

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of School Librarians (2010 Standards)

National recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the American Library Association/ American Association of School Librarians (ALA/AASL).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Valdosta State University

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

11 / 22 / 2020

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Master of Education in Instructional Technology: P-12 School Library Media

Grade Level⁽¹⁾

P-12

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

Program Type

Other School Personnel

Award or Degree Level(s)

- Master's (AASL/ALA only recognizes programs at the master's level.)

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:

ALA/AASL has not set a benchmarked licensure test data requirement.

Summary of Strengths:

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1: Teaching for Learning

Candidates are effective teachers who demonstrate knowledge of learners and learning and who model and promote collaborative planning, instruction in multiple literacies, and inquiry-based learning, enabling members of the learning community to become effective users and creators of ideas and information. Candidates design and implement instruction that engages students' interests and develops their ability to inquire, think critically, gain and share knowledge.

1.1 Knowledge of learners and learning. Candidates are knowledgeable of learning styles, stages of human growth and development, and cultural influences on learning. Candidates assess learner needs and design instruction that reflects educational best practice. Candidates support the learning of all students and other members of the learning community, including those with diverse learning styles, physical and intellectual abilities and needs. Candidates base twenty-first century skills instruction on student interests and learning needs and link it to the assessment of student achievement.

1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher. Candidates implement the principles of effective teaching and learning that contribute to an active, inquiry-based approach to learning. Candidates make use of a variety of instructional strategies and assessment tools to design and develop digital-age learning experiences and assessments in partnership with classroom teachers and other educators. Candidates can document and communicate the impact of collaborative instruction on student achievement.

1.3 Instructional partner. Candidates model, share, and promote effective principles of teaching and learning as collaborative partners with other educators. Candidates acknowledge the importance of participating in curriculum development, of engaging in school improvement processes, and of offering professional development to other educators as it relates to library and information use.

1.4 Integration of twenty first century skills and learning standards. Candidates advocate for twenty-first century literacy skills to support the learning needs of the school community. Candidates demonstrate how to collaborate with other teachers to plan and implement instruction of the AASL Standards for the 21st-Century Learner and state student curriculum standards. Candidates employ strategies to integrate multiple literacies with content curriculum. Candidates integrate the use of emerging technologies as a means for effective and creative teaching and to support P-12 students' conceptual understanding, critical thinking and creative processes

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessment 1 is the GACE Content Assessment. Candidates show proficiency in this area.

Assessment 2 is the Cataloging Project. This project includes some alignment to standard 1.3 where all candidates are proficient. The rubric in relation to this standard is more specific and captures performance in relation to this standard, though still appears to use subjective qualifiers ("some", "little", "no") between the levels of performance. The rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to the assessment product and not on the specific tasks described in instructions to candidates.

Assessment 4 is the Library Media Internship Portfolio. This project includes alignment to standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 and all candidates are proficient. The rubric used continues to 1) use subjective qualifiers ("clear", "proficient", "little"), and 2) use vague descriptions that are duplicative for all standards rather than being evaluated on specific tasks.

Assessment 5 is the Instructional Design Project. All candidates show they are above proficiency for standards 1.1 and 1.2. The rubric for this standard has been improved.

Assessment 7 is the new Empowering Learners Project. All candidates show above proficiency for standard 1.4.

The program submitted Assessments 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 to document candidate mastery of Standard 1, Teaching for Learning. Assessments 1 and 4 present overall evidence for Standard 1 whereas Assessment 2 specifically addresses 1.3, Assessment 5

addresses 1.1 and 1.2, and Assessment 7 addresses 1.4. Revised rubrics better delineate how the standard is addressed within each assessment.

Standard 1 is now met

Standard 2: Literacy and Reading

Candidates promote reading for learning, personal growth, and enjoyment. Candidates are aware of major trends in children's and young adult literature and select reading materials in multiple formats to support reading for information, reading for pleasure, and reading for lifelong learning. Candidates use a variety of strategies to reinforce classroom reading instruction to address the diverse needs and interests of all readers.

