



***REVIEWING THE ACTFL/CAEP PROGRAM REPORT***

ACTFL Executive Director: Marty Abbott

ACTFL Program Review Coordinator: Judith Shrum, Emerita, Virginia Tech

ACTFL Audit Team:

Teresa Bell, Brigham Young University

Rebecca Fox, George Mason University

Dave McAlpine, Emeritus, University of Arkansas-Little Rock

Shawn Morrison, College of Charleston

Pete Swanson, Georgia State University

Edward VanVliet, State University of New York, Geneseo

## Preface

This is the first version of ACTFL's guide developed to assist ACTFL reviewers and audit team members as they review Program Reports. Although it is based in large part on NCATE and CAEP guides, it contains information, suggestions, and requirements that are specific to the work of preparing foreign language teachers using the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards* (2013).

## REVIEWING THE ACTFL/CAEP PROGRAM REPORT

### Roles of Reviewers

- Judge alignment of assessment and candidate data with *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*
- Clearly communicate strengths and weaknesses in relation to the standards
- Make a judgment with a clear and open mind
- Make a judgment based on accepted criteria rather than personal bias
- The job of the reviewer is to make as objective an assessment as possible about the degree to which a given program meets the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*, based on candidate performance evidence.

### Primary Documents and Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS):

Institutions, colleges or universities, or agencies that prepare foreign language teachers are called Education Preparation Providers (EPPs). The **Program Report** is the documentation submitted by the program within an EPP to demonstrate that it meets the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*. All of the information that you will use to make a decision will be found in the Program Report. This document, submitted either March 15 or September 15 on-line, is available to you in Program Review System (PRS) through Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS) at <http://www.aims.caepnet.org>. You can print out individual sections of the Program Report if you'd prefer to work with a hard copy.

To gain access to AIMS, you will first need to let CAEP Staff know of your availability for any given review cycle, and inform them of any conflicts of interest you may have, e.g., a program where you worked, or where your family members attend, etc. In April and September of each year CAEP Staff will send you a Conflict of Interest (COI) email inviting you to participate in a survey to give them this information. The letter will include the survey URL, your login id, and your password. In April and October of each year, you will receive an email informing you of which programs you have been assigned to prepare a Reviewer Report. There may be one or two other reviewers who will be working on your team. They will each prepare a report, listed as Reviewer 1 or Reviewer 2 or Lead Reviewer (Reviewer 3). You will know which reviewer you are because your AIMS screen will only allow you to access the icon for the reports you've been assigned and as the reviewer number you've been assigned. The Lead Reviewer will coordinate the team, contacting everyone and keeping the team on schedule, and then completing a compiled Team Report based on everyone's consensus.

The Audit Report will be prepared by members of the ACTFL Audit Team by examining the Team Report (and Reviewer Reports if necessary). The Audit Team may change the Team's decisions, revise wording, or verify accuracy in order to provide positive guidance to the program. The CAEP Staff reviews the Audit Team's report, which at this point is called the National Recognition Report, and posts the Final Report, which is then returned to the Program. All of the ACTFL/CAEPs use the same format for the CAEP Program National Recognition Report.

Once you have your assignment, go to <http://www.aims.caepnet.org> and log in with your id and password. Note the "Resources" button on the left side menu where you can click for sample good reports and assessments from program that are nationally recognized by ACTFL/CAEP, webinars for new reviewers, for lead reviewers, and other helpful information. Click on "Program Review System (PRS)" and you will see a screen for the programs you are to review. From left to right, you will see:

- the name of the program
- the degree they are describing
- the standards they are using
- the review team assigned
- the Option Report, usually A but sometimes B
- a section on the Program Report that shows "Previous" and "Current"; the Current report has a date below it for the current review cycle; the previous report with a "1" on it was the report submitted by the program prior to the current one, and the report with a "2" on it was submitted in an even earlier review cycle
- a section for Reviewer Reports, 1, 2, Lead, Team, and Auditor
- a section for Final Report that shows "Previous" and "Current", and again the "1" is a final report most recent to the current final report
- lastly, you will see a column for the Recognition Decision.

Download the current Program Report and open it. You may wish to save it on your desktop or print it out. The designation on the file will probably not make much sense to you, but it does to CAEP Staff. For our purposes, it might be best to re-label the file something like this:

XYZ University BA march 2015 PROG or  
XYZ University MA march 2015 PROG

If you are working on a Response to Conditions Report, you should also download the previous National Recognition Report from the "Final" column and label it something like:

XYZ University BA sept 2015 AUDIT

This way you don't have to keep going back to the AIMS site and re-downloading when you can't remember which report you are working on while moving back and forth among several documents.

After you've downloaded the Program Report, click on the paperclip on the top left menu to see the Attachments, which should include the assessments, Program of Study, Attachment C Self-Assessment for ACTFL, and any other documents the program supplied. The paperclip should be obvious on a PC but on a MAC you may have to take additional steps: Go to "View" on the top tool bar, scroll down to "Show/Hide", slide over to "Navigation panes" and scroll down to

“Attachments”, where you will see the paper clip icon. You will need to open these documents as you continue your review. You can save and/or print them.

As you review the Program Report you will have several documents to work with. The first is the **ACTFL/CAEP Reviewer Worksheet** and is included at the end of this document.

ACTFL/CAEP has prepared a worksheet that based on CAEP’s generic worksheet but it is more specific to *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*. It will help you work your way through the standards, and will help you prepare the information you will need to complete the Program Recognition Report. You may want to print this out so you can use it to take notes as you read through the report. This is a personal document and will not be shared with your teammates. You will not submit the Worksheet to CAEP. The Worksheet is just a tool to help you complete the review and to guide you in preparing the information you will need to complete the Program Recognition Report.

