

Program Report for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Option C

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

COVER SHEET

1. Institution Name

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

2. State

Pennsylvania

3. Date submitted

MM DD YYYY

07 / 06 / 2015

4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:

Dr. Eileen W. Glisan

Phone:

(724) 357-2325

Ext.

E-mail:

glisan@iup.edu

5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:

Dr. Jeffrey J. Fratangeli

Phone:

(724) 357-4719

Ext.

E-mail:

jefffrat@iup.edu

Name:

Dr. Randy Cromwell

Phone:

(724) 357-2485

Ext.

E-mail:

rcrom@iup.edu

6. Name of institution's program

Spanish Education K - 12

7. NCATE Category

Foreign Language Education-Spanish

8. Grade levels⁽¹⁾ for which candidates are being prepared

K - 12

(1) e.g. K-6, K-12

- Advanced Teaching
- First Teaching License
- Other School Personnel
- Unspecified

10. Degree or award level

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only

11. Is this program offered at more than one site?

- Yes
- No

12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered

13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared

Instructional I - Spanish Education K - 12

14. Program report status:

- Initial Review this cycle, Continuing Recognition
- Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required or Recognition with Probation
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions

15. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:

NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section IV. Does your state require such a test?

- Yes
- No

SECTION I - CONTEXT

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of ACTFL standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

Following the instructions for Option C, there have been no substantial changes to IUP's Spanish Education K-12 Program since our last program review in Fall 2009. The Department of Spanish referred to in the 2009 Program Report is now the Department of Foreign Languages in the current report, as the original department merged with the other languages into one department in 2011. However, this merger had no impact on the Spanish Education K-12 Program, given that Spanish is the only language that has a teacher preparation program. It is important to note that the current Program Report addresses the ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers (2002) under Option C. This is the last review cycle in which use of the 2002 standards is permitted. Nonetheless, we have already begun to make the transition to the new 2014 ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards.

Program Assessments and Rubrics-We have not made changes to our 8 program assessments since our last program review in 2009 because our assessments had been recently developed/changed at that time. While the assessments have remained the same since 2009, several of the rubrics were expanded from 3 levels of performance to 4 levels of performance in order to better differentiate among the large group of students who tended to fall within the broad "Acceptable" category. This change to the rubrics will be discussed in further detail within the narratives for Assessments #4, 5, 7, and 8. The rubric change has provided us with richer data about the performance of our candidates on each criterion of the rubrics. Additionally, we modified slightly the rubric used for Assessment #2 in an effort to clarify the expectations for candidates in the area of writing and to have a seamless continuum between the expectations at the intermediate and advanced levels, particularly in the 300-level culture courses and the 300-/400-level literature courses (see further details in the narrative for Assessment #2).

Assessment System-At the time of our last program review in 2009, IUP had recently launched a comprehensive assessment system that was based on the "Key Assessment Rating System" (KARS). For each course, faculty identified a key assessment that illustrates achievement of course objectives; for each key assessment, rubrics were developed that illustrate the NCATE levels of performance: Target, Acceptable, Unacceptable. These assessments were mapped onto Danielson's components, the then-10 INTASC principles, and program objectives. The then- Department of Spanish was one of the first departments to develop key assessments and rubrics for each of its courses and to post this information to its website: <http://www.iup.edu/foreignlanguages/spanish/courseinfo/assessment/default.aspx>. Other IUP programs, as well as programs at other institutions, have used this site as a model for developing key assessments and rubrics.

In 2013, IUP began transitioning from KARS to LiveText, a course-based system for assessing learning outcomes and entering/storing data entered on scoring rubrics. The 8 assessments reported on in this Program Report are now on LiveText, and all faculty teaching the courses within which these assessments occur enter the data for candidates in their courses each semester.

As were explained in our previous Program Report and will be discussed in the individual assessment narratives in the current report, assessments that are unique to Spanish Education K-12 include the exit ACTFL OPI and WPT (minimum level of Advanced Low required), as well as the components of the Mid-Program Review, including the writing sample in Spanish, advisory OPI, and English interview (i.e., Professional Involvement Log).

