NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
Initial Preparation of Foreign Language Educators

National recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).
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Name of Institution
Oklahoma State University

Date of Review
02 / 01 / 2017

This report is in response to a(n):
- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review
Secondary Education: Foreign Language Education (PK-12), French/ German/ Spanish

Grade Level(1)
PK-12

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

Program Type
First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)
- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master’s

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA decision on national recognition of the program(s):
- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation OR Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)
The program meets or exceeds SPA benchmarked licensure test data requirement, if applicable:
- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
Not able to determine

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

No data provided.

Summary of Strengths:

The department of foreign languages offers courses in all content areas, including linguistics. Faculty members specialize in the areas they teach. There is communication between the department of foreign languages and the school of teaching and curriculum leadership to address common goals, such as the need for candidates to obtain high proficiency levels in the language they will teach.

The program is new and has not gone through any assessments yet. However, the description is quite impressive. It is commendable that they will offer candidates a variety of experiences in both rural and urban settings, and at all levels of education: elementary, middle, and high. It is also highly commendable that candidates receive three different methods courses in foreign language education.

Technology was also highlighted, which is truly critical in this increasingly technical/technological age.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1: Language Proficiency. Candidates in foreign language teacher preparation programs possess a high level of proficiency in the target languages they will teach. They are able to communicate effectively in interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational contexts. Candidates speak in the interpersonal mode at a minimum level of "Advanced Low" (French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish) or "Intermediate High" (Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean) on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). They comprehend and interpret oral, printed, and video texts by identifying the main idea(s) and supporting details, inferring and interpreting the author's intent and cultural perspectives, and offering a personal interpretation of the text. Candidates present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers with language proficiency characteristic of a minimum level of "Advanced Low" or "Intermediate High" according to the target language, as described above.

Met  Met with Conditions  Not Met

Comment:

The program presents Assessments #1, #2, #3, #4, #6, and #8 as evidence of the degree to which their candidates meet ACTFL Standard 1.

Assessment #1 is the State Exam and partially addresses Standard 1. No data are provided.

Assessment #2 is the evaluation of course grades and partially addresses ACTFL Standard 1. It would be more appropriate that Assessment #2 be provided for Standard 2, however, the program should use the CAEP guidelines for using course grades as an assessment.

Assessment #6 is the OPI, the main component of standard 1, but there are no candidate data reported. The program should collect, analyze, and report 2
applications of candidate data for Assessments #1, #2, and #6 in aggregated and disaggregated tables by language and year.

It should be noted that Assessments #3 and #4 are pedagogical assessments and should not be used to provide content knowledge for Standards 1 or 2. 1. Assessment #8 is an essay on professionalism and has no relevance to Standard 1.

**Standard 2: Cultures, Linguistics, Literatures, and Concepts from Other Disciplines.** Candidates demonstrate understanding of the multiple content areas that comprise the field of foreign language studies. They demonstrate understanding of the interrelatedness of perspectives, products, and practices in the target cultures. Candidates know the linguistic elements of the target language system, and they recognize the changing nature of language. Candidates identify distinctive viewpoints in the literary texts, films, art works, and documents from a range of disciplines accessible to them only through the target language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

The program presents Assessments #1, #2, #3, and #4 as evidence of meeting Standard 2.

Assessment #1 is the State Exam and should not be used as evidence of Standard 2.

Assessment #2 is the evaluation of course grades and partially meets Standard 2, however no candidate data are provided. The program must be sure that it follows the CAEP guidelines for grade reporting in evidence of Standard 2. In addition, the program must collect two applications of candidate data, analyze and report the data in aggregated and disaggregated form.

Kindly refer to information regarding pedagogical Assessments #3 and #4 in Standard 1 above.

**Standard 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Knowledge of Students and Their Needs.** Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the principles of language acquisition and use this knowledge to create linguistically and culturally rich learning environments. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of child and adolescent development, the context of instruction, and their students’ backgrounds, skills, and learning profiles in order to create a supportive learning environment that meets individual students’ needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

Assessments #1, #3, #4, #7, and #8 are offered as evidence of meeting Standard 3.

Assessment #1 is the State Exam and should not be used for pedagogical evidence.

Assessment #3, a lesson plan, and Assessment #4, the student teaching observation, partially address Standard 3.

Assessment #8 is a professionalism essay. It partially addresses Standard 3
and could be improved if topics relevant to the standard are addressed, such as the role of negotiation of meaning, full versus partial use of L2 at different levels of instruction.

Assessments #3 and #8 have a potential of aligning with Standard 3 when data become available. For one of these assessments, greater emphasis on candidate knowledge and application of the principles of language acquisition theory.

For each of these three assessments, two applications of candidate data must be collected, analyzed, and reported in aggregated and disaggregated forms by language and year.

Assessment #7 is a reflection paper. It is very generic in nature and does not align with Standard 3.

**Standard 4: Integration of Standards in Planning and Instruction.** Candidates in foreign language teacher preparation programs understand and use the national Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century (2006) and their state standards to make instructional decisions. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the standards and integrate them into their curricular planning. They design instructional practices and classroom experiences that address these standards. Candidates use the principles embedded in the standards to select and integrate authentic materials and technology, as well as to adapt and create materials, to support communication in their classrooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

Assessments 1, 3, 4, and 5 are offered as evidence of meeting Standard 4.

Assessment #1 is the State Exam and has no relevance to Standard 4.