## Overview of Program Report

The Program Report consists of a Cover Sheet and five sections.

- The Cover Sheet provides basic information about the program being submitted;
- Section I presents background and contextual information about the program;
- Section II includes a chart that lists each of the 6-8 assessments, their nature and place in the program;
- Section III includes a chart that links the 6-8 assessments with the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*
- Section IV provides a two page narrative describing the assessment, how it is aligned with *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from two applications of the assessment, plus the assessment tool itself as given to teacher candidates or a description of it, the rubric and/or scoring guide and the data tables for each of the 6-8 assessments;
- Section V provides information on how the program faculty members have used the data to improve their program and strengthen candidate performance.

The following information supplies more detail about each section of the Program Report including information on how to use each section as you complete your evaluation. Good Program Reports and good assessments from programs that at nationally recognized by ACTFL/CAEP can be found at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl> and from the ACTFL website at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep>.

### Section I—Context

Section I, the Context Section of the Program Report, should provide background information for the reviewer. It includes information about the program, the environment, and the demographics in which the program functions in its state. This section also includes descriptions of faculty expertise and experience in the specialty field, relationship of assessments used in the program to the EPP’s assessment system, and the program of study together with the field and

clinical experiences required for the program. Concerns, strengths, or deficiencies found in this part of the Program Report may be seen in the evidence provided for the subsequent sections of the report and may serve to explain that evidence. If, as you read Section I, you have strong concerns about the faculty, curriculum or other components of the program, you may note them on your Reviewer Worksheet and/or include them in Part F, item F.1, of the Program Recognition Report.

## **Section II—Assessments and Related Data**

Section II is a chart that program compilers will use to list the key assessments. You will be using this information as you work through Section III and IV of the report so you may find yourselves clicking back and forth between these sections.

## **Section III—Standards Assessment Chart**

The chart in Section III links the assessments to the standards. Each standard is listed in the first column. In the final column compilers have checked the numbers of the assessments (from the chart in Section II) that they feel address each standard.

## **Section IV—Evidence for Meeting Standards.**

In Section IV compilers provide a narrative for each of their key assessments. In this narrative they are asked to

- provide a brief description of the assessment
- describe how the assessment addresses the standards (as checked in the chart in Section III)
- provide a brief analysis of the data findings
- provide an interpretation of how those data provide evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards* by number, title, and/or wording from the standard.

Following in the same document should be three components for each assessment: the assessment instrument as given to teacher candidates (or complete descriptions of the assessments), the rubric and/or scoring guide for each assessment, and a chart that includes the data for each assessment. You will also notice that for the 6-8 key assessments, the program has uploaded the narrative, assessment description or tool, scoring guide and data as one document that should be labeled “Assessment 3”, for example. Some programs may choose to upload the descriptive narrative, instrument, the rubric/scoring guide, and the data chart as separate documents but it is much easier for reviewers if these components are all in one document. When examining the different attachments within the Program Report, the program should have uploaded no more than 20 attachments.

As a reviewer, you will use this information to answer two primary questions: 1) are the assessments appropriate for the cited standards? and 2) do the candidate data demonstrate that most candidates meet the standard? The information in Section IV should give you insight into

how the faculty perceive the assessments align with the standards and provide information about any data that appear questionable or, perhaps, absent.

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

The purpose of the final portion of the Program Report, Section V, is to demonstrate that faculty have used results from the key assessments to improve candidate achievement and program performance. The Program Report template includes these directions to report compilers:

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 members have 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.

Reviewer evaluation comments on this portion of the Program Report are placed in Part D of the Program Recognition Report. This information also provides critical information for the Board of Examiners.

## **Completing a Program Review**

### **Getting Started:**

When you first open up the Program Report you might find it helpful to begin by reading Section I first, scanning Sections II and III, and then opening the attachments and in Section IV. This should help give you an understanding of the assessments and how they relate to the standards. You can then go to the Reviewer Worksheet (and/or other ACTFL/CAEP documents) and work through each of the questions.

The Reviewer Worksheet is organized around *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*. You are asked to evaluate each of the assessments assigned to a specific standard (from Section III of the Program Report), evaluate the reported candidate data, and then to make a decision about whether or not each standard is met.

The following information is to help guide you as you answer each of the questions on the Reviewer Worksheet. Rubrics will be developed for each of these questions. The rubrics have three levels: target, acceptable, and unacceptable. Each of these is defined below:

- Target: Fully meets and exceeds standard
- Acceptable: Meets standard; weaknesses may be found, but overall the standard is met
- Unacceptable: Weaknesses are serious and must be addressed prior to positive rating

### **A. Are the assessments aligned with the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*?**

Assessments must be aligned with the standards—there must be a match between the content of the standard and what the assessment is measuring. It is quite likely that a single assessment could address components of multiple standards (as indicated in the chart in Section III of the Program Report). Here are some questions that reviewers might ask as they evaluate alignment of the assessments:

- **CONTENT**—Do the same or consistent content topics appear in the assessments that are in the standards?
- **RANGE** —Do the assessments address the range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are delineated in the standard? Some *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards* are very comprehensive, some cover smaller elements. In general, is the preponderance of the content of the standard addressed by the assessments assigned to it? If the ACTFL/CAEP standard is very dense and covers a number of concepts, it is not necessary to check off every single element. It is better to look holistically at the standard as you compare it to the assessments. ACTFL/CAEP resources should be helpful to you when addressing this question.

