** Content Expert Report**

**English Education**

**(05-17)**

Education Standards and Practices Board

**Program report status** (check one)**:**

**Initial review  Continuing Review  Focus Visit**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of Content Expert:** |  |
| **Content Expert Telephone:** |  |
| **Content Expert Email:** |  |
| **Date Submitted:** |  |
| **Institution Being Evaluated:** |  |
| **Program Being Evaluated:** |  |
| **Degree:** |  |
| **Grade Level(s):** |  |

**Is this program offered at more than one site?**  **Yes**  **No**

If yes, list sites where the program is offered:

**Summary of Recommendations**

After completing your review, for each sub-standard listed below, place a check under the column that matches your decision.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Met** | **Met With Weakness** | **Not Met** |
| **05020.1** |  |  |  |
| **05020.2** |  |  |  |
| **05020.3** |  |  |  |
| **05020.4** |  |  |  |
| **05020.5** |  |  |  |
| **05020.6** |  |  |  |

**English Education**

**Directions:** Please read the Content Area Report (CAR) supplied by the institution.

1. Review program’s response to Section II.1 Areas of Weakness from Prior Review. For each standard in which there was a weakness from the prior review, make a recommendation as to whether that weakness should be removed or retained. If it is to be retained provide a rationale for retaining it in Part I.B. If it has been partially but not fully addressed restate the weakness in Part I. C and provide a rationale.
2. Make a recommendation for each program standard as to whether it has been met, met with weakness, or not met based on the evidence provided. For any standard “met with weakness” or “not met” identify the weakness(es) and provide a rationale.

**Part I: Areas of Weakness from Prior Review \*\*\***

**XXXXX.X** *Write the standard and the original weakness here.*

A. **Content Expert Decision**: Should the weakness be removed, retained, or restated and retained? Check one only.

     Weakness Should Be Removed      Weakness Should Be Retained

     Restated Weakness

B. **For Decisions of “Weakness Should Be Retained”:** Provide a rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs.

i. **Rationale:**

C. **For Decisions of “Restated Weakness”:** Write the new language for the weakness. Provide a rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs.

1. **Restated Weakness:**

ii. **Rationale:**

***\*\*\*Note: This template can be copied and pasted into the document multiple times when more than one area of weakness was cited in a prior review.***

**Part II Program Standard Recommendations**

**05020.1 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes literature and multimedia texts as well as knowledge of the nature of Pre-adolescents and adolescents as readers,**

**05020.1.1** Candidates are knowledgeable about texts – print and non-print text, media text, classic texts and contemporary texts, including middle level and young adult- that represent a range of world literature, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different genders, ethnicities, and social classes; they are able to use literary theories to interpret and critique a range of texts.

**05020.1.2** Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents read text and make meaning through interaction with media environments.

General Comments: Middle level is now a group younger than young adult. We don’t teach secondary pre-service teachers how to teach students how to read. We need to help secondary pre-service teachers to identify reading difficulties.

A. **Content Expert Decision**: Is the program standard met, met with weakness, or not met?

     Met       Met with Weakness      Not Met

B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs.

i. **Weaknesses:**

ii. **Rationale:**

**05020.2 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes language and writing as well as knowledge of adolescents as language users.**

**05020.2.1** Candidates can compose a range of formal and informal texts taking into consideration the interrelationships among form, audience, context, and purpose; candidates understand that writing is a recursive process; candidates can use contemporary technologies and/or digital media to compose multimodal discourse.

**05020.2.2** Candidates know the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics); they understand the concept of dialect and are familiar with relevant grammar systems (e.g. descriptive and prescriptive); they understand principles of language acquisition and development (vocabulary, morphology, spelling); they recognize the influence of English language history on ELA content; and they understand the impact of language on society.

**05020.2.3** Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose formal and informal text and make meaning through interaction with media environments.

A. **Content Expert Decision**: Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?

     Met       Met with Weakness      Not Met

B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs.

i. **Weaknesses:**

ii. **Rationale:**

**05020.3 Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for reading and the study of literature to promote learning for all students.**

**05020.3.1** Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences utilizing a range of different texts – across genres, periods, forms, authors, cultures, and various forms of media – and instructional strategies that are motivating and accessible to all students, including English language learners, student with special needs, student from diverse language and learning backgrounds, those designated as high achieving, and those at risk of failure.

**05020.3.2** Candidates design a range of authentic assessments (e.g. formal and informal, formative and summative) of reading and literature that demonstrate an understanding of how learners develop and that address interpretive, critical, and evaluative abilities in reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and presenting.

