

**National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)**

**Standards for Initial Preparation of Teachers  
of Secondary English Language Arts 7-12  
April 2012**

**Contact Person:**

Professor Janet Alsup  
Purdue University  
English Department  
500 Oval Drive  
West Lafayette, IN 47907  
(765) 494-3777  
jalsup@purdue.edu

## I. Introductory Material

### **Brief Introduction to the Program Standards**

This document contains standards for prospective teachers who seek to complete English language arts teacher preparation programs at the initial secondary level. These standards reflect what ELA teachers should know and be able to do in the areas of content knowledge, content pedagogy, learners and learning, and professional knowledge and skills. Each standard and its related elements were written to progress from a theoretical/research supported knowledge base to the application of the knowledge in professional practice.

Literacy educators are among the most important in our schools. The mastery of reading, writing, and oral communication is essential for success in all areas of study and in most professions. Perhaps more than in any other discipline, the ELA teacher's role has greatly expanded over the last fifty years; not only are English teachers responsible for reading, writing, speaking and listening; they are now teaching visual and media literacy and multimodal reading and composing. As the domain of the ELA teacher becomes ever wider, the role of standards to facilitate curriculum development of teacher preparation programs becomes more central. With so much to possibly teach when preparing new ELA teachers, what should be the focus? How do teacher educators ensure that teacher candidates are as prepared as possible to teach language arts in today's diverse world?

While standards-based instruction is often a point of controversy in our profession as in many others, clear performance standards or objectives are vital to teacher educators as they make decisions about how to prepare new teachers. These revised NCTE/NCATE standards, based on our 2006 Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts and compatible with INTASC Principles, outline what knowledge, skills, and performances are essential for a new secondary English language arts (ELA) teacher. They are based on empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory and the wisdom of practice. In revising these standards, we have attempted to retain useful components of the previous standards while making them more specific, clearly defined and timely.

*Our revised NCTE standards reflect a set of foundational principles, including:*

- A thorough understanding of ELA content is vital for the effective ELA teacher
- Various aspects of ELA instruction, reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing, are interrelated and integrated in effective professional practice
- Informational, literary and creative reading and writing experiences are important for rich literacy education

- Multimedia reading and composing skills are essential to contemporary literacy education
- ELA teacher candidates must be knowledgeable about how adolescents best learn and committed to responding to the needs of all learners
- Effective lessons and instructional units are evidence based, built on the alignment of planning, teaching, and assessment, and reflective of classroom context and students' dynamic identities
- Effective ELA teachers are reflective and open to collaboration and ongoing professional development

### **Statement on Development of the Standards**

This section outlines the various mechanisms NCTE engaged in during the revision of our SPA standards to ensure connections to research and practice as well as attention to expert, stakeholder review. The CEE (Conference on English Education) as an affiliate group of English teacher educators within NCTE has responsibility for leading this revision process. The following mechanisms are described in detail below:

#### *Soliciting and Responding to Comments*

During the time of standard revision (2007 to the present) multiple stakeholder groups were contacted and the responses were solicited to various drafts of the standards. Below we outline these various groups and how their feedback was solicited and responded to:

#### Work of various NCTE/CEE Committees:

Building on the work of a 2006 CEE (Conference on English Education—the national organization of English teacher educators) Committee on Standards and Accreditation, an initial task force comprised of 15 CEE and NCTE members with knowledge of the history of NCTE SPA standards was created. This task force engaged in face-to-face, email, and telephone conference communications from 2007-2010. This group drafted and disseminated initial drafts of the standards as well as engaged in many hours of conversation about how they should be similar to and different from our existing NCTE standards.

In 2010 a writing group comprised of a sub-set of 8 individuals from this larger committee was formed. This writing group met twice in person (once in 2011 and once in 2012 for weekend-long meetings) and had numerous email and phone conversations. This group continued revising the standards based on comments from various stakeholders and NCATE guidelines and response. This group continues to meet and communicate about ongoing revisions. Areas of special consideration for this group as they revised the existing standards included the following:

- Separating content standards from performance standards to clarify assessment and rubric development
- Integrating consideration of social justice and equity into the standards
- Integrating more complex treatment of technology and multimodal instruction into the standards

Response from NCTE/CEE Membership:

NCTE and CEE members were polled three different times and in three different contexts as the standards were being developed.

First, the entire CEE membership was sent an email in March-April of 2011 asking for comments on the draft at that time. The following email was sent to the approximately 2500 CEE members:

“The **draft NCTE/NCATE standards for initial English teacher preparation** have been prepared for your review. **These standards** are derived from the NCTE Guidelines for Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts, most recently revised in 2006. As you might know, in 2003 CEE was given the responsibility by NCTE to prepare/revise **these standards** when they are requested, and NCATE has requested a revision to be submitted by NCTE/CEE this fall. You have been selected to be among the first round of reviewers/responders since you are active members of CEE. Many people have worked on these standards over the past year, including multiple CEE members serving on committees and working groups. We thank all of these individuals for their hard work. Most recently, a writing task force met in Chicago in January to finish the draft you see here. Please keep in mind as you review these standards and provide feedback that there are certain NCATE guidelines that must be followed, including the requirement that there be no more than 7 standards, 28 elements and 0 sub-elements or indicators. Additionally, the standards must be consistent with four NCATE identified principles: content knowledge, content pedagogy, learning environments, and professional knowledge and skills. As you review this draft, keep in mind that standards such as these will form the basis for NCTE/NCATE review of all English Education programs seeking national recognition. Please use the following questions as a guide and return your feedback to the writing task force, at [jalsup@purdue.edu](mailto:jalsup@purdue.edu). Since our report to NCATE also must include a review of relevant research and scholarship, we would also appreciate any suggestions for this literature review. **Please respond by April 29th, 2011.** After we receive all feedback, the writing task force will meet to reevaluate **the draft**. Note: Reading and literature are sometimes described separately in **this draft** (see Standard II). "Reading" in this document refers to the knowledge that candidates must have for teaching the complex processes of engaging with texts, from comprehending to close reading to interpretation and evaluation. "Literature" refers to knowledge of texts that candidates must have to engage students in the reading of texts from our diverse culture's literary corpus.

1. To what extent do you think the standards reflect what English educators value

- for initial preparation of English language arts teachers?
2. What gaps, if any, do you see in the standards that should be addressed? Please provide a brief rationale for your suggestion(s).
  3. What standard(s), if any, would you significantly revise and/or delete? Please provide a brief rationale for your suggestion(s).
  4. How useful and "assessable" do you see these standards for NCTE/NCATE review of English education programs?
- Thank you for your time."

We received responses from 41 individuals on this email list. In response to the comments, the writing group was divided into subcommittees and assigned a standard/s to review. The chair of the writing group sent each writing group member a document containing all feedback received, organized by standards. After each subcommittee reviewed feedback and offered revisions, a phone conference of the entire writing group was held to make final decisions about revisions based on member comments. As a result, a revised draft was created. Areas that were revised based on this synthesis of the comments included:

- Clarification of "reading" instruction and content knowledge as opposed to "literature" instruction and knowledge
- Further tweaking of the standard concerning equity and social justice to ensure that it would be assessable according to NCATE procedures
- Further revision of the standard concerning professional knowledge and development to ensure that it would be assessable according the NCATE procedures
- The increased inclusion of technological skills related to English teaching
- Increased attention to formative assessment and the use of student assessment data
- Increased attention to explicit standards and elements related to adolescent learning

Second, the new revised draft referenced above was shared at the June 2011 CEE conference at Fordham University. A special session was organized and advertised for this purpose. Approximately 15 CEE members attended and offered additional feedback, primarily concerning arts and literacies integration and reading versus literature instruction.

Third, the newly revised draft was shared at the November 2011 NCTE convention in Chicago. The draft was shared at the CEE business meeting, and the approximately 150 members present were invited to respond. Most responses centered on Standard VI about social justice, equity, and diversity. Members were confident this standard needed to be included, but were continuing conversations held earlier about the standard's ability to be assessed. Additionally, members suggested relevant research, which the writing group later consulted for incorporation into these revised standards.

Response from other SPAs and Associations:

The chair of the writing group, Professor Janet Alsup, contacted various SPAs, states, and institutions by email asking them to review a draft of the standards. The following were contacted with a brief email explaining the context of the request and attaching the most recent standards draft. These SPAs, states, and institutions were contacted based on the advice of our NCTE/NCATE Program Review Coordinator.

*SPAs*

IRA (International Reading Association)

ACTFL (American Council of the Teaching of Foreign Languages)

TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages)

NCSS (Social Studies)

*NCATE States*

Arkansas Department of Education

Maryland Department of Education

South Carolina Department of Education

*NCATE Institutions:*

University of Connecticut

Gallaudet-Washington

University of Maryland-Baltimore County

Oklahoma State University

Winthrop-South Carolina

Mississippi State

Manhattanville College

University of Houston-Clear Lake

University of Wyoming

The responses and suggestions received from SPAs, states and institutions included the following, in summary:

- Reconsider connections with Common Core State Standards
- Strengthen references to interdisciplinary nature of discipline and reciprocal national of reading/writing
- Add more about reading instruction
- Add more overt references to ELLs
- Add element of practice/implementation to social justice/equity standard as well as consideration of language as power
- Add component to standards about candidates communicating with policy makers

The writing group again communicated by phone and email about the suggestions and incorporated some, disregarded others, and tabled yet others for further consideration and discussion. For example, the second, third, and fifth bullets led to specific standards revisions; the fourth and sixth bullets were not directly

implemented as changes after discussions about the purpose and audience of the standards document; the first bullet was discussed, but at the current time it was decided that the standards do include references to informational texts and argument, key ELA components of the CCSS. However, this suggestion will continue to be considered over the next few months.

Response from NCATE:

We submitted a draft of our standards to NCATE in August 2011. We received some useful feedback from NCATE in November 2011. The most significant piece of feedback was to revise the standards to be consistent with the four principles, around which all SPA standards should be organized: the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility. These standards had been newly implemented by NCATE as the focus of all standards. The writing committee took this feedback very seriously, and organized the second face-to-face meeting at this time to respond to it. During the second meeting (January 2012) the committee also developed rubrics.

*Drawing on Developments in the SPA's field*

The standards have considered and drawn from other sets of standards important to ELA teachers and ELA teacher educators, including our Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts (a longer document on which our current and revised standards are based, which was most recently revised in 2006), INTASC Principles, and the Common Core State Standards for ELA 7-12.

