

Reviewer Report Writing Document - 2011 Version (Revised for NCTE Program Reviewers)

This document was originally received and reviewed in at the 2009 NCATE Clinic, and is intended as an aid to program reviewers, auditors, and NCATE staff tech editors as a resource for language that can be used in National Recognition Reports when comments are needed. The document is for *internal use* only; information within is fluid and subject to change at any time.

None of the language within is mandated for use (although of course some of it is dependent on policy requirements). However, phrases captured may help reviewers write the report as well as get some sense of what general expectations are across SPAs.

The intention is for this reviewer guide to be a *living document*, updated after each cycle of SPA reviews. This means that anyone who uses it should feel free to add to, revise, or question anything within. Send your changes or recommendations to Margie Crutchfield or any other member of the program review staff. Margie -- in consultation with the SPA coordinator as needed -- will have the final say as to what changes are made.

Part A - Test Results

The comment section for A.2 should be limited to whether or not Assessment 1 documents the required 80% candidate pass rate on the state licensure test in the content area. It should not include comments on the evidence provided by Assessment 1 toward meeting standards.

Context	Menu of Phrases	Comments
1 80% pass rate on state content test is met	<i>no comment necessary</i>	<i>Comment optional, particularly if there are no extenuating circumstances</i>
	Passing the Praxis II is a requirement for entry to student teaching.	<i>Substitute state content test in this phrase if Praxis is not used.</i>
	Passing the Praxis II is a requirement for program completion.	<i>Substitute state content test if Praxis is not used.</i>
	The program has documented a pass rate of [≥80%] for the past three years.	<i>If fewer than 10 in most current year of data, pass rate should be based on three years of data.</i>
	The program has documented a pass rate of [≥80%] in the most current academic year.	<i>If 10 or more completers in current academic year, pass rate can be based on one year only.</i>
	Although the pass rate is not clearly documented in Assessment 1, the report states that candidates must pass the Praxis II as a requirement for [program completion / admission to student teaching].	<i>If the report includes a definitive statement in the Context section or in Assessment 1 that passing the state test is a requirement for program completion, that is sufficient to check that the pass rate is met.</i>
2 Pass rate not met	Information provided in Assessment 1 documents that the program has a pass rate of [≤80%]. The program must document an 80 percent pass rate in order to achieve full national recognition. The pass rate must be based on the most recent academic year (if there are 10 or more test-takers included in the reported test results for that year), or the past three academic years (if there are fewer than 10 test-takers in the most recent year of reported test results).	<i>Select "not met" only if pass rate is definitively not met by data provided. Pass rate is based on either one year or three years of data.</i>
3 Pass rate not applicable	Although Assessment 1 documents a [<i>strong, 100 percent</i>] pass rate, the requirement is not applicable to programs with fewer than 10 program completers over a three-year period.	
	The 80 percent pass rate requirement is not applicable to programs with fewer than 10 program completers over a three-year period.	
	No candidates have yet taken the required state licensure test.	
	The state does not require a licensure test for this program.	<i>See program selection on cover sheet (item 15). Some institutions may institute their own requirement for Praxis II, but in that case "not applicable" is still the correct choice.</i>
	The state has not yet established a passing score for the licensure test in this program.	
4 Pass rate cannot be determined	Assessment 1 does not provide test data in such a way that the pass rate can be determined.	
	The number of test-takers in the data set is not provided.	
	The state passing score is not provided.	
	Although the program indicates that the pass rate is met, no data are provided to support this statement.	

Context	Menu of Phrases	Comments
4a Multistate or distance learning campus	State licensure exam data must be provided to demonstrate that program completers who reside in the U.S. and who take a state exam in any state have an aggregate 80% pass rate (for states that require licensure exam in the content area).	

Part A - Summary of Strengths

- ▶ Although reviewers have been encouraged by NCATE and NCTE to list program strengths, it sometimes may be more appropriate to leave the section blank, rather than include gratuitous references to areas where the program simply meets basic expectations (e.g., "The program has sequenced field experiences,") Positive comments on the quality of the report itself - as opposed to the quality of the program and/or some of its assessments or other practices – are best placed in Part F of the report.
- ▶ When strengths are listed, they should not be followed by "caveats." (For example, "Most of the assessments submitted by the program have the potential to provide evidence for standards; however . . ."). On the other hand, comments that are encouraging to the program (e.g., "Although work is needed on some assessments to make them more closely aligned with the standards, the assessment system overall consists of comprehensive and challenging requirements that are well integrated to form a meaningful framework for candidate evaluation.")
- ▶ The "Summary of Strengths" should not be used for overall commentary on the program report.

Part B - Status of Meeting SPA Standards

Although SPAs use a variety of approaches to writing comments for each standard in Part B, the most common and, it seems, helpful format is to first list the assessments that are attributed to the standard in Section III, and then write a brief comment on how well each assessment addresses the standard.

Context	Menu of Phrases	Comments
5 Framing comments for standards in Part B (introductory statement)	The program indicated that Assessments [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8] provide evidence for this standard.	<p><i>No comment is necessary if the standard is met.</i></p> <p><i>Name the assessment the first time it is mentioned in Part B.</i></p> <p><i>Avoid excessive repetition of comments. If the same comment about an assessment applies to other standards, it is best to say "See comment under Standard 1 on Assessment 1."</i></p> <p><i>It is not necessary to include the decision in the comment (e.g., "Standard 6 is met.") although it is fine to do that. However, the comment should clearly support or justify the decision.</i></p>

Hypothetical example of comment in Part B for Standard 2:

introductory phrase

The program indicates that Assessments 1, 2, and 4 provide evidence for Standard 2.

