

BA Teacher Licensure in World Languages and Cultures (Accredited)—Year One

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for Academic Programs

Please list all of the student learning outcomes for your program as articulated in the assessment plan.

Candidates will...

1. Demonstrate an oral proficiency level of Intermediate-Low (as defined by ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines) at the conclusion of WLS/F/G 2202G (intermediate level course)
2. Demonstrate an oral proficiency level of Advanced-Low (as defined by ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines) before their Student Teaching semester.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the multiple content areas that comprise the field of foreign language studies (Culture; Linguistics; Literatures).
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the interrelatedness in a culture of the perspectives, products, and practices that comprise the cultural framework.
5. Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of second language acquisition and the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (W-RSLL)* in their instructional planning.
6. Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of second language acquisition and the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (W-RSLL)* in their instructional practice.
7. Demonstrate knowledge and skills in content and pedagogy to implement teaching their language of concentration.
8. Demonstrate dispositions appropriate to their future profession.
9. Demonstrate effective advocacy for their profession.

SPA for World Languages: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) .

<https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/caep/PreparingACTFLCAEPProgramReportFeb2016.pdf>

ACTFL/CAEP Report Guidelines

<https://www.actfl.org/assessment-research-and-development/actfl-assessments/actfl-postsecondary-assessments/oral-proficiency-interview-opi>

Overview of Measures/Instruments

<p>SLO(s)</p> <p><i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i></p>	<p>ULG*</p>	<p>Measures/Instruments</p> <p><i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i></p>	<p>How is the information Used?</p> <p><i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i></p>
<p>1. Demonstrate a proficiency level of Intermediate-Low (as defined by ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines) at the conclusion of 2202G.</p>	<p>S, R¹</p>	<p>Modified OPI (Oral Proficiency Interview)</p> <p>10-criteria/3-level rubric aligned with ACTFL standard. <i>ACTFL 1. Language Proficiency</i>. 20 points: Intermediate Low.</p> <p>Rubric:</p> <p>Novice High: Below 19 (Does not Meet)</p> <p>Intermediate Low: 20-24 (Meets)</p> <p>Intermediate Mid: Above 25 (Exceeds)</p> <p>Time: Exit interview in WLS/WLF/WLG 2202G.</p> <p>The interview is conducted by the 2202G instructor, using a rubric that follows ACTFL proficiency guidelines and checks for performance in the domains Language Functions, Context/Content, Text Type, and Accuracy. While ACTFL does not stipulate a minimum level for students at the intermediate level, we use this informal assessment to advise candidates on areas for improvement and learning strategies.</p> <p>Faculty submit rubric data at the conclusion of 2202G. Results are shared with the Assessment Committee.</p>	<p>Target: Intermediate Low (20 points). 80% expected to reach Target.</p>
<p>2. Demonstrate a proficiency level of Advanced Low² (as defined by ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines) before student teaching.</p>	<p>S, R¹</p>	<p>Official ACTFL OPI/ OPIC</p> <p>A rating of Advanced Low is required for ACTFL/CAEP accredited institutions. <i>ACTFL 1 a. Speak in the interpersonal mode of communication at a minimum level of “Advanced Low.”</i></p> <p>Candidates submit evidence of an “Advanced Low” rating after taking the official ACTFL OPI/OPIC before their student teaching semester. The exam rates performance in the domains</p>	<p>Target: Advanced Low. 90% expected to reach Target at first attempt.</p>

<p align="center">SLO(s)</p> <p align="center"><i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i></p>	<p align="center">ULG*</p>	<p align="center">Measures/Instruments</p> <p align="center"><i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i></p>	<p align="center">How is the information Used?</p> <p align="center"><i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i></p>
		<p>Language Functions, Context/Content, Text Type, and Accuracy.</p> <p>Format: The OPI exam is a 20-30 minute interview with an external tester provided by Language Testing International (LTI). The interview takes place over the phone, or over the computer (OPIc). The interview is double-rated. Candidate receives an official ACTFL OPI certificate that specifies the achieved proficiency level.</p> <p>Candidates who do not meet Advanced Low undergo remediation (for example, by taking WLS/F/G 3502 Advanced Oral Proficiency) and retake the exam.</p> <p>Results are shared with the Assessment Committee, ISBE through report as needed, and ACTFL/CAEP Accreditation Review Report.</p>	
<p>3. Demonstrate understanding of the multiple content areas that comprise the field of foreign language studies (Culture; Linguistics; Literatures).</p>	<p>S,W,C,R</p>	<p>Literature paper/ or oral presentation on a literary topic/s or text/s.</p> <p>Item in Culture Portfolio. Culture portfolio is submitted before student teaching.</p> <p>During their coursework, candidates choose two papers or presentations for inclusion in their Culture Portfolio. One artifact needs to focus on literature, and one needs to focus on culture. To qualify for inclusion in the portfolio, the literature paper/presentation is assessed with a rubric (8-criteria/3-level rubric) that is aligned with <i>ACTFL Standard 1 a. Demonstrating Language Proficiency</i>. Target: *Advanced-Low in writing and speaking. <i>ACTFL Standard 2 b. Demonstrating Understanding of Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions</i>.</p>	<p>Culture Portfolio: Candidates can <u>only</u> include a paper or presentation (from their coursework) that has met a minimum of 2 (Target) in each criterion. 100% expected to reach Target.</p>