### **B. Do the assessments assess meaningful cognitive demands and skill requirements at challenging levels for candidates?**

Here are two questions that reviewers might ask as they evaluate this question:

- **COMPLEXITY**—Are the assessments congruent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill requirements described in the standards?
- **DIFFICULTY**—Is the level of effort required, or the difficulty or degree of challenge of the assessments consistent with standards? Is this level reasonable for candidates who are ready to teach or to take on other professional educator responsibilities?
- From what you find in the assessment, the instructions, and the scoring guide, is the assessment measuring what it purports to measure?

#### **Other issues:**

- **SPECIFICITY**—Are the assessments vague or poorly defined? The assessments might include an entry like “portfolio entries, test results, observations.” What entries? What test results? What observations? These need to be identified as specific experiences that are evaluated with rubrics. Is the assessment information oblique or confused? Sometimes the response does not actually address the standard.
- **OTHER REMINDERS FOR REVIEWERS**—
  - If grades are used as evidence, then the Program Report must follow the instructions on the CAEP website that describes how programs use grades to assess content

knowledge. This document should give a description of the assessment by providing brief descriptions of the courses and a rationale as to why these courses were chosen, show alignment between the course grades and the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*, submit grading policies and a minimum expectation for candidate grades and finally, present data tables presenting, at a minimum, the grade distributions and mean course grades for candidates in the selected courses. Institutions cannot claim that an acceptable grade in a course in which an important experience is embedded is sufficient to assume that the specific experience is satisfactory. For example, if a research project in a required course is cited as an example of how candidates meet a ACTFL/CAEP standard, the course grade (which includes many measures beyond the research project) cannot automatically be assumed to reflect information about candidate mastery of the standard. Please see <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/grade-policy>.

- If the program is a post-baccalaureate or Master's degree program that admits candidates from other institutions, it should employ and report data from a transcript analysis, using the following format: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/transcript-analysis>.

### **C. Are the assessments free from bias?**

From information provided in the Program Report, reviewers should be able to infer some important qualities about the avoidance of bias. Assessments should be constructed in ways that avoid biases in both language and in testing situations.

Reviewers can consider the following question:

- Are the assessments and their scoring guide free from racial, ethnic, gender, cultural, or other bias?

### **D. Are the scoring guides/rubrics clear and are the levels of candidate proficiency they describe distinct and appropriate?**

A scoring guide is the tool faculty use to determine candidates' ratings on specific assessments. Scoring guides should address relevant and meaningful attributes of candidate knowledge and performance related to the standards on an assessment task and should be used to reach meaningful decisions. Scoring guides can take many forms (such as Likert scales and rubrics) depending on the assessment activity.

Regardless of the form the scoring guides take, they should have written and shared criteria for judging performance that indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated. They should be explicit enough to anchor judgments about the degree of success on a candidate assessment.

Many assessments are little more than checklists completed at the end of the student teaching experience. They do not define what is being sought and the ratings are in some cases mere numbers or words subject to broad interpretation (e.g., 1, 2, or 3; or excellent, good, acceptable).



Such instruments do not provide either candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.

ACTFL reviewers expect to see full rubrics with descriptions of candidate performance for each category. It is important that the rubrics align to the standard and that the task the candidates perform is one that will enable them to show their ability to perform according to the expectations of the standard.

To be reliable, assessments must be capable of yielding approximately the same values across raters. One way to achieve inter-rater reliability is to train raters, but this is difficult to evaluate in this paper review. A second and more practical approach is to carefully review instruments that are highly explicit as to expectations and ratings.

When evaluating scoring guides, reviewers can consider such questions as the following:

- Are scoring guides clear and explicit about faculty expectations for candidate proficiencies in relation to standards?
- Do scoring guides address relevant and meaningful attributes of candidate performance on an assessment task? Do assessments and scoring guides work together so that different levels of candidate proficiency can be clearly distinguished
- When rubrics are used, is there specific guidance on what a rater might look for?

Good assessments from programs that are nationally recognized by ACTFL/CAEP can be found at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/actfl> and at <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep>.

#### **E. Do the data as reported indicate the extent to which the candidates meet the standard?**

The key summarizing question for reviewers is: does the program present convincing evidence that its graduates can demonstrate that they have mastered the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*? The primary sources of information for you to use to address this question are the narratives and data charts in Section IV for each assessment. This should give you a complete picture of the data, how faculty members interpret the data, and any contextual issues that might have had an impact on the data. Remember that the purpose of this kind of assessment for the program is so that they can be assured that their candidates are able to perform according to the expectations set by the profession in the standards.

#### **F. Is the standard met?**

After answering the previous four questions, you are now asked to make a holistic decision on whether or not the standard is met. In general, most of the previous four questions should be met at the acceptable level for the standard to be met, but this should certainly be a matter of professional judgment. For example, you may deem that the assessments and scoring guide are appropriate but that there are no data available yet, because the assessment is new and data have not been collected. In this situation, you may determine that the standard is met with conditions.

In another situation, the assessments may be appropriate but the scoring guide is so weak that the data are essentially useless. In this case, the standard could not be met.

## **G. Final Program Recognition Decision**

After you have made individual decisions for each of the standards, you are asked to look at all of these decisions and then make one recognition decision for the program as a whole. As you do this, there are several things to consider.

Consideration in Determining a Program Rating

- Number of standards not met.
- Degree of divergence of ratings across standards

Remember...

- There may be many ways to reach the same goal.
- Judgments must be based on standards, not personal opinion
- Be reasonable, not harsh nor gullible

Possible program recognition decisions:

The three possible final decisions are described below:

### *1. National Recognition contingent upon unit accreditation*

- The program substantially meets standards
- No further submissions required; program will receive full national recognition when the unit receives accreditation
- Program will be listed on the CAEP web site as Nationally Recognized if the unit is already accredited. If the unit is not accredited, the program will be listed as National Recognized pending unit accreditation.

