Learning - <i>Required</i>	17
Assessment 6 – Attitudes/Dispositions (if not included in other assessments) or other program assessment – <i>Required</i>	18
Assessments 7/8 – <i>Optional</i>	19
Section V – Use of Assessment Results - <i>Required</i>	19
Preparing the Option B Program Report for English	20
Preparing the Option C Program Report for English	21
Option D Program Report Conditions and Preparation	21
Decision Criteria for All Options	21
Program Decisions	22
Submission Checklist	24
Review Decision Actions	30
Submission Requirements for Conditional Decision	30
Submission Requirements for Revisions	32
Further Assistance	35
Appendix A – Guidelines for the Use of Grades as a Content Assessment	36

Initial Steps for Preparing the Program Report for English

- Review the most current copy of the *NCTE/NCATE Program Standards for Initial Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts* available at <http://www.ncte.org/cee/ncate/program>
- Review NCTE's *Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts* (2006). The *Guidelines*, which provide the full scope and basis for the Standards, are available from NCTE at <http://www.ncte.org/cee/ncate>
- See also *Guidelines and Procedures for the NCATE Web-based Program Review System* available at <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/tabid/116/Default.aspx>. This site contains a number of useful resources that will provide insight into the electronic reporting system used by NCATE for program reviews.
- Access the NCTE/NCATE Connection page on the NCTE website for the latest NCTE resources: <http://www.ncte.org/cee/ncate/program>
- Identify the program(s) that will be submitted for review.
- Determine who has the key responsibility for preparing and submitting the report.
- Review all information on the NCATE website pertaining to the preparation of electronic program reports and become familiar with the format and scope. Where possible, attend workshops conducted by NCATE on the preparation of program reports and the interpretation of standards. Information on such workshops is available from NCATE. NCTE conducts periodical web seminars on submission requirements, procedures, and documentation. See the NCTE/NCATE Connection page referenced above for the most current information.
- Read carefully the General Directions provided in this document.
- Consult with the person in charge of the institution's campus-wide NCATE review to determine timelines and procedures. Obtain the relevant information connected to NCATE Unit Standards for the teacher education. The program review process is an integral part of the Unit Accreditation, especially Unit Standard 1.
- Review the pertinent NCATE Unit standards, the *NCTE/NCATE Program Standards* (2003), and other relevant materials with faculty who will be called upon to provide information and/or assist in the preparation of the report.
- Establish a close relationship between the English department and the education because both share responsibility for providing data and assisting with completion of the report. Both areas' contributions will need to be reflected in the report.
- Identify any pending changes in curriculum, assessments, etc., and ensure that data to document such changes are readily available.
- Collect source materials:
 1. Obtain a current university catalog to check course numbers, titles, and requirements, including admission criteria for the program.
 2. Obtain the current program of study including coursework required for all candidates in the program. If the program is for undergraduates, be sure that all the content coursework requirements are contained in the program of study. Post-baccalaureate programs, degree

- granting or not, need to provide the course of study and a method of determining undergraduate content proficiency beyond any state mandated standardized test(s).
3. Determine, with the assistance of program faculty, the key assessments to be used to represent the program in the report. **Note: Programs are limited to eight assessments which must be aligned with the current NCTE/NCATE Program Standards. All standards must be accounted for in the report. See section on Assessments.**
 4. Obtain current documents that include the assessments themselves, process for their use, rubrics/scoring criteria, and candidate performance data for at least the past year. These elements will need to be in formats that can be attached easily to the electronic review. See directions on how to use the electronic review format at <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/tabid/116/Default.aspx>
Note: Generally, programs will need to submit data for the most recent year but this requirement may vary, depending upon when the program is being reviewed. Verify this requirement with NCATE and/or NCTE. At a minimum, programs will be expected to have at least two applications to provide sufficient data for their performance assessments. Circumstances which prevent supplying the data should be explained fully and carefully in the Context section of the report.
 5. The program report will be input online using the PRS/AIMS system. It is recommended that the program complete the appropriate Program Report format for NCTE found at <http://www.ncate.org/Standards/ProgramStandardsandReportForms/tabid/676/Default.aspx#NCTE> before accessing the PRS system. You must contact NCATE in order to obtain the URL and login codes required to enter the site. Once you log into the system you will be directed to complete the **coversheet** for your report and will be given prompts to respond to each question or section in the report. You can input text online *or* you can cut and paste text from a prepared document. Some documents will be submitted as attachments (See electronic review format referenced above in #4.).
 6. Organize documentation in the order required by the Program Report format. See, in particular, the focus called for in each of the required assessment templates
 7. Narratives to support each of the assessments to be submitted; note limitations on length of narratives and minimum requirement of six assessments. All assessments submitted must include the assessment instrument or assignment (unless a standardized test), the rubric for scoring, a data table, and a short analysis of the collected data.

Who Reviews the Report?

The completed report is submitted electronically to NCATE and then is sent to trained NCTE reviewers. They determine if the information provided in the report meets the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards.

The Program Report Form

To understand the format and content required for an electronic program review, view the program review template and the electronic review format as referenced in Initial Steps.

Program preparers must complete the form as indicated. A number of useful resources that provide insight into the electronic reporting system also can be found at those sites.

The Option A initial program report includes a Cover Sheet and five sections. The Cover Sheet asks for basic information about the program being submitted. Section I seeks background and contextual information (Program of Study as an attachment); Section II includes a chart that requires a list of each of the six to eight assessments the program will submit; Section III requires that a chart that aligns the six to eight assessments with the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards be completed; Section IV requires a narrative explanation of how each assessment addresses the cited standards and what the assessment data

says about candidate performance (documents and information as attachments); and Section V requires information on how the faculty have used or intend to use the candidate performance assessment data to improve program quality and candidate performance.

Below are more details about each section of the Option A Program Report and information on how to complete the report. To assist program faculty in determining whether they have addressed each section appropriately, scoring rubrics are also included. These rubrics reflect the essence of what NCTE program reviewers use to determine if a program meets the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards.

Section I: Context Narrative

Careful reading of this section will help the program faculty provide a clear context for the institution's English language arts teacher preparation program. The information should be both detailed and concise in presenting the particular features called for in Section I.

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of NCTE/NCATE Program Standards.

Not infrequently, a state will have requirements specific to that state. For example, the state may require a certain number of courses in reading, speech, or English as a Second Language; or perhaps the state has permitted certain kinds of waivers for candidates in an effort to increase the number entering the teaching force. In some instances, a state may have its own set of standards for English language arts teacher preparation that do not entirely align with NCTE/NCATE Program Standards. Also a state may require a generic evaluation form be used across all clinical practice. Any aspect of your state's requirements that might affect how your program is viewed in relation to the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards should be addressed here.

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours or days required for field experiences prior to student teaching and the number of hours for student teaching or internships. See examples in the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards MATRIX, Category 1.0 ELA Candidate Program Structure and the description in the rubric for Standard 1, Element 1.2.

In this section, program faculty must provide a clear description of all field experiences connected with the total program of preparation, culminating in student teaching/ internship. Care should be taken to show how field experiences are integrated and sequential in the program and how they are aligned with NCTE/NCATE Standards. Essential information includes the following:

- A thorough explanation of all observation/participation opportunities (early field experience) as well as student teaching and criteria for performance is expected.
- Information about the involvement of English department faculty as well as education faculty in supervision should be provided.
- The criteria for selecting classroom teachers to be supervisors/cooperating teachers and the frequency and nature of supervision (e.g., whether the supervision is a shared responsibility among English, education, and cooperating teachers) must be addressed.

If the assessment of candidate performance in early field experiences is not included as one of the eight assessments in the report, address the assessment criteria here and their alignment with NCTE/NCATE Standards, providing data on student performance as space permits. See NCTE/NCATE Program Standards in Category 1.0, especially Standard Element 1.3.

3. Description of the criteria for admission to the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program.

Provide a clear description of all elements required for the admissions process, including at what point in the program candidates are admitted, any standardized testing requirements, interview protocols/criteria, written products, process for reviewing prior work and determining its relevance to the standards, etc. **Note: Identification of the criteria and process for accepting and aligning prior course work with NCTE/NCATE standards in the case of post-baccalaureate or master’s programs is essential. (See Attachment 1 explanation below).**

If the elements of the admission process are not addressed in one or more of the eight assessments, provide data indicating rate of admission, and other aggregated data showing the effectiveness of the admissions process over the past three years. This may include any benchmarks or “gates” that are part of the admission/retention process. See NCTE/NCATE Program Standards Category 1.0, especially Standard Element 1.4.

4. The chart with the number of candidates and completers should be self-explanatory.
5. The chart on program faculty and expertise should include the identification of all those faculty, both English and education, who are directly involved in the preparation of ELA candidates; i.e., those who teach methods courses, required content courses, and/or who are involved in supervision of candidates in the field. In the category of scholarship/leadership/service, attention should be given to identifying activities that relate, as much as possible, to the field of English language arts teacher preparation. In the category of teaching or professional experience in the schools, again, activities related to English language arts are preferred; information about licensure, including area, is highly desirable as well.

Section I calls for attachments and for information on assessments. See below.

A. Attachments

1. The program of study is an important piece of evidence because it offers reviewers an overall view of the program. In essence, it is the only place in the report that the preparer has an opportunity to offer a full view of what the faculty believes to be the necessary content and experience for the preparation of its candidates. Although an attachment from a college catalog or a student advisement sheet is permissible as long as course titles are included, the program faculty should try to provide a more carefully delineated attachment that offers a glimpse of course focus/content, beyond titles, and an indication of how the course of study aligns with the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards. Consult the 2003 NCTE/NCATE Program Standards: www.ncte.org/cee/ncate/program .