<p>SLO(s)</p> <p><i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i></p>	<p>ULG*</p>	<p>Measures/Instruments</p> <p><i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i></p>	<p>How is the information Used?</p> <p><i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i></p>
		<p>Results are shared with the Assessment Committee, ISBE through report as needed, and ACTFL/CAEP Accreditation Review Report.</p>	
<p>3. Demonstrate understanding of the multiple content areas that comprise the field of foreign language studies (Culture; Linguistics; Literatures).</p>	<p>S,W,C,R</p>	<p>Culture paper, or oral presentation (with powerpoint) on a cultural topic/s or text/s</p> <p>Item in Culture Portfolio. Culture portfolio is submitted before student teaching.</p> <p>During their coursework, candidates choose two papers or presentations for inclusion in their Culture Portfolio. One artifact needs to focus on literature, and one needs to focus on culture. To qualify for inclusion in the portfolio, the culture paper/presentation is assessed with a rubric (6-criteria/3-level rubric) that is aligned with <i>ACTFL Standard 1a Demonstrating Language Proficiency</i>. Target: *Advanced-Low in writing and speaking.</p> <p><i>ACTFL Standard 2a. Demonstrating Cultural Understandings.</i> <i>ACTFL Standard 2b. Demonstrating Understanding of Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions.</i></p> <p>Results are shared with the Assessment Committee, ISBE through report as needed, and ACTFL/CAEP Accreditation Review Report.</p>	<p>Culture Portfolio: Candidates can <u>only</u> include a paper or presentation (from their coursework) that has met a minimum of 2 (Target) in each criterion. 100% expected to reach Target.</p>
<p>4. Demonstrate an understanding of the interrelatedness in a culture of the perspectives, products, and practices that comprise the cultural framework (<i>World-</i></p>	<p>W,C,R</p>	<p>Reflection, or Journal, on study abroad or immersion experience</p> <p>Candidates write and submit a reflection on a study abroad or other immersion experience. The reflection (or journal) and the examples given need to prove understanding of the target</p>	<p>Culture Portfolio: Candidates can <u>only</u> include a reflection that has met a minimum of 2 (Target) in each criterion. 100% expected to reach Target.</p>

<p>SLO(s)</p> <p><i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i></p>	<p>ULG*</p>	<p>Measures/Instruments</p> <p><i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i></p>	<p>How is the information Used?</p> <p><i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i></p>
<p><i>Readiness Standards for Learning Languages).</i></p>		<p>culture as a system in which cultural perspectives are reflected through practices and products.</p> <p>The reflection is assessed with a rubric (6-criteria/3-level rubric) that is aligned with <i>ACTFL Standard 1a</i> (Target: Advanced-Low in writing and speaking). <i>ACTFL Standard 2a. Demonstrating Cultural Understandings.</i></p> <p>Results are shared with the Assessment Committee, ISBE through report as needed, and ACTFL/CAEP Accreditation Review Report.</p>	
<p>5. Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of second language acquisition and the <i>World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (W-RSLL)</i> in their instructional planning.</p>	<p>W,C,R</p>	<p>Unit Plan Assessed by Methods Instructor in WLE 3400 through a foreign-language specific rubric (as required by ACTFL) that is aligned with <i>ACTFL Standards 2,3,4,5.</i> 11-criteria/3-level rubric.</p> <p>The unit plan is also assessed in Live Text using COE's non-foreign language specific assessment instrument through a rubric in Live Text.</p> <p>Results are shared with Assessment Committee, ISBE through report as needed, and ACTFL/CAEP Accreditation Review Report.</p>	<p>Target: Level 2 in each criterion. 22 points (Meets). 90% expected to reach Target.</p>
<p>6. Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of second language acquisition and the <i>World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (W-RSLL)</i> in their instructional practice.</p>	<p>S,W,R</p>	<p>Student Teaching Evaluation 47 subareas/3-level rubric. Co-operating teachers complete a program-specific evaluation of candidates and return it directly to the Department Chair. The evaluation/rubric was developed by the Department in accordance with ACTFL guidelines. <i>ACTFL Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.</i></p>	<p>Target: 94 points total. Level 2 (Met) in each criterion. Max: 141 (47 sub-areas, 3 points max each) Subareas are analyzed and strengths and weaknesses determined. Max points:</p>