Perhaps the strongest connection is to our Guidelines, drafted in 2006. The following listing of “opportunities essential in effective English teacher preparation programs” serves as a foundation for both our current and revised standards:

“Those charged with the education of ELA teacher candidates should ensure that these future teachers have opportunities to do the following:

1. Develop an understanding of teaching and learning processes through experiences with a wide range of verbal, visual, technological, and creative media and experience the integration of reading, writing, speaking, listening, technology, and various media within lessons.
2. Expand themselves as literate individuals who use their critical, intellectual, and aesthetic abilities to participate in a democratic society.
3. Experience a wide range of literature consistent with their own and their students’ motivations, interests, and intellects.
4. Experience opportunities to write and speak for multiple audiences and purposes.
5. Participate in model classrooms that function as communities of learners and users of language.
6. Experience the modeling of varied strategies of effective assessment practice both within individual courses and within the ELA teacher certification program as a whole.
7. Experience current language arts methodologies and strategies for teaching

various genres, literary perspectives, and visual/medial literacies and language approaches.

8. Experience the affective and cognitive needs of diverse populations and cross-cultural literacies and pedagogical approaches valuable for acquiring English as a second language.

9. Develop a sense of belonging to a professional community and a desire for professional growth that will help them, as ELA teacher candidates, sustain their commitment to the profession over time.

10. Reflect on their own and others' instruction as a means for self-improvement and self-understanding" (*Guidelines*, 2006, p. 11).

#### *Using the Knowledge Base*

A comprehensive listing of relevant research and scholarship, as well as a summary of how the references are applicable to the standards, is included after each standard and rubric below.

#### *Developing Consensus*

As noted in the section "Soliciting and Responding to Comments" above, multiple groups of stakeholders were consulted, records were kept of their responses and comments, and task forces and writing groups specifically responded to them. We used both email, web-based, and face-to-face methods for distributing drafts and soliciting feedback. While not every comment was immediately integrated into the draft, the committees reviewed and discussed each one in the context of research and scholarship in the field, NCATE processes and procedures, and possible contradictions/conflicts with other suggestions and previous revisions. Many comments and suggestions did result in change to the ongoing draft document, as summarized above.

#### **Potential Duplication and/or Overlaps in Standards**

To our knowledge, there is no problematic duplication or overlap with other SPA's standards.

#### **Analysis of Differences from Current Standards**

##### *Commonalities and Differences with existing NCTE NCATE Standards (2003)*

The revised standards presented here are similar to the 2003 standards in several ways, including the reliance on research and scholarship as a foundation for the standards, a focus on both content and pedagogical content knowledge, and some attention to discipline-specific dispositions (more discussion of dispositions occurs below).

These revised standards are different in perhaps more ways, due to a variety of contextual forces. New guidelines from NCATE about the form and organization of the standards resulted in many changes such as the shortening of the overall document (from 4 standards, 27 indicators, and 26 sub-indicators to 7 standards and 23 elements) and the organization of the document around the four major principles. Other changes were made based on committee and task force discussions and feedback from our numerous stakeholders, many of whom have experience



writing NCATE SPA reports. These changes include separating content from content pedagogy in the standards, integrating reading, writing, speaking, listening and viewing in the standards as much as possible, including explicit references to both reading instruction and literature, more references to contemporary technologies, and explicit inclusion of social justice and equity standards.

## II. Standards

### **Approach to Implementation of the SASB Policy on Guidelines**

Our approach to the implementation of this Policy has been threefold:

1. Theoretical and ideological work by NCTE and CEE committees and subcommittees (discussion of purpose and audience, principles of effective ELA teacher preparation)
2. Application of this theoretical framework to specific standards and elements by the writing subcommittee
3. Ongoing revision based on organized and analyzed stakeholder response
4. Writing of this final report according to specified guidelines by the writing subcommittee with feedback from NCTE executive officers and NCTE/NCATE Program Review Coordinators

Every attempt was made at each stage above to focus the standards on ELA specific knowledge, performances, and dispositions. Standards and/or elements were generally omitted if the committee(s) viewed them as being already covered in Unit standards. Standards VI and VII in our revised standards might be considered “dispositional”; however, their articulation in our standards document shows them to be specifically related to ELA teaching and learning.

For example, Standard VI, “Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how theories and research about social justice, diversity, equity, student identities and schools as institutions can enhance students’ opportunities to learn in English Language Arts” may seem general. However, the two elements underneath it link the items in this standard directly to ELA and literacy lesson and unit planning, especially when considering issues of language and dialect. A teacher of literature and language should approach issues of social justice, diversity and equity in a unique way; human interactions are often the focus of literary texts, and the social/cultural effects of language are often discussed in ELA classrooms. Standard VII, “Candidates are prepared to interact knowledgeably with students, families, and colleagues based on social needs and institutional roles, engage in leadership and/or collaborative roles in ELA professional learning communities, and activity develop as professional educators” might also seem general until the elements are considered. The elements demonstrate that this standard refers specifically to the modeling of *literacy* practices for students/parents as well as literacy and language related professional development and engagement.

At this time, we have included no supplementary materials as noted in Part B.6, although we plan to develop sample assessments within the NCATE submission options to share with ELA programs in the near future.

**Statement on Preponderance of Evidence**

The revision committee understands that reviewer decisions about whether or not standards are met will be based on the “preponderance of evidence” at the standard level. This means that there should be an “overall confirmation of candidate performance on the standards in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence” (SASB Worksheet, p. 7). Our rubrics have been designed with this policy in mind.

## Copy of the Standards and Rubrics

<b><i>Content Knowledge</i></b>		
<p><b>Standard I:</b> Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes literature and multimedia texts as well as knowledge of the nature of adolescents as readers.</p> <p><b>Element 1:</b> Candidates are knowledgeable about texts—print and non-print texts, media texts, classic texts and contemporary texts, including young adult—that represent a range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different genders, ethnicities, and social classes; they are able to use literary theories to interpret and critique a range of texts.</p> <p><b>Element 2:</b> Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents read texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.</p>		
Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations with Conditions	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p><i>Candidates' performance</i> meets the expectations described for the standard(s) with the breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanation(s) with competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standard(s), Key Elements and Supporting Explanation(s). Scoring guides or rubrics generally provide qualitative distinctions between levels of performance.</p>	<p><i>Candidates' performance</i> meets most of the expectations described for the standard(s) with some breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanations and with a degree of competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standards(s), most Key Elements, and supporting explanations. Scoring guides or rubrics show some degree of alignment but do not always provide clear distinctions between levels of performance.</p>	<p>Program evidence <i>does not show</i> that candidates' performance meets the Initial level expectations described in the Key Elements and Supporting Explanation.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are not aligned consistently with the Initial Standard, Key Elements and Supporting Explanation; therefore, it is not possible to generate candidate performance data related to the standard. Scoring guides or rubrics fail consistently to provide clear distinctions among levels of performance.</p> <p>Program <i>uses little or no data</i> in determining what improvements might be</p>

<p>Program is <i>using data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are disaggregated by NCTE/NCATE program standard and program, indicating that candidate performance reflects a mastery of ELA subject matter specifically including literature and multimedia texts as well as awareness of adolescents as readers through knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide range of texts—print and non-print, media, classic, contemporary and young adult—and literary theories through which to understand them</li> <li>• A range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and awareness of the experiences of diverse readers</li> <li>• How adolescents read texts and make meaning in a variety of contexts</li> </ul>	<p>Program is <i>using somewhat limited data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> may be disaggregated by standard but may not consistently indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>	<p>made in teaching and learning and to inform program planning.</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are not disaggregated by standard nor do they indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>
---	---	---

## Supporting Explanation

Historically, literature has been at the heart of English language arts. In recent years, the definition of literature has become increasingly inclusive, but the knowledge of a wide-range of texts continues to be one of the pillars on which instruction is built. Well-prepared candidates will not necessarily know a specific set of works but they will be experienced readers who are familiar with literature from many different traditions and in many different genres. Of particular note is the growing significance of knowledge about non-print/media texts. Candidates must be able to analyze such texts and understand their place in society and in the English language arts curriculum. Candidates must also understand and be able to use a variety of literary theories and interpretive methods to help them make meaning of texts and determine their significance.

Just as important as knowledge of literary and other texts is knowledge of adolescent readers—how they read and respond to literature, how they develop as readers over time, and how their experiences as readers interact with and influence their lives. Once again, special note should be made of the increasingly significant and rapidly evolving role of media texts as an aspect of adolescent experience, both in and out of school. Well-prepared candidates must be knowledgeable about how adolescents make use of media texts and online environments and how those texts and environments are both similar to and different from more traditional literary experience.

Note: Throughout the NCTE/NCATE Standards the term "text" is used to refer to all printed works--novels, poems, plays, newspapers, magazines, etc. However, in the case of online/electronic materials, which often consist of not only words but static images, moving images, sounds, etc., additional terms such as "online" or "media" are sometimes added to indicate that these texts are qualitatively different from traditional paper texts--and to indicate that defining such materials is work in progress.

## REFERENCES

### *Element 1:*

- Applebee, A. (1974). *Tradition and reform in the teaching of English: A history*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Appleman, D. (2009). *Critical encounters in high school English: Teaching literary theory to adolescents* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York and Urbana, IL: Teachers College Press and National Council of Teachers of English.
- Comber, B., & Simpson, A. (2001). *Negotiating critical literacies in classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Donelson, K.L., & Nilsen, A.P. (2005). *Literature for today's young adults* (7<sup>th</sup> edition). New York: Longman.
- Latrobe, K. H., & Drury, J. (2009). *Critical approaches to young adult literature*. New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers. ISBN: 978-1555705640
- Lewis, M., Leland, C., & Harste, J. C. (2008). *Creating critical classrooms: K-8 reading and writing with an edge*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Probst, R. E. (1988). Dialogue with a text. *English Journal*, 77(1), 32-38.
- Probst, R. E. (2004). *Response and analysis* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann
- Rosenblatt, L.M. (1995). *Literature as exploration* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: The Modern Language Association.
- Rogers, T., & Soter, A. O. (1997). *Reading across cultures: Teaching literature in a diverse society*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. (2003). Literary theory. In J. Flood, D, Lapp, J.R. Squire, & J.M. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (pp. 67-73). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The reader, the text and the poem*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.
- Soter, A. O. (1999). *Young adult literature and the new literary theories: Developing critical readers in middle school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Stevens, L. P., & Bean, T. W. (2007). *Critical literacy: Context, research, and practice in the K-12 classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

**Element 2:**

- Alvermann, D. (2002). Effective literacy instruction for adolescents. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 34(2), 189-208.
- Cambourne, B. (1995). Toward an educationally relevant theory of literacy learning: Twenty years of inquiry. *The Reading Teacher*, 49(3), 182-190.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). What does it take to create skilled readers? Facilitating the transfer and application of literacy strategies. *Voices From the Middle*, 15(4), 16-22.
- Flood, J., Heath, S. B., & Lapp, D. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual arts, Vol. 2*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum and IRA.
- Franzak, J. (2006). Zoom: A review of the literature on marginalized adolescent readers, literacy theory, and policy implications. *Reviews of Research in Education*, 76(2), 209-248.
- Greenleaf, C., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(1).
- Guthrie, J. T., Alao, S., & Rinehart, J. (1997). Engagement for young adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 40(6), 438-446.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2001). "Engagement and Motivation in Reading" In Kamil, M. L. et al., (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research, volume 3*, (pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ivey, G. & Broadus, K. (2001). "Just plain reading": A survey of what makes students want to read in middle school classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36, 350-377.
- Kim, H. & Kamil, M. (2003). Electronic and Multimedia Documents. In Sweet, A. P. & Snow, C. E. (Eds.) *Rethinking Reading Comprehension* (pp. 166-175). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading: Insights from the research*. Englewood, CA: Libraries Unlimited.
- Lenters, K. (2006). Resistance, struggle, and the adolescent reader. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 50(2), 136-146.