In the case of post-baccalaureate or master’s candidates, program faculty must offer clear evidence in the report of how prior content based coursework is assessed and aligned with the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards and of how any deficiencies are identified and addressed prior to the candidates’ exit from the program.

2. Other attachments may include tables illustrating clinical experience hours or other information that cannot be typed into the form.

B. Assessment Rubric

The following rubric is tentative and subject to continuing development. However, it represents a general view of what may or may not be considered acceptable in relation to the components of Section I: Context.

Not Acceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p>1.1. Candidates complete a Program of Study with little specific attention to content or practice appropriate for ELA teachers.</p>	<p>1.1. Candidates complete a specified Program of Study that encompasses both the content and practice appropriate for ELA teachers</p>	<p>1.1. Candidates complete a Program of Study that reflects a strong integration of content, current theory, and practice appropriate for ELA teachers</p>
<p>1.2 Candidates explore little theory or current practice related to ELA and meet only limited performance requirements in field experiences, including less than ten weeks of student teaching.</p>	<p>1.2. Candidates explore both theory and practice in their ELA preparation and meet performance requirements in a range of field experiences, including a minimum of ten weeks of student teaching in ELA classrooms, supervised and assessed as a part of the overall preparation program for ELA candidates.</p>	<p>1.2. Candidates explore a strong blend of theory and practice in their preparation with evidence of completing assessed performances in fully supervised field experiences that reflect a variety of settings and student populations and which include ten weeks or more of student teaching in classrooms with ELA licensed teachers.</p>
<p>1.3 Candidates work with college, university, and school faculty in English and education who are not current in their content knowledge and in their practice of effective pedagogy and attitudes appropriate to preparing ELA teachers.</p>	<p>1.3. Candidates work with college, university, and school faculty in English and education who demonstrate that they are current in their content knowledge and in their practice of effective pedagogy and attitudes appropriate to preparing ELA teachers.</p>	<p>1.3. Candidates work with college, university, and school faculty in English and education who collaborate on a regular basis to strengthen their teaching, develop curriculum, and pursue knowledge in the content, pedagogy, and attitudes appropriate to the preparation of ELA teachers.</p>

Not Acceptable	Acceptable	Target
1.4 Candidates perform within a program that bases decisions about candidates' continuation and completion of the program on unclear performance assessments and without the benefit of a systematic candidate performance system.	1.4 Candidates meet performance criteria within an assessment system that assesses candidates' performances at appropriate transition points throughout the ELA program.	1.4 Candidates meet performance benchmarks and/or gateways within an ELA program and unit assessment system that regularly evaluates candidate performances by using multiple forms of assessment which demonstrate validity and reliability and which are common to all ELA candidates.

Section II: Assessments and Related Data

Considerable review and discussion should occur among faculty in English and education as well as with school personnel to determine what assessments best reflect the performance of the program's ELA candidates and demonstrate that candidate performance is aligned with NCTE/NCATE Program Standards. Since the number of assessments a program can present is limited to eight, selection of these key assessments is, without question, the single most important decision for a program in preparing its review.

Program faculty must understand that, in all likelihood, they will need to call upon assessments that occur at different transition or gateway points in the program, that assessments may be attached to courses in English, courses in education, and to field experiences, including student teaching or combinations of these experiences. There needs also to be an understanding that since the number of key assessments is limited to no more than eight and that some are already specified by NCATE; candidate performance assessments, in almost all cases, will need to address multiple NCTE/NCATE Program Standards. The assessment templates offer suggestions as to which standards might be addressed, but the program faculty has the ultimate responsibility for identifying which standards are addressed by which assessments and for making that alignment clearly apparent to program reviewers.

Whatever assessments are selected, the program faculty must ensure that a close match is present between the content of the standard(s) and what the assessment is purported to measure. Here are some questions that faculty might ask about such a connection:

1. Do the same or consistent content topics appear in the assessments that appear in the standards?
2. Do the assessments clearly address the breadth and depth of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are delineated in the standards and, in the case of Standards Category 3.0, the elements within the standards, i.e., In general, is the preponderance of the content of the standard(s) addressed by the assessment(s) assigned to it?
3. Do assessments assess meaningful cognitive demands and skill requirements reflected in standards at challenging but still reasonable levels for candidates?
4. Are the assessments free from racial, ethnic, gender, and/or cultural biases?

Note: NCTE standards usually contain multiple elements, frequently a combination of knowledge/skill and actual teaching application. Programs need to be aware of this when identifying standard alignment with assessments and if only part of a standard is addressed in an assessment, the program needs to acknowledge which part. To ensure the program addresses all

elements of each standard, the program should review the full text of the NCTE/NCATE Standards and pay particular attention to the rubrics that appear with each standard; these rubrics outline the expectations for evidence of candidate performance. See 2003 NCTE/NCATE Program Standards: www.ncte.org/cee/ncate/program

Program faculty should determine both the type and design of the assessments used to represent candidate performance. The selected assessments, however, *must be required of all students* in a program. Assessments could be drawn from key assignments within content or pedagogy courses, standardized or special examinations, early field experience assessments, transition assessments at key points in the program (i.e., a performance required of all candidates before they move to the next stage of a program). Other possibilities include learning logs/reflection journals with accompanying performance rubrics aligned with key standards, action research projects (preferably carried out in classrooms) with assessment criteria matched to selected standards, and student teaching assessments including supervisor and cooperating teacher assessments of candidate performance. Still other possible assessments could include complete candidate portfolios or elements such as lesson plans and/or unit plans drawn from such portfolios to show candidates' ability to meet certain standards, or work sample projects or case studies focused primarily on student learning, not candidate learning. Criteria/rubrics clearly aligned with selected NCTE standards must be present for evaluating any such required assignments. In general, the design of assessment tasks/performances should meet common criteria. Reviewers will look for these criteria across all assessments and will use them to evaluate the program's assessment system.

Criteria to Evaluate Assessments

Criteria	Comment
Appropriateness of assessment to the elements of unit or program standards it is meant to inform	___ Acceptable ___ Not Acceptable
Level of expectations that faculty hold for knowledge or performance candidates should exhibit in their responses to the assessments	___ Acceptable ___ Not Acceptable
Effectiveness and efficiency of the assessment in gathering important and significant information	___ Acceptable ___ Not Acceptable
Use of the assessment for key decisions about candidate progression or identification of candidate needs	___ Acceptable ___ Not Acceptable
Credibility of the assessment (accuracy, consistency, fairness and avoidance of bias) and faculty attempts to document that credibility	___ Acceptable ___ Not Acceptable
Authenticity of candidate performance to be assessed, including impact on student learning, grades 6–12 where appropriate	___ Acceptable ___ Not Acceptable
Clarity of alignment between specified standards and the assessment	___ Acceptable ___ Not Acceptable
Source: Adapted from <i>Assessing Education Candidate Performance: A Look at Changing Practices</i>, Emerson J. Elliott, Project Coordinator, May 2003. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. See http://www.ncate.org/resources/assessment/assessment_examples.pdf .	

Names and Types of Assessments. As the identification of the key assessments occurs, program preparers need to settle upon a consistent name or title for each assessment (i.e., Institution X Admission Protocol, ELA Work Sample, PRAXIS II). The same name or title must be used throughout the report. Failure to do so may well cause confusion among reviewers regarding which assessment is being referenced at particular points in the report. The same caution applies to identifying the type or form of assessment;

again, to avoid confusion, program preparers are advised to settle upon a single descriptor for each assessment and use it consistently throughout the report (i.e., admission essay, portfolio, standardized test).

Time of Assessment. Identification of where and when in the program a particular assessment occurs is important. In Section II, program preparers are asked to identify specifically where each assessment occurs in the program. Provide more information than simply “during the junior year” or “in student teaching.” More specific information such as “beginning of first semester of the junior year,” “at the completion of student teaching,” or “prior to taking the English methods class” will help reviewers envision where candidates are in the program and how the assessment then should match their knowledge base and skill level. If the assessment occurs in a course, indicate if it is a culminating product, or one that is simply a task within the course. If the assessment occurs at a particular transition point or gateway in the program, that should be noted.

Section III: Standards Assessment Chart

Program faculty must be very familiar with the complete text of the most current NCTE/NCATE Program Standards. Faculty should review thoroughly the standards and *all elements* in conjunction with the selection of assessments prior to the development of the program report. **Note: Program faculty need to understand that the template provided by NCATE is a shortened version of the NCTE standards. But the programs are held responsible for knowing the elements within each standard and reflecting them in the design of the assessments. Review of the full standards, therefore, is crucial. See 2003 NCTE/NCATE Program Standards at www.ncte.org/cee/ncate/program**

As this review takes place, faculty will need to understand that although they may have many assessments occurring throughout the English language arts teacher preparation program, they will need to identify the six to eight assessments that they believe best meet the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards and best capture the performance of *all candidates*. See information about kinds of assessments in Section II.

Note: In all cases, assessments must show direct alignment with the NCTE/NCATE Standards; if a generic assessment is used, the program is responsible for showing how the generic items and corresponding performance data connect with the NCTE/NCATE Standards. If this is not done, program reviewers have no way of telling if the program itself has carefully reviewed the assessment(s) and made a professional judgment about the alignment and reliability of the generic features of the assessment(s). Faculty should remember that the purpose of the review is to determine how well candidates meet NCTE/NCATE standards, not state standards nor INTASC Principles.

In making the final selection of assessments for this report, the assumption should be made that, in almost all cases, assessments will address multiple standards and/or elements. In fact, some overlap among assessments and standards may naturally occur. The categories of Content Knowledge, Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions, and Effect on Student Learning which appear in the Standards Assessment Chart appear to have been aligned with NCTE/NCATE Program Standards. However, because most of the NCTE program standards were not written in ways that make these distinctions very explicit, program faculty should focus primarily on actual alignment of assessments with standards to ensure that all standards are being adequately addressed.