Assessment 1 provides strong evidence for meeting Standard 2; the state exam is aligned to this standard, and candidate category scores are consistently high in the content area of this standard.

Assessment 2 provides some evidence for meeting Standard 2; see comments on Assessment 2 under Standard 1.

Assessment 4 (student teaching evaluation) and its scoring rubric are comprehensive and well constructed; however, the generic nature of the instrument and rubric limits its ability to provide definitive evidence that candidates perform the skills included in the standard.

The standard is met with conditions. Assessment 4 needs to be revised for closer alignment to the standard in order to demonstrate that candidates can perform the skills delineated by the standard.

Avoid cutting and pasting comments from standard to standard if the comment does not differ from one to the next.

Indicate name of assessment the first time it is mentioned in Part B (at least).

Last sentence tells the program how reviewers came to their decision and also tell program what it must do to fully meet the standard.

Inappropriate Assessments

The following comments might be used in Parts B, C, or E. when assessments in and of themselves are not appropriate and should be replaced or dropped from the program's set of 6-8 assessments.

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
6 General opening statement	The assessment is not suitable for evaluating candidates' competency related to this or other standards.	
7 General explanatory statement	Only assessments that evaluate the performance of all candidates on the same set of standards-aligned knowledge and/or skills, and are measured by means of accurate and objective scoring guides, are suitable for submission as one of the 6-8 assessments.	
8 Assessment allows options	The assessment allows candidates to choose among tasks, activities, or the subject matter for their written response; there is no assurance that all candidates will address the option that aligns to this standard.	
	The assessment is designed in such a way that there is no assurance that all candidates will be evaluated on this particular standard or element.	
9 Self-assessment	Assessment [#] is based on candidates' assessment of their own performance. While such assessments can provide useful feedback, they are not considered suitable as program report assessments, due to the inherent lack of objectivity that is characteristic of self-assessments.	
10 External survey	Surveys of graduates or employers are not suitable as one of the program report assessments, as there is no assurance that the performance of all program graduates will be captured.	
11 Assessment a cluster of assignments	The assessment as submitted consists of a group of unrelated or uncoordinated assignments. Although "clustering" of similar or unified assignments can be suitable as a means of creating a single and comprehensive program assessment, there must be a relational design that links those assignments (e.g. a series of similarly designed essays that cover a series of standards; or two course projects that are linked to the theme of the course and to one or more standards).	
12 Assessment is a course	The program submitted a description of a course and its activities as an assessment; however, without information on how candidates are evaluated on linked assignments in the course, accompanied by a standards-based scoring guide and data, this is not a suitable assessment submission.	
13 Assessment is too broad or unfocused	The assessment is too broad or unfocused to be a useful means of assessing candidate knowledge and skills at the level of specificity required by standards; generally assessments work best when they are focused on the elements of one or more related standards, as opposed to being generalized assessment of all or most standards.	
14 Assessment is duplicative	The assessment essentially evaluates the same knowledge and skills and through the same means as Assessment [#], with the only critical difference being that the candidates are evaluated at a different point in their program. The program's 6-8 assessments should consist of a series of distinct assessments that in their totality serve as a unified assessment of candidate summative knowledge and skills as articulated by standards.	<i>This comment is meant for programs that use a formative and summative version of the same assessment as two separate assessments.</i>
	The assessment evaluates the same knowledge and skills and uses the same basic assessment instrument as Assessment [#], with the only difference being that the data are derived from different evaluators; as such, it isn't suitable as an independent assessment. The program may wish to report the data from this assessment as a component of Assessment [#], or else replace this assessment.	<i>This comment is meant for programs that provide student teacher evaluation data from supervisors and from cooperating teachers as two different assessments.</i>

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
15 Duplicative (portfolio)	This portfolio-based assessment, as presented, provides data for many of the same assessments that are included in the rest of the report. Although a portfolio can be used as an assessment source, in most cases a further dimension must be added to the requirements in order to make it a distinct assessment, rather than only a repository of artifacts that reflect other key program assessments. For example, candidates might be asked to gather artifacts and provide a written defense of their competency in some or all standards.	
16 Assessment is too narrowly focused	The assessment only measures candidates on one standard or element, and thus may be too narrowly focused to be included as one of the 6-8 comprehensive assessments used by the program.	
	Although the assessment is an effective measure of Standard [##], it only evaluates candidates on a single standard or element, and thus may be too narrowly focused to be included as one of the 6-8 comprehensive assessments used by the program.	
17 Praxis III	Praxis III is not considered a suitable assessment, due to its generic nature as well as the fact that it is an induction assessment, not suitable for initial licensure.	<i>Pathwise is another version of Praxis III; neither is appropriate for initial licensure</i>
18 Praxis I (or other general knowledge test)	Praxis I is not an assessment of candidate content knowledge in their specific teaching area, and thus is not aligned to content knowledge standards for NCTE..	
19 Praxis PLT (or equivalent pedagogy test)	The Praxis PLT is a generic test of pedagogy and, except in an indirect way, does not address the specific content pedagogy reflected by the NCTE standards.	
20 Assessment is a group project	Assessments that are based and evaluated on group work are usually not suitable assessments, since the performance of individual candidates is not evaluated. Consequently, they do not provide assurance that all candidates have mastered the skill that the project is designed to assess.	

Assessment 1 issues

The following comments might be used in Parts B, C or E related to common problems with Assessment 1.