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)

There have been no changes in the field and clinical experiences required for the program since our last program review. As explained in our last Program Report, our candidates in Spanish Education participate in two early field experiences. As sophomores, they complete Pre-Student Teaching I (EDUC 242) in a local elementary school, where they teach Spanish to K-5 students in an after-school program. This experience is completed in conjunction with the first of two methods courses, "Teaching Elementary Content Through Spanish" (SPAN 390), and is designed to provide students with practice teaching Spanish at the elementary school level. In the second experience, candidates, as juniors, complete Pre-Student Teaching II (EDUC 342) in either a middle school or high school in the Pittsburgh Public Schools. This second experience provides candidates with experiences teaching a diverse population of students at the secondary level in an urban setting. Candidates spend a total of 35 hours in the school over a period of five or more full days, where they complete observation tasks, work with special needs students, and design and teach a series of Spanish standards-based lessons.

All teacher candidates at IUP complete a 15-week Student Teaching experience in their final semester after all course work has been completed. Candidates seeking certification in two areas may split the 15 weeks and do a quarter in each discipline. Sometimes Spanish candidates teach at a middle school for one quarter and at a high school for the second quarter.

The last fall semester prior to Student Teaching, candidates complete the second of two methods courses, "Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Secondary School" (EDUC 453). In order to qualify for Student Teaching, all teacher candidates at IUP must successfully complete the requirements of Step 2 of the 3-Step Process for Teacher Education. Teacher candidates must demonstrate Advanced-Low speaking and writing proficiency in Spanish on the ACTFL OPI/WPT the semester BEFORE Student Teaching in order to qualify for the experience.

3. Please attach files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)

Spanish Education Program of Study	Spanish Education Candidate Advising Information
------------------------------------	--

See **Attachment** panel below.

4. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.

5. Candidate Information

Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.

Program: Spanish Education K-12		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers ⁽²⁾
2014-2015	17	5
2013-2014	28	6
2012-2013	36	4

⁽²⁾ NCATE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

6. Faculty Information

Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

Faculty Member Name	Dr. Eileen W. Glisan
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ph.D. in Spanish Applied Linguistics & Teaching Methodology, Univ. of Pittsburgh
Assignment: Indicate the role of the	Coordinator, Spanish Education K-12 Program Certified OPI Tester of Spanish Supervisor of Field Experiences

faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Advisor of Juniors/Seniors in Program Professor of Methodology Courses
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	Co-author of Teacher's Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction, most widely used foreign language methods textbook in teacher preparation programs across the country, now in 5th edition, 2016. Co-director, ACTFL Research Priorities in Language Education Project, 2009 to present, to design and promote a national research agenda in foreign language education. Member, ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards Revision Task Force (2010-2013).
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	PA certification (K-12) in Spanish & French. 1 year teaching experience in junior-senior high school. Clinical supervision of student teachers in Spanish (1985-present). Conducts in-service training for K-12 foreign language teachers across the country.

Faculty Member Name	Dr. Frank B. Brooks
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ph.D. in Foreign Language Education, The Ohio State University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Supervisor of Field Experiences Advisor of Freshman/Sophomores in Program Professor of Methodology Courses
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	Recipient of 2014 ACTFL Research Priorities in Foreign Language Education grant. Project: "Attainment of the Oral Proficiency Standard: Successful FL Teacher Preparation Programs." Co-author of: "It takes a department! A study of the culture of proficiency in three successful foreign language teacher education programs." Foreign Language Annals 47 (2014): 592-613. (Co-authored with Mark A. Darhower). Co-Chair: IUP Spring Methodology Conference on Foreign Language Teaching, 2006 to present.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Virginia certification (K-12) in Spanish. 7 years high school teaching in Virginia (Spanish, English, English as a Second Language). Supervision of student teachers at IUP, 2005-present; supervision of student teaching interns in Florida (1995-2005).