<p>SLO(s)</p> <p><i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i></p>	<p>ULG*</p>	<p>Measures/Instruments</p> <p><i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i></p>	<p>How is the information Used?</p> <p><i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i></p>
		<p>This departmental evaluation form is in addition to the general teaching evaluation form that co-operating teachers return to the College of Education.</p> <p>Results are shared with the Assessment Committee, ISBE through report as needed, and ACTFL/CAEP Accreditation Review Report.</p>	<p>90% expected to reach Target.</p>
<p>7. Demonstrate knowledge and skills in content and pedagogy to implement teaching their language of concentration.</p>	<p>S,W,R</p>	<p>Illinois State Licensure Test for Spanish/French/German</p> <p>Five subareas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretive Listening • Interpretive Reading • Language Acquisition and Instruction • Presentational Writing • Presentational Speaking <p>ILTS Test description: 65 multiple choice questions. 2 constructed response assignments. Total score required: 240 or above, to be admitted to student teaching. AS ISBE outlines: Candidate's raw score is converted to a scaled score ranging from 100 to 300. A scaled score of 240 suggests that the candidate answered enough questions to meet the score requirement of 240.</p> <p>The IL State Licensure test is aligned with ACTFL standards.</p> <p>Results are reported to the program chair by COE. Subareas are analyzed to determine strengths and weaknesses. Candidates who do not pass at first attempt are advised on further coursework and learning strategies.</p> <p>EdTPA exam during Student Teaching</p>	<p>Pass: 240 total (scaled) score. See description of instrument used by ISBE.</p> <p>80% expected to reach Target (240+) at first attempt.</p>

<p>SLO(s)</p> <p><i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i></p>	<p>ULG*</p>	<p>Measures/Instruments</p> <p><i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i></p>	<p>How is the information Used?</p> <p><i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i></p>
		<p>Results of licensure test and EdTPA are shared by COE with the Department Chair. Chair shares results with the Assessment Committee, ISBE through report as needed, and ACTFL/CAEP Accreditation Review Report.</p>	
<p>8. Demonstrate dispositions appropriate to their future profession.</p>		<p>Departmental Dispositions Assessment of candidates. 10-criteria/4-level rubric. <i>ACTFL 6. Professional Development, Advocacy, and Ethics</i></p> <p>Candidates provide instructors in all 3000/4000 level courses that are taken in our Department and count towards the major with the departmental Dispositions assessment form. The form is completed by the instructor at the end of the course and submitted to Chair. Rating of “average” and “below average” in any of the 10 areas will lead to a meeting with candidate and remediation.</p> <p>Methods instructor also completes COE’s Disposition Evaluation in LiveText. Results are shared with the Assessment Committee, ISBE through report as needed, and ACTFL/CAEP Accreditation Review Report.</p>	<p>Target: “above average” in all 10 areas. 90% expected to reach Target.</p>
<p>9. Demonstrate effective advocacy for their profession.</p>	<p>W, R, C</p>	<p>Professional Record.</p> <p>6-criteria/3-level rubric.</p> <p>Developed by the Department in accordance with ACTFL guidelines. Candidates document participation in professional development opportunities, collaboration with others and building of communities of learners outside the classroom. Professional Record includes these items: Reflection paper on</p>	<p>Target for “Acceptable” (12 points). Max points: 18. 90% expected to reach Target.</p>

<p>SLO(s)</p> <p><i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i></p>	<p>ULG*</p>	<p>Measures/Instruments</p> <p><i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i></p>	<p>How is the information Used?</p> <p><i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i></p>
		<p>ICTFL conference participation, Essay: Rationale for Foreign Language Learning; Statement of Plans for Future Professional Development; Participation Record in Program Activities.</p> <p><i>ACTFL 6 a.b.c.: Professional Development, Advocacy, and Ethics</i></p> <p>Submitted before student teaching.</p> <p>Results are shared with the Assessment Committee, ISBE through report as needed, and ACTFL/CAEP Accreditation Review Report.</p>	

**Please reference any University Learning Goal(s) (ULG) that this SLO, if any, may address or assess. C=Critical Thinking, W=Writing & Critical Reading; S=Speaking and Listening; Q=Quantitative reasoning; R=Responsible Citizenship; NA=Not Applicable*

NOTES

¹ULG Responsible Citizenship: Effective, meaningful oral communication in a second language requires not only accurate use of linguistic elements but also the application of communicative customs appropriate to the cultures and communities in which the language is spoken. As a result, students will be expected to interact with the interviewer in manners appropriate to the culture associated with the language being evaluated. In this sense, the successful application of cultural knowledge exhibited in an oral communicative context is an indicator of the ability to function as a responsible (global) citizen.