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
21 No subtest scores	Subscore data were not provided; without such data, candidate strengths and weaknesses in the subareas of the test that relate to individual standards and/or their elements cannot not be determined or used by the program for analysis.	
21a	See further information on obtaining Praxis II data, including category scores, on the NCATE website http://ncate.org/governance/PraxisIIDataStd1.asp?ch=37 or the ETS website http://www.ets.org/praxis/institutions/scores/receiving	
22 Subtest scores unclear or not analyzed	Although subtest scores were provided, no information was provided on how to interpret their meaning in terms of candidate performance in each area.	
	The analysis of data findings did not include any interpretation or analysis of subtest scores.	
23 Test not aligned to standards	Because the content area licensure test is not aligned to the NCTE standards, it provides only limited evidence of meeting this or other standards.	
25 NCTE & Praxis II	The alignment of the Praxis II exam to NCTE standards is not endorsed by NCTE.	
	Although the program has appropriately provided test data and evidence meeting the 80 percent pass rate as required by NCATE, the alignment of the Praxis II exam to NCTE standards is not endorsed by NCTE. Therefore, Assessment 1 provides only limited evidence toward meeting this or other NCTE standards.	
26 Alignment to standards not provided	The report did not include information on the alignment of the test objectives to the NCTE standards. Without this information, it is impossible for reviewers to determine whether the scores provided indicate candidate mastery of the standard.	
27 Alignment inaccurate	The alignment of test objectives to this standard is too indirect for candidate scores to be used as evidence for meeting this standard.	
28 Assessment inappropriate to standard	The state licensure exam, being a paper-and-pencil test, is an ineffective measure for this performance-based standard.	
	The state licensure exam, being a paper-and-pencil test, has no application to the performance-based aspects of this standard, and thus provides only limited evidence toward meeting the standard.	

Assessment 2 issues (Course Grades and Comprehensive Exams)

The following comments might be used in Parts B, C or E related to common problems with course grade assessments and comp exams, which are most often used for Assessment 2.

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
29 Course-grade based assessment	If grades in courses are used as an assessment, the program must follow NCATE guidelines for the construction of the assessment: http://www.ncate.org/institutions/GuidelinesGrades.asp?ch=90	
	See NCATE guidelines for the construction of an assessment based on course grades at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/GuidelinesGrades.asp?ch=90 .	<i>May want to combine this information with one or more of the comments below.</i>
	Insufficient information was provided on how course content aligns to standards.	
	No information was provided on how course grades are determined or assigned.	
	Only combined GPAs were provided. Aggregate data are needed for each course in order to determine candidate strengths and weaknesses across content areas as represented by course grades.	
	Only courses that deliver content related and aligned to the NCTE standards should be used as the basis for this assessment.	
30 Comprehensive exam related to program content	More information is needed on how exam questions are determined and scored.	
	Based on the sample provided, the exam does not appear to be an adequate instrument for evaluating candidates on the depth and breadth of standards that the exam is purported to cover.	
	The objectives of the exam, and their alignment to NCTE content standards, is not clear.	
	The choices given to candidates for essay questions do not ensure all candidates will be evaluated on their knowledge of this particular standard or element.	

Assessment narrative issues

The following comments might be used in Parts B, C or E related to common problems with the narrative section of assessment documentation (description, alignment, and analysis). No references are made to item 4 in the narrative (Data as Evidence for Meeting Standards) because very few reports include comments specific to that item of the narrative.

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
31 Narrative not provided, or incomplete	The narrative section for the assessment was not included. See the introduction to Section IV in the program report template for what must be included in assessment documentation.	
	The narrative section for the assessment is incomplete and does not follow guidelines for documentation of an assessment as is outlined in the introduction to Section IV in the program report template.	
	The narrative section for the assessment is incomplete; see guidelines for documentation of an assessment outlined in the introduction to Section IV in the program report template.	
DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSESSMENT		
32 Missing	A brief description of the assessment was not included.	
33 Inconsistent w/ assessment instrument	The description of the assessment appears inconsistent with the assessment instrument or instructions to candidates.	

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
34 Inconsistent w/ Section II	The description of the assessment is not consistent with the information provided for the assessment in Section II of the report.	
35 Vague or incomplete	The description of the assessment does not provide enough information to give reviewers a sense of context for the assessment.	
ALIGNMENT TO STANDARDS		
36 Missing	Assessment documentation did not include an explanation or matrix that demonstrates the alignment to standards.	
37 Inconsistent with Section III	Although Section III indicates that this standard is addressed by Assessment [#], the assessment itself does not include reference to the standard, nor does the assessment appear to be an appropriate source of evidence for the standard.	
	Section III indicates that this standard is addressed by Assessment [##], but the standard is not referenced in the alignment information provided. Although the standard is referenced in the assessment instrument and/or rubric, reviewers are unable to see the specific relationship of the standard to the assessment requirements.	
38 Not included in alignment, but could be	Although the program makes no mention of this standard in its documentation of Assessment [#], it appears that with some modification the assessment could document candidate proficiency in relation to this standard.	
39 Inconsistent with instrument/ rubrics	The alignment to standards provided in Part 2 of the assessment documentation is not consistent with the standards referenced in the assessment instrument and/or rubrics.	
40 Not aligned to standards	Alignment is provided to INTASC Core Principles or state standards, but not to the NCTE standards.	
	Alignment is made to concepts included in NCTE standards, but not to the standards themselves.	
41 Vague	Alignment to standards is not demonstrated, or is too vague or indirect to be convincing.	
42 Aligned to content standards but not to their elements	Alignment is made to overall content standards, and not to elements of standards.	
ANALYSIS OF DATA FINDINGS		
43 Missing	Assessment documentation did not include an analysis of data findings.	
44 Insufficient	The analysis of data findings does not examine what the data reveal about candidate strengths and weaknesses in terms of assessment performance.	
45 Only looks at overall scores	The analysis of data findings only includes a discussion of candidate overall performance, instead of relative performance on assessment components as aligned to standards.	
46 Interprets data rather than analyzes findings	The analysis of data findings is focused on numerical interpretation of the data, as opposed to a discussion of findings relative to candidate strengths and weaknesses as revealed by their performance on components of the assessment.	
47 Not enough data for analysis	Because the amount of performance data collected to date is small, only general references are made about data results.	