### *2. National Recognition with Conditions*

- The program generally meets all 6 *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*; however, a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
  - Insufficient data to determine if standards are met
  - Insufficient alignment among standards or scoring assessments or scoring guides
  - Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides
  - An insufficient number of SPA standards was met
  - The NCATE 80% pass rate on state licensure tests is not met; this is a requirement of programs whose EPPs are completing an NCATE legacy accreditation process. CAEP does not have an 80% pass rate requirement.

The program has two opportunities within the 18-months after the decision to submit a Response to Conditions Report in order to remove the conditions. If

the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.

The program is listed on the CAEP website as *Nationally Recognized with Conditions* until it achieves *National Recognition* or its status is changed to *Not Recognized*, in which case the program will be removed from the list on the website.

The conditions will be explicit and clearly stated in Part G of the National Recognition Report. CAEP provides training to reviewers, ACTFL/CAEP Coordinators, and audit teams on writing explicit and specific conditions statements.

3. *Further Development Required:*

- There are many unmet critical standards, OR there are not many unmet standards but they are so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate.
- The program will have two opportunities within the 12- to 14-months after the first decision to submit a Revised Report in order to attain *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. These reports will be sent to the same team of reviewers if possible. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.

After two submissions within the 12- to 14-month period (from the first decision) that were unsuccessful in reaching either *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*, a program would receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized*.

Implications for further action:

- Conditions must be explicit and clearly stated in Part G of the National Recognition Report. If possible, the report will be sent to the original team for review.
- CAEP will provide training to reviewers, ACTFL/CAEP Coordinators, and Audit Teams on writing explicit and specific conditions statements.
- See also the section on Part G and writing conditions later in this report.

Special note: To receive ACTFL/CAEP National Recognition, programs must meet Standard 1a fully as evidenced by an official ACTFL OPI designated as Assessment 6 or Assessment 1 (if it's the state-required assessment). To meet the standard, Advanced Low (Intermediate High for Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, or Korean) must be set as the minimum level required on an official version of the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview. For candidates in international programs whose target language is English, the required minimal level is Intermediate High in English. It is not required that all candidates have reached that level at the time the Program Report is submitted. The data submitted should show that progress is being made at the institutional level. The report must describe the institutional plans for ensuring that all of its candidates reach the required level.

Latin and Standard 1: Although there is no OPI for Latin, programs should demonstrate teacher candidate knowledge that addresses the standard. From *ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards* (2002), p. 5-6, Standard 1: “Candidates who teach target languages with a Roman alphabetic writing system, including the classical languages, must demonstrate a minimum writing proficiency level of Advanced-Low. ...”

“Since the primary goal of teachers of classical languages lies in the interpretation of written texts, no specific speaking and writing proficiency levels are established for candidates who teach these languages. However, teachers of classical languages should be able to ask simple comprehension questions in the target language based on the texts being read. They should also have the ability to write simple sentences in the target language. Candidates teaching classical languages must be able to comprehend and interpret original written works in these languages. Their ability to interpret texts is based on the type of text and the degree to which they are familiar with the content of the text.”

### **Strengths:**

As you read through the report, you should pay attention to aspects of the program that are unique and/or that you see as strengths. There is a section on the ACTFL/CAEP Reviewer Worksheet for you to note these as you see them. Strengths can either be specific aspects of the program (e.g., diversity of clinical sites) or more global statements (e.g., a major focus on teaching in urban settings). These will be cited in Part A in the ACTFL/CAEP Program Recognition Report in the text box labeled as “Summary of Strengths.”

## **The ACTFL/CAEP Program Recognition Report**

The ACTFL/CAEP Program Recognition Report is the formal document that you complete and submit to CAEP. Your team leader, using individual reviewer reports and other input will complete the team report that will be submitted to CAEP. The ACTFL/CAEP Audit team will have access to all the individual reviewer reports as well as the final report. A Program Recognition Report should be completed for each Program Report you review.

The CAEP Program Recognition Report has 7 sections. The following information provides information about each section and describes how to use information from the Reviewer Worksheet to complete the report.

### **Introductory Information:**

Complete this information for each program. This information can be copied from the Cover Sheet of the Program Report.

### **Part A—Recognition Decision**

#### **A.1—ACTFL/CAEP Decision on CAEP Recognition of the Program**

In this section put your final decision, taken from the Reviewer Worksheet, Section G. There are three possible decisions: Nationally Recognized, Nationally Recognized with Conditions or Further Development Required/Recognized with Probation.

## **A.2—Test Results**

The information on the test results on the state-required test can be taken from the Cover Sheet in the Program Report. There is place for you to add comments if appropriate. Comments may refer to the program's high success rate on the state test, or to explanations needed about discrepancies between number of candidates and number of examinees. Programs completing accreditation under NCATE's Legacy process must show an 80% pass rate on the state-required test. CAEP does not stipulate the 80% pass rate. Instead it encourages programs to document progress toward an "aspirational goal" of 90%. ACTFL does not require a percentage pass rate, and these data would be considered under Standard 1.

## **A.3—Summary of Strengths**

It is important that you cite strengths of the program that you have noticed. These can be taken from your notes on the ACTFL/CAEP Reviewer Worksheet. Strengths could be either specific aspects of the program (e.g., diversity of clinical sites) or more global statements (e.g. a major focus on teaching in urban settings), but should not be just a reiteration of the sections of the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards* that were approved.