Faculty Member Name	Dr. Christina Huhn
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ph.D. in Foreign Language Education: Language and Literacy and Educational Technology Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Rates Mid-Program Review writing samples as a benchmark for WPTs
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	President, Appalachian Language Educators' Society (APPLES). Regional foreign language teachers association; 2014 – 2016. Author of: "Evaluating Effective Teaching in the 21st Century World Language Classroom." In Swanson, P. & Hoyt, K. (Eds) Dimension 2013. Valdosta, GA: Southern Conference on Language Teaching (SCOLT), pp. 104-120. April 2013. Author of: "In search of innovation: A review of research on effective models of foreign language teacher preparation." Foreign Language Annals, Special Issue, ACTFL Research Priorities, Phase I. Glisan, E. and Donato, R. (Eds), July 2012.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Teacher Certification: State of Indiana Professional Educators License - Instructional Certification. Methods instructor and clinical/student teacher supervisor. 2005 – 2011, Marshall University, Huntington, WV. Immersion Camp Instructor (Family Leader). WV Summer Language Immersion Camp. Summer 2012, 2013, 2014.

Faculty Member Name	Dr. Jason Killam
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ph.D. in Hispanic Linguistics (Second Language Acquisition), Indiana University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Advisor of Freshmen/Sophomores in Spanish Education K-12 Program Reviewer for Mid-Program Review (sophomores) Clinical Supervisor of Pre-Student Teaching I
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	Presenter at Kentucky Foreign Language Conference 2015: "The Descriptive Power of Definiteness (not Specificity) in the Acquisition of Direct Object Marking in Spanish." Lexington, KY. Appalachian Language Educators' Society (APPLES). Treasurer: 2015-present. Festival coordinator 2011-2013. Author of "Direct Object Marking and Word Order Processing in Spanish: An Unclear Connection." Proceedings of the 2012 Second Language Research Forum (2014): 101-109.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Texas Certification (6-12) in Spanish. Seven years teaching Spanish at the high school level in Mansfield, Texas. Three years serving as Department Chair for Foreign Languages and Electives. Supervision of student teachers at IUP (2014-present).

Faculty Member Name	Dr. Marjorie Zambrano-Paff
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ph.D. in Spanish Sociolinguistics-Forensic, University of Pittsburgh
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Certified OPI Tester of Spanish (Certification valid until 12/6/2016); conducts OPI testing of Spanish Education candidates Rates Mid-Program Review writing samples as a benchmark for WPTs

Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	Presenter at 2015 National Conference on Spanish in the United States, CUNY University New York, NY; "No comprendi" Literal Translations and Misleading Calques and their Effect in the United States Immigration Hearings. OPI/ILR Rater, Active OPI Interagency Language Roundtable Language Testing International tester, 2013-present. Author of Connecting Students to the "Lost C" (Communities) through an Online Language Learning community, Fall 2014 (Forthcoming). DLM De clase Internacional. Revista Digital del Departamento de Lenguas Modernas. Departamento de Lenguas Modernas, Tecnológico de Monterrey y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, México.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Elementary school Spanish teacher, Manchester Academic Charter School, Pittsburgh, PA, 2000-2001. Pre-School Spanish teacher, Water Works/Allegheny County Childcare Center, Pittsburgh, PA, Fall 1999.

(3) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.

(4) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

(5) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

(6) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.

Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

(7) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.

(8) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.

(9) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

7. Complete the ACTFL/NCATE Program Self-Assessment Table and attach below. Go to the following URL for a copy of this table. Save it to your computer, fill it out, and then upload it below.
<http://www.ncate.org/ProgramStandards/ACTFL/ACTFLAttachmentformt.doc>

Spanish Education Program Self-Assessment Table

See **Attachment** panel below.

SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the ACTFL standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

1. In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the ACTFL standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.(Response limited to 250 characters each field)

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment ⁽¹⁰⁾	Type or Form of Assessment ⁽¹¹⁾	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁽¹²⁾	Since the previous submission is this assessment New	Since the previous submission is this assessment Substantially Changed	Since the previous submission is this assessment Not Substantially Changed
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	ACTFL Writing Proficiency Test (WPT)	ACTFL WPT in Spanish	Semester prior to student teaching (October 15 for Spring Student Teaching; February 15 for Fall Student Teaching)	NO	NO	YES
Assessment #2: Assessment of content (required)	Cultural Investigation	Cultural Investigation		NO	NO	YES