- The New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard educational review* 66(1), 60-92.
- Probst, R. E. (2004). *Response and analysis* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Reed, J., Shallert, D., Beth, A., & Woodruff, A. (2004). Motivated reader, engaged writer: The role of motivation in the literate acts of adolescents. In T. Jetton and J. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent Literacy Research and Practice*, pp. 251-282. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The reader, the text and the poem*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.
- S.J. Samuels, (Eds.), *What Research Has To Say About Reading Instruction* (pp. 370-391). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Webb, A. (2012). *Teaching literature in virtual worlds: Immersive learning in English studies*. New York: Routledge.

**Content Knowledge**

**Standard II:** Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes language and writing as well as knowledge of adolescents as language users.

**Element 1:** Candidates can compose a range of formal and informal texts taking into consideration the interrelationships among form, audience, context, and purpose; candidates understand that writing is a recursive process; candidates can use contemporary technologies and/or digital media to compose multimodal discourse.

**Element 2:** Candidates know the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics); they understand the concept of dialect and are familiar with relevant grammar systems (e.g., descriptive and prescriptive); they understand principles of language acquisition; they recognize the influence of English language history on ELA content; and they understand the impact of language on society.

**Element 3:** Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.

Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations with Conditions	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p><i>Candidates' performance</i> meets the expectations described for the standard(s) with the breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanation(s) with competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standard(s), Key Elements and Supporting Explanation(s). Scoring guides or rubrics generally provide qualitative distinctions between levels of</p>	<p><i>Candidates' performance</i> meets most of the expectations described for the standard(s) with some breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanations and with a degree of competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standards(s), most Key Elements, and supporting explanations. Scoring guides or rubrics show some degree of alignment but do not always provide clear distinctions between</p>	<p>Program evidence <i>does not show</i> that candidates' performance meets the Initial level expectations described in the Key Elements and Supporting Explanation.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are not aligned consistently with the Initial Standard, Key Elements and Supporting Explanation; therefore, it is not possible to generate candidate performance data related to the standard. Scoring guides or rubrics fail consistently to provide clear distinctions among levels of performance.</p> <p>Program <i>uses little or no</i></p>



<p>performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are disaggregated by NCTE/NCATE program standard and program, indicating that candidate performance reflects mastery of ELA subject matter specifically including language and writing as well as awareness of adolescents as language users through knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to compose a range of formal and informal text taking into consideration form, audience, context, and purpose</li> <li>• The conventions of the English language as they relate to various rhetorical and cultural situations</li> <li>• How adolescents compose texts in multimodal environments</li> </ul>	<p>levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using somewhat limited data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> may be disaggregated by standard but may not consistently indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>	<p><i>data</i> in determining what improvements might be made in teaching and learning and to inform program planning.</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are not disaggregated by standard nor do they indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>
--	---	---

**Supporting Explanation**

Because writing is a major form of inquiry and communication that enables students to act effectively in their immediate social environment as well as in the world at large, candidates need to have knowledge of the writing process. This knowledge includes understanding of multiple models and theories of the writing process as well as the

usefulness of techniques such as self- and peer assessment along with teacher assessment. Candidates must know that much experience with expressive language is necessary to the development of effectiveness in all forms of discourse, informal and formal, and that writing for various purposes in a wide variety of forms (including media texts) for various audiences is a necessary part of this development. Fundamental to an understanding of adolescents as language users is a comprehensive understanding of developmental theories and processes by which people acquire, understand, and use language. Candidates need to know the relationship of language development to the basic principles and characteristics of human growth so that expectations regarding students' language use and development are related to student readiness and achievement levels.

Candidates need to be prepared to help students view English as a constantly changing language. As a context for the dynamic of language change, candidates need to know the major periods of language history and the significant changes connected to those periods and communicate those to students as a way of demonstrating the impact of events and people on language use and change. Because of diverse backgrounds, students exhibit a variety of language patterns. Candidates need to understand the nature and sources of language variety and embrace a global perspective on language. Through an understanding of the major semantic, syntactical, and auditory systems of English, candidates will be able to provide ways of discussing the role of language and its production. Candidates also need to understand the significance of grammar systems as one way to discuss language as well as how these systems work in the production of language. Such discussions, however, should be anchored in the actual uses of language rather than simply a study of language. Candidates should know when to use formal language structures and when informal structures are appropriate. Language development occurs as students use all the language processes and understand the relationships among them. Initial language acquisition occurs in the home and in a second-language environment as the need to understand and communicate occurs. Language development is a natural process that students begin as they expand and monitor their personal language on the basis of what they hear, understand and use. Hence candidates need to be aware of ways that language is acquired and developed so that they can provide appropriate situations where students can continue to develop their language skills.

## REFERENCES

### ***Element 1:***

- Chandler-Olcott, K., & Mahar, D. (2003a). "Tech-savviness" meets multiliteracies: Exploring adolescent girls' technology-mediated literacy practices. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38(3), 356-385.
- Chandler-Olcott, K., & Mahar, D. (2003b). Adolescents' anime-inspired "fanfictions": An exploration of Multiliteracies. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 46(7), 556-566.
- Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Leu, D. (Eds.) (2008). *Handbook of research on new literacies*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing process of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing*

- of adolescents in middle and high schools—A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writers: Teachers and students at work.* Exeter, NH: Heinemann.
- Grisham, D., & Wolsey, T. (2006). Recentering the middle school classroom as a vibrant learning community: Students, literacy, and technology intersect. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 49(8), 648-660.
- Hillocks, G. (1995). *Teaching writing as reflective practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kim, H., & Kamil, M. (2004). Adolescents, computer technology, and literacy. In T. Jetton and J. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 351-368). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kist, W. (2005). *New literacies in action: Teaching and learning in multiple media.* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2003). *New literacies, changing knowledge and classroom learning.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Leu, D. (2002). Internet workshop: Making time for literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, 55(5), 466-472.
- Marsh, J. (2006). Popular culture in the literacy curriculum: A Bourdieuan analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(2), 160-174.
- McGinnis, T. (2007). Khmer rap boys, X-Men, Asia's fruits, and Dragonball Z: Creating multilingual and multimodal classroom contexts. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 50(7), 570-579.
- Element 2:**
- Bauer, L. & Trudgill, P. (1998). *Language myths.* New York: Penguin.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication (1974/2003). Students' Right to Their Own Language. Downloaded October 8, 2009 from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CCCC/NewSRTOL.pdf>.
- Delpit, L., & Kilgour Dowdy, J. (Eds.) (2003). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom.* New York: The New Press.
- Fecho, B. (2004). *"Is this English?" Race, language, and culture in the classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses.* London, UK: Routledge-Falmer.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kolln, M. (2007). *Rhetorical grammar: Grammatical choices, rhetorical effects* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York : Longman.
- Myers, M. (1996). *Changing our minds.* Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- NCTE's Assembly for the Teaching of English Grammar. (2002 ). Some Questions and Answers about Grammar. Available online at <http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/qandaaboutgrammar>.
- Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Writing Study Group of the NCTE Executive Committee (2004). NCTE Beliefs about

- the Teaching of Writing. Available online at  
<http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/writingbeliefs>.
- Smitherman, G. (2000). *Talkin that talk: Language, culture and education in African America*. New York: Routledge.
- Stahl, S. (1999). *Vocabulary Development*. Newark Upper Falls, MA: Brookline Books.
- Weaver, C. (1996). *Teaching grammar in context*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Element 3**
- Alvermann, D. (2005). Exemplary literacy instruction in grades 7-12: What counts and who's counting? In J. Flood and P. L. Anders (Eds.), *Literacy development of students in urban schools: Research and policy* (pp. 187-201). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Alvermann, D. E., Hinchman, K. A., Moore, D. W., Phelps, S. F., & Waff, D. R. (Eds.). (2006). *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Leu, D. (Eds.) (2008). *Handbook of research on new literacies*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Graham, S. & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing Next: Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools --A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Kist, W. (2005). *New literacies in action: Teaching and learning in multiple media*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reed, J., Shallert, D., Beth, A., & Woodruff, A. (2004). Motivated reader, engaged writer: The role of motivation in the literate acts of adolescents. In T. Jetton and J. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 251-282). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Vasudevan, L. (2007). Looking for angels: Knowing adolescents by engaging with their multimodal literacy practices. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 50(4), 252-256.

***Content Pedagogy: Planning Literature and Reading Instruction in ELA***

**Standard III:** Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for reading and the study of literature to promote learning for all students.

**Element 1:** Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences utilizing a range of different texts—across genres, periods, forms, authors, cultures, and various forms of media—and instructional strategies that are motivating and accessible to all students, including English language learners, students with special needs, students from diverse language and learning backgrounds, those designated as high achieving, and those at risk of failure.

**Element 2:** Candidates design a range of authentic assessments (e.g., formal and informal, formative and summative) of reading and literature that demonstrate an understanding of how learners develop and that address interpretive, critical, and evaluative abilities in reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and presenting.

**Element 3:** Candidates plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences in reading that reflect knowledge of current theory and research about the teaching and learning of reading and that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and a variety of reading strategies.

**Element 4:** Candidates design or knowledgeably select appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about student interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes.

**Element 5:** Candidates plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language—structure, history, and conventions—to facilitate students’ comprehension and interpretation of print and non-print texts.

**Element 6:** Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials.

Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations with Conditions	Does Not Meet Expectations
<i>Candidates’ performance</i> meets the expectations described for the standard(s) with the breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanation(s) with	<i>Candidates’ performance</i> meets most of the expectations described for the standard(s) with some breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanations and with a	Program evidence <i>does not show</i> that candidates’ performance meets the Initial level expectations described in the Key Elements and Supporting Explanation.