The program faculty, therefore, will need to choose carefully which applicable assessments are checked in the Standards Assessment Chart for each indicated standard. If an assessment is checked against particular standard(s), reviewers will expect to see *clear evidence* of how that assessment aligns with the cited standard(s). The responsibility lies with the preparer to make this alignment as explicit as possible, often by identifying specific standard elements by standard number or even by phrasing in the assessment.

If such alignment is not clear, the assessment may be unacceptable for the particular standard(s) cited. Such a finding would then, of course, mean the candidate performance data would not be appropriate for the standard(s) either. Preparers are advised to choose their strongest assessments for particular standards and not attempt to “load up” the evidence by citing additional assessments that are only peripherally involved with addressing the standard, or have little or no relevance to the standard(s) cited, or by making sweeping generalizations about alignment that simply cannot be specifically substantiated.

Section IV: Evidence for Meeting Standards

As program faculty prepare to provide the data that will indicate candidates are meeting the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards, they need to remember that the six to eight assessments upon which their program will be evaluated must be common to all candidates in the program. For each assessment, as called for in Section IV of the report template, the program must provide the following: (Document limits of 2 MB per attachment)

- A brief description of the assessment, including its title, which must match the title in Section II, and its use in the program. Included in this description should be (1) a brief history of the assessment’s development; (2) an explanation of how faculty are trained in its use; (3) how candidates are informed of the assessment and its relative weight in the overall assessment of their performance in the program; (4) the provisions for re-takes, if permitted; and (5) an indication of how the faculty have determined the validity and reliability of the assessment.
- The alignment of the assessment with the specific NCTE/NCATE Program Standards as identified in Section III of the report. Care should be taken to provide evidence related to alignment, including citing specific linkages of the assessment to specific standard(s) and elements. **Note: Wherever possible, the program faculty should have offered specific evidence of standards alignment in the assessment and scoring criteria/rubrics themselves. This is easily done by keying the actual Standard(s) to the rubrics and assessment as well as the data.**
- A brief /analysis of the data findings is to be included. This should not repeat the data in the attachment but provide an interpretation of how the data show evidence of candidates meeting the standards, including showing delineation among levels of candidate performance.

Preparers should answer three basic questions for this section:

1. Why are the assessments appropriate for the standards cited?
2. Is the alignment of the standards clearly identified within each assessment?
3. Do the candidate data demonstrate that most candidates perform at acceptable levels?

Section IV calls for multiple parts. The program is required to provide the following additional documentation for each assessment used:

- The assessment tool or assignment given candidates or, if a standardized examination, a description of the test and what it measures;
- The scoring guide/rubric for the assessment including cut scores and defined performance levels as appropriate
- Candidate performance data derived from the assessment (Raw data aggregated by standards cited).

Every attempt should be made to limit an assessment to the text equivalent of a single 2 MB submission; however, in some cases, the information required including assignment, rubric(s) and data may go beyond

that. If this is the case, the program may submit an additional document to complete the assessment requirement. NCATE will accept no more than 20 attached files for any one submission. **Note: Web links are not acceptable, and samples of actual student performances (portfolios, essays, units) are not to be included. Aggregated data of candidate performance are required by standard(s) cited. Do not chart individual candidate performance. Be certain that overall candidate performance data clearly reflect the levels of performance indicated in scoring criteria/rubrics and clearly relate to the cited standards.**

A. Attachment of Assessment Documents

Prior to the attachment of any assessment to the report, program faculty should review the complete assessment to ensure it is the best example to demonstrate candidate performance for specific NCTE/NCATE Program Standards cited. Faculty should also make certain that all parts of the assessment task are present, that directions to candidates are clear and complete, and that the assessment itself is the most current version upon which data about candidate performance were built. **Note: If the assessment has been revised and the candidate data being presented are a mix of performances on two or more versions of the task, careful note of this condition should be made in the presentation of the task and in subsequent discussion of the candidate performance data. In particular, the program needs to disaggregate data by assessment form; mixing data results across revised assessments is confusing and makes all the data useless for analysis. In addition, program faculty would be well advised to review each assessment against the general criteria previously noted. See p. 10.**

The information surrounding the scoring guides/rubrics/assessment criteria should not only be concise but clearly sufficient to enable reviewers to determine not only how well the task and criteria align with the identified NCTE/NCATE Program Standards, but also how valid and reliable the program has found the assessment and its criteria to be. Scoring criteria should address relevant and meaningful attributes of candidate knowledge and performance related to the NCTE Standards cited for the assessment task and should be used to reach meaningful decisions. The criteria for assessing performance should be written, should be clearly aligned with identified standards, and should be shared with candidates. Such criteria should be explicit enough to anchor judgments about the degree of success on a candidate assessment. To be reliable, assessments must be capable of yielding approximately the same values across raters. When evaluating scoring guides or rubrics, reviewers will consider such questions as the following:

1. Are scoring guides/rubrics clear and specific about faculty expectations for candidates' performance in relation to cited standards?
2. Do scoring guides/rubrics address meaningful and relevant attributes of candidate performance on the assessment tasks?
3. Are the scoring guides/rubrics and the assessment process free from racial, ethnic, gender, and/or cultural biases?
4. Do scoring guides/rubrics clearly connect back to the appropriate NCTE/NCATE standards?

Section V: Use of Assessment Results

In Section V of the report, the program faculty have an opportunity to explain how they have used the data from the assessments and to what extent they have found that data valid and reliable. To be sure that the data collected are useful to the program, care needs to be taken in designing the data tables that are used within each assessment to show evidence of candidate performance. Tables should reflect clearly the levels of performance specified in the assessment criteria, and data should be aggregated by year as well as by standard cited. Data need to be aggregated clearly so that reviewers can make judgments about the program's candidates as a group meeting the cited standards, not as individuals. Show clearly when and where in the program the performance data are collected.

Careful attention to how data are collected and analyzed will make it easy for the program to construct a complete and concise narrative for this section on how the program has used the data to improve candidate performance and strengthen the English language arts preparation program. See p. 21 for specific directions for Section V.

Note: In reporting candidate data on required state licensure tests (i.e., PRAXIS II, NES), indicate the state’s cut-off score for each test cited as evidence. For the most recent year of data reported, provide the mean and range of total scores and sub-scores or sub-categories for candidates on the licensure tests. Such data may not come directly to the program but may be accessible through the institution’s Institutional Research Office or comparable unit.

Programs should expect to have at least two applications worth of data for each assessment unless extenuating circumstances have intervened. If the latter is the case, the program should provide a clear explanation for the absence of ongoing assessment data.

Guidelines for Specific Assessments and Related Data

#1 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Data from licensure tests for content knowledge in English language arts. NCTE/NCATE Program Standards addressed in this assessment could include Program Standards 3.1–3.7 and their elements. If your state does not require licensure tests in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Information to be submitted in conjunction with **Assessment 1** should include the following:

1. The name of the licensure test or professional examination required by the state that addresses content knowledge.
2. Description of the alignment between the licensure test content and applicable NCTE/NCATE Program Standards and their elements and how that alignment was determined; see second note below.
3. Aggregated pass rates for each year over the past three years, including the most recent academic year prior to submission of the report. Data must be presented on all candidates, even if there were fewer than 10 test takers during a single year.
Note: NCATE requires that eighty percent of program completers who take the test must pass if the program is to be considered for national recognition. This remains true even if the state passing rate is lower (i.e., 70% vs. 80%) Programs with fewer than 10 completers over the past 3 years are exempt from the 80% rule. If there are 10 or more completers in current academic year, pass rate can be based on that year only.
4. The mean and range of relevant test sub-scores for the past three years. NCATE has an agreement with ETS for providing that information to institutions. See the NCATE Program Resources page: <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/tabid/116/Default.aspx>
Note: Federal accrediting guidelines for NCATE require it to collect these data. NCTE, however, has not endorsed the alignment of current PRAXIS II, NES, or other state designated tests with its standards. For the rationale and background on this issue, consult the NCTE/NCATE Research Project on the Assessment of the Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts (January 2001) at www.ncte.org/cee/ncate

Rubric for Assessment 1

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
No data are presented or data are not aggregated and/or less than 80% of the candidates pass as required. In the event the state does not require licensure exams, an alternative assessment is not offered or the assessment is insufficient to verify and validate performance in relation to the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards identified; or overall information is insufficient to form a decision about the candidates' performance.	Data are presented for state licensure tests and 80% or more of the candidates successfully pass the assessment; or a relevant alternative assessment is presented that provides evidence of successful candidate performance in relation to the standards identified.	Data are presented for state licensure tests that show 100% of candidates successfully pass or relevant alternative assessment evidence is provided that shows candidates are reaching the highest levels of appropriate performance standards in the area(s) identified.

#2 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge in the English language arts program. NCTE/NCATE Program Standards addressed in this assessment should include but are not limited to Program Standard Category 3.0. Examples of assessments could include comprehensive examinations, GPAs or grades tied to course of study (requires specific protocol), special projects, portfolio tasks, and/or other tasks within a course or cluster of courses. Assessment information should be provided as indicated in Section IV.

Even if the program faculty can show and justify that the content knowledge base for candidates is fully addressed in Assessment 1 (NCTE considers PRAXIS II, NES, or state test data inadequate for this purpose), attention should be given to providing further evidence in **Assessment 2** of candidate performance in relation to content standards either within Standards 3.1–3.7 and their elements. Particular attention should be given to alignment of candidate performance evidence with candidates' program of study and appropriate NCTE/NCATE Program Standards and their elements.