			End of Hispanic Civilization Through the 19th Century (SPAN 340) taken during the junior year, first semester, or sometimes earlier			
Assessment #3: Candidate ability to plan (required)	Comprehensive Unit Plan	Unit plan, with accompanying lesson plans, materials, and assessments	Methods course taken prior to student teaching: EDUC 453, Teaching of Foreign Languages in Secondary School	NO	NO	YES
Assessment #4: Assessment of clinical practice (required)	Student Teacher Summative Evaluation	Summative assessment of teaching practice and professional dispositions	End of Student Teaching	NO	NO	YES
Assessment #5: Candidate effect on student learning (required)	Teacher Work Sample	Work sample demonstrating candidate's effect on student learning, based on pre- and post-testing and data analysis	Project conducted during Student Teaching and submitted at the end of the experience	NO	NO	YES
Assessment #6: Additional assessment (required)	ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI)	ACTFL OPI in Spanish (official academic institutional upgrade)	Semester prior to Student Teaching (October 15 for Spring Student Teaching; February 15 for Fall Student Teaching)	NO	NO	YES
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses ACTFL standards (required)	Linguistic Analysis Investigation	Linguistics project (interview with native informant and analysis of speech sample)	End of Spanish Phonetics and Phonemics (SPAN 453) course taken during junior or senior year	NO	NO	YES
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses ACTFL standards (optional)	Professional Involvement Log		Log is checked twice: at Mid-Program Review and in Step 2 prior to Student Teaching	NO	NO	YES

		Professional involvement log, complied since freshman year; includes out-of-class work to develop Spanish proficiency and involvement in professional activities				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

(10) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

(11) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

(12) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

1. For each ACTFL standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple ACTFL standards.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
1. Language, Linguistics, Comparisons.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Candidates (a) demonstrate a high level of proficiency in the target language, and they seek opportunities to strengthen their proficiency (See the supporting explanation and rubrics for required levels of proficiency.); (b) know the linguistic elements of the target language system, recognize the changing nature of language, and accommodate for gaps in their own knowledge of the target language system by learning on their own; and (c) know the similarities and differences between the target language and other languages, identify the key differences in varieties of the target language, and seek opportunities to learn about varieties of the target language on their own.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Candidates (a) demonstrate that they understand the connections among the perspectives of a culture and its practices and products, and they integrate the cultural framework for foreign language standards into their instructional practices; (b) recognize the value and role of literary and cultural texts and use them to interpret and reflect upon the perspectives of the target cultures over time; and (c) integrate knowledge of other disciplines into foreign language instruction and identify distinctive viewpoints accessible only through the target language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Candidates (a) demonstrate an understanding of language acquisition at various developmental levels and use this knowledge to create a supportive classroom learning environment that includes target language input and opportunities for negotiation of meaning and meaningful interaction and (b) develop a variety of instructional practices that reflect language outcomes and articulated program models and address the needs of diverse language learners.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Candidates (a) demonstrate an understanding of the goal areas and standards of the Standards for Foreign Language Learning and their state standards, and they integrate these frameworks into curricular planning; (b) integrate the Standards for Foreign Language learning and their state standards into language instruction; and (c) use standards and curricular goals to evaluate, select, design, and adapt instructional resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Assessment of Language and Cultures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Candidates (a) believe that assessment is ongoing, and they demonstrate knowledge of multiple ways of assessment that are age- and level- appropriate by implementing purposeful measures; (b) reflect on the results of student assessments, adjust instruction accordingly, analyze the results of assessments, and use success and failure to determine the direction of instruction; and (c) interpret and report the results of student performances to all stakeholders and provide opportunity for discussion.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Professionalism.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Candidates (a) engage in professional development opportunities that strengthen their own linguistic and cultural competence and promote reflection on practice and (b) know the value of foreign language learning to the overall success of all students and understand that they will need to become advocates with students, colleagues, and members of the community to promote the field.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: For assessments that are listed in Section II as Not Substantially Changed since the previous submission:

1. Upload a current copy of the assessment and scoring guide (to ensure that reviewers are using the correct versions) and
2. Provide current data on all assessments.