Assessment issues (instrument, scoring guide, data tables)

The following comments might be used in Parts B, C or E related to common problems with the assessment itself (instrument, scoring guide or rubric, data tables). In most cases, the complete comment would consist of multiple statements related to different components of the assessment.

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
ASSESSMENT DOESN'T ADDRESS STANDARD		
48 General statement	The assessment does not address this standard.	
49 Referenced in Section III but not in assessment	Although the assessment is indicated as addressing this standard in Section III, the assessment as presented in Section IV does not reference this standard.	
50 Paper-and-pencil test	Because Assessment [#] is a paper-and-pencil test, it has only limited application to the performance-based nature of this standard.	
51 Not an accurate measure of standards	The assessment as presented does not appear to be a good fit with the standards it is purported to address.	
ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT		
52 Missing	The assessment instrument or assignment given to the candidates was not included. Without this documentation, it is not possible for reviewers to know what specific tasks, knowledge and activities candidates are evaluated on.	
53 Description and not instructions	The assessment instrument submitted reads more as a description of the assessment, rather than the actual directions that are given to the candidate for completing the assessment.	
54 Vague	The instructions for completing the assessment are too vaguely stated for reviewers, or candidates, to understand what candidates are specifically required to do.	
55 Incomplete	The instructions to candidates appear to be incomplete or not provided in enough detail for reviewers, or candidates, to understand what candidates are specifically required to do.	
56 Unclear	Although an assessment instrument is included, there is not enough context to understand how it is used or applied.	
57 Inconsistent w/ description	The assessment instrument appears to be inconsistent with the description of the assessment.	
58 Inconsistent w/ Section II	The assessment appears to be inconsistent with the information provided in Section II of the report.	
59 Not aligned to standards	It is not clear how the assessment is aligned to the standards it is purported to address, based on alignment information provided.	
60 Superficially aligned to standards	Although the assessment has been annotated with references to the standards it is purported to address, the alignment in most cases appears indirect or superficial. It is not evident that the assessment has been customized or revised in any way for more specific alignment to the NCTE standards.	
61 Aligned to multiple v individual standards	Activities or requirements within assessments must be set off in such a way that each task or requirement is specifically designed to measure competency on a single standard or standard element.	
62 Aligned to INTASC or other standards	The assessment as presented is aligned to [INTASC, state, institutional] standards, and not the NCTE standards.	

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
<i>instead of SPA standards</i>		
63 Assessment is generic	The generic nature of the assessment does not allow for specific alignment to the NCTE standards.	
	The generic nature of the assessment does not allow for specific alignment to the NCTE standards, although the assessment could be revised to that end.	
SCORING GUIDE OR RUBRIC		
64 Missing	The assessment is not supported by a rubric or scoring guide.	
65 Insufficient	The rubric/scoring guide is insufficiently developed to serve as a guide for the consistent and accurate evaluation of candidate performance.	
	The rubric/scoring guide is not sufficiently developed to ensure interrater reliability.	
66 Generic; not aligned to standards	Although the alignment to standards is evident in the assessment instrument, the rubric does not describe performance levels in ways that reflect the standards.	
	The rubric indicators are not aligned to standards.	
67 Not correlated to assessment instrument	The rubric categories are inconsistent with the assessment components; candidates are not evaluated on the specific tasks described in the instructions to candidates.	
68 Not correlated to performance	The rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to the assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.), and not on the performance of skills or possession of knowledge as described by standards.	
69 Not anchored by descriptions of performance	Rubrics do not describe the qualities or characteristics of performance that would indicate unacceptable, acceptable and target performance.	
	Rubrics largely mirror the language of the standards, and do not describe candidate performance at each level in operational terms.	
70 Quantitative rubrics	Candidate performance tends to be rated by quantitative vs qualitative factors.	
71 Rubrics are mainly checklists	Rubrics are essentially a checklist of items to be turned in order to complete the assessment, and do not provide means for a qualitative, standards-based evaluation of candidate performance.	
72 Distinctions between performance levels not clear	Rubrics do not always make a clear distinction between performance levels; in particular, the expectations of target level performance are not clearly enough differentiated from acceptable performance.	
	Rubrics do not appear to be grounded in a basic agreement of what constitutes unacceptable, acceptable, and target performance.	
	The unacceptable indicators for most rubric items are based on noncompletion of requirements, as opposed to completion of requirements in such a way that standards are not met.	
73 Distinctions in performance are not objective	Rubrics rely on the subjective use of qualifiers (e.g. "most," "somewhat," "exceptional") to describe differences between levels of performance, instead of on descriptions of what an evaluator would expect to see at each performance level.	
74 Rubrics use the standards themselves as descriptors	Rubrics are founded on the language of the standards, and not on descriptions of performance that would characterize knowledge and/or performance of the standards by means of the assessment tasks.	
75 Rubrics do not	Rubrics must be designed to capture performance related to individual elements of standards, instead	