<p>competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standard(s), Key Elements and Supporting Explanation(s). Scoring guides or rubrics generally provide qualitative distinctions between levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are disaggregated by NCTE/NCATE program standard and program, indicating that candidate performance reflects the ability to plan instruction and design assessments for reading and the study of literature to promote learning of all students through knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theory, research, and practice in ELA to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences utilizing a range of different texts and instructional</li> </ul>	<p>degree of competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standards(s), most Key Elements, and supporting explanations. Scoring guides or rubrics show some degree of alignment but do not always provide clear distinctions between levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using somewhat limited data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> may be disaggregated by standard but may not consistently indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>	<p><i>Assessment tools</i> are not aligned consistently with the Initial Standard, Key Elements and Supporting Explanation; therefore, it is not possible to generate candidate performance data related to the standard. Scoring guides or rubrics fail consistently to provide clear distinctions among levels of performance.</p> <p>Program <i>uses little or no data</i> in determining what improvements might be made in teaching and learning and to inform program planning.</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are not disaggregated by standard nor do they indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>
---	---	--

<p>strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methods to design a range of authentic assessments of reading and literature</li> <li>• The design or selection of appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction</li> <li>• Instructional design that incorporates knowledge of language to facilitate students' comprehension</li> <li>• Instructional planning that appropriately reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

**Supporting Explanation**

Today’s English language arts teachers have moved beyond teaching traditional “literature” to being responsible for the planning, teaching, and assessing of a wide range of texts (e.g., genres, periods, forms, authors, cultures, media), selecting appropriate reading assessments to inform instruction, and incorporating a knowledge of language to help their students attain high levels of comprehension. In English education programs, candidates need a breadth and depth of learning experiences to prepare them to succeed at this task.

Well-prepared candidates understand that students need opportunities to read a wide range of texts and genres and that they need to take all of their students into consideration when planning instruction. As such, candidates are able to plan instruction that provides every student with equitable access and exposure to relevant, motivating, and challenging material and instruction.

Well-prepared candidates also understand that “reading” incorporates a complex series of elements and processes (e.g., phonemic awareness, vocabulary, comprehension, semantic cues). Candidates are able to plan differentiated instruction using appropriate before, during, and after reading strategies. Relatedly, candidates plan instruction that takes into account the nature of language (i.e., different text structure, distinctive text conventions) to facilitate students’ comprehension of fiction and non-fiction.

Well-prepared candidates additionally understand that in order to plan and teach reading (of a range of texts) that they need to know their students’ backgrounds, interests, and ability levels. To gain this knowledge they are able to design and/or select a range of informal and formal measures (e.g., interest surveys, attitude surveys, fluency assessments) to provide a baseline for instruction and future assessment. Candidates understand that they will use this information to plan instruction and design authentic assessments that incorporate higher-order tasks in order to measure students’ interpretive and critical thinking abilities. Integral to this planning is recognizing when to collaborate with other content area teachers and/or incorporate materials from other disciplines (history, art, etc.).

## REFERENCES

### Element 1:

- Alvermann, D. E., Hinchman, K. A., Moore, D. W., Phelps, S. F., & Waff, D. R. (Eds.). (2006). *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents’ lives* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Anderman, E., & Maehr, M. (1994). Motivation and schooling in the middle grades. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(2), 287-309.
- Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Applebee, A. (1996). *Curriculum as conversation: Transforming traditions of teaching and learning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Beach, R., & Myers, J. (2001). *Inquiry-based English instruction: Engaging students in life and literature*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gambrell, L. B. (1996). Creating classroom cultures that foster reading motivation. *The Reading Teacher*, 50, 14-25.
- Lewison, M., Leland, C., & Harste, J. C. (2008). *Creating critical classrooms: K-8 reading and writing with an edge*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Reznitskaya, A., Anderson, R.C., Dong, T., Li, Y., Il-hee, K., & Kim, S. (2008). Learning to Think Well: Application of Argument Schema Theory to Literacy Instruction. In Collins Block, D. & Parris, S. (Eds.), *Comprehension Instruction: Research-Based Best Practices* (pp. 196-213). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Rueda, R., Velasco, A., & Lim, H. J. (2008). Comprehension Instruction for English Learners. In Collins Block, D. & Parris, S. (Eds.), *Comprehension Instruction: Research-Based Best Practices* (pp. 294-305). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Sturtevant, E. G., Boyd, F. B., Brozo, W. G., Hinchman, K. A., Moore, D. W., & Alvermann, D. E. (Eds.). (2006). *Principled practices for adolescent literacy: A framework for instruction and policy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.



Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 420 - 432.

Wilhelm, J. (1995). *You gotta be the book: Teaching engaged and reflective reading with adolescents*. New York: Teachers College Press.

### **Element 2:**

Baker, L. (2008). Metacognition in Comprehension Instruction: What We've Learned Since NRP. In Collins Block, D. & Parris, S. (Eds.), *Comprehension Instruction: Research-Based Best Practices* (pp 65-79). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Beach, R., Campano, G., Edmiston, B., & Borgmann, M. (2010). *Literacy tools in the classroom: Teaching through critical inquiry, grades 5-12*. New York and Berkeley, CA: Teachers College Press and the National Writing Project.

Corcoran, C., Dershimer, E., & Tichenor, M. (2004). A teacher's guide to alternative assessment: Taking the first steps. *The Clearing House*, 77(5), 213-216.

Friese, E., Alvermann, D., Parkes, A., & Rezak, A. (2008). Selecting texts for English language arts classrooms: When assessment is not enough. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique* 7(3), 74-99.

Honig, B., Diamond, L., & Gutlohn, L. (2008). *CORE: Teaching Reading Sourcebook*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) Novato, CA: Arena Press.

International Reading Association. (2009). Standards for the assessment of reading and writing (revised). Retrieved December 10, 2009, from <http://www.reading.org/General/CurrentResearch/Stnadards/AssessmentStandards.aspx>.

Johnston, P., & Costello, P. (2005). Principles for literacy assessment. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 4(2), 256-267.

Lee, C. (1998). Culturally responsive teaching and performance-based assessment. *Journal of Negro Education*, 67(3), 268-279.

Linn, R., Baker, E., & Dunbar, S. (1991). Complex, performance-based assessment: Expectations and validation criteria. *Educational Researcher*, 20, 15-21.

Ohanian, S. (2009). On assessment, accountability, and other things that go bump in the night. *Language Arts*, 86(5), 371-381

Sarroub, L., & Pearson, P. D. (1998). Two steps forward, three steps back: The stormy history of reading comprehension assessment. *The Clearing House*, 72(2), 97-105.

Thompson, M. (2008). Transforming Classroom Instruction to Improve the Comprehension of Fictional Texts. In Collins Block, D. & Parris, S. (Eds.), *Comprehension Instruction: Research-Based Best Practices* (pp159-170). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Thomas, S., & Oldfather, P. (1997). Intrinsic motivations, literacy, and assessment practices: "That's my grade. That's me." *Educational Psychologist*, 32(2), 107-123.

### **Element 3:**

Almasi, J. (2003). *Teaching Strategic Processes in Reading*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (2000). Literacy practices. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 7-15). New York: Routledge.
- Beach, R., Appleman, D., Hynds, S., & Wilhelm, J. (2011). *Teaching literature to adolescents* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Beers, K. (2003). *When kids can't read: What teachers can do*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Blau, S. (2003). *The literature workshop*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Guthrie, J., Perencevich, K., Wigfield, A., Taboada, A., Humenick, N., & Barbosa, P. (2006). Influences of stimulating tasks on reading motivation and comprehension. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 232-245.
- Hall, L. A., Burns, L. D., & Edwards, E. C. (2010). *Empowering struggling readers: Practices for the middle school*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Hinchman, K. A., & Sheridan-Thomas, H. K. (Eds.). (2008). *Best practices in adolescent literacy instruction*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Jago, C. (2003). *The Call of the Wild: Using the elements of literature for comprehension*. *Voices From the Middle*, 11(1), 64-65.
- Kieffer, M.J., & Leasux, N.K. (2007). Breaking down words to build meaning: Morphology, Vocabulary, and reading comprehension in the urban classroom. *Reading Teacher*, 61(2), 134-144.
- Langer, J. (2011). *Envisioning literature: Literary understanding and literature instruction* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Scherff, L. (2010). Using young adult literature to promote comprehension with struggling readers. In L. A. Hall, L. D. Burns, & E. C. Edwards, *Empowering struggling readers: Practices for the middle school* (pp. 99-116). New York: Guilford Press.
- Schunk, D. H., & Rice, J. M. (1993). Strategy fading and progress feedback: Effects on self-efficacy and comprehension among students receiving remedial reading services. *The Journal of Special Education*, 27(3), 257-276.
- Schwartz, R. (1997). Self-monitoring in beginning reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 51(1), pp 40-48.
- Tracey, D. H., & Morrow, L. M. (2006). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models*. New York: Guilford Press.

#### **Element 4:**

- Beers, K. (2003). *When kids can't read: What teachers can do*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Duffy, G. (2009). *Explaining Reading: A Resource for Teaching Concepts, Skills, and Strategies*. New York, New York: Guilford Press.
- Guthrie, J., & Alao, S. (1997). Designing contexts to increase motivation for reading. *Educational Psychologist*, 32, 95-107.
- Guthrie, J. T., Alao, S., & Rinehart, J. (1997). Engagement for young adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 40(6), 438-446.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2001). "Engagement and Motivation in Reading" In

- Kamil, M. L. et al., (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research, volume 3*, (pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Guthrie, J., & Davis, M. (2003). Motivating struggling readers in middle school through an engagement model of classroom practice. *Reading Research Quality, 19*, 59-85.
- Guthrie, J., Perencevich, K., Wigfield, A., Taboada, A., Humenick, N., & Barbosa, P. (2006). Influences of stimulating tasks on reading motivation and comprehension. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99*(4), 232-245.
- Guthrie, J. T., McRae, A., & Klauda, S. L. (2007). Contributions of concept-oriented reading instruction to knowledge about interventions for motivations in reading. *Educational Psychologist, 42*(4), 237-250.
- Guthrie, J., Coddington, C., & Wigfield, A. (2009). Profiles of reading motivation among African American and Caucasian students. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41*(3), 317-353.
- Honig, B., Diamond, L., & Gutlohn, L. (2008). *CORE: Teaching Reading Sourcebook*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) Novato, CA: Arena Press.
- Johnston, P., & Costello, P. (2005). Principles for literacy assessment. *Reading Research Quarterly, 4*(2), 256-267.
- Kamil, M.L., Borman, G.D., Dole, J., Kral, C.C., Salinger, T., & Torgesen, J. (2008). *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices: A Practice Guide* (NCEE #2008-4027). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/adlit\\_pg\\_082608.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/adlit_pg_082608.pdf)
- Schiefele, U. (1996). Topic interest, text representation, and quality of experience. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 21*, 3-18.
- Schraw, G. (1997). Situational interest in literary text. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 22*(4), 436-456.
- Vacca, R. T., & Vacca, J. L. (2008). *Content area reading: Literacy and learning across the curriculum* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Pearson. ISBN: 0205568823.