Assessment #3 is the lesson plan, which aligns well with Standard 4, but no data were available.

Assessment #4 is the student teaching evaluation, which addresses Standard 4, but no data were available.

Assessment #5 is the candidate work sample, aspects of which are pertinent to Standard 4.

For the three assessments provided in evidence of Standard 4, two applications of candidate data must be collected, analyzed and reported in aggregated and disaggregated tables by language and year.

**Standard 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures – Impact on Student Learning.** Candidates in foreign language teacher preparation programs design ongoing assessments using a variety of assessment models to show evidence of P-12 students’ ability to communicate in the instructed language in interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational modes; and to express understanding of cultural and literary products, practices, and perspectives of the instructed language. Candidates reflect on results of assessments, adjust instruction, and communicate results to stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
Assessments #4 and #5 were provided in evidence of ACTFL Standard 5. Assessment #4 is the Observation Rubric. It aligns well with Standard 5. Assessment #5 is the evaluation of a Candidate Work Sample. It aligns well with Standard 5. However, no data were available. For the two assessments provided in evidence of Standard 5, two applications of candidate data must be collected, analyzed and reported in aggregated and disaggregated tables by language and year.

**Standard 6: Professional Development, Advocacy, and Ethics.** Candidates engage in ongoing professional development opportunities that strengthen their own linguistic, cultural, and pedagogical competence and promote reflection on practice. Candidates articulate the role and value of languages and cultures in preparing all students to interact successful in the global community of the 21st century. They understand the importance of collaboration to advocate for the learning of languages and cultures. Candidates understand and explain the opportunities and responsibilities inherent in being a professional language educator and are committed to equitable and ethical interactions with all stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comment:**

Assessments #7 and #8 were listed as evidence of meeting Standard 6.

Assessment #7 is a reflection paper. In its current form, the reflection is generic and does not address this standard adequately.

Assessment #8 is a professionalism essay. It partially addresses this standard, but can be improved (see comments in standard 3).

Two applications of the assessment must be reported, analyzed in aggregated and disaggregated forms by language and year.

**PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE**

**C.1. Candidates’ knowledge of content**

Candidates benefit from the availability of courses in the major content areas, including linguistics, taught by faculty who specialize in the field they teach. Content knowledge is one of the strongest points of the report. Several Assessments (e.g., #1, #2, #3, #4, #6, and #7) were provided in evidence of ACTFL Standards 1 and 2. The program is advised to use content Assessments -- #1, #2, and #6) for Standards 1 and 2.

No data were presented, however, and it is thus not possible at this juncture to determine the strength of the program's candidate content knowledge. Candidate data must be provided in its response to conditions report.

**C.2. Candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions**

Standards 3-6 have the potential of being fully addressed after some revisions are completed and two applications of candidate data are collected, analyzed
and reported in aggregated and disaggregated forms.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

Assessments #4 and #5 have the potential to fully address this area after some modifications are done and data become available.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

The program reports that they have no data to report. However, they do have program completes for 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. It is not clear why results for, at least, Assessments #1 and #6 were not reported for these years. It is apparent that results from these assessments have been applied towards improvement of the program and courses taken by candidates and the addition of a study abroad or language immersion requirement.

The program underwent ACTFL review in the past and has benefited from previous feedback. Some positive initiatives have also been enacted, such as opportunities to study abroad and communication between the foreign language department and the school of teaching and curriculum leadership to improve candidates' proficiency levels.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

The program may want to clearly list a target of Advanced Low on the official ACTFL OPI for candidates to meet and delineate a clear action plan for candidates who do not obtain such score or a higher score. Intermediate High must be listed as the target for non-Roman alphabet language candidates.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

None.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the CAEP site visitors:

None.

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

National Recognition with Conditions. The program has received a decision of conditional national recognition. See below for details.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

* The program is recognized through:
Subsequent action by the institution: To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted in accordance with the instructions below. The program has up to two opportunities to address conditions. If the program is submitting an Option A Response to Conditions Report for the first time, the possible deadlines for submitting that report are 3/15/17, 9/15/17, 3/15/18, or 9/15/18. Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 9/15/17 submission deadline. If the program is submitting an Option C Response to Conditions Report, the deadline for submitting that report is 3/15/17. Option C review is scheduled to be discontinued starting fall 2017. A program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this Recognition Report.

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a second Response to Conditions Report, the next report must be submitted by the date below. Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (or within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued). See above for specific date.

For all assessments, the program must collect two applications of candidate data, analyze and report the data in aggregated and disaggregated form.

The program is also encouraged to read the commentary accompanying each of the Standards in order to better align its assessments with the appropriate content standards and with those that focus on pedagogy. For Standard 3, there needs to be a stronger emphasis on candidate knowledge of language acquisition theories.

For Assessment #6 and candidate language proficiency, the program needs to explicitly set Advanced Low on the official ACTFL OPI for Roman alphabet languages (and Intermediate High for non-Roman alphabet languages such as Chinese, Japanese, Arabic and Russian) as the target rating that candidates must meet and delineate a clear action plan for candidates who do not obtain such rating or a higher rating. This is implicit, but stating it explicitly in the narrative and in all communication with students and in the commentary for Assessment #6 will make this clearer.

At the time that data are available, the program must also provide evidence of how it uses the data to update and enrich its program as it engages in continuous improvement.

Once these conditions are fulfilled, the program will receive National Recognition. The Review team acknowledges all you have accomplished to date!
This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.