For assessments that are listed in Section II as New or Substantially Changed since the previous submission:

The 6 – 8 key assessments listed in Section II as New or Substantially Changed must be documented and discussed in Section IV. Taken as a whole, the assessments must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. The key assessments should be required of all candidates. Assessments and scoring guides and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements [each relating to specific SPA standard(s)], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a cumulative score..

In the description of each assessment listed in Section II as New or Substantially Changed below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas to be aligned with the elements in NCATE's unit standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment listed in Section II as New or Substantially Changed, the compiler should prepare one document that includes the following items:

(1) A two-page narrative that includes the following:

- a. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
 - b. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
 - c. A brief analysis of the data findings;
 - d. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording;
- and

(2) Assessment Documentation

- e. The assessment tool itself or a rich description of the assessment (often the directions given to candidates);
- f. The scoring guide for the assessment; and
- g. Charts that provide candidate data derived from the assessment.

The responses for e, f, and g (above) should be limited to the equivalent of five text pages each, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

Note: As much as possible, combine all of the files for one assessment into a single file. That is, create one file for Assessment #4 that includes the two-page narrative (items a – d above), the assessment itself (item e above), the scoring guide (item f above), and the data chart (item g above). Each attachment should be no larger than 2 mb. Do not include candidate work or syllabi. There is a limit of 20 attachments for the entire report so it is crucial that you combine files as much as possible.

1. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: State licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge. ACTFL standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to standards 1 and 2. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 1 - WPT Licensure Assessment

See **Attachment** panel below.

2. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge in the language to be taught. ACTFL standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to Standards 1 and 2. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations; written interpersonal/presentational tasks; capstone projects or research reports addressing cross-disciplinary content; philosophy of teaching statement that addresses the role of culture, literature, and cross-disciplinary content; and other portfolio tasks. ⁽¹³⁾(Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 2 - Cultural Investigation

See **Attachment** panel below.

(13)A portfolio is a collection of candidate work. The information to be reported here requires an assessment of candidates' content knowledge as revealed in the work product contained in a portfolio. If the portfolio contains pieces that are interdependent and the portfolio is evaluated by faculty as one assessment using a scoring guide, then the portfolio could be counted as one assessment. Often the assessment addresses an independent product within the portfolio rather than the complete portfolio. In the latter case, the assessment and scoring guide for the independent product should be presented.

3. PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom-based instruction. ACTFL standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 3, 4 and 5. Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates' abilities to develop lesson or unit plans, individualized educational plans, needs assessments, or intervention plans. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 3 - Comprehensive Unit Plan

See **Attachment** panel below.

4. PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. ACTFL standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to standards 3, 4, 5 and 6. An assessment instrument used in student teaching should be submitted. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 4 - Student Teacher Summative Evaluation

See **Attachment** panel below.

5. EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING. Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning. ACTFL standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standard 3, 4, and 5. Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 5 - Teacher Work Sample

See **Attachment** panel below.

6. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment that demonstrates candidates are orally proficient in the languages to be taught, according to proficiency levels stipulated in Standard 1.a. Results of the OPI/TOPT should be submitted. ACTFL standard addressed in this entry is Standard 1. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 6 - ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI)

See **Attachment** panel below.

7. Additional assessment that addresses ACTFL standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of professional development experiences, memberships in professional organizations, conference participation, philosophy statements, and case studies.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 7 - Linguistic Analysis Investigation

See **Attachment** panel below.

8. Additional assessment that addresses ACTFL standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1 and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

See **Attachment** panel below.

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning. In addition, for each assessment listed in Section II, describe why or why not the assessment has been changed since the program was submitted previously.