If the program chooses to use grades as evidence, the program report must describe how the content that the candidates have studied aligns with NCTE/NCATE Program Standards and at what level of performance the grades meet those standards. Programs should not claim that an acceptable overall grade for a course in which an important performance task is embedded is sufficient to verify that the performance on the task is acceptable (See Appendix A for a copy of the NCTE/NCATE Guidelines for Using and Documenting Course Grades). A number of programs select key representative performance tasks within required content courses with appropriate rubrics and build a composite picture of candidate performance related to content standards; still other programs may choose to do a similar assessment but require students to build a portfolio that contains key artifacts that either the candidates and/or the faculty consider representative and then provide an overall assessment, taking care, once again, to indicate specifically what standards are addressed and how. **Note: A program should not assume that by merely citing a program GPA requirement (i.e., an overall 2.5) that this citation in and of itself is sufficient evidence of candidates' meeting NCTE's content standards, especially if the program's**

program requirements, e.g. a program of study or advisement checksheet, do not, in themselves, align well with specific NCTE standards; a more prudent and appropriate response is to develop assessments similar to those suggested above and develop a candidate performance data base accordingly. The same caution applies to simply accepting the assumption that post-baccalaureate and master’s candidates who have completed an undergraduate degree in English automatically meet all content requirements in the NCTE standards. In the latter case, programs are required to have in place a transcript protocol that provides evidence that the standards and elements in Category 3.0 align with the candidate’s undergraduate content coursework. A program also may well need to have one or more additional content assessments to provide a more in-depth view of candidate knowledge. This applies to both undergraduate and graduate program candidates.

Rubric for Assessment 2

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Performance task requirements, criteria, and/or levels of performance are not sufficient or do not appear to cover the elements of identified standards or data provided do not offer convincing evidence that candidates have a sufficient knowledge base to meet the ELA content standards identified.	Performance task requirements, criteria, and/or levels of performance appear sufficient to cover the elements of the identified standards, and the data provided offer convincing evidence that candidates have a sufficient content knowledge base to meet the ELA standards identified.	Strong performance task requirements, criteria, and/or levels of performance are more than sufficient to cover the elements of the identified standards, and the data provided offer evidence of high levels of candidate performance that, in turn, suggests an in-depth content knowledge base for candidates.

#3 (Required) Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan curriculum-based instruction in English language arts. NCTE/NCATE Program Standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards Categories 2.0 and 4.0. Examples of assessments include the evaluation of all candidates’ abilities to develop lesson and unit plans, needs assessments, and/or other planning tasks. Assessment information should be provided as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 3 evidence should provide reviewers with a clear understanding of how all candidates are evaluated on professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that include locating and evaluating appropriate instructional materials, planning units, and lessons that incorporate appropriate ELA content, addressing the needs and interests of a diverse student population, organizing classroom environments to facilitate ELA instruction, using technology to enhance ELA instruction, etc. Assessment data could be drawn from a major unit/lesson planning/teaching project, a transition or gateway assessment, or from a subset of portfolio requirements. Care should be taken to identify clearly the standards being assessed and the context within which the performance occurs—methods course classroom, clinical experience, or both. **Note: If generic assessments are used, the program has the responsibility of clearly documenting the alignment of designated NCTE standards with the key elements of the assessment, often by actually overlaying the standards directly onto the assessment instrument(s) and the**

scoring rubrics; candidate performance data also should be reported in this way. Often the scoring rubric and data are drawn from a composite of a generic or unit wide assessment and an addendum that focuses on those standards unique to the preparation of English language arts teachers.

Rubric for Assessment 3

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations and/or performance data do not demonstrate that candidates are able to meet the standards cited.	Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations are appropriately aligned with the identified NCTE/NCATE Program Standards, and performance data demonstrate that candidates are able to meet the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards cited..	Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations and/or performance data demonstrate that candidates are able to meet and exceed the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards cited.

#4 (Required) Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: Assessment that demonstrates candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions are effectively applied in practice. NCTE/NCATE Program Standards that could be addressed in this assessment include Program Standard Categories 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0. Particular emphasis should be placed upon performance in field experiences, including but not restricted to, student teaching. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 4 should build upon or complement the data reported for Assessment 3. Specific attention should be given in this assessment to addressing standards not covered previously in Assessment 3, especially those standards related to classroom teaching situations. If performance in field experiences has not been addressed, then the program faculty should address assessment of candidate performance in classrooms. Consequently, the most logical evidence to present here would be the student teaching assessment instrument. As with all the assessments, program faculty should identify clearly what NCTE/NCATE Program Standards are being met through the performance in the field and where one would find these standards reflected in the assessments and scoring rubrics. Particular attention needs to be given to those elements of student teaching that call for candidates to use English language arts effectively in teaching young people. **Note: Emphasis upon candidate performance data based on assessment of generic teaching skills will not be sufficient unless the program can clearly indicate the specific NCTE standard(s) being addressed by the generic elements in the assessment instrument; scoring rubrics and reporting of candidate performance data should also reflect this alignment. Being aware of the elements that show the full scope of standards is expected and assessments and data should reflect this; if only one element of a standard is represented, then this should be made clear. Often the scoring rubric and data are drawn from a composite of a generic or unit wide assessment and an addendum that focuses on those standards unique to the preparation of English language arts teachers.**

Rubric for Assessment 4

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations and/or performance data do not demonstrate that candidates are able to meet the standards identified, or the requirements are inappropriately aligned with standards.	Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations are appropriately aligned with the identified NCTE/NCATE Program Standards, and performance data demonstrate that candidates are able to meet the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards identified.	Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations and/or performance data demonstrate that candidates are able to meet and exceed the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards identified.

#5 (Required) Effects on Student Learning: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on learning. NCTE/NCATE Program Standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Program Standard Category 4.0. Examples of assessments could include those based on assessment of student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, classroom action research, assessments by cooperating teachers,. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

For **Assessment 5**, reviewers will typically expect to find clear evidence of the engagement of candidates with student learning and evidence of the effects of that engagement. Such evidence might focus upon candidates’ ability to plan and carry out a particular teaching task with students that generates student performance data which the candidate then can be called upon to analyze in terms of improved student achievement. Such tasks are addressed in an NCATE paper “Student Learning in NCATE Accreditation” (Emerson J. Elliott, July 8, 2004). The paper suggests a core of activities in which the candidate carries out the following:

- undertakes a diagnosis (pre-test) of student learning in some area that the candidate will teach;
- plans an appropriate sequence of instruction to advance student learning and teaches in ways that engage students who bring differing background knowledge and learning needs;
- conducts some concluding assessment (or post-test);
- documents the student learning that did or did not occur;
- reflects on changes in teaching that might improve results.

Another avenue might be the use of an instrument that analyzes the impact of the candidate’s work on student achievement or specific components within the student teaching or other field experiences providing reliable and valid data about the impact of candidate performance on student learning. However, if such an assessment is used, the elements of this performance being assessed must be clearly identified along with the rubric/scoring criteria used. Generic assessments are insufficient by themselves (see note below). The rubrics for Standards Categories 2.0 and 4.0 in the complete text of the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards can offer valuable clues as to the kinds of performance that might be assessed in relation to student learning.

Note: Caution is advised if the program elects to use a generic assessment; clear identification of the specific NCTE/NCATE standards being addressed by generic elements within an assessment is required, and scoring rubrics and candidate performance data should be reported in a similar fashion.

Rubric for Assessment 5

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations and/or performance data do not demonstrate that candidates are able to meet the standards cited, and/or requirements are not appropriately aligned with identified standards.	Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations are appropriately aligned with the identified NCTE/NCATE Program Standards, and performance data demonstrate that candidates are able to meet the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards cited.	Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations and/or performance data demonstrate that candidates are able to meet and exceed the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards cited.

#6 (Required) Assessment that addresses NCTE Standard Category 2.0. If the program has not previously addressed Standard Category 2.0—Candidate Attitudes elsewhere, this assessment should focus on how candidates demonstrate meeting those standards. Examples include but are not limited to candidate evaluations in field experiences, candidate dispositions as reflected in portfolio tasks, reflection/learning logs, candidate pedagogy performance, candidate impact on student learning, or perhaps studies that demonstrate candidate dispositions. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

The program should clearly address candidates’ dispositions in relation to NCTE Standard Category 2.0 in this required assessment (**Assessment 6**) if this standard has not been addressed fully in other cited assessments. If NCTE Standard Category 2.0 has been addressed, then the program can use this sixth required assessment to address standards that have not appeared in previous assessments or use the assessment as an opportunity to provide additional evidence to strengthen the case for addressing certain standards.

Rubric for Assessment 6

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations and/or performance data do not demonstrate that candidates are able to meet the standards cited and/or that requirements are not appropriately aligned with identified standards.	Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations are appropriately aligned with the identified NCTE/NCATE Program Standards, and performance data demonstrate that candidates are able to meet the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards cited.	Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations and/or performance data demonstrate that candidates are able to meet and exceed the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards cited.

#7 & #8(Optional) Additional assessments that address NCTE/NCATE Program Standards. Examples include but are not limited to candidate knowledge, evaluations of field experiences, candidate dispositions, candidate pedagogy performance, candidate impact on student learning, licensure tests not addressed previously, or elements of portfolios that address particular standards. Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessments 7 and 8 offer a program choices in terms of where more evidence may be needed to show candidate performance in relation to particular NCTE/NCATE Program Standards. Program faculty are strongly encouraged to use these assessments as a means for providing a deeper, richer view of what the program expectations are for candidate performance and how the faculty gather the appropriate evidence in relation to key standards.

Rubric for Assessments 7 & 8

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations and/or performance data do not demonstrate that candidates are able to meet the standards identified and/or that requirements are inappropriately aligned with cited standards.	Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations are appropriately aligned with the identified NCTE/NCATE Program Standards, and performance data demonstrate that candidates are able to meet the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards cited.	Performance task requirements, criteria, and minimum expectations and/or performance data demonstrate that candidates are able to meet and exceed the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards cited.