²Advanced Low is the target proficiency level for teacher licensure candidates in World Languages to obtain licensure (as stipulated by ACTFL for CAEP accredited institutions).

<https://www.actfl.org/resources/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012>

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012—Speaking

Advanced Mid

Advanced Mid Speakers at the Advanced Mid sublevel are able to handle with ease and confidence a large number of communicative tasks. They participate actively in most informal and some formal exchanges on a variety of concrete topics relating to work, school, home, and leisure activities, as well as topics relating to events of current, public, and personal interest or individual relevance. Advanced Mid speakers demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe in the major time frames of past, present, and future by providing a full account, with good control of aspect. Narration and description tend to be combined and interwoven to relate relevant and supporting facts in connected, paragraph-length discourse. Advanced Mid speakers can handle successfully and with relative ease the linguistic challenges presented by a complication or unexpected turn of events that occurs within the context of a routine situation or communicative task with which they are otherwise familiar. Communicative strategies such as circumlocution or rephrasing are often employed for this purpose. The speech of Advanced Mid speakers performing Advanced-level tasks is marked by substantial flow. Their vocabulary is fairly extensive although primarily generic in nature, except in the case of a particular area of specialization or interest. Their discourse may still reflect the oral paragraph structure of their own language rather than that of the target language. Advanced Mid speakers contribute to conversations on a variety of familiar topics, dealt with concretely, with much accuracy, clarity and precision, and they convey their intended message without misrepresentation or confusion. They are readily understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives. When called on to perform functions or handle topics associated with the Superior level, the quality and/or quantity of their speech will generally decline.

Advanced Low²

Speakers at the Advanced Low sublevel are able to handle a variety of communicative tasks. They are able to participate in most informal and some formal conversations on topics related to school, home, and leisure activities. They can also speak about some topics related to employment, current events, and matters of public and community interest. Advanced Low speakers demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe in the major time frames of past, present, and future in paragraph-length discourse with some control of aspect. In these narrations and descriptions, Advanced Low speakers combine and link sentences into connected discourse of paragraph length, although these narrations and descriptions tend to be handled separately rather than interwoven. They can handle appropriately the essential linguistic challenges presented by a complication or an unexpected turn of events. Responses produced by Advanced Low speakers are typically not longer than a single paragraph. The speaker's dominant language may be evident in the use of false cognates, literal translations, or the oral paragraph structure of that language. At times their discourse may be minimal for the level, marked by an irregular flow, and containing noticeable self-correction. More generally, the

performance of Advanced Low speakers tends to be uneven. Advanced Low speech is typically marked by a certain grammatical roughness (e.g., inconsistent control of verb endings), but the overall performance of the Advanced-level tasks is sustained, albeit minimally. The vocabulary of Advanced Low speakers often lacks specificity. Nevertheless, Advanced Low speakers are able to use communicative strategies such as rephrasing and circumlocution. Advanced Low speakers contribute to the conversation with sufficient accuracy, clarity, and precision to convey their intended message without misrepresentation or confusion. Their speech can be understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives, even though this may require some repetition or restatement. When attempting to perform functions or handle topics associated with the Superior level, the linguistic quality and quantity of their speech will deteriorate significantly.

INTERMEDIATE Speakers at the Intermediate level are distinguished primarily by their ability to create with the language when talking about familiar topics related to their daily life. They are able to recombine learned material in order to express personal meaning. Intermediate level speakers can ask simple questions and can handle a straightforward survival situation. They produce sentence-level language, ranging from discrete sentences to strings of sentences, typically in present time. Intermediate-level speakers are understood by interlocutors who are accustomed to dealing with non-native learners of the language.