**Element 5:**

- Beck, I. L. (2006). *Making sense of phonics: The hows and whys*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Biancarosa, G. & Snow, C. E. (2006). *Reading Next -- A Vision for Action and Research in Middle and High School Literacy: A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Harvey, S. & Goudvis, A. (2007). *Strategies That Work: Teaching Comprehension for Understanding and Engagement*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Honig, B., Diamond, L., & Gutlohn, L. (2008). *CORE: Teaching Reading Sourcebook*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) Novato, CA: Arena Press.
- Leu, D.J., Coiro, J., Castek, J., Hartman, D., Henry, L.A., & Reinking, D. (2008). Research on Instruction and Assessment in the New Literacies of Online Reading Comprehension. In Collins Block, D. & Parris, S. (Eds.), *Comprehension Instruction: Research-Based Best Practices* (pp 321-346). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Shanahan, T. & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching Disciplinary Literacy to Adolescents: Rethinking Content-Area Literacy. *The Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), pp 40-59.
- Torgesen, J.K. & Mathes, P.G. (1998). *What every teacher should know about phonological awareness*. Florida Department of Education.
- Torgesen, J.K., Miller, D.H., Rissman, L.M., Decker, S.M., Roberts, G., Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., Francis, D.J., Rivera, M.O., & Lesaux, N. (2007). *Academic Literacy Instruction for adolescents: A guidance document from the Center on Instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.
- Element 6:**
- Allen, J. (2004). *Tools for teaching content literacy*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Applebee, A. N. (2002). Engaging students in the disciplines of English: What are Effective schools doing? *English Journal*, 91(6), 30-36.
- Berlin, J. (2003). *Rhetoric, poetics, and cultures: Refiguring English studies*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- Daniels, H., & Zemelman, S. (2004). *Subjects matter: Every teacher's guide to content-area reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hillocks, G. (1995). *Teaching writing as reflective practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kane, S. (2011). *Literacy and Learning in the Content Areas (3<sup>rd</sup> ed)*. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway, Publishers, Inc.
- Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 96-107.
- Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (1991). Instructional discourse, student engagement, and literature achievement. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 25(3), 261-290.
- Shanahan, T. & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching Disciplinary Literacy to Adolescents: Rethinking Content-Area Literacy. *The Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), pp 40-59.
- Shanahan, C., Shanahan, T., & Misichia, C. (2011). Analysis of expert readers in three disciplines: History, mathematics, and chemistry. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43(4), 393-429.
- Small, R. C., & Strzeppek, J. E. (1988). *A casebook for English teachers: Dilemmas and decisions*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Vacca, R. T., & Vacca, J. L. (2008). *Content area reading: Literacy and learning across the curriculum (9<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. Boston: Pearson.

***Content Pedagogy: Planning Writing and Composition Instruction in ELA***

**Standard IV:** Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for composing texts (i.e., oral, written, and visual) to promote learning for all students.

**Element 1:** Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant composing experiences that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and contemporary technologies and reflect an understanding of writing processes and strategies in different genres for a variety of purposes and audiences.

**Element 2:** Candidates design a range of assessments for students that promote their development as writers, are appropriate to the writing task, and are consistent with current research and theory. Candidates are able to respond to student writing in process and to finished texts in ways that engage students’ ideas and encourage their growth as writers over time.

**Element 3:** Candidates design instruction related to the strategic use of language conventions (grammar, usage, and mechanics) in the context of students’ writing for different audiences, purposes, and modalities.

**Element 4:** Candidates design instruction that incorporates students’ home and community languages to enable skillful control over their rhetorical choices and language practices for a variety of audiences and purposes.

Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations with Conditions	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p><i>Candidates’ performance</i> meets the expectations described for the standard(s) with the breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanation(s) with competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standard(s), Key Elements and Supporting</p>	<p><i>Candidates’ performance</i> meets most of the expectations described for the standard(s) with some breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanations and with a degree of competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standards(s), most Key Elements, and supporting</p>	<p>Program evidence <i>does not show</i> that candidates’ performance meets the Initial level expectations described in the Key Elements and Supporting Explanation.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are not aligned consistently with the Initial Standard, Key Elements and Supporting Explanation; therefore, it is not possible to generate candidate performance data related to the standard. Scoring guides or rubrics fail consistently</p>

<p>Explanation(s). Scoring guides or rubrics generally provide qualitative distinctions between levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are disaggregated by NCTE/NCATE program standard and program, indicating that candidate performance reflects the ability to plan instruction and design assessments for composing texts through knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theory, research and practice in ELA to plan standards-based, coherent, and relevant composing experiences</li> <li>• Processes for designing a range of assessments and approaches to responding to student writers</li> <li>• Instructional design related to the strategic use of language conventions in the context of student writing</li> </ul>	<p>explanations. Scoring guides or rubrics show some degree of alignment but do not always provide clear distinctions between levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using somewhat limited data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> may be disaggregated by standard but may not consistently indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>	<p>to provide clear distinctions among levels of performance.</p> <p>Program <i>uses little or no data</i> in determining what improvements might be made in teaching and learning and to inform program planning.</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are not disaggregated by standard nor do they indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>
--	--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional design incorporating students' home and community languages in the context of various audiences and purposes</li> </ul>		
--	--	--

**Supporting Explanation**

The field of English Education is grounded in a large body of knowledge concerning effective pedagogical strategies for the teaching of composition based on empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and the wisdom of practice. These strategies are consistent with several prevailing principles: writing is a recursive process; writing may be individual or collaborative; writing processes are dependent upon context, purpose and audience; writing is dependent upon substantive feedback; writing assessments should be authentic and context dependent; writing demands attention to accepted language conventions, and contemporary technologies affect composition processes by broadening the methods and means of composing.

Well-prepared candidates understand that writing is a recursive process and it should be taught as such. The traditional stages in the writing process of invention, drafting, revising and editing are essential to composition pedagogy; it is also essential that ELA candidates understand these stages as fluid and dependent upon context and purpose.

Well-prepared ELA candidates also understand various approaches to the writing process, both individual and collaborative, that are rhetorically based and dependent upon context, purpose, and audience. The context of the writing act, such as individual student and classroom needs and requirements, media used for composing, specific assignment guidelines and reasons for composing, affect how candidates plan instruction and assess student compositions. Candidates understand that authentic contexts for composing should be supplied whenever possible. Candidates understand the importance of learning language conventions for textual clarity and view such conventions as dependent upon the rhetorical situation.

Finally, ELA candidates demonstrate their ability to supply task-specific, encouraging feedback to student writers to improve their composing skills;

additionally, candidates are invested in helping student writers give effective peer feedback and self-assess.

## **REFERENCES**

### **Element 1:**

- Christensen, L. (2000). *Reading, writing, and rising up: Teaching about social justice and the power of the written word*. Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators, the National Council of Teachers of English, & the National Writing Project. (2011). *Framework for success in postsecondary writing*.
- Culham, R. (2003). *6+1 traits of writing: The complete guide grades 3 and up*. New York: Scholastic.
- Gallagher, K. (2006). *Teaching adolescent writers*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Graham, S. & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing Next: Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools --A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Hillocks, G (1995). *Teaching Writing as Reflective Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lindemann, E. (1987). *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Newkirk, T., & Kent, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Teaching the neglected "R": Rethinking writing instruction in secondary classrooms*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Rozema, R., & Webb, A. (2008). *Literature and the web: Reading and responding with new technologies*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Snyder, I. & Bulfin, S. (2008). Using new media in secondary English class. In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C. Lankshear, & D. Leu (Eds.), *Handbook of research on new literacies* pp. 297-324). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Stephens, L. C., & Ballast, K. H. (2011). *Using technology to improve adolescent writing: Digital make-overs for writing lessons*. Boston: Pearson.
- Traig, J. (Ed.). (2005). *Don't forget to write: 54 enthralling and effective writing lessons for students 6-18*. San Francisco: 826 Valencia.
- Writing Study Group of the NCTE Executive Committee. (2004, November). NCTE beliefs about the teaching of writing*. Urbana, IL: NCTE. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/writingbeliefs>.

### **Element 2:**

- Elbow, P. (2000). *Everyone can write: Essays toward a hopeful theory of writing and teaching writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Graham, S. & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing Next: Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools --A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Hillocks, G (1995). *Teaching Writing as Reflective Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Romano, T. (1995). *Writing with passion: Life stories, multiple genres*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.



- Romano, T. (2000). *Blending genre, altering style*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Ruth, L., & Murphy, S. (1988). *Designing writing tasks for the assessment of writing*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Swenson, J., Rozema, R., Young, C. A., McGrail, E., & Whitin, P. (2005). Beliefs about technology and the preparation of English teachers: Beginning the conversation. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education* [Online serial], 5(3/4). Available: <http://www.citejournal.org/vol5/iss3/languagearts/article1.cfm>.

**Element 3:**

- Gallagher, K. (2006). *Teaching adolescent writers*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Hillocks, G (1995). *Teaching Writing as Reflective Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lattimer, H. (2003). *Thinking through genre: Units of study in reading and writing workshops 4-12*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Milner, J. O., & Milner, L. F. M. (2003). *Bridging English* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Newkirk, T., & Kent, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Teaching the neglected "R": Rethinking writing instruction in secondary classrooms*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Romano, T. (2000). *Blending genre, altering style*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

**Element 4:**

- Conference on College Composition and Communication (1974/2003). Students' Right to Their Own Language. Downloaded October 8, 2009 from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CCCC/NewSRTOL.pdf>.
- Fecho, B. (2004). *Is this English? Race, language, and culture in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31, 132 - 141.
- Moje, E., Ciechanowski, K.M., Kramer, L., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and Discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(1), 38-70.
- Risko, V., & Walker-Dalhouse, D. (2007). Tapping students' cultural funds of knowledge to address the achievement gap. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(1), 98-100.
- Smitherman, G., & Villanueva, V. (Eds.) (2003). *Language diversity in the classroom: From intention to practice*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.
- Tatum, A. (2008a). Toward a more anatomically complete model of literacy instruction: A focus on African American male adolescents and texts. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 155-180.
- Tatum, A. (2008b). Discussing texts with adolescents in culturally responsive ways. In K. Hinchman and H. Sheridan-Thomas (Eds.) *Best practices in adolescent literacy*, 3-19. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Zuidema, L. A. (2005). Myth education: Rationale and strategies for teaching against linguistic prejudice. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(8), 666-75.

***Learners and Learning: Implementing English Language Arts Instruction***

**Standard V:** Candidates plan, implement, assess, and reflect on research-based instruction that increases motivation and active student engagement, builds sustained learning of English language arts, and responds to diverse students’ context-based needs.