To give you some guidance, here are a couple of examples of well written "Summary of Strength" statements:

- ongoing development of proficiency by means of diagnostic testing, coursework, and mock OPI interviews prior to taking the official ACTFL OPI
- emphasis on reflective practitioner throughout education coursework
- use of an action research project that focuses candidates on their effect on student learning
- review process is data driven and there is evidence of revisions/program changes resulting from examination of collected assessment data. Assessments included in review clearly demonstrate evidence that most candidates are meeting Professional Standards. Rubrics are detailed, easy to understand, clear in their analysis and aligned with relevant program standards

## **Part B—Status of Meeting *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards***

In this section cite each individual standard as Met, Met with Conditions or Not Met. Take this information from Column F of the Reviewer Worksheet. If a standard is found Met with Conditions or Not Met, you must include a comment to explain why it is met with conditions or not met. Programs appreciate positive reviewer comments even if the standard is met, and thus it's best not to leave the comment boxes empty. If a standard was met in a previous report, please type in "Met in previous National Recognition Report (2/2016). The comment should provide enough information for the program to be able to understand the issue.

Some guidelines for writing the comments:

- Use objective, impartial language
- Be complete so no other information is needed to understand why standard is “not met.”
- Explanation must be related only to the standard
- Be as clear and specific as possible
- Use direct language without being harsh or unprofessional
- Don’t use modifiers that appear tentative or uncertain
- Cite weaknesses if these have not already been addressed
- Be careful about including specific instructions for remediation (e.g. the faculty should develop a new course). Any “suggestions” from the reviewers will be taken as “commands” by the faculty. It is not the reviewers’ role to proscribe programmatic changes, but to provide explanation for why particular standards were not met.

To give you some guidance, here are a couple of examples of well written comments for Part B:

- The program offers Assessment 2 to address Standard 2 – Cultures, Linguistics, Literatures, and Concepts from Other Disciplines. This assessment does not refer specifically to cultures, linguistics or literatures; rather it is focused on planning lessons that improve student understanding through the use of various reading processes. (Met with conditions)
- The program cites assessment 5, the rubric and data table based on the state assessment, as providing evidence to address Standard 4 – Integration of the Standards into Planning. However, reviewers found no mention of the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (2015) in this assessment tool. Also, reviewers found no scoring guides or rubrics in the information provided to help understand how a candidate’s performance is as “target/proficient/developing” or as “exceeds/meets/approaches”. There was no information specific to the relationship of the state assessment and the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*, including standard 4. (Unmet)
- As evidence addressing Standard 4 (Integration of Standards into Planning) the program cites Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Evaluation). The assessment as required by the program’s institution is generic for all of its programs and must be supplemented to show how teacher candidates in foreign language classrooms perform in ways that are specific to *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*. (Met with conditions.)
- The program has put in place the requirement for a minimal score of Advanced Low on an official ACTFL OPI. This requirement appears in the Plan of Studies and other materials given to teacher candidates. The program provides ongoing development of oral proficiency including a “mock OPI” and a remediation plan for candidates who do not reach Advanced Low. (Met)

## **Part C—Evaluation of Program Report Evidence**

In Part C you are asked to evaluate how well the program's assessments and candidate data address content knowledge, pedagogical and professional content knowledge skills and dispositions, and candidate impact on student learning. The information in Part C summarizes the Program Report evaluation in a way that will be extremely useful to the Board of Examiners when they evaluate the unit against Unit Standard 1.

In this section, reviewers should discuss how appropriately the ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards were addressed in each of the three categories, C.1, C.2, and C.3; whether the assessments were of sufficient quality to address the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*; how effective the scoring guides were in identifying appropriate levels of proficiency, and to what extent candidates are meeting the standards. To complete Part C, you should use the chart in Section III of the Program Report. To complete section C.1, find those standards that have "Content Knowledge" checked in the second column and summarize your decisions for those standards (or components of those standards). For C.2, find those standards in the Section III chart that are cited for "Pedagogical/Professional Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions. For C.3, find those standards that are cited for "Effect on Student Learning."

The last page of the Reviewer Worksheet has a table to help you organize your response to Part C. In each of the sections of Part C you should write relatively brief (1-2 paragraphs) that summarize your evaluation of the relevant standards.

To give you some guidance, here are a couple of examples of well written comments for Part C:

- The institution indicated assessments to address areas of content knowledge essential for foreign language teachers. However, evidence from Assessment 2 was not available; other assessments provided only limited data for some areas of content knowledge (i.e., cultural products, practices, and perspectives); and no evidence was available to indicate knowledge of the three modes of communication, negotiation of meaning, or use of target language.
- The institution indicated Assessments 3, 4, and 5 address ACTFL's standards applicable to pedagogical knowledge and skills. However, the elements of the scoring rubrics and the candidate data presented only indirectly or narrowly addressed most of these standards. The generic nature of the assessments does not provide the program with information about its candidates' standards-based performance in foreign language classrooms. It was difficult for reviewers to see relationships from the information and candidate data presented that was clearly directed toward and aligned with the applicable standards.
- Assessments 1 (state test), 2 (Literary/Cultural Project), 6 (ACTFL OPI), 7 (Linguistic Comparison and Analysis) provide ample evidence that the program's teacher candidates have adequate content knowledge for teaching foreign languages.
- Analysis of student learning is clearly covered in the assessments. Many of the projects are cross-referenced and cover content, pedagogy as well as student learning impact standards.
- The program appears to understand that it has considerable work to do; some significant weaknesses have been identified and the program indicates it knows it must work on these. Significant changes and strengthening of the program can come from this realization. This review should assist in the process as well.

## **Part D—Evaluation of the Use of Assessment Results.**

In Part D, you should provide your evaluation of the information submitted in Section V of the Program Report. Questions for consideration might include:

- Is it clear that assessment evidence is used by the institution in evaluating the program, counseling candidates, and revising courses or other elements of the program?
- Has the institution made program changes based on assessment evidence?
- Do you find the faculty interpretations consistent with the evidence provided in the Program Report?
- Are the implications for programs that appear in this section of the Program Report derived from the interpretations?

