

# STATE OF OKLAHOMA RECOGNITION REPORT ON THE PREPARATION OF CHEROKEE LANGUAGE EDUCATORS

This report is in response to a(n):

\*Initial Review       \*Revised Report       \*Response to Condition

\* Northeastern State University, Oklahoma

\_\_\_\_\_  
[insert name of institution submitting the program report along with the state in which it is located]

\* May 30, 2007 \_\_\_\_\_ [insert date of review: Month/Day/Year]

<b>*Program(s) Covered by this Review:</b>	<b>Program Type</b>	<b>*Award or Degree Level(s)</b>
Cherokee Language	Initial teacher license in field K-12 certification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Baccalaureate <input type="checkbox"/> Postbaccalaureate <input type="checkbox"/> Masters <input type="checkbox"/> Endorsement, Certificate, or License (specify) _____ _____

## **PART A—RECOGNITION DECISION** (see Section G for specifics on decision)

**A.1—Decision recognition of the program(s):**

Recognized  
 Recognized with conditions  
 Not nationally recognized

**A.2—Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)**

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

Yes     No     Not applicable     Not able to determine

**Comments:** The state's testing company is developing a Subject Area Test for Cherokee. The report does not indicate, however, when this test will be given for the first time, and how many candidates from those listed as being enrolled in the program (25) will be taking the test before they are set to graduate.

**A.3—Summary of Strengths:**

The program is clearly working to develop assessments of candidates' linguistic knowledge and proficiency in speaking and writing with accuracy and appropriate vocabulary. Plans have been made to develop a state licensure exam and an official Oral Proficiency Interview. Candidates have the opportunity to do directed study work with a native speaker of Cherokee in order to increase their oral proficiency. An important professional conference is held annually on the campus and candidates will be required to present their own work at the conference. The faculty member teaching two courses in methods of teaching Cherokee literacy and Cherokee language immersion is fluent in Cherokee. Extensive field experiences are provided to candidates.

## PART B—STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

M = Met      NM = Not Met

ACTFL Standard	Specific Program or Level <sup>2</sup>
<p><b>Standard 1. Language, Linguistics, Comparisons.</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Has Potential to Meet Standard</b></p>
<p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p><b>Standard 1a.</b> The state licensure exam (Assessment 1) will include listening, speaking, writing, and reading components but in and of itself will not be sufficient evidence of candidates' gaining the targeted levels of proficiency. Other assessments that are in place for the program should provide additional data about the number of candidates who can demonstrate Intermediate-High speaking proficiency through an official OPI (Assessment 6), and Intermediate-High writing proficiency at the (Assessment 7).</p> <p>It is not clear that the comprehensive exam for the advanced Cherokee course will be substantially different from the state licensure exam (Assessment 2).</p> <p><b>Standard 1b.</b> Assessments 2 and 7 should provide data about the number of candidates who can demonstrate Intermediate-High levels of knowledge about the linguistic elements of the Cherokee language. In fact, the rubrics presented for these assessments focus almost exclusively on linguistic competency and use of vocabulary. The rubric for Assessment 2 does <b>not</b> reflect the components of knowledge that the narrative description of the assessment promises: elements of social, historical, and teaching methodology. Since the exam itself is not provided, there is no way to judge the correlation of the rubric to the exam.</p> <p><b>Standard 1c.</b> Neither the assessments described nor the rubrics presented address this sub-standard.</p>	

<sup>2</sup> More than one column may be used for standards decisions if the program report encompasses more than one program.

<p><b>Standard 2. Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts.</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Has Potential to Meet Standard</b></p>
<p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>The Cherokee Cultural Topic Essay (Assessment 8) is designed specifically to address Standard 2, and the accompanying rubric is generally related to <b>Standard 2a</b>. There is no indication in the instructions to candidates that they <u>must use</u> literary and cultural texts to gather information on the cultural topic, so evidence of meeting Standard 2b may not be available. The rubric for Assessment 8 does not make clear that candidates are expected to use the framework of the foreign language K-12 standards in their teaching module or in their own investigation of the topic, which is what Standard 2b describes.</p> <p>Assessment 6 (OPI) is <u>not</u> designed to measure cultural or literary knowledge.</p>	