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

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

At this juncture in the report, the program faculty are given the opportunity to represent their best efforts in **Section V** to show how candidate data influence changes in the content of the program, the experiences candidates have as they move through the program, and the overall impact the program appears to have on candidates to perform well in a variety of settings. Although the directions suggest that the program

not address individual assessments, it may be necessary and appropriate to refer to particular assessment information as a basis for showing why a program has chosen to make particular changes or how certain assessment information will be collected in the future to justify certain program actions. In essence, the program faculty need to show clearly that they are responsive to the assessment data being collected, that careful planning goes into programmatic change, and that determining the reliability and validity of the assessment data are a major part of the faculty's planning efforts.

Rubric for Section V

Not acceptable	Acceptable	Target
Program offers no evidence of systematic collection of candidate performance data over time, can cite few if any instances of program change based upon candidate performance data, and has no means in place to determine reliability and validity of any data collected.	Program faculty are able to show systematic collection, analysis, and use of performance data to strengthen the program over time. Faculty are able to identify program changes that have occurred or will occur that can be directly traced to candidate performance data. The program involves practitioners in the analysis of data and the development and implementation of changes. Evidence is present that the program regularly checks the reliability and validity of any data collected.	Program faculty and practitioners involved with program candidates regularly collaborate on the collection and analysis of program data, recommend and act upon changes suggested by such data, track the effect of such changes over time, and systematically and regularly check the reliability and validity of the data on candidate performance.

Preparing the Option B Program Report for English

Option B is a new option where the program has only two requirements in terms of assessments, the state mandated content examination, if required; and an assessment focused on candidate effect on student knowledge. Other than the examination, the program may submit up to seven assessments or as few as one additional assessment. Programs need to meet the same set of standards as in Option A; an in depth narrative concerning the program is required in addition to the information usually contained in Sections I-V. A special program report form is required which can be found at <http://www.ncate.org/Standards/ProgramStandardsandReportForms/tabid/676/Default.aspx#NCTE>

Specifically, the program can select the key assessments (required of all candidates) with the following constraints:

1. A program cannot use more than 8 key assessments. There is no minimum requirement.
2. Assessments must be required of all candidates.
3. The program must include the state licensure test in the program area for Assessment #1. This requirement is waived if there is no state licensure test in the program area.
4. One assessment must demonstrate candidate effect on student learning.
5. In their entirety, the assessments and data should demonstrate that candidates have mastered the NCTE Program Standards.

The program also must include the program of study required of all candidates as well as the information required in Section I. The in depth narrative that provides a rationale for how the key assessments, taken as a whole, demonstrate candidate master of NCTE/NCATE Program Standards is a requirement for Section IV.

Experienced team and lead reviewers participate in the review of Option B submissions only after completing an NCATE Program Web Seminar. Selection of Option B teams is made by the NCTE/NCATE Program Review Coordinator in consultation with the NCTE/NCATE Program Review Audit Team

Preparing the Option C Program Report for English

This option is only available to programs that, during their previous review cycle, were recognized using the 6-8 key assessment model (Option A), first available for programs submitted in Fall 2004 and required from Spring 2005 to the present. If programs meet these criteria, the documentation required for the current review could be significantly reduced. A special NCTE/NCATE template is required. The criteria consist of the following:

1. Programs must submit data on all assessments that shows that they continue to collect and evaluate evidence of candidate proficiency.
2. Programs submit documentation only for those assessments that are new or that have been substantively changed since the previous submission.
3. Programs respond only to those items in Section I (Context) for which there have been substantial changes since the previous submission.
4. There is a greater focus on Section V where programs explain in detail how they have used data to improve candidate performance and strengthen their programs.

Experienced team and lead reviewers participate in the review of Option C submissions only after completing an NCATE Program Web Seminar. Selection of Option C teams is made by the NCTE/NCATE Program Review Coordinator in consultation with the NCTE/NCATE Program Review Audit Team.

Option D Program Report Conditions and Preparation

This option, not yet implemented, permits an institution to conduct validity and reliability studies of its assessments in lieu of other program report evidence requirements. The validity and reliability of assessments (content in relation to standards, consistency with other evidence, success in subsequent employment, etc.) is so integral to a standards and performance-based national recognition review that systematic examination of validity is essential. It would, by definition, directly address NCTE Program Standards. It would permit institutions with appropriately prepared faculty to formulate a task as part of accreditation that is meaningful for them, while, not unimportantly, helping to advance the research base for educator preparation. It is an option that might lend itself to joint participation across several institutions, or at least across programs within an institution. Before a program could choose this option, it must review approval from NCATE. Selection and training of NCTE/NCATE Reviewers will not happen until and unless an institution has been granted approval; at that time, NCATE will provide the training in cooperation with NCTE.

Decision Criteria for All Options

Reviewers looking at the program's final report are charged with answering this fundamental question:

Does the program present convincing evidence that its candidates are prepared in relation to the standards and that candidate performance data indicate candidates meet the standards as cited by the program?

The overall report should provide detailed contextual information about the program, candidates, faculty, and the assessment system; it should provide as evidence carefully selected and prepared assessments clearly aligned with specified NCTE standards that have been tested and proven valid and reliable; it

should provide clear, specific criteria that reflect alignment with NCTE Standards and that are the criteria by which the faculty assess candidate performance on each assessment; and it should provide clear information about each of the assessment tasks/ performances, the process for assessing candidate performance, the aggregated data for each candidate assessment, and an explanation of how the program faculty use or intend to use the data that are generated to further improve the program.

Program Review Decision Options

A. Decision Choices for a Program not Previously Recognized by NCTE:

Those programs that are going through review for the first time using the latest NCTE/ NCATE Program Standards (2003) will have several opportunities to submit reports before a final recognition decision is applied. This will allow new programs the opportunity to receive feedback and make changes in their programs without being penalized with a “not recognized” decision. It will also allow the program review process to be more collaborative between the SPAs and the program faculty. The following decision choices would also apply to programs at institutions that may have been recognized in the past but are not currently recognized one year prior to the site visit to determine Unit accreditation.

A program that is being evaluated for the first time will receive one of the following three results:

1. *National Recognition contingent upon unit accreditation*
 - The program substantially meets standards.
 - No further submission required, program will receive full *national recognition* when the unit receives accreditation.
 - Program will be listed on the NCATE web site as Nationally Recognized if the unit is already accredited. If the unit is not accredited the program will be listed as Nationally Recognized pending unit accreditation.
2. *National Recognition with Conditions contingent upon unit accreditation*
 - The program generally meets standards; however a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
 - Insufficient data to determine if standards are met.
 - Insufficient alignment among standards or scoring assessments or scoring guides.
 - Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides.
 - The NCATE requirement for an 80% pass rate on state licensure tests is not met.
 - The program has two opportunities within 18-months after the decision to remove the conditions. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.
 - The program is listed on the NCATE website as *Nationally Recognized with Conditions* until it achieves *National Recognition* or its status is changed to *Not Recognized*, in which case the program will be removed from the list on the website.
3. *Further Development Required (Non Recognized Status):*
 - The standards that are not met are critical to a quality program and more than a few in number OR are few in number but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate.
 - The program will have two opportunities within the 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain *national recognition* or *national recognition with conditions*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*

A program could receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized* only after two submissions within the 12 to 14 month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in achieving *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*.

B. For programs previously recognized by NCTE/NCATE, there are different result decisions:

1. *Continued National Recognition*

- The program substantially meets standards.
- No further submission required.
- Program is listed on the NCATE web site as *Nationally Recognized*.

2. *Continued National Recognition with Conditions*

- The program generally meets standards; however, a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
 - Insufficient data to determine if standards are met
 - Insufficient alignment among standards or scoring assessments or scoring guides
 - Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides
 - The NCATE requirement for an 80% pass rate on state licensure tests is not met
- The program will have two opportunities within the 18 months after the first decision to attain *National Recognition*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*
- The program is listed on the NCATE website as *Nationally Recognized* (based on its prior review) until the UAB makes an accreditation decision for the unit. At that point, if the program is still *Nationally Recognized with Conditions* the designation on the website will be changed to *National Recognition with Conditions*. This designation will stand until the program achieves *National Recognition* or its status is changed to *Not Recognized*, in which case the program will be removed from the list on the website.

3. *Continued National Recognition with Probation*

- The standards that are not met are critical to a quality program and more than a few in number OR are few in number but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate. To remove probation, the unit may submit a revised program report addressing unmet standards within 12 to 14 months, or the unit may submit a new program report for national recognition within 12 to 14 months.
- The program will have two opportunities within the 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*
- The program is listed on the NCATE web site as *Nationally Recognized* (based on its prior review) until the UAB makes an accreditation decision for the unit. At that point, if the program is still *Recognized with Probation*, the designation on the website will be changed to *National Recognition with Probation*. This designation will stand until the program achieves *National Recognition* or its status is changed to *National Recognition with Conditions* or *Not Recognized*. If the status is *Not Recognized* the program will be removed from the website.

A program could receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized* only after two submissions within the 12 to 14 month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in reaching either *National Recognition* or *Continued National Recognition with Conditions*.

Note: NCTE will accept no more than two revised reports for any non-recognized decisions.

CHECKLIST FOR AN NCTE PROGRAM REPORT
(ADAPTED FROM “NCATE CHECKLIST FOR A PROGRAM REPORT 7-05”)

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS AND DISCUSSION SHOULD SERVE AS A MEANS OF VERIFYING THAT ALL REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF A PROGRAM REPORT HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED PRIOR TO SUBMISSION.