To give you some guidance, here are a couple of examples of well written comments for Part D:

- Supportive evidence is clear for all assessments and there is a procedure in place for the evaluation and application of that evidence for the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program.
- The program appears to understand that it has considerable work to do; some significant weaknesses have been identified and the program indicates it knows it must work on these. From this realization can come significant change and strengthening of the program. This review should assist in the process as well.
- The EPP has provided evidence that they have made adjustments to their foreign language teacher education program based on data collected from the first cohort of candidates. In one example from the Contextual Statement, an analysis was made of the match between content expectations of the program and of candidates' performance on the Praxis II exam as a way to determine monitor trends that may indicate the need for adjustment to the program.

## **Part E—Areas for Consideration**

In this section of the Program Recognition Report, reviewers address broad, programmatic issues that the review team feels may be affecting the program, but may not be standards based. This is also a section where the review team can write about any issues that may be affecting the program, even if the program is nationally recognized. Finally, the review team may choose to use this section to give “guidance” to programs on how to proceed in addressing issues within the program, especially if the decision is Not Nationally Recognized. What is written here may become conditions in the program's next submission seeking National Recognition. Write them as you would conditions, using action verbs in a bulleted list but without numbers, for example:

- implement official ACTFL OPI
- set minimal score at Advanced Low
- reflect the cultural framework (products, practices, perspectives) in literary cultural context and assessments.



In subsequent reports, these may become conditions and at that point they will be numbered – see the section below on Part G.

## **Part F—Additional Comments**

Part F provides you with the opportunity to make any additional comments that you think are appropriate. In F.1 your comments should focus on the Context Statement and other issues that were not addressed elsewhere in this report. In F.2, you can cite concerns for follow-up by the Board of Examiners. These could be issues that are related to the CAEP Unit Standards but not directly related to the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards*. For example, you may be concerned about the number of faculty assigned to the program in relation to the number of candidates, or you could be concerned that the clinical practice experiences are not sufficient for the program, or you could be concerned that the program does not appear to have a faculty member whose expertise is in foreign language teaching (F.1.).

## **Part G: Conditions Statement**

Part G acts as a contract between the ACTFL/CAEP and the program as they state what exactly the program must do in order to be Nationally Recognized. The conditions should be clear, precise, objective, and based on evidence and standards. It should NOT be an opinion or a judgment written by the team. Remember that the next review team will be looking at the response to conditions report when it is submitted. That team will zero in on this conditions section to determine whether the program is recognized. These should be numbered so that future report writers and auditors can identify them; they should begin with an action verb; if you are reviewing a Response to Conditions or Revised Report, use the same wording as in the original final National Recognition Report.

To give you some guidance, here are a couple of examples of well written conditions for Part G:

1. **Assessments #1 and #2:** Address candidate knowledge of content by standard (academic discipline) or whatever exam is required by the state where the program is located (e.g., Praxis II).
2. **Present aggregated candidate data** in a table or chart of candidate scores from high to low for each standard.
3. **Develop a new assessment** to demonstrate candidate content knowledge. Programs may use an essay or a project developed in collaboration with the Foreign Language Department, or another standardized test of content knowledge, or grades. For the proper format for use of course grades as evidence, please see <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/grade-policy>.
4. **Assessment #5** Address “Candidate impact on student learning” by showing how P-12 students performed as a result of instruction by the teacher candidate. The unit plan assignment could well yield such data if the candidate taught it in a P-12 classroom and conducted something as simple as a pre and post test on the unit.
5. **Standard 3.2:** Identify the instructor(s) of the Foreign Language Methods course(s) and indicate their backgrounds in foreign language education.
6. **Collect and analyze data** from 2 applications of all assessments.

7. Implement a transcript analysis procedure to evaluate post baccalaureate candidates to ensure standards and indicators are met. For the proper format for transcript analysis, please see <http://www.caepnet.org/accrreditation/caep-accrreditation/program-review-options/transcript-analysis>.
8. Submit a revised Section II report if assessments address different standards than in the original Program Report.

As the program faculty members write their Response to Conditions Report, they will address these conditions, and they may use what you write in the comments box for each standard as guidance. Thus, comments in the boxes in Part B for each standard are not conditions but may elaborate some steps the program might take to address a condition.

## Decision Making FAQs

In general, CAEP expects reviewers to use their professional judgment in making decisions. However, it is important that decisions are made consistently by reviewers within SPAs and across SPAs. This is difficult to do when we are unable to all meet together and share our thoughts, comments, and opinions until we reach consensus. This list of Decision-Making FAQs has been developed to help reviewers, as much as possible, make consistent decisions when their response is not clear-cut.

### **How much data must be presented?**

The EPP is expected to provide 3 years of data for each of the 6-8 assessments. Institutions submitting Program Reports for the first time will only need to submit one year of data for each of the 6-8 key assessments. **For ACTFL/CAEP SPA review, data from two applications of each assessment are required. This means give the assessment twice, collect/analyze/report the data.**

If the program is submitting a Response to Conditions Report or a Revised Report, it may submit data from one application of each new assessment.

### **What if the program has good assessments that appropriately address the *ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards* but only has data on some of the assessments?**

Reviewers expect to see data from two applications for all assessments submitted by programs. However, reviewers also need to have the information they will need to make an accurate decision about an overall program. Reviewers pay close attention to the context in which the report was written. For example, if the program has data from fewer than 2 applications of the assessment, what information has been provided by the program to explain the lack of data? The program should have written an explanation as to why their assessments have less than the required amount. For example, the program might explain that the data from the assessments indicated that candidates were not mastering the standards, so the program decided to create a new assessment that better aligned with the standards. The program should be given the benefit

of the doubt if the context is well explained, if there are data collection mechanisms in place, and if the program has submitted data from at least one application of all the assessments.