<p><b>Standard 3. Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices.</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Assessments as proposed <u>do not</u> adequately address Standard 3.</b></p>
<p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>As described, the Comprehensive Exam for CHER 3123 (Assessment 2) <u>does not</u> reflect foreign language Standard 3a or 3b in any way.</p> <p>The lesson plan template is generic, and <u>does not</u> specifically reflect the foreign language Standard 3a or 3b. The lesson plan rubric is aligned to Oklahoma “Minimum Criteria for Effective Teaching,” but is <u>not aligned</u> to the ACTFL Standard 3 and its sub-standards. The narrative description does not make clear whether one or multiple lesson plans will be evaluated for Assessment 3. If the lesson plans are developed in the Methods for the Immersion Classroom, it appears that the training for planning and the lesson planning that is evaluated will focus on “pre-kinder through elementary classrooms” only (CHER 3513 course description); however, the Context Statement indicates that some candidates may be doing their teaching for Clinical Pre-Internship II in secondary schools. To be useful, all data collected must relate equally to all candidates.</p> <p>The Full Internship Evaluation (Assessment 4) is generic, and <u>does not</u> specifically reflect the foreign language Standards 3a or 3b. The rubric is aligned to Oklahoma “Minimum Criteria for Effective Teaching,” but is <u>not aligned</u> to the ACTFL Standard 3 and its sub-standards: there is no mention in the rubric of language acquisition, language input, negotiation of meaning, or interaction in Cherokee; there is no mention of language program models that are utilized to address language learners’ diverse needs appropriately.</p> <p>The Reflection of a Lesson (Assessment 5) has some potential to demonstrate candidates’ understanding and achievement of Standard 3a and 3b. The narrative describing the assessment, however, indicates that only one lesson will be evaluated. The potential “data” gathered will thus be very limited and insufficient to ensure that the Standard has been met. Further, candidates are given no instructions about “data collection” or about what constitutes “appropriate evidence” of their impact on student learning. The rubric presented for Assessment 5 is <u>not aligned</u> to the ACTFL Standard.</p> <p>Assessment 7 and 8 bear no relation to ACTFL Standard 3.</p>	

<p><b>Standard 4. Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction.</b> Candidates (a) demonstrate an understanding of the goal areas and standards of the <i>Standards for Foreign Language Learning</i> and their state standards, and they integrate these frameworks into curricular planning; (b) integrate the <i>Standards for Foreign Language Learning</i> and their state standards into language instruction; and (c) use standards and curricular goals to evaluate, select, design, and adapt instructional resources.</p>	<p>Assessments as proposed <u>do not</u> adequately address Standard 4.</p>
<p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>Since the OSAT exam (Assessment 1) has not been developed yet, it is impossible to know if there will be a component which evaluates candidates' knowledge and understanding of the <i>Standards for Foreign Language Learning</i> and the P.A.S.S. guidelines.</p> <p>As described, the Comprehensive Exam for CHER 3123 (Assessment 2) <u>does not</u> reflect foreign language Standard 4a, 4b, or 4c in any way.</p> <p>The lesson plan template (Assessment 3) is generic, and <u>does not</u> specifically reflect the foreign language Standard 4a, 4b, or 4c. The lesson plan rubric is aligned to Oklahoma "Minimum Criteria for Effective Teaching," but is <u>not aligned</u> to the ACTFL Standard 4 and its sub-standards.</p> <p>Assessments 5, 7, and 8 bear <u>no relation</u> to ACTFL Standard 4. The assessments are not designed to evaluate candidates' standards-based teaching practices.</p>	