Intermediate Low Speakers at the Intermediate Low sublevel are able to handle successfully a limited number of uncomplicated communicative tasks by creating with the language in straightforward social situations. Conversation is restricted to some of the concrete exchanges and predictable topics necessary for survival in the target-language culture. These topics relate to basic personal information; for example, self and family, some daily activities and personal preferences, and some immediate needs, such as ordering food and making simple purchases. At the Intermediate Low sublevel, speakers are primarily reactive and struggle to answer direct questions or requests for information. They are also able to ask a few appropriate questions. Intermediate Low speakers manage to sustain the functions of the Intermediate level, although just barely. Intermediate Low speakers express personal meaning by combining and recombining what they know and what they hear from their interlocutors into short statements and discrete sentences. Their responses are often filled with hesitancy and inaccuracies as they search for appropriate linguistic forms and vocabulary while attempting to give form to the message. Their speech is characterized by frequent pauses, ineffective reformulations and self-corrections. Their pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by their first language. In spite of frequent misunderstandings that may require repetition or rephrasing, Intermediate Low speakers can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors, particularly by those accustomed to dealing with non-natives

Intermediate Mid

Speakers at the Intermediate Mid sublevel are able to handle successfully a variety of uncomplicated communicative tasks in straightforward social situations. Conversation is generally limited to those predictable and concrete exchanges necessary for survival in the target culture. These include personal information related to self, family, home, daily activities, interests and personal preferences, as well as physical and social needs, such as food, shopping, travel, and lodging. Intermediate Mid speakers tend to function reactively, for example, by responding to direct questions or requests for information. However, they are capable of asking a variety of questions when necessary to obtain simple information to satisfy basic needs, such as directions, prices, and services. When called on to perform functions or handle topics at the Advanced level, they provide some information but have difficulty linking ideas, manipulating time and aspect, and using communicative strategies, such as circumlocution. Intermediate Mid speakers are able to express personal meaning by creating with the language, in part by combining and recombining known elements and conversational input to produce responses typically consisting of sentences and strings of sentences. Their speech may contain pauses, reformulations, and self-corrections as they search for adequate vocabulary and appropriate language forms to express themselves. In

spite of the limitations in their vocabulary and/or pronunciation and/or grammar and/or syntax, Intermediate Mid speakers are generally understood by sympathetic interlocutors accustomed to dealing with non-natives. Overall, Intermediate Mid speakers are at ease when performing Intermediate-level tasks and do so with significant quantity and quality of Intermediate-level language.

Intermediate High Intermediate High speakers are able to converse with ease and confidence when dealing with the routine tasks and social situations of the Intermediate level. They are able to handle successfully uncomplicated tasks and social situations requiring an exchange of basic information related to their work, school, recreation, particular interests, and areas of competence. Intermediate High speakers can handle a substantial number of tasks associated with the Advanced level, but they are unable to sustain performance of all of these tasks all of the time. Intermediate High speakers can narrate and describe in all major time frames using connected discourse of paragraph length, but not all the time. Typically, when Intermediate High speakers attempt to perform Advanced-level tasks, their speech exhibits one or more features of breakdown, such as the failure to carry out fully the narration or description in the appropriate major time frame, an inability to maintain paragraph-length discourse, or a reduction in breadth and appropriateness of vocabulary. Intermediate High speakers can generally be understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives, although interference from another language may be evident (e.g., use of code-switching, false cognates, literal translations), and a pattern of gaps in communication may occur.

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012—Writing

Advanced Mid

Advanced Mid Writers at the Advanced Mid sublevel are able to meet a range of work and/or academic writing needs. They demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe with detail in all major time frames with good control of aspect. They are able to write straightforward summaries on topics of general interest. Their writing exhibits a variety of cohesive devices in texts up to several paragraphs in length. There is good control of the most frequently used target-language syntactic structures and a range of general vocabulary. Most often, thoughts are expressed clearly and supported by some elaboration. This writing incorporates organizational features both of the target language and the writer's first language and may at times resemble oral discourse. Writing at the Advanced Mid sublevel is understood readily by natives not used to the writing of nonnatives. When called on to perform functions or to treat issues at the Superior level, Advanced Mid writers will manifest a decline in the quality and/or quantity of their writing.

Advanced Low

Writers at the Advanced Low sublevel are able to meet basic work and/or academic writing needs. They demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe in major time frames with some control of aspect. They are able to compose simple summaries on familiar topics. Advanced Low writers are able to combine and link sentences into texts of paragraph length and structure. Their writing, while adequate to satisfy the criteria of the Advanced level, may not be substantive. Writers at the Advanced Low sublevel demonstrate the ability to incorporate a limited number of cohesive devices, and may resort to some redundancy and awkward repetition. They rely on patterns of oral discourse and the writing style of their first language. These writers demonstrate minimal control of common structures and vocabulary associated with the Advanced level. Their writing is understood by natives not accustomed to the writing of non-natives, although some additional effort may be required in the reading of the text. When attempting to perform functions at the Superior level, their writing will deteriorate significantly.