**Element 1:** Candidates plan and implement instruction based on ELA curricular requirements and standards, school and community contexts, and knowledge about students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

**Element 2:** Candidates use data about their students’ individual differences, identities, and funds of knowledge for literacy learning to create inclusive learning environments that contextualize curriculum and instruction and help all students participate actively in their own learning in ELA.

**Element 3:** Candidates differentiate instruction based on students’ self-assessments and formal and informal assessments of learning in English language arts; candidates communicate with students about their performance in ways that actively involve them in their own learning.

**Element 4:** Candidates select, create, and use a variety of instructional strategies and teaching resources, including contemporary technologies and digital media, consistent with what is currently known about student learning in English Language Arts.

Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations with Conditions	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p><i>Candidates’ performance</i> meets the expectations described for the standard(s) with the breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanation(s) with competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standard(s), Key Elements</p>	<p><i>Candidates’ performance</i> meets most of the expectations described for the standard(s) with some breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanations and with a degree of competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standards(s), most Key</p>	<p>Program evidence <i>does not show</i> that candidates’ performance meets the Initial level expectations described in the Key Elements and Supporting Explanation.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are not aligned consistently with the Initial Standard, Key Elements and Supporting Explanation; therefore, it is not possible to generate candidate performance data related to the standard. Scoring guides</p>

<p>and Supporting Explanation(s). Scoring guides or rubrics generally provide qualitative distinctions between levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are disaggregated by NCTE/NCATE program standard and program, indicating that candidate performance reflects the ability to plan and implement research-based instruction that increases active student engagement and motivation, builds sustained learning of ELA and responds to student's diverse needs through knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence-, context- and standards-based instructional planning in ELA</li> <li>• How to understand student difference and diversity to create inclusive learning environments</li> <li>• Strategies for differentiating instruction based</li> </ul>	<p>Elements, and supporting explanations. Scoring guides or rubrics show some degree of alignment but do not always provide clear distinctions between levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using somewhat limited data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> may be disaggregated by standard but may not consistently indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>	<p>or rubrics fail consistently to provide clear distinctions among levels of performance.</p> <p>Program <i>uses little or no data</i> in determining what improvements might be made in teaching and learning and to inform program planning.</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are not disaggregated by standard nor do they indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>
---	---	--

<p>on assessment data and methods for effectively communicating with students about their performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selecting, creating and using a variety of strategies and resources, including contemporary technologies</li> </ul>		
--	--	--

**Supporting Explanation**

The focus on students’ learning of the English language arts has an important history in the field. Since the Dartmouth Conference in 1966, the focus of teaching the English language arts has shifted from transmitting to students information about writing and literature to a focus on students’ experiences and how these experiences are shaped by language, particularly through their encounters with, and their composing of, texts. Since 1966 much has changed in our definitions of the field, but the focus on students, student-centered learning and the needs of learners, has only deepened. While English language arts candidates plan and implement instruction based on local, state, and national curriculum standards, they are able to position literary as well as other texts into the life experiences of students, and they invite students to compose texts within ongoing conversations. This positioning of texts requires that candidates understand the rich linguistic and cultural backgrounds that students bring to the classroom, language practices abundant in communicative potential and underpinned by funds of knowledge from the students’ homes and cultures. Candidates are able to situate texts so that students from various backgrounds can gain access to them, and students can compose texts to engage personally with communities they value as well as engage publicly in civic and academic life. Candidates’ understanding of their students enables them to see their students as active knowers, whose language practices enrich the classroom environment. They know that their students’ learning is connected to the language practices they bring to the classroom and the home environments from which they come. Candidates build on this knowledge base, expanding students’ capacities to be active readers and writers, finding ideas that they want to write about and inquire into as well as texts, both literary and nonliterary, that they see as purposeful in their lives.

Candidates engage students in active learning in the classroom. Students compose and engage with texts through reading to understand the world around them, to

explore ideas through inquiry, and to evaluate and critically analyze those texts.

Students are immersed in the processes of reading and writing, using these processes to deepen their learning and develop their capacities as writers and readers. English language arts candidates provide students opportunities to read and write about ideas that matter to them, as candidates continually challenge students to take up more complex texts and to write to a variety of audiences for differing purposes. Students are constantly learning more about who they are and how their ideas are positioned within different and larger conversations. The English language arts classroom, therefore, is a site for students to explore a wide range of literary texts that contribute to dominant cultural narratives as well as those that resist those narratives in order to see how cultural identities are constantly being remade and stories rewritten.

ELA candidates differentiate instruction so that all students have access to texts of various kinds and compose texts to varieties of audiences for differing purposes. Instruction is based on various formal and informal assessments of students, both candidates' assessments and students' self-assessments. Candidates are constantly observant of students' interactions in class, their writing-to-learn as well as revised and edited work, noticing how students are engaging with complex ideas and using other's ideas in service of their own. They use this knowledge to plan instruction and situate their practices so that all students are supported and challenged to continue developing as readers and writers. ELA candidates work with students to understand how meaningful self-assessment stem from an understanding of various ways valuing systems so that students are learning different ways of valuing texts, understanding their evolving development as readers and writers, their engagement with texts (how they like some texts and not others and how that valuing may change over time). Candidates communicate often with their students about the valuing of their work, particularly how values differ depending on contexts and audiences, how valuing is social, historical, and contingent, and how texts might be understood and valued highly in one context and the same text might be misunderstood or not seen as interesting in another. The aim of assessment is for students to develop a complex understanding of how text circulate and are valued, and to see their own contributions as writers as part of this complex systems of valuing.

Candidates also select, create, and use a variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners. Candidates have a large repertoire of approaches grounded in research. Candidates know that for students to develop as readers, they need to be reading; and for students to develop as writers and composers in traditional and new media, they need to be writing and composing, and writing and composing texts that are communicated to and read by real people. They are aware of, and know how to gain access to, many teaching resources, particularly by using contemporary digital technologies that give students and candidates access to academic conversations, literary and informational texts, and critical engagements of these texts. Digital technologies are part of candidates' practices because they offer candidates and students access and entry into ongoing authentic personal,

civic, and scholarly conversations and the possibility to compose texts that matter in those conversations.

## REFERENCES

### Element 1:

- Hudson, R. F., High, L., & Al Otaiba, S. (2007). Dyslexia and the brain: What does current research tell us? *The Reading Teacher*, 60(6), 506-515.
- Marzano, R. (2004). *Building Background Knowledge for Academic Achievement: Research on What Works in Schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31, 132 - 141.
- Moje, E., Ciechanowski, K.M., Kramer, L., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and Discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(1), 38-70.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2002). *Early and Middle Childhood Literacy: Reading – Language Arts*.
- Risko, V., & Walker-Dalhouse, D. (2007). Tapping students' cultural funds of knowledge to address the achievement gap. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(1), 98–100.
- Smagorinsky, P. (2008). *Teaching English by design: How to create and carry out instructional units*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

### Element 2:

- Alvermann, D. E. (2001). Reading adolescents' reading identities: Looking back to see ahead. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 44, 676–690.
- Andrade, H. (2008). Self-Assessment through Rubrics. *Educational Leadership*, 65(4), pp 60-63.
- Atwell, N. (1987). Class-based writing research: Teachers learning from students. In D. Goswami & P. R. Stillman (Eds.), *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency of change* (pp. 87-94). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Caldwell, J. (2007). *Comprehension Assessment: A Classroom Guide*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Carter, P. (2006). Straddling boundaries: Identity, culture, and school. *Sociology of Education*, 79, 304-329.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clay, M. (1993). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Corte, J. E. & Levine, C. G. (2002). *Identity formation, agency, and culture*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Danielewicz, J. (2001). *Teaching Selves: identity, Pedagogy, and Teacher Education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Egan-Robertson, A. (1998). Learning about culture, language, and power:

- Understanding relationships among personhood, literacy practices, and intertextuality. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 30, 449–487.
- Gee, J. P. (2000-2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education, *Review of Research in Education* 25, 99-125.
- Guthrie, J., & Alao, S. (1997). Designing contexts to increase motivation for reading. *Educational Psychologist*, 32, 95-107.
- Guthrie, J. T., Alao, S., & Rinehart, J. (1997). Engagement for young adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 40(6), 438-446.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2001). "Engagement and Motivation in Reading" In Kamil, M. L. et al., (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research*, volume 3, (pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 465–491.
- Lee, C. (1998). Culturally responsive teaching and performance-based assessment. *Journal of Negro Education*, 67(3), 268-279.
- Palincsar, A. S. (1986). Metacognitive strategy instruction. *Exceptional Children*, 53, 118-24.
- Rex, L. A. (Ed.). (2006). *Discourse of opportunity: How talk in learning situations creates and constrains*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Steineke, N. (2002). *Reading & writing together: Collaborative literacy in action*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Sweet, A., Guthrie, J.T., & Ng, M. (1998). Teachers' perceptions and students' reading motivations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 210 - 223.
- Wilhelm, J. D. (2007). *Engaging readers & writers with inquiry: Promoting deep understandings in language arts and the content areas with guiding questions*. New York: Scholastic.
- Wortham, S. (2004). The interdependence of social identification and learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41, 715-750.
- Wortham, S. (2006). *Learning identity: The joint emergence of social identification and academic learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zweirs, J., & Crawford, M. (2011). *Academic conversations: Classroom talk that fosters critical thinking and content understandings*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Element 3:**
- Cushman, K. (2003). *Fires in the bathroom: Advice for teachers from high school students*. New York: New Press.
- Gambrell, L.B., Palmer, B.M., Codling, R.M., & Mazzone, S.A. (1996). Assessing motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher*, 49, 518-533.
- FitzPatrick, D. (2008). Constructing complexity: Using reading levels to differentiate reading comprehension activities. *English Journal*, 98(2), 57-63.
- Groenke, S., & Scherff, L. (2010). *Teaching ya lit through differentiated instruction*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2001). "Just plain reading:" A survey of what makes

- students want to read in middle school classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36(4), 350–377.
- King-Shaver, B., & Hunter, A. (2003). *Differentiated instruction in the English classroom: Content, product, process, and assessment*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Schmitt, M. C. (1990). A questionnaire to measure children's awareness of strategic reading processes. *The Reading Teacher*, 43, 454–461.
- Tomlinson, C. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Element 4:**
- Hagood, M. C., Alvermann, D. E., & Heron-Hruby, A. (2010). *Bring it to class: Unpacking pop culture in literacy learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kajder, S. (2006). *Bringing the outside in: Visual ways to engage struggling readers*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Langer, J. A. (2011). *Envisioning literature: Literary understanding and literature instruction* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2003). *New literacies*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- National Council of Teachers of English (2008). 21st century literacies: A research policy brief. Retrieved from <http://www1.ncte.org/store/books/tech/128510.htm>.
- Ragsdale, D. A., & Smagorinsky, P. (2011). The role of play and small group work in activity-based instruction. In T. M. McCann, L. R. Johannessen, E. A. Kahn, P. Smaogorinsky, & M. W. Smith (Eds.), *Reflective teaching, reflective learning: How to develop critically engaged readers, writers, and speakers* (pp. 83-98). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Rozema, R., & Webb, A. (2008). *Literature and the web: Reading and responding with new technologies*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Sheridan-Thomas, H. (2007). Making sense of multiple literacies: Exploring preservice content area teachers' understandings and applications. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 46(2), 121-150.
- Snyder, I. & Bulfin, S. (2008). Using new media in secondary English class. In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C. Lankshear, & D. Leu (Eds.), *Handbook of research on new literacies* (pp. 297-324). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.