Before Submitting the Report

CHOOSING APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENTS

- Each assessment (assignment or requirement) is required for all candidates in the program; if this is not the case, a separate report will need to be filed for each program under review.
- The selected assessments are similar to or congruent with the types of assessments listed in Section IV of the NCTE’s program report template as suggested assessments. (Be certain to note the cautions about the use of grades/GPA as an assessment and determine that the necessary information documenting the basis for grades, etc., if used, is provided.)
- Assessments submitted for the six required assessments meet the specifications for those assessments, and are submitted in the order specified on Section II of the NCTE program report form. (Note: Assessment #1 must be the state licensure exam [if there is a state licensure exam] for content assessment in the program area; thus basic skills tests required for entrance to the program, e.g., Praxis I, are *not* acceptable.)
- Each NCTE standard is covered by at least one assessment that provides solid and direct evidence of candidate mastery of that standard; in most cases, standards are addressed by more than one assessment.

ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

- The assessment instrument is a comprehensive document (e.g., actual instructions given to the candidate, course descriptions as they appear in syllabi or catalogs, a sample test, or a rich and full description of the assessment—rather than a brief description or summary of the required expectation/s).
- The assessment is specifically designed for the program area in which it is used, or at least includes a supplement that addresses the specific content, pedagogy, and/or professional knowledge applicable to candidates in the program.
- The items or subscores in the assessment are either aligned to specific NCTE standards, or the alignment is specified in Section IV of the report form. (It is not sufficient to indicate alignment to state or other standards, even though the relationship to the NCTE standards may be close or overlap; the focus of the report is upon how candidates meet NCTE standards, not other sets of standards.)
- The name of the assessment is used consistently throughout the NCTE program report.

Recommendation: Embed cross-references to NCTE standards in the assessments themselves.

SCORING GUIDES (OR RUBRICS)

- The scoring categories (e.g., letter grades, numeric values, rubric scales) are consistent with the assessment instrument they are designed to evaluate and the data they provide or if data are converted

to another scoring framework, an explanation of the conversion is provided (e.g., how 1's and 2's on a scoring rubric convert to A's and B's).

- The scoring guide is aligned to the assessment, and precisely describes the difference between each scoring category. The expectation for each assessed item is clearly defined in the scoring guide and/or assessment instrument.
- The elements in the scoring guide are clearly aligned with the NCTE standards, or the alignment is clearly demonstrated in some easily understood manner.
- The minimal level of competence (for both a scored item and the overall assessment) is specified somewhere in the assessment documentation (e.g., the “acceptable” range on a rubric).
- The minimal level of competence identified by the scoring guide is equivalent to the level of competence described by an NCTE standard (see rubrics for each NCTE standard).

Recommendation: Embed cross-references to NCTE standards in the scoring guides.

DATA TABLES

- If the program report covers multiple program sites that use the same assessments, *data are disaggregated by each site.*
- Data are broken out as much as possible to show candidate performance on individual scored items (or subscores) within the assessment. For example, if a scoring guide or rubric is used to score an assessment, and the rubric has 10 elements that are rated, then data should be presented for all 10 elements. (This is especially important if the program intends to use data from some of these elements as a basis for demonstrating candidate competence with more than one NCTE standard.)
- Data are disaggregated by the semester/cohort/academic year represented. The total “n” should be stated along with the range of scores. Use of a mean score is insufficient.
- Data are presented in terms of the scoring categories in the assessment. For example, if candidates are scored according to a three-level scoring guide or rubric, data should reflect the range of candidate scores in each category of that rubric. (Note: If data have been converted to a different scoring scale in order to aggregate data across program sites or levels, make sure to explain that in the report.)
- All identifying candidate information (names, IDs, Social Security numbers) has been removed from data documents. Programs are cautioned that identifying candidates individually is a breach of Federal Law.
- The “n” in a data set is not inconsistent with candidate/completer information presented elsewhere in the report. (If the “n” is excessively greater or smaller than the number of candidates in a program, provide an explanation for the discrepancy.)
- Data presentation is reader-friendly and accompanied by legends and explanatory notes as necessary; numerical values are consistently used and clearly defined.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

- Section IV of the NCTE program report for each assessment includes a section for reflection on the overall quality of the data and briefly analyzes data across scored items within an assessment;

semesters across which the assessment has been given; and (if applicable) across candidate groups taking the same assessment. It is clear from the description what the program(s) has learned from the data; if more than one program site or level is included, discuss each separately.

- Section V of the program report describes steps taken to address areas in which data are weak, or significantly and consistently weaker than other areas (if data reveal the need for program changes). It is clear from the description that the program consistently applies data analysis in its program evaluation and improvement. Again, if more than one program site or level is included in the report, the discussion should clearly address both programs.

REPORT SECTIONS

Section I: Context

- The context section addresses all three items within a specified character count, not including attachments.
- The candidate/completer chart and the faculty information chart are completed.
- The Program of Study contains sufficient information to be a source document for the rest of the report (e.g., full course titles, number of credit hours, etc.). Programs are encouraged strongly to use the maximum attachment amount (2MG) to include key course descriptions, NCTE standards alignment, program structure, required vs. elective courses, or other information that might provide a frame of reference for reviewers.
- The context section does not include extraneous information or hyperlinks to other documents.

Section II: Assessments and Related Data

- The names of each assessment (Column 2) are used consistently throughout the report.
- The administration point of each assessment (Column 3) correlates to course names/numbers or program stages as they are outlined in the Program of Study and/or Context, Section I.
- The assessments are listed in the order specified in Column 1 of the NCTE program report form.
- For each of the six to eight assessments, the program has included (1) the assessment instrument or candidate assignment, (2) the scoring guide, and (3) data or an explanation of the lack of data. (Note: Licensure data presented as Assessment #1 does not require inclusion of the assessment instrument or scoring guide if it is a state or nationally used standardized test. In lieu of a description of the assessment, provide the test specifications and information on how the state test aligns with the NCTE standards; inclusion of cut scores is required; subscores or subcategories of scores on such assessments are highly encouraged.)

Section III: Relationship of Assessment to Standards

- At least one assessment is checked or selected for each NCTE standard.

Section IV: Evidence for Meeting Standards

- Each of the three additional components of the assessment must either be included with the narrative attachment or submitted with a descriptive title as a separate attachment. A total of 20 attachments to a program document are allowed. No attachment may be larger than 2 MB.
- Each of the components of the assessment is clearly labeled.

- The narrative section for each assessment specifically describes the relationship between the assessment and the particular NCTE standards it is cited for in the chart in Section III.

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

- Section V of the NCTE program report is organized according to content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, dispositions, and effect on student learning.

SUBMITTING THE REPORT

Overall

- Program cover sheet is completed carefully, in particular indicating the program report status—Initial Review, Response to a Not Recognized Decision, Response to National Recognition with Conditions, Continuing Recognition.
- Files have been named as follows:

File name	File contents
Section I—Context	Typed directly onto the report form. Has character count limitations for each area
Section I—Candidate & Completers Chart	Typed directly onto the report form
Section I—Faculty Chart	Typed directly onto the report form
Section I—Program of Study	Attachment —Program of study - 2MB limit
Section II—List of Assessments	Typed directly into chart provided in the report form for Section II.
Section III—Relationship of Assessment to Standards	Check system provided un the report form for Section III—Identification of applicable assessments from Section II aligned with appropriate NCTE standard(s). (Each NCTE standard must be covered by one or more assessments.)
Section IV—Evidence for Meeting Standards	See individual assessments listed below. (*indicates required assessment)
Assessment 1* —Content Knowledge	Narrative from Section IV for Assessment 1, including data analysis and the three additional documents required for all assessments: assessment instrument (unless a standardized test), scoring guide or cut score, and data chart. Combine all prepared files for this assessment into one file as a Word document that will be submitted as an attachment according to online prompts. <i>Note: There is a 2 MB maximum for each attachment; assessment and scoring criteria may not be appropriate to include for this assessment; see directions. No Web links.</i>

File name	File contents
Assessment 2* —Content Knowledge	Narrative from Section IV for Assessment 2, including data analysis and the three additional documents required for all assessments: assessment instrument (unless a standardized test), scoring guide, and data chart. Combine all prepared files for this assessment into one file as a Word document that will be submitted as an attachment according to online prompts. <i>Note: There is a 2 MB maximum for each attachment. No Web links.</i>
Assessment 3* —Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	Narrative from Section IV for Assessment 3, including data analysis and the three additional documents required for all assessments: assessment instrument or assignment, scoring guide, and data chart. Combine all prepared files for this assessment into one file as a Word document that will be submitted as an attachment according to online prompts. <i>Note: There is a 2 MB maximum for each attachment. No Web links.</i>
Assessment 4* —Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	Two-page narrative from Section IV for Assessment 4, including data analysis and the three additional documents required for all assessments: assessment instrument (unless a standardized test), scoring guide, and data chart. Combine all prepared files for this assessment into one file as a Word document that will be submitted as an attachment according to online prompts. <i>Note: There is a 2 MB maximum for each attachment. No Web links.</i>
Assessment 5* —Effects on Student Learning	Two-page narrative from Section IV for Assessment 5, including data analysis and the three additional documents required for all assessments: assessment instrument (unless a standardized test) or assignment, scoring guide, and data chart. Combine all prepared files for this assessment into one file as a Word document that will be submitted as an attachment according to online prompts. <i>Note: There is a 2 MB maximum for each attachment. No Web links.</i>

File name	File contents
Assessment 6* —Additional Assessment That Addresses NCTE Standards	Two-page narrative from Section IV for Assessment 6, including data analysis and the three additional documents required for all assessments: assessment instrument (unless a standardized test) or assignment, scoring guide, and data chart. Combine all prepared files for this assessment into one file as a Word document that will be submitted as an attachment according to online prompts. <i>Note: There is a 2 MB maximum for each attachment. No Web links.</i>
Assessments 7 & 8 —Additional Assessments That Address NCTE Standards (optional)	Two-page narrative from Section IV for Assessment 7/8, including data analysis and the three additional documents required for all assessments: assessment instrument (unless a standardized test) or assignment, scoring guide, and data chart. Combine all prepared files for this assessment into one file as a Word document that will be submitted as an attachment according to online prompts. <i>Note: There is a 2 MB maximum for each attachment. No Web links.</i>
Section V —Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance	Narrative description of how program uses assessment results for continuous improvement of the program. Text will be input online with character count limitations. Do not include tables or charts in Section V.