INTERMEDIATE

Writers at the Intermediate level are characterized by the ability to meet practical writing needs, such as simple messages and letters, requests for information, and notes. In addition, they can ask and respond to simple questions in writing. These writers can create with the language and communicate simple facts and ideas in a series of loosely connected sentences on topics of personal interest and social needs. They write primarily in present time. At this level, writers use basic vocabulary and structures to express meaning that is comprehensible to those accustomed to the writing of non-natives.

Intermediate Low

Writers at the Intermediate Low sublevel are able to meet some limited practical writing needs. They can create statements and formulate questions based on familiar material. Most sentences are recombinations of learned vocabulary and structures. These are short and simple conversational-style sentences with basic word order. They are written almost exclusively in present time. Writing tends to consist of a few simple sentences, often with repetitive structure. Topics are tied to highly predictable content areas and personal information. Vocabulary is adequate to express elementary needs. There may be basic errors in grammar, word choice, punctuation, spelling, and in the formation and use of non-alphabetic symbols. Their writing is understood by natives used to the writing of non-natives, although additional effort may be required. When Intermediate Low writers attempt to perform writing tasks at the Advanced level, their writing will deteriorate significantly and their message may be left incomplete.

Intermediate Mid

Writers at the Intermediate Mid sublevel are able to meet a number of practical writing needs. They can write short, simple communications, compositions, and requests for information in loosely connected texts about personal preferences, daily routines, common events, and other personal topics. Their writing is framed in present time but may contain references to other time frames. The writing style closely resembles oral discourse. Writers at the Intermediate Mid sublevel show evidence of control of basic sentence structure and verb forms. This writing is best defined as a collection of discrete sentences and/or questions loosely strung together. There is little evidence of deliberate organization. Intermediate Mid writers can be understood readily by natives used to the writing of non-natives. When Intermediate Mid writers attempt Advanced-level writing tasks, the quality and/or quantity of their writing declines and the message may be unclear.

Intermediate High

Writers at the Intermediate High sublevel are able to meet all practical writing needs of the Intermediate level. Additionally, they can write compositions and simple summaries related to work and/or school experiences. They can narrate and describe in different time frames when writing about everyday events and situations. These narrations and descriptions are often but not always of paragraph length, and they typically contain some evidence of breakdown in one or more features of the Advanced level. For example, these writers may be inconsistent in the use of appropriate major time markers, resulting in a loss of clarity. The vocabulary, grammar, and style of Intermediate High writers essentially correspond to those of the spoken language. Intermediate High writing, even with numerous and perhaps significant errors, is generally comprehensible to natives not used to the writing of non-natives, but there are likely to be gaps in comprehension.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of Foreign Language Educators

NCATE 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).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Eastern Illinois University

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

08 01 2016

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Foreign Language with Teacher Licensure/Major in French, German or Spanish with Teacher Licensure

Grade Level⁽¹⁾

K-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 NCATE 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]

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

The program has documented a pass rate of over 80 percent for the past three years.

Summary of Strengths:

Assessments have been strengthened and aligned with standards. Data has been disaggregated by completer, language, and year.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. Language, Linguistics, Comparisons.

Candidates (a) demonstrate a high level of proficiency in the target language, and they seek opportunities to strengthen their 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.

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

The program presents Assessments #1, #2, and #6 in evidence of the degree to which its candidates meet Standard 1. The program has provided examples of the use of data to inform program change and improvement, and it demonstrates that assessment data are systematically and comprehensively reviewed by faculty. Adjustments were made based on previous review.

Assessment #1, Illinois Licensure Testing System: Foreign Language Content Tests - French, German, Spanish, provides scores for each candidate.

Assessment #2, Culture Portfolio, was modified and now the descriptors of classification of the rubric are more specific.

Assessment #6, OPI, continues to demonstrate evidence of this standard and all but one student reported AL or higher (some of them after a remediation plan).

Assessments #4 and #8 were removed from this standard, since they only demonstrated some

Standard 2. Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts.

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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

The program indicated that Assessments #1, #2, #3, and #8 provide evidence for Standard 2. Assuggested in the previous report, Assessment #4 was removed from this Standard.

Assessment #1, Illinois Licensure Testing System (Foreign Language Content Tests - French, German, Spanish), now provides scores for each candidate.

Assessment #2, Culture Portfolio, was modified and now the descriptors of classification of the rubric are more specific.

Assessment #3, Instructional Planning Portfolio: Unit Plan/Learning Segment, data are not disaggregated by standard. Also, Table 1 shows some parts of the rubric without descriptors.

Standard 3. Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices.

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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

The program indicates that Assessments #3, #4, #5 and #8 provide evidence for Standard 3. Assessment#1, which only demonstrated some evidence of this standard, was removed.