2.1 Literature. Candidates are familiar with a wide range of children's, young adult, and professional literature in multiple formats and languages to support reading for information, reading for pleasure, and reading for lifelong learning.

2.2 Reading promotion. Candidates use a variety of strategies to promote leisure reading and model personal enjoyment of reading in order to promote habits of creative expression and lifelong reading.

2.3 Respect for diversity. Candidates demonstrate the ability to develop a collection of reading and information materials in print and digital formats that support the diverse developmental, cultural, social, and linguistic needs of P-12 students and their communities.

2.4 Literacy strategies. Candidates collaborate with classroom teachers to reinforce a wide variety of reading instructional strategies to ensure P-12 students are able to create meaning from text.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessment 1 is the GACE Content Assessment. Candidates show proficiency in this area.

Assessment 3 is the Literature Project. This project includes alignment to standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and all candidates are proficient. Rubric rows should isolate individual standard elements instead of evaluating the performance of two or more elements.

Assessment 4 is the Library Media Internship Portfolio. This project includes alignment to standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 and all candidates are proficient. The rubric used continues to 1) use subjective qualifiers ("clear", "proficient", "little"), and 2) use vague descriptions that are duplicative for all standards rather than being evaluated on specific tasks.

The program submitted Assessments 1, 3, and 4 to document candidate mastery of Standard 2, Literacy and Reading. Assessments 1 and 4 present overall evidence for Standard 2. Assessment 3 specifically addresses each element of Standard 2. Revised rubrics better delineate how the standard is addressed within Assessments 3 and 4.

Standard 2 is now met.

Standard 3: Information and Knowledge

Candidates model and promote ethical, equitable access to and use of physical, digital, and virtual collections of resources. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of a variety of information sources and services that support the needs of the diverse learning community. Candidates demonstrate the use of a variety of research strategies to generate knowledge to improve practice.

3.1 Efficient and ethical information-seeking behavior. Candidates identify and provide support for diverse student information needs. Candidates model multiple strategies for students, other teachers, and administrators to locate, evaluate, and ethically use information for specific purposes. Candidates collaborate with students, other teachers, and administrators to efficiently access, interpret, and communicate information.

3.2 Access to information. Candidates support flexible, open access for library services. Candidates demonstrate their ability to develop solutions for addressing physical, social and intellectual barriers to equitable access to resources and services. Candidates facilitate access to information in print, non-print, and digital formats. Candidates model and communicate the legal and ethical codes of the profession.

3.3 Information technology. Candidates demonstrate their ability to design and adapt relevant learning experiences that engage students in authentic learning through the use of digital tools and resources. Candidates model and facilitate the

effective use of current and emerging digital tools to locate, analyze, evaluate, and use information resources to support research, learning, creating, and communicating in a digital society.

3.4 Research and knowledge creation. Candidates use evidence-based, action research to collect data. Candidates interpret and use data to create and share new knowledge to improve practice in school libraries.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

Assessment 1 is the GACE Content Assessment. Candidates show proficiency in this area.

Assessment 4 is the Library Media Internship Portfolio. This project includes alignment to standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 and all candidates are proficient. The rubric used continues to 1) use subjective qualifiers ("clear", "proficient", "little"), and 2) uses vague descriptions that are duplicative for all standards rather than being evaluated on specific tasks.

Assessment 5 is the Instructional Design Project. All candidates show they are above proficiency for standard 3.4.

Assessment 7 is the new Empowering Learners Project. All candidates show above proficiency for standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3. However, standards 3.1 and 3.3 appear to be evaluated twice with minimal difference in the descriptions.

The program submitted Assessments 1, 4, 5, and 7 to document candidate mastery of Standard 3, Information and Knowledge. Assessments 1 and 4 present overall evidence for Standard 3 whereas Assessment 5 specifically addresses 3.4, and Assessment 7 addresses 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3. Revised rubrics better delineate how the standard is addressed within each assessment.

Standard 3 is now met.

Standard 4: Advocacy and Leadership

Candidates advocate for dynamic school library programs and positive learning environments that focus on student learning and achievement by collaborating and connecting with teachers, administrators, librarians, and the community. Candidates are committed to continuous learning and professional growth and lead professional development activities for other educators. Candidates provide leadership by articulating ways in which school libraries contribute to student achievement.