***Professional Knowledge and Skills***

**Standard VI:** Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how theories and research about social justice, diversity, equity, student identities, and schools as institutions can enhance students’ opportunities to learn in English Language Arts.

**Element 1:** Candidates plan and implement English language arts and literacy instruction that promotes social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society.

**Element 2:** Candidates use knowledge of theories and research to plan instruction responsive to students’ local, national and international histories, individual identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender expression, age, appearance, ability, spiritual belief, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and community environment), and languages/dialects as they affect students’ opportunities to learn in ELA.

Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations with Conditions	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p><i>Candidates’ performance</i> meets the expectations described for the standard(s) with the breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanation(s) with competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standard(s), Key Elements and Supporting Explanation(s). Scoring guides or rubrics generally provide qualitative distinctions between levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using data</i> to improve teaching and</p>	<p><i>Candidates’ performance</i> meets most of the expectations described for the standard(s) with some breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanations and with a degree of competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standards(s), most Key Elements, and supporting explanations. Scoring guides or rubrics show some degree of alignment but do not always provide clear distinctions between levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using somewhat limited data</i> to</p>	<p>Program evidence <i>does not show</i> that candidates’ performance meets the Initial level expectations described in the Key Elements and Supporting Explanation.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are not aligned consistently with the Initial Standard, Key Elements and Supporting Explanation; therefore, it is not possible to generate candidate performance data related to the standard. Scoring guides or rubrics fail consistently to provide clear distinctions among levels of performance.</p> <p>Program <i>uses little or no data</i> in determining what improvements might be made in teaching and learning and to inform</p>

<p>learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are disaggregated by NCTE/NCATE program standard and program, indicating that candidate performance reflects that reflects an awareness of theories and research about social justice, diversity, equity, student identities, and schools as institutions through knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theory and research in social justice, equity, and diversity and practice in ELA to plan standards-based, coherent, and relevant composing experiences</li> <li>• Processes for designing a range of assessments and approaches to responding to student writers</li> <li>• Instructional design related to the strategic use of language conventions in the context of student writing</li> <li>• Instructional design</li> </ul>	<p>improve teaching and learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> may be disaggregated by standard but may not consistently indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>	<p>program planning.</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are not disaggregated by standard nor do they indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>
--	--	---

incorporating students' home and community languages in the context of various audiences and purposes		
---	--	--

**Supporting Explanation**

Both NCATE and the National Council of Teachers of English alike have consistently supported policies related to the concept of supporting diversity in public schools, and particularly ensuring that teacher education programs produce teachers who believe that all students are capable of learning at high levels. Further, both organizations have historically supported the policy and ethical disposition that professional educators are responsible for making sure that all children are provided the kinds of support, resources, curriculum, and instruction they need in order to succeed in school. However, supporting diversity and teaching for social justice are related but distinct concepts, with the latter supporting the former. Many consider supporting diversity in classrooms to be a matter of simple recognition, tolerance, and inclusion. Teaching specifically for social justice, however, involves assertions that professional teachers (and therefore teacher education programs) are responsible for not only developing but clearly demonstrating dispositions to teach in ways that are explicitly intended to help reduce and even eliminate social inequities including unequal access, unequal opportunity to learn, and social or institutional practices that are (unintentional or otherwise) unfairly biased with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, gender expression, age, appearance, ability, national/geographic origin, language/dialect use, spiritual belief, appearance [including but not limited to variance in height and/or weight], sexual orientation, social class, economic circumstance, environment, ecology, and culture.

While we recognize that NCATE itself has raised concerns about the possible use of ostensibly “social justice” pedagogies to potentially indoctrinate and even thereby discriminate against potential candidates whose ideologies may lead them to hold certain beliefs that run counter to a non-specified but particularly “liberal” approach to professional teaching, considerable research now exists that clearly demonstrates how teaching for social justice is not merely a particular or partisan moral argument related to education. Rather, teaching for social justice in English language arts classrooms is clearly supportive of curriculum designs and instructional practices based on a significant body of both qualitative and quantitative scientific research. These approaches may be collectively referred to as “responsive” methods for teaching English language arts and literacy in contemporary society, and include theories and research studies related to Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, linguistic research affirming not only students’ right to their own language but the necessity of that language for use in increasing and accelerating language arts learning, Funds

of Knowledge research, Third Space pedagogies, and studies that demonstrate the ways in which achievement outcomes are almost perfectly correlated with access, opportunity, race, social class, and other factors listed above.

Designing teacher education programs to ensure candidates graduate with deep understandings of social justice issues and the knowledge needed to teach in ways that are socially just is emphatically necessary in order to reduce student achievement gaps and disparities in U.S. public schools. Based on consistent and long-term findings from social psychology related to the concept of Stereotype Threat (Steele, 2010), when teachers do *not* respond to diverse students—or when they respond to diverse students in ways that are negative, undifferentiated, or otherwise discriminatory—those students are found to consistently and significantly underperform compared to their peers whose identities, linguistic backgrounds, funds of knowledge, and out of school literacies are affirmed, reflected in curriculum, and actively used by teachers to contextualize core academic content and assessments.

In English language arts and literacy, teaching with social justice in mind is perhaps best illustrated in relation to research on literacy motivation and engagement. According to numerous studies over the past 25 years, certain classroom conditions are found to consistently correlate almost perfectly (.8) with increased student motivation, engagement, self-efficacy, learning, achievement, and continuing impulse to learn in English language arts and reading classrooms (Guthrie and Wigfield, 2001). These conditions include, significantly, having a teacher who is not only disposed to believe that all students are capable of learning at high levels, but also having a teacher who acts on that belief to systematically and strategically design classroom environments that provide diverse students with learning resources, explicit instruction, opportunities for practice, real-world applications, and collaborative exercises with goals that enable them to find relevance in the curricula they study and the assessments used to evaluate their learning. Given this research, teaching for social justice is not simply a moral act that reflects certain activist movements in English language arts teaching (though it *is* a moral act). Rather, teaching for social justice in English language arts classrooms is based on scientific research demonstrating that when teachers understand the nature of social diversity and how to support it in ELA classrooms, their students are more likely to engage, persist, and achieve at higher levels than those in classrooms where teachers are indisposed to use responsive curriculum and instructional methods.

Despite controversy and debate related to past discussions of teaching for social justice as an integral component of teaching and teacher education, Standard 6 is essential to research-based, principled practice in English language arts and English teacher education. And while debate continues about how teaching for social justice might be assessed for evaluation of both teacher education programs and teacher candidate performances, existing research makes such assessment quite possible. With regard to teacher candidates, for example, the research-bases associated with responsive pedagogies and psychological research related to literacy engagement

and motivation make it possible to assess candidates' performance and quality in more objective and principled ways. For example, teacher candidates can and should be assessed for their knowledge of these research-bases, for their abilities to implement associated findings and conclusions in their day-day instructional practices, and in assessments of their expectations regarding the abilities of diverse learners to succeed in English language arts. Similarly, teacher education programs can be assessed based on their inclusion of resources, field experiences, and implementation opportunities related to research about responsive pedagogies that explicitly lead to increased learning, equitable access, equal opportunity, and the explicit use of language arts teaching and scholarship to reduce and eliminate institutional, social, and even local practices that may be detrimental to NCTE's and NCATE's mutual goal of ensuring increased learning for *all* students. Given this evidence, teaching for social justice is not merely desirable as a brand of social activism in public education; rather, it is an essential aspect of teaching and teacher education that is highly practical, rooted in scientific research, and measurable in terms of outcomes for teacher, student, and school quality alike.

## REFERENCES

### Element 1:

- Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Beers, K. (2010). The 2009 NCTE presidential address: Sailing over the edge: Navigating the uncharted waters of a world gone flat. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 44(3), 340-352.
- Christensen, L. (2000). *Reading, writing, and rising up: Teaching about social justice and the power of the written word*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.
- Christensen, L. (2008). Creating critical classrooms—Reading and writing with an edge. In M. Lewison, C. Leland, & J. C. Harste, *Creating critical classrooms: K-8 reading and writing with an edge* (pp. xi-xiii). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Christensen, L. (2009). *Teaching for joy and justice: Re-imagining the language arts classroom*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Uncertain allies: Understanding the boundaries of race and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65, p. 541-569.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2000). Blind vision: Unlearning racism in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70, 157-190.
- Cusick, Phillip. *The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School*, New York, 1983.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58 (3), pp. 280-298.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Fecho, B. (2004). *Is this English? Race, language, and culture in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

- Jackson, P. (1968/1990). *Life in classrooms*. (Reprint edition, with new introduction). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power*. New York: Routledge.
- Kroeger, D. (2008). Thoughts on narrowing the policy-practice gap: Literacy teachers as critical bureaucrats. *Journal of Reading Education, 34*(1), 46-50.
- Mathieson, M. (1975). *The preachers of culture: A study of English and its teachers*. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- McLeod, J. (1995). *Ain't no makin' it: Aspirations and attainment in a low income neighborhood*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- McNeil, L. M. (1986). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Miller, S. (1991). *Textual carnivals: The politics of composition*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Morrell, E. (2008). *Critical literacy and urban youth: Pedagogies of access, dissent, and liberation*. New York: Routledge.
- New London Group (2000). *Multiliteracies: literacy learning and the design of social futures*, B. Cope and M. Kalantzis (Eds.). New York: Routledge.
- Noguera, P. A. (2008). *The trouble with black boys and other reflections on race, equity, and the future of public education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scherff, L., & Piazza, L. (2008). Why now, more than ever, we need to talk about opportunity to learn. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(4), 343-352.
- Element 2:**
- Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11*(1), pp. 3-42.
- Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto schooling : a political economy of urban educational reform*. New York : Teachers College Press.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. New York: Routledge.
- Conference on English Education. (2009, December). Beliefs about social justice in English education. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/cee/positions/socialjustice>.
- Chubb, J. E. & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children*. New York: The New Press.
- Delpit, L., & Dowdy, J. (2002). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Freedman, S. W., Delp, V., & Crawford, S. M. (2005). Teaching English in untracked classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English, 40*(1), 62-126.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*, 465-491.
- Miller, s., Williamson, P., George, M., King, J., Charest, B., Bieler, D., & Bolf-Beliveau, L. (2011). Applying the CEE position statement Beliefs about Social Justice in English education to classroom praxis. *English Education, 44*, 63-82.
- Moss, P. A., Gee, J. P., Haertel, E. H., & Young, L. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Assessment, equity, and opportunity to learn*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smitherman, G., & Villanueva, V. (Eds.) (2003). *Language diversity in the classroom:*

**Professional Knowledge and Skills**

**Standard VII:** Candidates are prepared to interact knowledgeably with students, families, and colleagues based on social needs and institutional roles, engage in leadership and/or collaborative roles in English Language Arts professional learning communities, and actively develop as professional educators.