For Assessment #3, Instructional Planning Portfolio: Unit Plan/Learning Segment, the rubric now shows descriptions that specifically address foreign language instruction, but data are not disaggregated by standard. Also, Table 1 shows some parts of the rubric without descriptors. On the other hand, through the Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages (FLE 3400) course, the program provides a good base to meet Standard 3.

not Meet Standard, 3- Meets Standards, 5-Exceeds Standards, but there are no descriptors for 2- Occasionally Meets, and 4-Occasionally Exceeds.

Assessment #5, edTPA, now partially aligns and demonstrates evidence of Standard 3. The rubric now shows descriptors to address knowledge of students. For the next cycle of accreditation reporting, the program should make certain that its Assessment #5 shows evidence of Language Acquisition Theories. Also, data (of one completer) is not disaggregated by standards.

Standard 4. Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction.

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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

The program indicates that Assessments #3, #4, #5 and #8 provide evidence for Standard 4. Assessment#1, which is a content assessment, was removed from this standard.

For Assessment #3, Instructional Planning Portfolio: Unit Plan/Learning Segment, the rubric now shows descriptions that specifically address the integration of standards in planning and foreign language instruction, but data are not disaggregated by standard. Also, Table 1 shows some parts of the rubric without descriptors

Assessment #4, Student Teaching Evaluation (Foreign Language Specific Instrument), is pedagogical in nature and it provides evidence for this standard. However, the rubric does not give descriptors for each numeric value. There are descriptors for: 1 -Does not Meet Standard, 3- Meets Standards, 5- Exceeds Standards, but there are no descriptors for 2- Occasionally Meets, and 4-Occasionally Exceeds.

Assessment #5, edTPA, now partially aligns and demonstrates evidence of Standard 4. The rubric now shows descriptors to address the integration of standards in planning instruction, but the data

Standard 5. Assessment of Language and Cultures.

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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



The program indicates that Assessments #3, #4, and #5 provide evidence for Standard 5. Assessment #1, which is a content assessment, was removed from this standard.

Assessment #3, Instructional Planning Portfolio: Unit Plan/Learning Segment, the rubric now shows one description that specifically addresses Standard 5, but data are not disaggregated by standard. Also, Table 1 shows some parts of the rubric without descriptors.

Assessment #4, Student Teaching Evaluation (Foreign Language Specific Instrument), is pedagogical in nature and it clearly provides evidence for this standard. However, the rubric does not give descriptors for each numeric value. There are descriptors for: 1-Does not Meet Standard, 3-Meets Standards, 5-Exceeds Standards, but there are no descriptors for 2-Occasionally Meets, and 4-Occasionally Exceeds. Data for this standard show several students with "N/A" which is scored as 2 (Occasionally Meets).

Standard 6. Professionalism.

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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

The program indicates that Assessments #4, #7 and #8 provide evidence for Standard 6.

Assessment #4, Student Teaching Evaluation (Foreign Language Specific Instrument), provides evidence for this standard. However, the rubric does not give descriptors for each numeric value. There are descriptors for: 1-Does not Meet Standard, 3-Meets Standards, 5-Exceeds Standards; but there are no descriptors for 2-Occasionally Meets, and 4-Occasionally Exceeds. Data for this Standard show several students with "N/A" which is scored as 2 (Occasionally Meets).

Assessment #7, Professionalism, provides evidence for this standard and it aligns with the standard. Data are disaggregated by completion, language, and year. Assessment #7 provides very good information on how well candidates are prepared in the professionalism area by requiring them to attend ICTFL and later submitting a report.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

As stated in the previous National Recognition report from February 2015, for Standards 1 and 2,

candidate knowledge of content is mainly assessed through Assessments #1, #2, and #6. Disaggregated data by completer (year and language) and alignment between standards and rubric descriptors demonstrate evidence to that completers have the necessary content knowledge.

C.2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content

Assessment #2, #3, #4, #5, and #8 provide strong evidence of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, thus evidence of Standards 3-6. The program strengthened its assessment instruments and tools since the last review, and now they strongly demonstrate that it assesses the candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, **knowledge, skills, and dispositions**

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

Assessment #5, edTPA, is the primary evidence in this area, and alignment to address Standards 3-5 has been made. As mentioned in the previous National Recognition report from February 2015, for the next accreditation cycle, the program should consider pre- and post-tests with candidate analysis of how instructions are adjusted based on the analysis.