### **How many standards can be “not met” and the program still receive national recognition?**

ACTFL requires that all six standards must be met to receive national recognition.

### **How many of the assessments must be performance-based?**

All of the assessments should be those in which the candidates demonstrate their performance that addresses the standard and is appropriate for the standards being addressed. For example, a paper and pencil test can be a good measure of a candidate’s knowledge base but it is certainly limited in its capability of demonstrating a candidate’s skill level. Most of the assessments should include activities--tasks that are conducted in a classroom, that provide direct measures of classroom performance, or are similar to daily activities a candidate would face in initial employment. Beginning in Fall 2008, ACTFL began accepting course grades as a key assessment. Course grades can only be used for Assessment #1, if there is no state licensure exam, Assessment #2 or for one of the optional assessments. There is a detailed description titled “Guidelines for Using and Documenting Course Grades as an Assessment of Candidate Content Knowledge” and can be found here on the CAEP website: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/grade-policy>.

For ACTFL, performance-based assessments can also specifically refer to the P-12 student performance as demonstrated in the Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA).

### **What is a linked Program Report and how is it reviewed?**

A linked report is a set of Program Reports that have identical assessments and scoring guides. These programs can ask to have their shells “linked” so that they really only need to submit one Program Report. When reviewers are reviewing a linked Program Report, they too, only need to write one recognition report. Once they have completed their recognition report, they can submit it. To move the first report into the second template, they click on the icon (notepad and pen) and it will ask them if they want to move this report into the template. The reviewers click ok and then click on the notepad and pen icon again. This will take them into the filled out recognition report template. The reviewers will need to change the cover page and then can make any changes to the report that they need to. Once changes have been made, reviewers can submit these reports. For a mini video explaining how to review linked reports, please see: [http://www.CAEP.org/programreview/miniPRS\\_pr.asp?ch=37](http://www.CAEP.org/programreview/miniPRS_pr.asp?ch=37).

### **Where can I find additional resources for more on program review?**

The CAEP website has many resources for program reviewers. You can find information and videos on reviewer trainings, archived web seminars and mini videos, information on the program review process and other important material about program review. Please go here to find out more about CAEP program review: <http://www.aims.caepnet.org>. To become a reviewer for ACTFL, please go to <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional->

development/actflcaep/actflcaep-program-reviewers. For more information on ACTFL/CAEP Standards and the *Guidelines for Preparing the CAEP Program Report* (2015), go to <http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/actflcaep>.

## **The following points have emerged from reviews. They are offered here to guide you.**

Please remember that our role is to see if the assessments align with and address our standards and are sufficiently robust to yield the kind of data that show teacher candidates' performance addresses the standard. This is to enable the program to make decisions about what they are doing. We are not in the business of counting how many candidates met expectations, or exceeded them. That's the value judgment the program makes in its analysis of the data for each assessment and in Section V.

1. Standard 1 and the OPI: Standard 1 is met if the program requires an official OPI, with a minimal score of Advanced Low. The program may also submit additional data from the state required test, etc.

Please check on Attachment C and in the narrative to make sure they are using an official OPI; we've had several programs that are checking the official box in Attachment C but then their narrative reveals a department OPI that is NOT an Institutional Upgrade or any other official version.

Wording to use if the OPI is not clearly an official version: It is not clear that the program is using an OFFICIAL ACTFL OPI and setting the minimal score at Advanced Low. It is the programs responsibility to ensure that reviewers understand the program's Assessment #6 as an official OPI by completing Attachment C: Self-Assessment Table indicating which of the acceptable forms of the OPI are being used. All of these forms must be arranged through Language Testing International who will ensure that the assessment is conducted by a trained and certified examiner, blind reviewed by another examiner, and that the data and analyses will be archived and further analyzed by ACTFL for national data assessment purposes. The options are: Official OPI which may be face-to-face or by telephone; the OPIc by computer, now available in many languages, and the academic institutional upgrade. An academic institutional upgrade is conducted by faculty members in the program who are a) currently certified by ACTFL, AND b) who submit the recorded OPIs to Language Testing International (LTI) for a second rating. Since the ACTFL/CAEP Standards emphasize ongoing development of proficiency, program should ensure that they benchmark the assessment of proficiency at various points in the teacher candidate's program, and that they provide remediation plans for those who do not reach Advanced Low.

2. OPI and international programs. We have received approval from CAEP for this revision, which appears in bold face, in our Standard 1 referring to teacher candidates enrolled in EPPs outside the US, who are preparing to teach English, and whose native language is not English:

Candidates speak at the Advanced Low level on the ACTFL proficiency scale except for candidates in Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean, who speak at the Intermediate High level. ***For international programs, where candidates' first language is not English and where candidates are preparing to teach English as a Foreign Language, candidates speak at the proficiency level equivalent to the categories above. Ex. Candidates whose first language is Spanish speak English at Advanced Low; candidates whose first language is Arabic speak English at Intermediate High.***

3. OPI for state test under NCATE legacy programs (still in the pipeline after the NCATE conversion to CAEP): If Assessment #1 (the state test) is the OPI, has the program met Standard 1? **If the state requires Intermediate High, and the program does too, then Standard 1 is NOT MET.**

Since it's the state test, programs must report 3 years of data and the 80% rule must be applied to the OPI when you check the info in Part A, p. 2 in item #15 (CAEP requirement for state test) of your National Recognition Report. Data must be reported with Assessment #1. For this part of your report, check YES if 80% pass the OPI at whatever level the state sets. Some reviewers are incorrectly checking "not applicable".