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
isolate individual standards or elements	of using single rubric categories to evaluate performance that relates to two or more standard elements.	
76 Acceptable performance not always "acceptable"	Descriptions of acceptable performance do not always mirror a minimal expectation of performance that would be expected by a first-year professional in the field.	
77 Minimal level of performance unclear	It is not clear, based on rubric categories, what the program considers to be minimally acceptable performance in each evaluated performance.	<i>Usually this would be that the program uses a 4-column rubric that has some intermediate category (e.g. "basic") between unacceptable and acceptable.</i>
78 Expectations for success not clear	The report does not specify what is required in order for the candidate to achieve a successful overall performance on the assessment. (In general, the NCTE expects that candidates must score at the acceptable level on all assessment performances that are measures of their standards.)	
79 Remediation measures not specified	The report does not specify what candidates must do, or are given the opportunity to do, if they are unsuccessful in meeting assessment expectations.	
80 For course grade assessment (#2)	The report does not include the institution or program's qualitative grading policy (i.e. what an "A" means, a "B" means, etc.)	
81 Impact on data	The report does not include information on the program or institution's minimum grade or grade point requirements.	
	As a result, the data derived from the assessment cannot be interpreted as evidence for meeting standards.	<i>This phrase might be appended to statements above related to insufficient scoring guides.</i>
DATA TABLES		
82 Lack of data	No data were provided for the assessment.	
83 Insufficient data	Data were only provided for one application]. NCATE expects data to be provided for two applications of the assessment instrument.	
	Data were only provided for a sample of candidates; data should be provided for all candidates.	
	The number of candidates for which data were reported seems disproportionately small to the number of candidates/completers reported in Section I.	
84 Holistic reporting of data	Data provided represent the overall score or grades received by candidates, and not performance on each standards-based item included in the assessment. Data provided in such a way cannot be used by the program for analysis of candidate strengths and weaknesses related to the assessment.	
85 Problems w/ how data are presented	The "n" for the data was not included.	
	The semester or year represented by the data is not included.	
	Data should be disaggregated by the semester or year represented by the data, as opposed to grouping multiple semesters or years of data in a single tabulation.	
86 Data not aligned to instrument	Data reported are not aligned to the assessment instrument or rubric; it is not clear what data represent.	
87 Data not aligned to standards	Data reported are not referenced to the standards, making it difficult for reviewers to interpret the meaning of data in relation to standards or performance reflected by the data.	
88 Data aligned to	Because the assessment and/or rubric are designed to evaluate performance across multiple standards	

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
<i>multiple standards</i>	in some cases, the resultant data cannot be used as evidence of successful candidate performance on individual standards or elements.	
<i>89 Problems w/ how data are presented</i>	Data are not presented in such a way that the meaning of data can be readily interpreted.	
	Only mean candidate scores were provided, and not the range; without knowing the range of scores, reviewers cannot tell whether all candidates scored at minimally acceptable levels.	
	Data should be aggregated to display the number and percentage of candidates who scored at the unacceptable, acceptable, and target levels in each scored category. Data should not be provided on a per candidate basis.	
	Candidate identifying information (e.g. names, initials, student ID #s) should not be included in the report.	
<i>90 Data reflect poor candidate performance</i>	Data show that not all candidates scored at acceptable levels; the program should indicate what remediation is offered to or required of candidates who do not achieve acceptable levels of performance on assessments.	
	Data indicate that not all candidates scored at acceptable levels, which is contradictory to or not reflected in the analysis of data findings.	
<i>91 Data not disaggregated by program level</i>	Data in the postgraduate and/or graduate level program report are identical to data in the baccalaureate report; data must be disaggregated to reflect performance of candidates in each program.	
<i>92 Data not disaggregated by site of delivery</i>	Data must be disaggregated to reflect candidate performance in programs delivered in each site or delivery mode.	

Part C - Evaluation of Program Report Evidence

Comments in the "phrase menu" below are provided as examples - there are too many variants to construct a set of common statements.

- ▶ Comments in Part C should be written with the understanding that the BOE team will make use of the information in its response to Standard 1 in the BOE report. Thus, summarized statements on the sufficiency of evidence in each of the three areas of Part C comprise the best approach to writing this section. NCTE asks reviewers to use Part C to summarize all comments related to individual assessments.
- ▶ Technical feedback on assessments that are primarily addressed to the report writer can be inserted in Part B of the report (see comments under the "Part B intros" tab). Alternately, detailed analysis of revisions needed to individual assessments could be placed in Part E of the report.
- ▶ Note that C.1, C.2 and C.3 are not "standards" and therefore should not be referred to as "met" or "not met." Instead, it is best to refer to them as areas of competency, or some other general phrase - as needed.
- ▶ A comment is required for C.1, C.2 and C.3 for first reviews.

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
93 C.1 Content Knowledge	Data from Assessments 1 (state licensure test) and 2 (course grades) provide sufficient evidence of candidate content knowledge.	
	Candidates' successful performance on the state licensure test provides evidence of candidate content knowledge. Candidate course grades also indicate that they master the content of coursework which is aligned to the NCTE's content-based standards.	
	Candidates' successful performance on the state licensure test provides evidence of candidate content knowledge. Candidate course grades provide some supporting evidence of candidate content knowledge.	
	Data from Assessment [#] support that candidates understand the subject matter that they teach.	
	The program did not provide sufficient evidence that candidates know the subject matter they will teach. See comments in Part B, Category 3.0 of the report..	
	Overall, the report did not provide conclusive evidence of candidate content knowledge. Subscores for licensure test data were not provided, and the course grade assessment was insufficiently documented.	
97 C.2 Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills	Data from Assessments 3 (Unit Plan) and 4 (Student Teaching Evaluation) provide primary evidence of candidate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.	
	Data from Assessments [#] also support candidate competency in these areas.	
	Because of the generic nature of assessments in this area, evidence is weak or insufficient that candidates have the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills specific to English language arts as reflected by the NCTE standards.	
	Assessments in this area are overly reliant on the evaluation of candidate knowledge of pedagogy, and not candidates' application or performance of that knowledge.	
98 C.3 Effects on Student Learning	Data from Assessment 5 (Modified Teacher Work Sample) provide evidence of candidate ability to demonstrate positive effects on student learning, even though data from only one semester were provided. The TWS has been aligned to the NCTE standards, and customized for	<i>Across SPAs, there does not seem to be full consensus of what is sufficient evidence of "effects on student learning." However, the majority of SPAs are satisfied</i>