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 has responded to the conditions stated in the previous National Recognition report, February 2015.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

It is recommended that assessment instruments that address more than one standard. For example, in Assessments #3 and #5, the program should consider analyzing and providing disaggregated data to demonstrate how each standard is being addressed by each individual assessment tool. As previously suggested (report from February 2015), the program should consider pre- and post-tests with candidate analysis of how instructions are adjusted based on the analysis.

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 Board of Examiners:

None

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

National Recognition. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's

next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. **To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted mid-cycle (2 years in advance for a 5-year cycle and 3 years in advance for a 7-year cycle) before the next scheduled accreditation visit.** The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation. *Please note that once a program has been nationally recognized, it may not submit another report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns cited in the recognition report.*

Please click "Next"

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



From: Christiane K Eydt-Beebe ckeydt@eiu.edu
Subject: Fw: ACTFL/CAEP program report Eastern Illinois University
Date: November 8, 2021 at 7:43 AM
To: Christopher J Mitchell cjmitchell@eiu.edu

For your records:
See below the e-mail from Teresa Bell (ACTFL Program Review Coordinator for CAEP) granting an extension until March 2022.

Christy Hooser from COE was copied. Let me know

if you need anything else. Thank you!

Christiane K. Eydt-Beebe, PhD
Chair & Associate Professor of German Department of
World Languages & Cultures Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, IL 61920 ckeydt@eiu.edu
217-581-5562 Direct
217-581-3021 Main Office

=====

To schedule a Zoom meeting with Dr. Eydt, follow this link:

<https://calendly.com/ckeydt>

Like [EIU World Languages & Cultures](#) on Facebook!

From: Teresa Bell <Teresa_Bell@byu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 10:06 PM
To: Christiane K Eydt-Beebe <ckeydt@eiu.edu>
Subject: Re: ACTFL/CAEP program report Eastern Illinois University

Dear Christiane,

It's great to hear from you! You may most definitely have an extension to March 2022. I'll make that change right away.

Best, Teresa

TERESA REBER BELL, Ph.D.

Associate Professor

German Section Head and Language Program Director
ACTFL Program Review Coordinator for CAEP

From: Christiane K Eydt-Beebe <ckeydt@eiu.edu>

Sent: Friday, August 20, 2021 2:47 PM

To: Teresa Bell <Teresa_Bell@byu.edu>

Cc: Christy M Hooser <cmhooser@eiu.edu>

Subject: ACTFL/CAEP program report Eastern Illinois University

Dear Teresa,

I hope your school year started well! We're gearing up for a busy new semester at EIU. It was nice to see many happy faces (above the mask) at our Panther Prowl today.

My reason for writing:

We would like to ask for an extension to submit our program report (Teacher Licensure Program in Spanish, French, and German).

We had originally planned to submit in September 2021. Due to COVID-related issues over the past year, we'd like to be granted a grace period of 6 months. I am confident that we will be able to submit a full report in March 2022.

I hope this extension will be possible and not cause any disruption in your work for ACTFL and CAEP. I am copying Christy Hooser from our College of Education since she coordinates EIU's reports.

Thank you for all your work, and all best for the year ahead. Christiane

Christiane K. Eydt-Beebe, PhD
Chair & Associate Professor of German Department of
World Languages & Cultures Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, IL 61920 ckeydt@eiu.edu
217-581-5562 Direct
217-581-3021 Main Office

=====

To schedule a Zoom meeting with Dr. Eydt, follow this link:

<https://calendly.com/ckeydt>

Like [EIU World Languages & Cultures](#) on Facebook!

CLAS Deans' comments on BA WLC-TL (accredited) report**Reviewer: Christopher Mitchell**

1. SLOs are generally clear and measurable, using language appropriate to the goals/the discipline and also language that uses middle levels of Bloom's Taxonomy ("demonstrate" in each one). As always, monitor your accreditation body's recommendations on SLO language, and refine as necessary.
2. The precision in the measures/how-used sections is appreciated and indicate that systematic analysis of multi-year data will be easy to do. A few specific questions to this regard:
 - a. For each measure, in the "how used" section can you give an expectation of what percentage of students will achieve the target? (This will enable you to analyze the data more efficiently.) **This was addressed in a received revision.**
 - b. Measure #1— can you give the numerical range for the evaluation scale, so that the "intermediate low (20 points)" target is better understood? **This was addressed in a received revision.**
 - c. Measure #5's target: not quite understanding the second sentence of the "how used" block— "22 points (Meets)." **This was addressed in a received revision.**
 - d. Measure #6's target: what's the numerical range for the evaluation scale? Same question for Measures #7 (licensure test – 240 out of how many points) and #9 (12 out of how many points). **This was addressed in a received revision.**

Overall, the plan seems comprehensive and ready for data collection. We look forward to seeing data analysis in fall of 2023.