**05030.3.3** Candidates plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences in reading that reflect knowledge of current theory and research about the teaching and learning of reading that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and a variety of reading strategies.

**05030.3.4** Candidates design or knowledgeably select appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing and acting on data about student interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes.

**05030.3.5** Candidates plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language – structure, history, and conventions – to facilitate students’ comprehension and interpretation of print and non-print texts.

**05030.3.6** Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials.

A. **Content Expert Decision**: Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?

     Met       Met with Weakness      Not Met

B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs.

i. **Weaknesses:**

ii. **Rationale:**

**05020.4 The program prepares candidates to plan instruction and design assessments for composing texts (i.e., oral, written, and visual) to promote learning for all students.**

**05020.4.1** Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant composing experiences that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and contemporary technologies and reflect an understanding of writing processes and strategies in different genres for a variety of purposes and audiences.

**05020.4.2** Candidates design a range of assessments for students that promote their development as writers, are appropriate to the writing task, and are consistent with current research and theory. Candidates are able to analyze and respond to student writing in process and to finished texts in ways that engage students’ ideas and encourage their growth as writers over time. Candidates are able to analyze data from standardized and classroom writing assignments and make instructional decisions.

**05020.4.3** Candidates design instruction on the foundational and strategic use of language conventions (grammar, usage, and mechanics) in the context of students’ writing for different audiences, purposes, and modalities.

**05020.4.4** Candidates design instruction that incorporates students’ home and community languages to enable skillful control over their rhetorical choices and language practices for a variety of audiences and purposes.

**05020.4.5** Candidates design instruction to teach students to access credibility and accuracy of information, integrating evidence, and documenting sources .

A. **Content Expert Decision**: Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?

     Met       Met with Weakness      Not Met

B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs. A rationale does not need to be provided for standards “met”.

i. **Weaknesses:**

ii. **Rationale:**

**05020.5 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how theories and research about social justice, diversity, equity, student identities, and schools as institutions can enhance students’ opportunities to learn in English Language Arts.**

**05020.5.1** Candidates plan and implement English language arts and literacy instruction that promote social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society.

**05020.5.2** Candidates use knowledge of theories and research to plan instruction responsive to students’ local, national and international histories, individual identities (e.g, race, ethnicity, gender expression, age, appearance, ability, spiritual belief, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and community environment), and languages/dialects as they affect students’ opportunities to learn in ELA.

A. **Content Expert Decision**: Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?

     Met       Met with Weakness      Not Met

B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs. A rationale does not need to be provided for standards “met”.

i. **Weaknesses:**

ii. **Rationale:**

**05020.6 Candidates are prepared to interact knowledgeably with students, families, and colleagues based on social needs and institutional roles, engage in leadership and/or collaborative roles in English Language Arts professional learning communities, and actively develop as professional educators.** **Note: This standard is covered in INTASC Standards and as such, addressing it is optional.**

**05020.6.1** Candidates model literate and ethical practices in ELA teaching, and engage in/reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA.

**05020.6.2** Candidates engage in and reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA that demonstrate understanding of and readiness for leadership, collaboration, ongoing professional development, and community engagement.

A. **Content Expert Decision**: Is the sub-standard met, met with weakness, or not met?

     Met       Met with Weakness      Not Met

B. **For Decisions of “Met with Weakness” or “Not Met”:** Describe the specific weakness identified and the rationale for the decision. This information will guide the institution to provide additional information in their rejoinder, or be used to determine stipulations for the institution to address by the time the next visit occurs.

i. **Weaknesses:**

ii. **Rationale:**

**II. Curriculum Exhibit Form SFN 14381 (or status sheet):** This form or status sheet provides the opportunity for institutions to document the entire program including general studies, teaching specialty, and professional education. This form is used to document each student transcript that applies for teacher licensure. Please review this form to make sure all of the courses listed above for each sub-standard are listed as a “**Requirement”. If a course is missing or is not a required course, please list below:**

**III. Content Expert Review of Standard and recommendation to State Board of Examiner (BOE) Team for the Site Visit:** The content expert provides an initial review of the program standard and provides a recommendation to the CAEP/State Board of Examiners for the onsite review. **What additional information should the CAEP/ESPB Team research on-site during the visit?**

This report will be electronically forwarded to the CAEP/State Board of Examiners nine months prior to the scheduled program review visit. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the Education Standards and Practices Board Executive Director at (701) 328-9646.

**Thank you for taking the time from your busy schedule to help document that our North Dakota institutions of higher education have prepared our teachers for the best possible education for all North Dakota students.**