ACTFL standards do not require that 80% of the candidates score Advanced Low; the 80% only applies to the state required test, and if the state requires the OPI, then 80% of the candidates must pass with whatever score the state sets, even if it's intermediate high. However, **programs that wish to be nationally recognized must set the level at Advanced Low regardless of the state's minimal level.** If the **program** requires Advanced Low on an official OPI (recommend a remediation program), then Standard 1 is **MET** regardless of the level set by the state.

Wording to use: **"Although the state of \_\_\_\_\_ requires a minimum level of Intermediate High on the ACTFL OPI, the program must require a minimum level of Advanced Low in order to be nationally recognized by ACTFL/NCATE."**

4. Revised and Response to Conditions reports:

- be sure to check the previous report's conditions box and use the **same** terminology when you fill out the conditions box; you can even copy it and paste it into your report
- data from only one application of each assessment is needed
- we can't add new conditions, even if we missed something important in a previous review
- if a standard was met in a previous report, it's still met. In the comment box for the standard type "Met in previous National Recognition Report (8/2015)."

5. Be sure to keep Assessments numbers straight and apart from Standards numbers. For example, in most reports the OPI is Assessment #6, not Standard 6. Some people feel that using the pound or hash tag sign in front of the Assessment numbers helps to keep this straight. Your choice.

6. OPI & remediation plan: We can't mandate a remediation plan for those candidates who do not reach Advanced Low but we can certainly recommend that the program would benefit from it.

7. Low enrollment: Defined as 5 or fewer completers in the last 3 years over ALL the languages in a program. This is the choice of the program; it's not required that they do this; some programs still want to submit review to the ACTFL/CAEP because they value the prestige or want the feedback, or because their state wants the report. Here is a comment you can put in Areas for consideration or in section F:

Wording to use: Please note that CAEP allows programs with very low enrollment numbers to be exempted from the national program review requirement, pending approval from the respective state agency. Very low enrollment is defined as 5 or fewer completers in the last 3 years. If the program wishes to consider that option in place of submitting a report, it should contact Banhi Bhattacharya at CAEP (Banhi.Bhattacharya@caepnet.org). The program is encouraged to consider this possibility.

7. B. What decision do you make if they have a program of French, German, and Spanish (for example) and there are no candidates in French and German, only for Spanish? First, check the table in the context statement in Section I Candidate Information where programs indicate enrollment to make sure there are no candidates in the languages where they report no data.

IN MAY OF 2014, AT THE ACTFL/CAEP COORDINATORS MEETING, IT WAS DISCUSSED AND DECIDED THAT HENCEFORTH, IN THE CASE OF LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WITH ONE LANGUAGE HAVING DATA AND ANOTHER WITH NO DATA, IF THEY USE THE SAME ASSESSMENTS, AND IF THE STANDARD IS MET FOR THE LANGUAGE WITH DATA, THE STANDARD WOULD BE MET FOR THE LANGUAGE WITHOUT DATA AS WELL ON THE STRENGTH OF THE ASSESSMENTS AND THE DATA FOR THE LANGUAGE WITH DATA.

9. DATA RULE reminder:

For EPPs, on the state-required test, 3 years of data required.

**Data Rule for SPA reports:** Programs submitting an initial report are required to submit data from two applications of the assessment for full national recognition. That is, the assessment must be given and data collected at least two times. For revised and response to conditions reports, data from one application of the assessment is required for full recognition. For EPPs undergoing accreditation review for the first time, programs must include at least one year of data from all assessments in order to be eligible for full national recognition. See: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/data-requirements>.

10. GRADES: Wording to use: For the proper format for use of course grades as evidence, please see <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/data-requirements>.

11. TRANSCRIPT ANALYSIS (generally used for programs that accept students from other

programs, e.g., MA or post bacc.) Wording to use: For the proper format for transcript analysis, please see <http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/transcript-analysis>.

12. If the recognition decision is “nationally recognized with conditions” and the conditions require that the program revise which assessments address which standards, please include a condition that the program must submit a revised Section II, Section III, and a revised Attachment C to reflect changes they make.

13. Please remember that all SIX ACTFL Standards must be met to gain national recognition.

14. If the recognition decision is:

-- Further Development Required, the program’s next submission is called a Revised report (2 allowed); if they don't get "with conditions" after 2 Revised Reports they get Not Nationally Recognized and they have to start again. We are urged to give "with conditions" if the program has made adjustments per recommendations of the previous audit.

-- Nat. Rec. with Conditions, the program is allowed 2 resubmissions and if they do not achieve National Recognition, they must start again with a new report and their status becomes Not Nationally Recognized.

Reviewers are strongly discouraged from giving "with conditions" a third time. By this time, the program will have used 5 opportunities to reach national recognition and will have used up a large amount of reviewer time and expertise. Besides that, the AIMS system is not built to allow 3 “with conditions” submissions. However, believing that systems ought to reflect human values, if the program has made good progress and needs only submit data for revised assessments, a 3<sup>rd</sup> chance to resubmit a Response to Conditions report can be given. Please let the audit team know your decision and they will carry it forward to CAEP.

15. According to CAEP’s Checklist for Evaluating Key Assessments and ACTFL/CAEP Program Reports in PRS, if a rubric is used to score an assessment, and the rubric has 10 criteria that are rated, then data should be presented for each of the 10 criteria.

16. Rubrics must contain cells that describe behavior – simple Likert scales are scoring guides or checklists and do not tell the candidate what to do to demonstrate the desired performance. Likewise, programs should not simply include the numerical designation of the standard or element; they should also include AT LEAST the title of the standard or element.