- Copies of all files have been saved to a secure location at the institution before uploading to NCATE. Files are in Word, not Rich Text Format or some other format that may make uploading problematic. PDF files are appropriate, especially for data.
- Files are uploaded to NCATE website per instructions from NCATE.
PLEASE NOTE: NCATE must be notified well in advance of the submission deadline in order to prepare the submission site.
- Once you log in to the system you will be directed to complete the coversheet for your report and will be given prompts to respond to each question in the report. You can input text on-line *or* you can cut and paste text from your prepared document. Double check that contents of all files appear before exiting site. A program may upload files, make revisions, and change responses to online prompts until the final submission.
- Once report has been submitted, compilers can open a single PDF file of the entire report including all attachments (these appear in a separate window in the PDF). Note that compiler will need Adobe Reader 7.0 or higher to appropriately open and read the report and its file attachments.

REVIEW DECISION ACTIONS: WHAT TO DO WHEN THE REVIEW OF A PROGRAM IS RECEIVED BY THE INSTITUTION

Reviews of submitted program reports will be sent to the institution on a schedule determined by NCATE. Upon receipt of the review, the program should have a decision based on the criteria adopted by NCATE (2008). If the program is **Nationally Recognized**, there is no need to take any further action other than to read the review carefully, noting any suggestions (Areas for Consideration) that the program should consider in the future. If the program receives one of the other designations, it will need to take action based on the criteria adopted by NCATE (2008) and described previously in these Guidelines.

Filing a Nationally Recognized with Conditions Report after an Initial Review

In some cases, the reasons for the citation of Conditions will be very clear and the program may be able to make the necessary adjustments and/or collect the appropriate evidence/data that can form the basis of a response with little additional effort. In other instances, the program may not be as certain as to what the issues are or how it might address the conditions. In this latter case, the program is encouraged to contact the NCTE/NCATE Program Review Coordinator to discuss the options and to seek clarification on how to respond before developing its Conditions Report. **Note: *In all cases, the program faculty should take ample time to re-assess what they have to offer in the way of new or revised evidence; in some instances, new or revised assessments may have to be developed; candidate performance data will have to be gathered and analyzed—this always takes more time than anticipated. In other cases, the program faculty will have to provide clearer alignment of assessments and scoring criteria with standards and provide new reports of data. In other words, the program should take advantage of the 18 months and not rush to submit a revised report only to have it returned because the program did not fully address all conditions. If there is any question about the timeline for resubmitting, check with NCATE.***

When developing the Conditions Report, the program needs to be attentive to addressing only those conditions that have been cited in Part G of the original recognition report. There is no specific template or format for the Response to Conditions Report because the reasons for the Conditions decision can vary greatly from one program to the next. However, the report should be organized in the following manner.

Section VI should begin with the list of the items from Part G of the original recognition report. Then the report should address each item in turn. For each item a brief narrative should be prepared describing how the faculty has addressed the specific issue. If necessary, appropriate documentation should be included either within Section VI (if not specifically tied to an assessment) or as an attachment to the relevant assessment designation in Section IV.

Example: The National Recognition with Conditions Report states that the following conditions must be met in order for the program to obtain full national recognition:

- Provide data for assessments #3, #5 and #6.
- Provide specific examples of data analysis and application to program improvement.

The Response to Conditions report, therefore, might consist of the following in Section VI:

1. The list of conditions (the two bulleted items).
2. For the first bullet, “provide data for assessment #3, #5, and #6, the compiler could write a brief narrative explaining the data collection process since the original report was submitted. Data

charts for the three assessments would then be included (either as text in the narrative or as attachments in the appropriate assessment of Section IV).

A response to the second bullet (“Provide specific examples of data analysis and application to program improvement”) would not require data charts. Instead, a narrative describing how the program has analyzed data and used data to evaluate and perhaps make changes to the program would be included. Specific examples would strengthen the response.

THE PROGRAM SHOULD USE THE SAME ELECTRONIC REPORT TEMPLATE AVAILABLE FOR INITIAL REPORTS AND CLEARLY MARK ON THE COVER SHEET THAT THE REPORT IS A RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS. ALL CHANGES OR ADDITIONS SHOULD BE SUMMARIZED IN SECTION VI OF THE SUBMISSION. THEN, THE PROGRAM NEEDS ONLY TO INDICATE THE STANDARDS BEING ADDRESSED, IDENTIFY THE ASSESSMENTS REPLACED OR REVISED, PROVIDE APPROPRIATE EXPLANATIONS ACCORDING TO THE APPROPRIATE SECTIONS OF THE TEMPLATE, AND, OF COURSE, ATTACH, CLEARLY LABELED, THE REVISED OR NEW ASSESSMENTS, SCORING CRITERIA, AND CANDIDATE DATA.

If changes are made in assessments, care needs to be taken to ensure that the standards they now align with are clearly indicated; in some instances, a changed assessment might no longer address a standard or standards that the original assessment did. The order of assessments should also be carefully checked and appropriate indication provided in the report of any changes (e.g., an assessment originally used for certain standards has now been changed to address another set of standards).

Response to Conditions Reports are submitted in the same way as new program reports. Institutions must notify NCATE (via e-mail, margie@ncate.org) at least one month before a submission deadline (September 15, or March 15) of their intention to submit a Response to Conditions Report. Once this information is received, NCATE staff will send the NCATE Program Coordinator the appropriate URL, user id and password.

Although every effort will be made to have the Conditions Report reviewed by the same team that did the original review, this is not always possible due to the availability and workload of reviewers; therefore, the Conditions Report should note the specific areas where the conditions exist (See Section VI requirements) and not rely on the reviewers to search out the information in the prior submission. ***Note: If material exists in that report that the program believes is relevant, then that information can be inserted into the Conditions Report (properly referenced); however, if an explanation was not sufficient in the first review, simply repeating the explanation in the Conditions Report will be unlikely to change the review team’s decision.***

The Conditions Report cannot add assessments beyond the eight already identified by NCTE/NCATE. For example, a program may not develop a ninth or tenth assessment and submit it as further evidence of meeting standards; the program does, however, have the option of dropping one or more of its former assessments and substituting new one(s) or revised ones in their place with appropriate notice in the report that this is being done and that data related to the new/revised assessments are reported in the Conditions Report. ***Note: Any new or revised assessment must have, as a minimum, one application of data, and preferably more, or it will not be considered as complete evidence for reaching a review decision to move the program to Nationally Recognized.***

Should a program submit a Conditions Report and the evidence is found to be insufficient to remove all of the original conditions cited, the program could lose its recognition status. In this case, the program would then have to submit a substantially revised report or a completely new report for consideration within 18 months or retain its designation as non-recognized status until the next review cycle for unit accreditation. This possibility should alert the program to the wisdom of taking as much of the 18 months

window as possible to ensure it addresses all conditions fully. In the latter case, the program would again have up to 18 months to address the conditions still not met and submit a revised report; the program would have one opportunity to do this. Simply, the failure to correct the condition(s) in a timely fashion could cause the program to be dropped back to a non-recognized status.

Filing to Remove a Non Recognized or Probationary Designation after an Initial Review

As noted under the criteria for the non recognized (Further development required or probation) designation, to receive such a designation, a program will have not met one or more key standards. This typically suggests any or all of the following happened:

- Assessments were not aligned fully and clearly with key standards;
- Program offered little or no evidence for a number of key standards;
- Assessments were poorly constructed and appeared not to provide reliable evidence related to standards;
- Scoring rubrics were poorly designed, not sufficiently discriminating, and/or had little apparent alignment with cited standards;
- Program relied heavily on generic assessments with no clear identification of alignment with NCTE/NCATE standards;
- Narrative explanations were unclear, and/or not relevant to the standards to be addressed;
- Unfounded and/or unverified assumptions were made about the validity and reliability of some assessments and/or performance data in conjunction with standards;

When a program receives the NCTE/NCATE review of its program that carries the non-recognized or probationary designation, the program faculty need to spend considerable time reviewing the recognition report; in particular, the program faculty need to review the cited standards not met, assessments aligned with those standards, scoring criteria for those assessments, and the candidate data generated by the assessments. In addition, the program faculty need to review carefully its narrative explanations in the original report related to the areas cited as needing consideration along with, of course, the comments from the review team. In some cases, the reasons will be very clear and the program may be able to make the necessary adjustments and/or collect the appropriate evidence/data that can form the basis of a response. In other instances, the program may not be as certain as to what the issues are or how it might revise an inadequate assessment. In this latter case, the program is encouraged to contact the NCTE/NCATE Program Review Coordinator to discuss the program's options and to seek clarification on how to respond before developing its Revised Report.

Note: NCTE will review a non recognized or probationary program only twice. It is conceivable, although not mandatory, that a program can be reviewed in this category and provide enough evidence of compliance or progress to be moved to Nationally Recognized with Conditions; if this were to occur, the program would then follow the timeline, guidelines, and process provided under that category. A program may also be moved from a non recognized or probationary status to Nationally Recognized if sufficient evidence is provided. Failure to address successfully in the program response all conditions identified in the however, could also result in the program receiving a decision of Not Recognized until the next unit accreditation review cycle.

The program has two options for response in the category of non or probationary recognition. The program may elect to submit a revised program report or a completely new report within 18 months to remove the original decision. The program should clearly identify when submitting its report whether it is a revision or a completely new report. *In the revised report, the program must focus on those specific conditions that have been identified in the NCTE/NCATE Program Review. In a new report, the program is required to provide all information called for in the NCTE/NCATE report template for an initial program report, paying particular attention, of course, to the weaknesses identified in the initial report.*

A Revised Program Report does not require the submission of all components of the original report. In most cases, the revised report will focus on the submission of revised or new assessments that better provide evidence for standards found unmet by reviewers. In some cases, reviewers will also ask for clarification or additional information related to other parts of the original report. This should be provided in Section VI.