4.1. Networking with the library community. Candidates demonstrate the ability to establish connections with other libraries and to strengthen cooperation among library colleagues for resource sharing, networking, and facilitating access to information. Candidates participate and collaborate as members of a social and intellectual network of learners.

4.2 Professional development. Candidates model a strong commitment to the profession by participating in professional growth and leadership opportunities through membership in library associations, attendance at professional conferences, reading professional publications, and exploring Internet resources. Candidates plan for ongoing professional growth.

4.3 Leadership. Candidates are able to articulate the role and relationship of the school library program's impact on student academic achievement within the context of current educational initiatives. Utilizing evidence-based practice and information from education and library research, candidates communicate ways in which the library program can enhance school improvement efforts.

4.4 Advocacy. Candidates identify stakeholders within and outside the school community who impact the school library program. Candidates develop a plan to advocate for school library and information programs, resources, and services.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Comment:

Assessment 1 is the GACE Content Assessment. Students show proficiency in this area.

Assessment 2, the Cataloging Project, includes some alignment to standard 4.2 where all candidates are proficient. The rubric is more specific and captures performance in relation to the standard, though still appears to use subjective qualifiers ("some", "little", "no") between the levels of performance. Also the rubric uses a single rubric category to relate standards 4.2 and 5.1. The rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to the assessment product and not on the specific tasks described in instructions to candidates.

Assessment 3 is the Literature Project. This project includes alignment to standard 4.1 and all candidates are proficient. Further suggestions may include isolating individual standards instead of evaluating the performance of two or more elements.

Assessment 4 is the Library Media Internship Portfolio. This project includes alignment to standards 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 and all candidates are proficient. The rubric used continues to 1) use subjective qualifiers ("clear", "proficient", "little"), and 2) use vague descriptions that are duplicative for all standards rather than being evaluated on specific tasks.

Assessment 6 is the Case Study Analysis. This project includes alignment to standards 4.3 and 4.4. All candidates are proficient. Future recommendations include 1) separation of each standard instead of single rubric categories for more than one standard, and 2) eliminate subjective qualifiers, like "some", "little" or "no."

The program submitted Assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 to document candidate mastery of Standard 4, Advocacy and Leadership. Assessments 1 and 4 present overall evidence for Standard 4 whereas Assessment 2 specifically addresses 4.2, Assessment 3 addresses 4.1, and Assessment 6 addresses 4.3 and 4.4. Revised rubrics better delineate how the standard is addressed within each assessment.

Standard 4 is now met.

Standard 5: Program Management

Candidates plan, develop, implement, and evaluate school library programs, resources, and services in support of the mission of the library program within the school according to the ethics and principles of library science, education, management, and administration.

5.1 Collections. Candidates evaluate and select print, non-print, and digital resources using professional selection tools and evaluation criteria to develop and manage a quality collection designed to meet the diverse curricular, personal, and professional needs of students, teachers, and administrators. Candidates organize school library collections according to current library cataloging and classification principles and standards.

5.2 Professional Ethics. Candidates practice the ethical principles of their profession, advocate for intellectual freedom and privacy, and promote and model digital citizenship and responsibility. Candidates educate the school community on the ethical use of information and ideas.

5.3 Personnel, Funding, and Facilities. Candidates apply best practices related to planning, budgeting, and evaluating human, information, and physical resources. Candidates organize library facilities to enhance the use of information resources and services and to ensure equitable access to all resources for all users. Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate policies and procedures that support teaching and learning in school libraries.

5.4 Strategic Planning and Assessment. Candidates communicate and collaborate with students, teachers, administrators, and community members to develop a library program that aligns resources, services, and standards with the school's mission. Candidates make effective use of data and information to assess how the library program addresses the needs of their diverse communities.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessment 1 is the GACE Content Assessment. Candidates show proficiency in this area.