<p><b>Standard 5. Assessment of Language and Cultures.</b> 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.</p>	<p>Assessments as proposed <u>do not</u> adequately address Standard 5.</p>
<p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>The Lesson Plan (Assessment 3) template is generic, and <u>does not</u> specifically reflect the foreign language Standard 5a, 5b, or 5c. The lesson plan rubric is aligned to Oklahoma “Minimum Criteria for Effective Teaching,” but is <u>not aligned</u> to the ACTFL Standard 5 and its sub-standards. The final segment of the Lesson Plan, “Reflection,” has some potential to demonstrate candidates’ understanding and achievement of Standard 5. The narrative describing the assessment, however, indicates that only three lessons will be taught, thus limiting the potential “data” gathered from K-12 pupils about their learning of Cherokee. Evidence will be insufficient to ensure that the Standard has been met. Further, candidates are given no instructions about “data collection” or about what constitutes “appropriate evidence” of their impact on student learning.</p> <p>The Full Internship Evaluation (Assessment 4) is generic, and <u>does not</u> specifically reflect the foreign language Standard 5. The rubric is aligned to Oklahoma “Minimum Criteria for Effective Teaching,” but is <u>not aligned specifically</u> to the ACTFL Standard 5 and its sub-standards.</p> <p>Assessment 6 (OPI) is <u>not</u> designed to measure candidates’ impact on <i>their pupils’ learning</i>.</p> <p>Assessments 7 and 8 bear <u>no relation</u> to ACTFL Standard 5. The assessments are not designed to evaluate candidates’ impact on <i>their own pupils’ learning of Cherokee</i>, which is what this Standard requires.</p>	

<p><b>Standard 6. Professionalism.</b> 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.</p>	<p>Assessments as proposed <u>do not</u> adequately address Standard 6.</p>
<p><b>Comment:</b></p> <p>The Full Internship Evaluation (Assessment 4) is generic, and <u>does not</u> specifically reflect the foreign language Standard 6. The rubric is aligned to Oklahoma “Minimum Criteria for Effective Teaching,” but is <u>not aligned specifically</u> to the ACTFL Standard 6 and its sub-standards: there is no component measuring candidates’ efforts to increase their own language proficiency through professional development, nor is there any component assessing candidates’ advocacy efforts.</p> <p>The Indian Symposium Presentation <u>has potential</u> as an opportunity for candidates to become advocates for the study of Cherokee in the K-12 schools, and participation in the symposium is definitely an opportunity for candidates’ professional development if they attend sessions beyond their own assigned presentation. However, the presentation as described (Assessment 7) does not reflect the components of Standard 6a or 6b; the instructions and rubric seem more closely related to the language proficiency Standard 1. The rubric is <u>not aligned</u> at all with Standard 6.</p> <p>Assessments 3 and 8 bear <u>no relation</u> to ACTFL Standard 6.</p>	

## PART C—EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

<p><b>C.1—Candidates’ knowledge of content.</b> ACTFL performance-based standards addressed in this entry could include (but are not limited to) Standards 1, 2. Information from Assessments #1, #2 and #3 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #7 and #8 may also focus on content knowledge.)</p> <p>Assessments provided, especially # 7 and #8, are on the right track to provide future data on candidates’ knowledge and skill in the mechanics of the Cherokee language. The state OSAT (Assessment #1) and the ACTFL Proficiency Interview (Assessment #6) are yet to be developed, but they should also render useful data about the candidates’ preparation to speak, read, and write in Cherokee. It will be imperative that the narrative description of each assessment and the instructions to candidates clearly demonstrate how the assessment task is specifically aligned to ACTFL standards. The rubrics must demonstrate a clear differentiation between levels of knowledge/skill, and the descriptors used in the rubric <u>categories</u> (e.g. morphology, phonology, syntax, semantics, discourse knowledge, processes of analyzing culture, etc.) must be clearly aligned to ACTFL standards. The rubrics provided by ACTFL can be helpful in accomplishing this.</p>
--

**C.2—Candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.** ACTFL standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 3-6. Information from Assessments #4 and #5 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #7 and #8 may also focus on pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.)

Because the program utilized generic assessment instruments to evaluate candidates’ ability to plan standards-based instruction, to teach standards-based lessons, and to assess their impact on K-12 students’ learning of Cherokee language, it is impossible to state that the ACTFL Standards 3, 4, 5, and 6 have been met. The tools that are used university-wide to assess unit and lesson planning (Assessment #3) and to assess student teaching (Assessment #4) can be used if it can be clearly demonstrated exactly how they align with ACTFL standards 3-6. It is also possible to develop additional, new instruments that are designed to show alignment.

Although the program states that Assessments #7 and #8 address ACTFL Standards 3 and 4, they do not do so.

**C.3—Candidate effects on P-12 student learning.** ACTFL standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 3-5. Information from Assessment #5 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #7 and #8 may also focus on student learning.)