**Element 1:** Candidates model literate and ethical practices in ELA teaching, and engage in/reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA.

**Element 2:** Candidates engage in and reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA that demonstrate understanding of and readiness for leadership, collaboration, ongoing professional development, and community engagement.

Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations with Conditions	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p><i>Candidates' performance</i> meets the expectations described for the standard(s) with the breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanation(s) with competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standard(s), Key Elements and Supporting Explanation(s). Scoring guides or rubrics generally provide qualitative distinctions between levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using data</i> to improve teaching and learning and to inform</p>	<p><i>Candidates' performance</i> meets most of the expectations described for the standard(s) with some breadth and depth indicated in the key elements and supporting explanations and with a degree of competence appropriate for an Initial, beginning teacher of English language arts.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are aligned with the appropriate Initial Standards(s), most Key Elements, and supporting explanations. Scoring guides or rubrics show some degree of alignment but do not always provide clear distinctions between levels of performance.</p> <p>Program is <i>using somewhat limited data</i> to improve teaching and</p>	<p>Program evidence <i>does not show</i> that candidates' performance meets the Initial level expectations described in the Key Elements and Supporting Explanation.</p> <p><i>Assessment tools</i> are not aligned consistently with the Initial Standard, Key Elements and Supporting Explanation; therefore, it is not possible to generate candidate performance data related to the standard. Scoring guides or rubrics fail consistently to provide clear distinctions among levels of performance.</p> <p>Program <i>uses little or no data</i> in determining what improvements might be made in teaching and learning and to inform program planning.</p>

<p>program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> are disaggregated by NCTE/NCATE program standard and program, indicating that candidate performance reflects preparation to interact knowledgeably with students, family, and colleagues; engage in professional learning communities; and actively develop as professional educators through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modeling literate and ethical practices in ELA</li> <li>• engaging in and reflecting on a variety of experiences related to ELA that demonstrate understanding of and readiness for leadership, collaboration, ongoing professional development, and community engagement.</li> </ul>	<p>learning and to inform program planning</p> <p><i>Performance data</i> may be disaggregated by standard but may not consistently indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>	<p><i>Performance data</i> are not disaggregated by standard nor do they indicate candidate performance on all aspects of the standard(s).</p>
---	---	--

**Supporting Explanation**

English language arts teachers shape and reshape identities within cultural contexts through language, literature, and composition. Developing a professional identity is an ongoing process that begins in the preservice program but continues throughout a career. In English education programs, candidates need experiences that help them develop what Alsop calls “an intellectual and emotional readiness to function



in the professional role” (196). Such experiences are characterized by critical inquiry, informed action, and thoughtful reflection.

Well-prepared candidates model literate and ethical practices in English Language Arts. They understand the need to educate literate citizens for a democracy. Their English language arts planning and instruction are characterized by inquiry, critical thinking, and using language to understand and act on the self and others. They employ reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing, and representing as tools for learning not as ends in themselves. They demonstrate honesty and integrity and expect it from students. Assessment and grading practices are fair and equitable. Because education is a community concern, it is essential that candidates are prepared to interact respectfully and knowledgeably with those who influence learning in and out of school: students, colleagues, and families.

Well-prepared candidates engage in and reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA that demonstrate understanding of and readiness for leadership, collaboration, ongoing professional development, and community engagement. Whether candidates lead a campus or group or class discussions, engage in classroom-based research, collaborate on class or community projects, attend conferences, or engage in other experiences related to ELA, there is evidence of their willingness and ability to deeply consider the implications of their intentions, actions, and results.

## REFERENCES

### Element 1:

- Alsop, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. New York: SUNY.
- Cohen, D. (1990). The case of Ms. Oublier. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12(3), pp. 327-345.
- Cohen, D. K. (1988). Teaching practice: Plus ça change. In Philip W. Jackson (Ed.), *Contributing to educational change: Perspectives on research and practice* (pp. 27-84). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1990*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fecho, B. (2004). *Is this English? Race, language, and culture in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Franzak, J. K. (2002). Developing teacher identity: The impact of critical friends practice on a student teacher. *English Education*, 34, 258-280.
- Hawthorne, S., Goodwyn, A., George, M., Reid, L., & Shoffner, M. (in press). The state of English education: Considering possibilities in troubled times. *English Education*.
- Labaree, D. (1996). The trouble with ed schools. *Educational Foundations*, 10:3 (Summer), 27-45.
- Labaree, D. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over

- educational goals.  
*American Educational Research Journal*, 34(1), pp. 39-81.
- Labaree, David F. (2000). On the Nature of Teaching and Teacher Education: Difficult Practices that Look Easy." *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, p. 228-233.
- Lampert, M. & Ball, D. (1999). Aligning teacher education with contemporary k-12 reform visions. In Linda Darling-Hammond and Gary Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice*, 33-53. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lampert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach?: Perspectives on dilemmas in practice. *Harvard Educational Review*, 55, 178-194.
- Phillips, D. K., & Carr, K. (2010). *Becoming a teacher through action research: Process, context, and self-study* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Rymes, B. (2009). *Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Element 2:**
- Burns, L. (2007). A practical guide to political action: Grassroots and English teaching. *English Journal*, 96(4), 56-61.
- Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Goodman, K. (2008). Making reading curriculum by professional consensus and by legislative mandate. *Journal of Reading Education*, 34(1), 5-15.
- Groenke, S. L. (2010). Seeing, inquiring, witnessing: Using the equity audit in practitioner inquiry to rethink inequity in public schools. *English Education*, 43, 83-96.
- Kroeger, D. (2008). Thoughts on narrowing the policy-practice gap: Literacy teachers as critical bureaucrats. *Journal of Reading Education*, 34(1), 46-50.
- McCann, T. M., Johannessen, L., & Ricca, B. (2005). *Supporting beginning English teachers: Research and implications for teacher induction*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Scherff, L., & Singer, N. R. (2008) Framing and re-framing through computer-mediated communication (CMC): Providing pre-service teachers with alternate support structures. *Learning Inquiry*, 2, 151-167.
- Singer, N. R., & Zeni, J. (2004). Building bridges: Creating an online conversation community for preservice teachers. *English Education*, 37(1), 30-49.
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weaver-Hightower, M.B. (2007). An ecology metaphor for educational policy analysis: A call to complexity. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 153-167.
- Wise, B. (2007). Turning reading research into policy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(3), pp. 407-411.

### **III. Supporting Material**

#### **Information on SPA Responsibilities Under NCATE State Partnerships**

State partnership standards are reviewed by a select set of program reviewers, mainly the audit committee, who have had special training and who are highly experienced in program review. State reviews are assigned to at least one reviewer by the Program Coordinator who then serves as the auditor of the report. No state reviewer works with state standards/procedures from within his/her own state; on occasion, a reviewer may also ask to not review state standards due to other possible conflicts. All state standards are reviewed by at least one reviewer and the Program Coordinator with input for a consensus decision.

Besides having contact information for states and others on the webpage dedicated to the NCTE/NCATE Review Process, the NCTE/NCATE Program Coordinator does multiple presentations at the Annual Fall CAEP Conference and attends and participates in, along with other Program Coordinators and State Representatives, the Annual Clinic in May. Also, the Program Coordinator works closely with state representatives who provide statewide trainings for programs. Examples include Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Arkansas. If the Program Coordinator is not available, a member of the audit team or a highly experienced lead reviewer from that state provides the training.

#### **Training and Resources**

NCTE has procedures in place for the nomination of potential reviewers including a full day on site training. Twice yearly, a letter and application are sent to all members of the Council for English Education, using the NCTE “Connected Community” direct webmail process. Further, NCTE has links on the appropriate NCATE site areas that take those interested who are not NCTE/CEE members to the requirements for becoming an NCTE/NCATE Program Reviewer. All potential reviewers must be current members of both NCTE and CEE and, after training, have to agree to review at least once (two reviews) in an academic year, participate in the yearly work session (offered at NCTE Conventions and online), and sign the confidentiality agreement.

Although the yearly trainings are focused on the use of the NCTE/NCATE Program Standards for determining program recognition, another of the requirements for becoming a reviewer is recent experience in English methods coursework and supervision connected to the teaching of English language arts in secondary classrooms. These experiences provide a basis for understanding state practices, policies, and procedures beyond those that the potential reviewer has experienced in his/her own institutions and programs. There is reference to those issues as a part of the training process and afterwards within the work sessions. See attached notice of application for Spring 12 training and the following link to the program review resources: <http://www.ncte.org/cee/ncate/program>.

Descriptive information concerning program training, usually conducted as a web

seminar twice yearly at nominal cost, is made available on the NCTE/NCATE Connection webpage (linked to NCATE Resources) and blast e-mails are sent to institutional NCATE Coordinators where unit visits are scheduled for two-four years out with registration information approximately six weeks prior the actual web training. All NCATE requirements are met with these formal trainings. Also, the NCTE/NCATE Program Coordinator is available by e-mail and phone to assist program faculty and states.

Additional resources for institutions and programs writing SPA reports is available on the NCTE website at <http://www.ncte.org/cee/ncate/program>. At this URL individuals can find the standards, the Guidelines, examples of successful assessments, and other suggestions and tips for SPA report writers. Also listed on the website are all nationally recognized programs and sample program reports.

**Information on SPA Procedures for Selection, Training, and Evaluation of Program Reviewers and Representation of Diversity Within the Profession**

Selection of program reviewers is done through an application process and committee consensus. The Chair of CEE, the NCTE Program Review Coordinator, the NCTE Representative to NCATE, and the NCTE/CAEP liaison make up the selection committee. The training, both initial and on going, is provided by the NCTE Program Review Coordinator with assistance from the NCTE Representative. The audit team does periodic evaluations of reviewer proficiency under the direction of the NCTE Program Review Coordinator.

NCTE has a stated policy regarding representation of diversity within the profession. This policy provides a guide for the diversity of our program reviewers. Program reviewers represent such diverse backgrounds as Native American, Latino(a), African-American, and Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. The male, female balance is moving toward equality; as of now the percentages are approximately 40 and 60, respectively.

**SASB “Worksheet” for Review of Revised Standards**

This worksheet is attached.