Assessment 2 is the Cataloging Project. This project includes some alignment to standard 5.1 where all candidates are proficient. The rubric in relation to this standard is more specific and captures performance in relation to this standard, though still appears to use subject qualifiers ("some", "little", "no") between the levels of performance. Also, in relation to this standard, the rubric uses a single rubric category to relate standards 4.2 and 5.1. The rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to the assessment product and not on the specific tasks described in instructions to candidates.

Assessment 4 is the Library Media Internship Portfolio. This project includes alignment to standards 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 and all candidates are proficient. The rubric used continues to 1) use subjective qualifiers ("clear", "proficient", "little"), 2) use vague descriptions that are duplicative for all standards rather than being evaluated on specific tasks.

Assessment 6 is the Case Study Analysis. This project includes alignment to standards 5.2 and 5.3. All students are proficient. Future recommendations include 1) separation of each standard instead of single rubric categories for more than one standard, and 2) eliminate subjective qualifiers, like "some", "little" or "no."

The program submitted Assessments 1, 2, 4, and 6 to document candidate mastery of Standard 5, Program Management and Administration. Assessments 1 and 4 present overall evidence for Standard 5 whereas Assessment 2 specifically addresses 5.1 and 5.4, and Assessment 6 addresses 5.2 and 5.3. Revised rubrics better delineate how the standard is addressed within each assessment.

Standard 5 is now met.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

ALA/AASL standards addressed in this entry could include Standards 1-5. Information from Assessments #1 and #2 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on content knowledge.)

The GACE state licensure test provides evidence of candidates' content knowledge. Most of the instructions have been reworded, and most rubrics have been reworded. Data from Assessments 1 and 2 provide evidence of candidates' knowledge of content in the field. The program has identified additional opportunities for learning about current trends and indicates a move to the 2019 ALA/AASL/CAEP Standards for School Librarian Preparation.

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

ALA/AASL standards that could be addressed in this entry include Standards 1-5. Information from Assessments #3 and #4 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.)

Data from Assessments 3, 4, and 6 provide evidence of candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions. One of these assessments has been revised and includes an additional learning experience with alignment to AASL standards. The program has noted

incorporation of additional technology tools, possible revision of a previously used key assessment, inclusion of additional field experience opportunities, and incorporation of the 2018 National School Library Standards for Learners, School Librarians, and School Libraries.

O

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

ALA/AASL standards that could be addressed in this entry include but are not limited to Standards 1-5. Information from Assessment #5 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on student learning.)

Candidates impact P-12 student learning, as evidenced in designing and implementing instruction, in developing a collection area, and in doing their field experience. Data from Assessments 5 and 7 provide evidence of candidate effects on P-12 student learning. The potential shift of Assessment 7 from summer to fall and/or spring semester would allow candidates the additional opportunity to demonstrate impact on student learning.

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)

Through the summary of findings, interpretation of findings, and future plans in Section V of the program report, the program has demonstrated evaluation and application of assessment results to improve candidate performance and to strengthen the program.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

Rubrics for each assessment should be further refined, revised, and developed to indicate not only clear standards alignment but also qualitative differences in candidate performance at each rubric level. Minimize the use of "all," "some," or "none" to differentiate levels, and minimize the use of quantitative measures (for example, 5 titles/less than 5 titles; 1-2 required elements missing/3 or more elements missing). Rubrics rely on the subjective use of qualifiers (e.g. "most," "somewhat," "exceptional") to describe differences between levels of performance, instead of on descriptions of what an evaluator would expect to see at each performance level. Rubrics could better describe the qualities or characteristics of performance that would indicate unacceptable, acceptable and target performance.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

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

PART G -DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- ① **National Recognition.** The program is recognized through the semester and year of the provider's next CAEP accreditation decision in 5-7 years. The Recognition Report will serve as program level evidence for the accreditation cycle it has been initiated. **To retain recognition and to gather new evidence for the next accreditation cycle, another program report must be submitted mid-cycle 3 years in advance of the next scheduled accreditation visit.** The program will be listed as Nationally Recognized through the semester of the next CAEP accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and CAEP. The institution may designate its program as Nationally Recognized by the SPA, through the semester of the next CAEP accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon CAEP 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.