The program does not present a convincing assessment tool to measure candidates’ impact on K-12 pupil learning. The instructions to candidates about their “lesson reflection” are incomplete and lack any detail to guarantee that candidates know what data to collect and how to collect it. The rubric relates to anecdotal evidence that will not render sufficient evidence that candidates meet Standard 5.

Although the program states that Assessments #7 and #8 address ACTFL Standard 5, they do not do so.

## **PART D—EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

**D—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.)**

Not applicable at this time

## **PART E—AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

All rubrics must be aligned to ACTFL Standards in clear and specific ways. If multiple assessment tools are used to provide evidence of meeting more than one standard, it must be clear that assignments given to the candidates will result in artifacts that can actually measure what is purported.

## PART F—ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### F.1—Comments on context and other topics not covered in sections B-D:

Clarify some confusing elements in the Context Statement and Attachments, which are listed here in no particular order:

- It is not clear whether Cherokee Education is a degree program or simply a licensure program, since it is unusual that a language degree major would only be required to complete 29 credit hours in language courses. Attachment C indicates that candidates are 'encouraged' to take two 4000-level language classes in order to reach desired levels of proficiency, but coursework is not required, according to the Course of Studies list.
- Attachment A lists 25 candidates currently enrolled in the program, but it is not clear if these are students who have been officially "admitted to professional education," which is the typical definition of "candidate." If any of the 25 students are officially "candidates," approaching their Full Internship, there could be some data available to present in the report.
- No time frame is discussed for the implementation of the OSAT or the OPI in Cherokee. Will those assessments be in place before the first candidates are ready for their Full Internship, as required?
- The Context Statement does not make clear that Cherokee candidates must complete their Pre-Internship I and II experiences in Cherokee-language classrooms, guided by cooperating teachers who are teachers of Cherokee. Is it possible to guarantee that Cherokee instruction is offered in the small, medium and large schools where candidates do the internships?
- It is not clear that the "clinical faculty" supervising student teaching are themselves fluent in Cherokee, or that the cooperating teachers are fluent speakers of Cherokee. Is the "university faculty" who might observe live teaching or a video of teaching in the Pre-Internship II class one of the faculty members who teaches Cherokee language classes? If a fluent speaker of Cherokee observes the student teacher only once out of 6 required observations, is that sufficient to verify that the candidate is proficient enough in the language to teach it effectively?
- Are Cherokee Education candidates all native speakers of Cherokee? If not, will they have the language skills needed to teach P-12 pupils who are native language speakers?
- It is not clear from Attachment B that the faculty members teaching Cherokee language classes have advanced degrees in the Cherokee language or in second-language acquisition or applied linguistics. It appears that possibly only one of the education faculty who supervise Internships has a degree or prior experience in learning and/or teaching languages other than English.
- Attachment C indicates that the 8 points on the Self-Assessment Table are "described in the Context narrative." The reader finds no narrative statements that the program has special emphasis on oral proficiency; that there are literature components in the program; that candidates have field experience prior to student teaching that take place in Cherokee-language classrooms.

**F.2—Concerns for possible follow up by the Board of Examiners:**

**PART G: TERMS AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS FOR DECISIONS**

**Program is recognized.** The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation visit in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE review 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 review, in its published materials. **National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.**

*Subsequent action by the institution:* None. Nationally recognized programs may not file revised reports addressing any unmet standards or areas for improvement.

**Program is recognized with conditions.** The program is recognized through June 2014. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified above, in its published materials. **National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.**

*Subsequent action by the institution:* To retain accreditation, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted within 18 months of the date of this report, no later than December of 2009. The report must address the conditions specified in the box below. Failure to submit a report by the date specified above will result in loss of national recognition.

**Program is not recognized.** Programs that retain recognition from a prior review will lose recognition at the end of the semester in which the NCATE accreditation visit is held, unless a revised program report is submitted in or before that semester.

*Subsequent action by the institution:* A revised report, addressing unmet standards, may be submitted within 18 months of the date of this report, no later than [date to be filled in by NCATE]. The institution may submit a new program report at any time. In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

**Recognition with conditions:** The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (see above for specific date):

Make corrections as noted above.