(Response limited to 24,000 characters)

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Since 1991, the IUP Department of Foreign Languages (formerly Department of Spanish) has gathered evidence from an externally used assessment (the OPI) that its teacher candidates in Spanish are able to speak at a level that the profession has deemed appropriate for foreign language teacher candidates. For the past 10 years, we have used the official double-rated OPI and WPT to assess the speaking and writing proficiency of our candidates, and we have a decade's worth of assessment data from Language Testing International (LTI). In addition to these proficiency data obtained through external validation, we have also conducted unofficial benchmark testing with our sophomore teacher candidates at the mid-program review point to assess their progress in speaking and writing and to provide feedback and remediation. Specifically: (1) Candidates complete an unofficial OPI with one of our currently certified OPI testers of Spanish and receive an advisory rating with a detailed description of what they are able to do in Spanish and what they need to be able to do in order to reach the minimum level of Advanced Low; and (2) Candidates complete an informal writing assessment and receive a similar description and recommendations for improving their writing. We believe that these benchmark assessments have been key to enabling candidates to improve and meet the minimum required level of Advanced Low in both speaking and writing prior to entering Student Teaching.

It merits mentioning that, in a recent survey of IUP cooperating teachers conducted by our College of Education and Educational Technology, the following comments were made by cooperating teachers in Spanish regarding the preparation of our teacher candidates as it pertains to their proficiency in Spanish:

- "The fluency level of the candidates in Spanish is without compare. We have had to stop accepting candidates from other colleges and universities because their proficiency level was not high enough to work with our AP-level 7 students."
- "Spanish teacher candidates easily negotiate meaning with students and create a non-threatening environment conducive to language acquisition."
- "Spanish teacher candidates are passionate about Spanish language and culture and are always looking for new ways to learn and grow."

Historically, departmental faculty have worked diligently to provide opportunities for our Spanish majors to improve their proficiency and cultural understanding outside of class (e.g., Ándale—Spanish Club, Piso Cervantes—Spanish Floor of Residence Hall, LASO—Latin American Student Organization). Several faculty members devote hours each week to conversing with teacher candidates, including by phone, in an effort to practice Advanced-level functions. We have continued to use the OPI results as one data point for making curricular and programmatic decisions. For example, beginning in Fall 2015, the senior-level conversation course, SPAN 450—Conversation Forum, will be a required, rather than an elective, course to provide opportunities for candidates to focus on developing their oral proficiency at the Advanced level. Over the years, we have developed a community of learners who understand and value the attainment of a high level of proficiency in Spanish and have a commitment to reaching as high a level as possible. We are pleased that the majority of our Spanish Education candidates reach the Advanced-Low level of oral proficiency on their first attempt prior to Student Teaching. We will continue our efforts to provide ample extra-curricular activities and to design remediation plans for students who do not achieve the required level on their first attempt at the exit OPI.

We have also used WPT data to make curricular decisions. Since our last program review, we have had 2 faculty retreats, and one focus of both was to examine ways in which the writing proficiency of candidates (i.e., all students in Spanish courses) could be improved, in light of the fact that some students each year were not achieving the Advanced Low level on the first WPT attempt. We had two faculty retreats, one in Fall 2009, and the other in Fall 2014, where one of the issues was the role of writing across the Spanish curriculum. Two specific curricular changes resulted:

- (1) In 2011, the course SPAN 230 Intermediate Composition was revised and renamed SPAN 230 Intermediate Composition and Grammar to include a review grammar component and to focus on the writing genres of summary, description, and narration. Additionally, the revised course incorporates more writing opportunities that parallel the WPT requirements: timed writing without access to dictionaries and other instructional materials; and
- (2) In Spring 2015, a new composition course was developed, SPAN 330 Advanced Spanish Composition and Grammar, to focus on the writing genres of exposition, argumentation, and academic research. This course was created in part to provide additional opportunities for our teacher candidates to work towards writing at the Advanced level. This new course will be offered for the first time in Fall 2015.

Our discussion of writing proficiency also focused on the development of writing in our advanced-level culture and literature courses and the

expectations in terms of written products that students produce. As a result, in 2012, we made some adjustments to the rubric that we had been using (in our previous program review) for SPAN 340 Hispanic Civilization Through the 19th Century and the other 300-level culture courses to make clearer the expectations for the types of writing and elements being assessed. Further, in 2014, we developed a totally new rubric to assess the final paper that students create in our upper-level literature courses. We designed both of these rubrics to have similar criteria so that we are measuring the same areas in research writing across the curriculum at the 300- and 400- level. See the narrative for Assessment #2 for more detailed discussion of the rubric. We are not including the literature rubric in this report since it is not being used currently in any of our 8 assessments being presented for review. However, the following is a comparison of the criteria on the two rubrics:

300-Level Culture Rubric

Content of Paper (Cultural Products, Practices, Perspectives)

Originality

Use of Sources in Research

Organization

Grammatical Accuracy/Mechanics

Vocabulary

300-/400-Level Literature Rubric

Content of Paper

Originality & Quality of Thesis

Quality of Research/Use of Sources

Organization & Argumentation

Grammatical Accuracy/Mechanics

Vocabulary

We use the data from these assessments to monitor the performance of our candidates in the area of writing so that can continue to make course and curricular changes.

On a yearly basis, departmental faculty examine the data from our key assessments in each course (i.e., KARS and new LiveText systems) in order to examine trends in the performance of our candidates. In our last program review, we developed more “robust” assessments that provide an opportunity for candidates to synthesize what they are learning in multiple courses within and beyond the department (see Assessments #2 and #7). Our content knowledge assessments illustrate that candidates are attaining content-based expectations of both our program competencies and the ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards. We attribute this to at least two factors: (1) all Spanish majors participate in a study abroad program; and (2) prior to our last program review, we updated all course objectives to be performance- and proficiency-based and aligned courses more with expectations of ACTFL/NCATE (now transitioning to ACTFL/CAEP).

In order to continue the progress we have made in the area of improving candidates’ knowledge, departmental faculty need to continue to be educated in terms of the newly revised K-16 World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages and the ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards. Some faculty still do not have a thorough understanding of areas such as the 3-P cultures framework, interpretive listening and reading, second-language acquisition issues, and standards-based planning and assessment. Our Departmental Assessment Committee continues to work on creating opportunities to bring faculty together for purposes of professional development and discussion, as in our faculty retreats. Continued progress requires ongoing collaboration among faculty.

Note: We have not made changes to our content assessments (#1, #2, #6, #7) because we feel that these are still cutting-edge assessments and indeed have been adopted by many other institutions for use in their programs. As explained in detail in Assessment #2, we changed the criteria in the rubric for the Cultural Investigation to address the concerns about the development of our candidates’ writing proficiency. Additionally, as explained in detail in Assessment #7, we expanded the rubric from 3 to 4 performance levels to better capture the specific performances of candidates at the broader “Acceptable” level.

PROFESSIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

Assessment data clearly verify that IUP’s Spanish Education K-12 candidates are reaching the expectations outlined in the ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards with respect to pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions. We believe that two factors continue to contribute to this: (1) our candidates are engaged in teaching from the time they are sophomores, and (2) course work and teaching experiences are closely intertwined.

Each year IUP requires each program to produce its Student Performance Data Analysis Report (SPDAR), in which faculty use the data from our key assessments (presented in this Program Report) to analyze the performance of teacher candidates in terms of professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The results of the reports from the past 3 academic years, together with the data presented in this Program Report for the 8 assessments, reveal the following areas in which candidates have shown improvement since our last program review:

1. integrating the 3-P cultures framework into their lessons;
2. addressing interpretive listening and reading more extensively in their teaching; and
3. reflecting on their teaching in a more insightful, in-depth manner.

We believe these improvements are the result of our integrating much more work on these three areas in the 2 methodology courses and field experiences through additional modeling and opportunities for us to provide feedback to candidates prior to Student Teaching. In the recent survey of IUP cooperating teachers (mentioned in the previous section), teachers commented on how highly skilled our candidates are in

using technology to integrate the 5 Cs, especially communities and cultures.

Performance data also reveal the following areas in which candidates still need to grow:

1. making connections between other school subjects and Spanish in their lessons;
2. providing opportunities for students to interact with target-language communities; and
3. integrating a discussion of SLA theories into the self-reflections of their teaching.