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
	<p>application in an English classroom. Further evidence is provided by items related to effect on student learning on the Student Teacher Evaluation, on which all candidates scored at or above the acceptable level.</p> <p>The program has not provided sufficient evidence of student learning. Assessment 5 (Reflection on Student Learning) requires candidates to reflect on the progress made by two students in their first student teaching placement, but does not require that reflection to be supported by data derived from candidate assessment of student learning prior to and after the candidates' teaching experiences with those students. Moreover, the TWS should be based on whole class instruction, and not just a sample of students.</p>	<p><i>with a TWS-like assessment that (a) is customized for use in a classroom that represents their discipline; (b) is at least generally aligned to their standards to the extent that alignment is justifiably incorporated; (c) is based on whole class, or at least small group instruction, and not a "case study" approach; (d) takes place over an extended period of teaching and most commonly in the clinical experience; (e) requires candidates to collect and analyze pre- and post data. Some SPAs seem to require actual evidence of student learning as a criterion of candidate success on the assessment. On the other end of the spectrum, some SPAs only require that candidates are "assessed on assessment," and evaluated for positive impact on student learning during their clinical experience - and do not always require that Assessment 5 be based on a TWS model.</i></p>

Part D - Evaluation of the Use of Assessment Results

Comments below in the "phrase menu" are provided as examples - there are too many variants to construct a set of common statements.

- ▶ A comment in Part D is required for all first reviews. If the SPA wishes Section V to be revisited in the Revised or Response to Conditions report, it should make that clear - either in comments in this part of the report, or in Parts E or G. **Unless the reviewers specifically request or suggest that Section V be resubmitted, programs should not be considered under an obligation to resubmit Section V in future reports.**
- ▶ Reviewers should be careful to distinguish between the impact of lack of data due to new assessments or failure of the program to submit data, v lack of data due to small program size. Comments - in Part D and elsewhere in the report - should not suggest that small programs themselves are a problem.

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
<p>99 Response complies with requirements for Section V</p>	<p>The program has provided examples of the use of data to inform program change and improvement, and it demonstrates that assessment data are systematically and comprehensively reviewed by faculty and other stakeholders.</p>	
	<p>Although the program is [very] small, it is evident that program faculty examine data on a regular basis and discuss what data findings might suggest. It is clear that faculty have a process in place to closely monitor data over time in order to determine whether program changes are needed. In addition, faculty use assessment data to adjust their approach to implementing some assessments; in particular, based on the fact that many candidates had difficulty with the TWS in the first two semesters of implementation, faculty</p>	

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
100 Not enough data to provide substantive response	now meet with candidates individually to discuss their approach and progress on the assessment.	
	The program has a process in place to ensure faculty analysis of assessment data, although to date available data have been limited primarily to the results of state licensure exams. However, the program documented that it has made a change to content level entry requirements for post baccalaureate candidates as a result of those candidates' relatively poor showing on some subareas of the Praxis II content test, which candidates take before admission to the program.	
	Due to the small size of the program and the lack of data for three new or revised assessments, the program has little data to apply toward program analysis. No program changes were reported. It is also not evident that the program has a process in place for systematic analysis of data. This section of the report, informed by additional data, should be addressed in the program's Revised Report.	
101 Response does not address Section V	Because the assessments submitted by the program need further revision in order to make them effective for the collection of standards-based data, reviewers have no feedback to offer on this section. The program should resubmit this section of the report once it has collected data on revised assessments.	
	The program's response focused on changes it has made to the program and program assessments over the past three years, but does not refer to any assessment data as being an impetus for program change.	
	The narrative in Section V of the report addressed changes made by the unit, and not at the program level. Section V was not organized according to the categories of content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge, and student learning.	

Part E - Areas for Consideration

Even among NCATE staff there may not be complete agreement as to the role of Part E in the national recognition report. Also the purpose of this part of the report has evolved over time. Most SPAs however use Part E to convey general comments about the program's assessments and the overall ability of assessments to meet standards and achieve or maintain national recognition. In other words, comments in this part of report are most likely to relate to the program's assessment system itself, and not to other aspects of the program or the report. Based on that view of the role of Part E, here are some general comments:

- ▶ If the program has not achieved National Recognition, comments should provide overall guidance or summarization of what needs to be done to improve assessments, or provide evidence of candidate success on assessments, in order for standards to be met. Programs will use comments in this section, and in Part B, to guide their preparation of the Revised Report.
- ▶ If the program has achieved National Recognition, comments should give direction to the program for further improvements and refinements to be made to the assessment system (as needed).
- ▶ If the program is Recognized with Conditions, comments should distinguish between what must be done to address Conditions v other areas for consideration that should be attended to by the program, but are not serious enough to be Conditions to National Recognition. In fact, it might work best to only list the areas for consideration that are not actual Conditions to Recognition in Part E, and then end with a statement of "also see Conditions to Recognition listed in Part G."
- ▶ Part E does not require a comment. There is no need to repeat comments that are made in sufficient detail elsewhere in the report.
- ▶ Comments in Part E should be written in the form of declarative statements, as opposed to directives. Example:

"The rubric for Assessment 7 is not aligned to the assessment instrument or to the NCTE standards."

vs

"Align the rubric for Assessment 7 to the assessment and NCTE standards."