To plan what to submit in responding to a “non recognized” decision, the program should refer to the comments for unmet standards (Part B of the Recognition Report), as well as comments in Part D, Areas for Improvement. Parts C and F of the report may also provide information on the aspects of the original report that are deficient, lacking, or require clarification.

Preparing the Revised Program Report

To prepare a Revised Program Report, follow the same directions for submitting the original report program report. In Section VI of the report form, (1) describe what the program has done to address the concerns of the reviewers, and (2) list all components of the report that are being resubmitted in your revised report. Then prepare the revised parts of the report for submission.

Example:

The Not Nationally Recognized Report states that three standards are not met. Two standards—primarily content-based—used grades in content courses (Assessment #2) as a primary assessment, but reviewers indicate that more information is needed about the content of courses, and the range of grades for candidates in those courses. For the third unmet standard, the program had relied on an assessment (Assessment #6) that reviewers found too generic to provide direct evidence. In Part D of the report, reviewers also noted that clinical faculty were not listed on the faculty chart under Section I.

The Revised Program Report, therefore, might consist of:

- (1) Section VI - a narrative description of what has been done to improve or replace the two assessments found deficient, as well as a list of the components of the report that were being resubmitted (i.e. the following four items);
- (2) A revised Assessment #2, including all three parts of the assessment (Section IV, Assessment 2);
- (3) A new assessment and scoring guide for Assessment #6, as well as a statement noting when the new assessment will be implemented and piloted (Section IV, Assessment 6), and when required data will be available; and
- (4) A revised Section II chart, listing the changed list of assessments;
- (5) A revised faculty chart (Section I, Attachment B)

Submitting the Revised Program Report

Revised program reports are submitted in the same way as new program reports. Institutions must notify NCATE (via e-mail, margie@ncate.org) at least one month before a submission deadline (September 15 or March 15) of their intention to submit a revised report. Once this information is received, NCATE staff will send the NCATE Program Coordinator the appropriate URL, user id and password.

Compilers will be submitting program reports using NCATE's PRS/AIMS system but, as noted above, may not need to re-submit all sections of a report. In most cases, the revised report will focus on the submission of revised or new assessments that better provide evidence for standards found unmet by

reviewers. The following provides specific information on creating each section of the report for the PRS system. Follow these instructions for whichever sections are necessary for the revised report being submitted.

Although efforts will be made to send the revised report to the same team that did the original review, this is not always possible due to reviewer availability and workload. If the program believes the original report contains relevant information, it can elect to insert it, with appropriate attribution, into the revised report rather than refer the team to the prior submission. *However, simply submitting material solely from the original report as a response is highly unlikely to change the review decision.* Reviewers will be seeking new information, clearer explanations, evidence of revisions in the program, etc., as indications that the program has taken the review seriously and has taken steps to correct the deficiencies that have been noted.

Such steps could include any or all of the following:

- Development and at least piloting of new assessment(s). **Note:** *The program cannot exceed the number of assessments originally permitted (8); failure to allow for this will cause the program to be Not Nationally Recognized on that basis alone. The program can, however, indicate it has dropped one or more of its original assessments and introduced new ones with corresponding rubrics and candidate data.*
- Revisions of existing assessments along with new candidate performance data and accompanying explanation of the rationale for change, implications of results, etc. At least one application for new/revised assessments is expected. Time needs to be allowed for collection of such data.
- Clearer and fuller identification of alignment of assessments and standards, especially in cases where generic assessments were used.
- Clearer disaggregation of candidate performance data (i.e., perhaps the program has folded two programs into one report but failed to disaggregate the data by program).

In a completely *new report*, the program area could provide evidence of any or all of the following:

- significant changes in program requirements;
- significant revision and testing of assessments with corresponding candidate data;
- development of new assessments with corresponding candidate data;
- establishment of a new/revised assessment system;
- improved collection of candidate performance data;
- stricter alignment of assessments and standards;
- reduction of reliance on generic assessments;
- submission of two reports because requirements and assessments for one set of candidates have been identified as being sufficiently different from another set of degree or licensure candidates.

In the case where a completely new report is submitted, the report will be treated as new and always sent to a new team. Consequently, the program should not assume the review team has prior knowledge of what was originally submitted. This means that all information provided in the report needs to be clearly explained and referenced within the report itself without reliance on any other documents. This does not mean necessarily that some material from the original submission might not be included, but since the option to provide a new report has been elected, reviewers will be expecting to see a complete program submission.

Further Assistance

During the preparation of its report, program faculty may wish to seek clarification and further information regarding elements of the report. Questions pertaining to electronic components or related factors should be directed to NCATE Contacts: Dr. Margie Crutchfield, NCATE, 2010 Massachusetts Avenue NW Suite 500, Washington, DC 20036-1023; E-mail: margie@ncate.org; Tel: 202-466-7496; Fax: 202-296-6620. Questions about standards, program faculty training, or report content should be directed to NCTE Contacts: Leni Cook, Coordinator, NCTE/NCATE Program Reviews, E-mail (preferred): cooklg@cox.net; Tel: 310-377-3701; Fax: 310-377-2031; or Patricia Lambert Stock, National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 W. Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801-1096; E-mail: plstock@msu.edu; Tel: 217-278-3632; Fax: 217-328-0977.

APPENDIX A

Guidelines for Using and Documenting Course Grades as a Program Assessment

The NCTE/NCATE program review system accepts grades in only content courses as evidence. Grades can be used for Assessment #1 (if there is no state licensure test), Assessment #2, or one of the optional assessments.

Acceptable documentation required for programs using content course grades is as follows:

1. Courses must be required for all candidates in the program; elective courses may not be used as evidence.
2. Faculty may choose which courses will be used in this assessment. For example, they could select all courses in an academic major, or they could select a cluster of courses that address a specific domain, or they could select only one course, etc.
3. The documentation of course grades-based evidence must include curriculum requirements, including the course numbers of required courses. (a) For baccalaureate programs, documentation must be consistent with course listings provided in the Program of Study submitted in Section I of the program report. (b) If course grades are used as an assessment for a graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution, the assessment must include the advising sheet that is used by the program to determine the sufficiency of courses taken by a candidate at another institution. The advising sheet should include specific information on required coursework and remediation required for deficiencies in the content acquirement of admitted candidates.
4. The grade evidence must be accompanied by the institution's grade policy or definitions of grades.
5. Grade data should be disaggregated by program level (e.g. baccalaureate and post baccalaureate), grade level preparation (e.g. middle grades and secondary), licensure category (English education), and program site.
6. Syllabi cannot be submitted.

Format for Submission of Grades as a Course-Based Content Assessment

The following format is required for submission of grades as a course grade-based assessment under Section IV of the program report:

Part 1. Description of the assessment. Provide a brief description of the courses and a rationale for the selection of this particular set of courses. Provide a rationale for how these courses align with specific SPA standards as well as an analysis of grade data included in the submission.

Note: If course grades are used as an assessment for a graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution, the report must include the advising sheet that is used by the program to determine the sufficiency of courses taken by a candidate at another institution.

Part 2. Alignment with SPA standards. This part must include a matrix that shows alignment of courses with specific SPA standards (see example below). Brief course descriptions must be included along with how the course meets the cited standards. A graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution must show alignment between the SPA standards and the program's advising sheet that is used to determine the sufficiency of courses taken by a candidate at another institution.

Part 3. Grade Policy and Minimum Expectation. The program must submit grading policies that are used by the institution or program and the minimum expectation for candidate grades (e.g., all candidates must achieve a C or better in all selected coursework)

Part 4. Data table(s). Data tables must provide, at minimum, the grade distributions and mean course grades for candidates in the selected courses. NOTE: The "n" in the data table/s for each year

or semester should be relatively consistent with the numbers of candidates and completers reported in Attachment A to Section I. Large inconsistencies between the two data sets should be explained in a note included with the data table(s).

Format Examples

Part 2. Alignment Matrix and Course Description (Full Catalog Course Description in Program of Study)

SPA Standard/s Addressed by Course	Course Name & Number	Brief Description of Course and How the Course Meets the Cited Standards, e.g. Key Assignments
3.1 (3.1.1, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6)	English Language I (ENG 200)	Course focuses on English language attributes. 75% of course grade based on 3 research papers, each focusing on an area in the course (language variety and evolution, acquisition and development, use and abuse).
3.5 (3.5.1,3,5,2, 3.5.4)	Literature of the Diaspora (ENG 347)	Course focuses on literature by authors associated with the diaspora. 40% of course grade based on essay exams about required readings; 30% of course grade based on literature logs reflecting analysis of required readings including literary theory and criticism.

Part 4. Sample Data Tables

Example 1. Candidates' Grades in Required English Courses Secondary English Education Candidates Baccalaureate Program						
	2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-2007	
	Average course grade (range)*	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Average course grade (range)	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Average course grade (range)	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
ENG 200	3.0 (2.5–3.9)	100	3.0 (1.5–3.9)	85	3.25 (2.3–3.9)	90
ENG 347	2.75 (2.0 – 3.5)	85	3.0 (2.5–3.9)	100	2.75 (2.0 – 3.5)	85

*A = 4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0

Example 2. Mean GPA in English Major Courses for Candidates admitted to MAT Program Secondary English Education Candidates		
Academic Year	GPA (mean, range)*	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
2004-2005	3.75 (3.0– 3.9)	100
2005-2006	3.3 (3.0 – 3.5)	100
2006-2007	3.4 (3.2 – 3.7)	100

*A = 4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0