Indeed, integration of both the Connections and Communities Goal areas of the national student standards is an area that is being addressed on a national level as being challenges for teachers at all levels of instruction. Ways in which we plan to address these three areas include:

- introduce some of the SLA theories typically introduced in the second methodology course (EDUC 453) earlier in the sophomore-year methodology course (SPAN 390) so that candidates have more time to explore and understand them;
- include more work in the methods courses and Pre-Student Teaching I and II on integrating the Connections goal area so that candidates are more comfortable working with Connections in Student Teaching, and provide more examples of lessons that include cross-disciplinary concepts; and
- integrate more projects in which candidates are required to interact with native speakers so that they acquire ideas for how they may integrate the Communities goal area into their teaching.

On our annual SPDAR reports, we will continue to evaluate progress made in these three areas.

Note: We have not made changes to our pedagogical assessments (#3, #4, #5, #8) because we feel that these are still cutting-edge assessments and indeed have been adopted by many other institutions for use in their programs. As explained in detail in Assessments #4, #5, and #8, we did expand the rubrics from 3 to 4 performance levels to better capture the specific performances of candidates at the broader "Acceptable" level.

EFFECTS ON P-12 STUDENT LEARNING

The Teacher Work Sample developed by the Spanish Education K-12 Program in 2005 has continued to serve as the model for the other teacher preparation programs at IUP and in other foreign language programs outside of IUP. Indeed the Comprehensive Unit Plan assignment in EDUC 453 (Teaching Foreign Language in the Secondary School) illustrated in Assessment #3 has enabled candidates to practice the steps involved in unit and daily lesson planning.

Data obtained through the Work Sample indicate that our candidates demonstrate that they have positive effects on K-12 student learning, as a result of Student Teaching. Performance on this assignment has steadily improved each year. Over the past two years, we have placed more emphasis on ways to differentiate instruction and have made this a requirement for Student Teaching. We believe that this additional focus has enabled our candidates to more fully understand the reason for conducting pre- and post-assessment and how pre-assessment results can provide valuable information regarding readiness of their P-12 students to learn and the need for differentiation.

We plan to work with our colleagues who teach EDSP477 Assessment of Student Learning: Design and Interpretation of Educational Measures in an effort to implement strategies for helping our candidates to interpret the data results from their P-12 students more effectively. Additionally, we will provide more exemplars of unit plans that integrate technology and higher-order thinking skills, beginning in the sophomore-level methodology course (SPAN 390). Further, we will continue to work on specific components of the Work Sample in our methods courses and our early field experiences, Pre-Student Teaching I and II, so that candidates become accustomed to making a case that they are having positive effects on the learning of their P-12 students.

Note: We have not made changes to Assessment #5 (Teacher Work Sample) because it has been a model for others to follow and is still a cutting-edge assessment. As explained in detail in Assessment #5, we did expand the rubric from 3 to 4 performance levels to better capture the specific performances of candidates at the broader "Acceptable" level.

It is important to note the positive feedback that we consistently receive from Spanish Education K-12 teacher candidates upon graduation and from alumni who have teaching positions. A few recent comments offered in response to a survey request from our College of Education and Educational Technology include:

- My program was seriously amazing, and could not have prepared me more. I am first year teacher and recently returned to present at the language conference held at IUP.
- I was barely nervous for interviews because I felt SO prepared through IUP's program. I have already received multiple job offers and am so fortunate that I chose IUP to pursue my career pathways.
- The program was difficult at times, but IUP has a solid reputation with its Teacher Preparation Programs, and countless school districts seek out IUP graduates. I feel prepared to have my own classroom in the near future!

In summary, our program collects, analyzes, and uses the data results from our key assessments to assess the performance of our candidates in Spanish Education K-12 in the areas of content knowledge in Spanish, professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and candidate effects on P-12 learning. Data from these assessments are used (1) to inform candidates about their progress in the program; (2) to provide faculty with data-driven information about candidate progress in terms of specific rubric criteria as well as overall trends in performance across courses; and (3) to discuss and make informed changes to the program (i.e., to the curriculum, courses, teaching) to improve the performance of our candidates. Through this process, our assessment system enables us to close the loop between assessment and instruction.

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. For Revised Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the standards that were not met in the

original submission. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Revised Report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/RevisedProgramReports/tabid/453/Default.aspx>

For Response to Conditions Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the conditions cited in the original recognition report. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions Report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/ResponseToConditionsReport/tabid/454/Default.aspx>

(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

Please click "Next"

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