- ▶ Refrain from advice that reflects personal preferences but is not dictated by any publicly available guidelines on writing program reports. An example would be suggesting that a program only use three-column rubrics, or that it replace an optional assessment with one that you have found to be useful in your own assessment system.

Examples of Areas for Consideration that are most often included in Part E:

- ▶ A detailed analysis of problems with individual assessments, often including examples drawn from the assessment used to illustrate what the problem is.
- ▶ An analysis of the flaws of the overall assessment system, including:
 - assessments that should be removed or replaced (see "inappropriate assessments")
 - the need for assessments to address the elements of standards, and not just the overall standard
 - the misinterpretation of standards within some assessments
 - overreliance on paper-and-pencil assessments
 - overreliance on assessments that are not based on performance in a classroom setting
 - duplicative or overlapping assessments, which weaken the overall assessment system
 - too many assessments (i.e. bundled assignments), creating a cumbersome and disjointed assessment system
 - reliance on generalized assessments that try to cover all standards, as opposed to creating a series of integrated assessments that each comprehensively focus on individual standards or groups of compatible standards.
- ▶ Concerns related to lack of two applications of data for some/all assessments, or inconsistency of the "n" in data sets across the report
- ▶ Suggestion that the program, although recognized, refine its rubrics for greater specificity.
- ▶ Suggestion that the program continue to revise assessments to create more specific alignment to standards.

Part F - Additional Comments

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

Comments in Part F.1 should relate to the Context section of the report, or may include comments related to overall problems with the report submitted (excess typos, confusing presentation, didn't follow guidelines, etc.) Some SPAs also use this part of the report to commend the program on the quality of the report, or changes made to address original review concerns.

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
102 Faculty qualifications	The degrees of many/most faculty are not in the field of English].	
	None/few of the program faculty members have terminal degrees.	
	None/few of the program faculty are full-time and/or tenure-track.	
	None/few of the faculty who supervise student teaching have experience or certification in the area of English language arts.	
	The faculty member who teaches the methods class does not have an academic background in English language arts.	
103 Faculty reported incorrectly	Only faculty who are directly affiliated with the program should be reported (i.e. professors and instructors, directors or administrators, supervisors of clinical experiences).	

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
	It was not clear which faculty member(s) are responsible for supervising student teachers.	
	The roles and responsibilities of faculty members were not clear from the information provided.	
104 Field experiences	It was not clear from Section I of the report that candidates participate in field experiences across the grade range of the license for which they are preparing.	
	The number of hours candidates must spend in required field experiences was not included in the report.	
	Not enough information was provided on what candidates are required to do in their field and/or clinical experiences.	
	It was not clear from the report what courses included required field experiences.	
105 Enrollment number discrepancies	The candidate and completer numbers reported in Section I appeared inconsistent with the numbers in data tables in most assessments. In particular, assessments that use program completers as the basis for data should be relatively consistent to the number of completers reported per year in Section I of the report. Although data discrepancies are common and to be expected, they should be explained in an explanatory note accompanying data tables.	
106 Discrepancies between candidates/completers	The great discrepancy between candidates and program completers should be explained in the next report, so that reviewers have a better understanding of why it appears that a small number of program enrollees complete the program.	
107 Fewer than five completers in three years	Please note that in the fall of 2009, NCATE's Specialty Areas Studies Board approved a policy that will allow programs with very low enrollment numbers to be exempted from the national program review requirement, pending approval from the respective state agency. If the program wishes to consider that option in place of submitting a second report, please contact Dr. Margaret Crutchfield at NCATE (margie@ncate.org).	
108 Program level discrepancies	Section I of the program report referenced a postbaccalaureate/graduate initial licensure program in addition to the baccalaureate program. If the institution offers this program at a postbaccalaureate or graduate level, separate reports should be submitted for those programs. See NCATE guidelines at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/guidelinesProcedures.asp?ch=90	
109 Report did not follow guidelines; advised to seek assistance	The report did not follow NCATE guidelines for report submission. Please review NCATE guidelines at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=10 . The program may also benefit from participating in a NCATE Webinar on preparation of program reports, or visit archives of previous webinars; see http://www.ncate.org/public/upcomingWebSeminars.asp . NCTE assessment examples are also available at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/assessmentLibrary.asp?ch=90 .	
	The report did not follow guidelines for submission of assessment documentation (Section IV). Please review directions at the beginning of Section IV in the program report document.	
	The program is advised to contact the program coordinator for NCTE before engaging in work on a follow-up report.	
	The program is advised to review NCTE guidelines for report preparation at www.ncte.org/cee/ncate/program	
	The program may benefit from attending a report preparation workshop. Workshops are held at NCATE Institutional Orientations, ATE and AACTE conferences, and through web seminars..	

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
	Files uploaded in the report should be named for easy identification of the file contents (e.g. "Program of Study," "Assessment 1.")	
	Extraneous information (course syllabi, faculty handbooks, etc) should not be included in the report.	

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

Reviewers should only include comments in this part of the report if they wish to bring the BOE's attention to something in the report that may have implications in that team's review of the NCATE unit standards. Comments may reflect a concern with a certain program practice, or may alert the BOE to a unique or creative practice that may extend to other programs as well. However, reviewers should not include comments that ask the BOE to "investigate" whether the program is making or has made changes, collected data, analyzed data, etc., as outlined by reviewers' concerns within the body of the report. Reviewers should also bear in mind that the BOE reads the entire National Recognition Report, so that all reviewers' comments are taken into consideration as part of the evidence that the BOE considers.

Some examples of appropriate comments in F.2 are:

- ▶ a concern that methods course(s) are not offered, or not offered in such a way that content-specific pedagogy is taught
- ▶ a concern that the quality or quantity of field experiences appears to be out of line with common practices for NCATE-quality programs
- ▶ concerns with faculty qualifications

Part G - National Recognition with Conditions

The phrases below might be used as part of the general information provided to a program on what to include in their Response to Conditions report. Reviewers should keep in mind that programs are only required to submit sections of the report that they are instructed to submit in a follow-up report.

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
110 Opening statement	The following conditions to national recognition must be addressed in a report submitted by the date noted above.	
111 Resubmit Sections II or III	Section II and III of the program report should be resubmitted in the Response to Conditions report, to include information incorporating all assessments and standards.	<i>This may be required at the discretion of the SPA.</i>
112 Resubmit Section V	Section V should be revised and resubmitted in the next report, and should focus on the program's review and use of assessment data included in the Response to Conditions report.	<i>This may be required at the discretion of the SPA.</i>
113 Submitting revised assessments	Revised assessments should include all information required (narrative plus documentation) as outlined in the introduction to Section IV in the program report template.	<i>At discretion of SPA, but is probably a sensible request to make.</i>
114 Data requirements	At least one application of data, derived from revised assessments and rubrics, must be included for each resubmitted assessment.	

General comments on writing conditions statements:

- ▶ Number the conditions that are specified in this section if there are three or more individual conditions to address.
- ▶ Each statement of condition should clearly state, and only consist of, what the program must do in order to satisfy that condition. The statement can refer the program to comments in other parts of the report for guidance on how to address the condition.
- ▶ Statements of condition should be framed as directives. Although the program may have some latitude in how it addresses the condition, the condition must be addressed and should not be referred to as a "suggestion" or "recommendation" or something the program "may do."
- ▶ Conditions should bear a direct relationship to standards that are not met or are met with conditions. NCTE has one programmatic standard; therefore conditions can be cited for programmatic issues such as curriculum, contextual issues such as admission requirements, or the quality of the report. Also, the requirement for an Assessment of Student Learning, which for NCTE often has only a tangential relationship to its standards can be a condition to recognition even if the lack of such an assessment does not impact standards decisions.
- ▶ Many SPAs specify what sections of the report, besides assessments, should be resubmitted with the Response to Conditions report (most often Sections II, III and V). If the SPA does not specify these should be resubmitted, the program is not under obligation to resubmit them.
- ▶ On occasion, a SPA may direct the program to include other material in their Response to Conditions report (for example, a clearer description of field experiences or a better delineated Program of Study). In this case, it may be a better idea to include such a request in Part F of the report (e.g., "Please include

more information on the content and clock hours of field experiences as part of the Response to Conditions report") rather than including it as a Condition to Recognition.

► Conditions statements should also spell out SPA expectations for the data to be provided in the Response to Conditions report. Programs are not under an obligation to submit current data for assessments other than those that the SPA indicates must be resubmitted.

Conditions given for a second time

► If the program has failed to meet conditions for a second time, it has an opportunity to resubmit if within the designated time period. In this case, the conditions statements in the first report should be the basis of the conditions cited in the second report. The program should be informed what conditions have been met, what conditions are partially met, and what remain unmet. Reviewers should not cite additional conditions, although every now and again, the program's first Response to Conditions may cause an original condition to be revised or augmented. If this occurs, the report should include a comment as to why the original conditions language has been altered.

► It is probably "cleanest" to use other parts of the report (Parts B and/or E) to explain why the program's first attempt to address conditions were unsuccessful, and use Part G only to spell out the remaining conditions in ways that parallel the conditions statements in the first report.

Revised Reports

The phrases below may be useful in writing the National Recognition report in response to a Revised Report (or a Response to Conditions Report).

Context	Phrase Menu	Comments
115 Part A - Pass Rate Requirement	An 80 percent pass rate was established in previous report.	
	Previously established	
116 Parts C or D	Sufficiently addressed in previous report	
	Not applicable to this report	

General Comments on Revised Reports

Part A - If the pass rate was found to be met, or deemed not applicable, in the first review, the program is not required to re-address this section UNLESS so directed by the SPA in its prior review.

Part B - All standards found met in the first report must retain that status. If the standard was found met in the previous review, it is sufficient to check the "met" decision and leave the comment field blank. Or some version of that. (Some reviewers do not select a decision, but put a comment that the standard was previously met. As long as it is clear, either method is okay.

Part C - In most cases, some or all of the items in Part C will require a new response based on changes the program has made to its assessments. However, if no changes were made or required for the program's content-based assessments, for example, reviewers may simply indicate "Sufficiently addressed in previous report" or something to that effect.

Part D - A response is not required UNLESS the program has rewritten this section - OR was directed to resubmit this section and failed to do so.

Data requirements - As with Response to Conditions reports, the Revised Report is only required to contain updated or new data if it is so directed by the SPA in the previous national recognition report. In most cases, the SPA should not require additional data from assessments that do not require revision and were submitted with sufficient data in the previous report.

Appendix A

NCATE links useful for program report reference:

Assessment Library: <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/assessmentLibrary.asp?ch=90>

Program Review Process: <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=10>

Guidelines & Procedures for Web-Based Review: <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/guidelinesProcedures.asp?ch=90>

Guidelines for Postbaccalaureate Review - see link from NCATE Program Standards page: <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/programStandards.asp?ch=4>