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**Name of Institution**
The University of Memphis, TN

**Date of Review**
02 / 04 / 2008

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

**Program(s) Covered by this Review**
School Library Media

**Program Type**
Other School Personnel

**Award or Degree Level(s)**
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only

**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 [See Part G]
- Not nationally recognized
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

Comment:
There are suspected errors in the discussion of the assessment. In the description, the program notes that Praxis II is an admission requirement. That would be unusual, since in most programs, Praxis II is an exit or pre-practicum requirement. There is also some confusion about the number of candidates taking the test. Apparently only about half of the candidates are required to take the Praxis. This is not explained.

Note: If there is no state requirement that candidates must take the Praxis II for licensure, or if there is no program requirement that all candidates must take the Praxis II as an internal program assessment, then another content-based assessment should be submitted for Assessment #1.

If, however, candidates are not required to take and pass the test as a requirement for program completion, then Praxis II data will necessarily be limited to those candidates who seek in-state licensure and whose scores are reported to the university.

The Praxis II requirement for this program should be clarified in the Response to Conditions report.

Summary of Strengths:
Program of study is strong, and is consistent with programs demonstrating strong alignment with AASL standards. The planning aspect of program administration is strong in the policies, procedures, and more theoretical aspects, but not in the direct hands-on applications. Selection of resources for specific applications appears to be a strength.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. School library media candidates encourage reading and lifelong learning by stimulating interests and fostering competencies in the effective use of ideas and information. They apply a variety of strategies to ensure access to resources and information in a variety of formats to all members of the learning community. Candidates promote efficient and ethical information-seeking behavior as part of the school library media program and its services.

Standard 1.1. Efficient and ethical information-seeking behavior. Candidates model strategies to locate, evaluate and use information for specific purposes. Candidates identify and address student interests and motivations. Candidates interact with the learning community to access, communicate and interpret intellectual content. Candidates adhere to and communicate legal and ethical policies.

- Met
- Met with Conditions
- Not Met

Comment:
The area of efficient information-seeking behavior is evident in several assessments. However, there is little evidence of ethical information-seeking. Little if any evidence is provided regarding intellectual freedom, plagiarism, etc.

**Standard 1.2. Literacy and reading.** Candidates are aware of major trends in reading material for children and youth. Candidates select materials in multiple formats to address the needs and interests of diverse young readers and learners. Candidates use a variety of strategies to promote leisure reading. They model their personal enjoyment of reading in order to promote the habits of creative expression and lifelong reading.

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

**Comment:**
Assessment #3 is not specific to literacy and reading. Assessment #6 does not address major trends in reading material, the promotion of leisure reading, or modelling personal enjoyment of reading.

**Standard 1.3. Access to information.** Candidates support flexible and open access for the library media center and its services. Candidates identify barriers to equitable access to resources and services. Candidates facilitate access to information in print, non-print, and electronic formats. Candidates comply with and communicate the legal and ethical codes of the profession.

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

**Comment:**
See Element 1.1 above. The legal and ethical codes of the profession, part of the above element, do not appear to be addressed.

**Standard 1.4. Stimulating learning environment.** Candidates demonstrate ways to establish and maintain a positive educational climate in the library media center. Candidates identify relationships among facilities, programs, and environment that impact student learning. Candidates plan and organize library media centers according to their use by the learning community.

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

**Comment:**
Assessment #3 does not pass muster, since it is a course grade which shows candidate's overall and comprehensive knowledge of the library program but does not specifically demonstrate candidate's ability to plan for a stimulating learning environment. The element is met with Assessment #4.

**Standard 2.1. Knowledge of learners and learning.** Candidates design library media instruction that assessed learner interests, needs, instructional methodologies, and information processes to assure that each is integral to information skills instruction. Candidates support the learning of all students and other members of the learning community, including those with diverse learning styles, abilities and needs. Information skills instruction is based on student interests and learning needs and is linked to student achievement.
### Standard 2.2. Effective and knowledgeable teacher.

Candidates work with classroom teachers to co-plan, co-teach, and co-assess information skills instruction. The library media specialist as teacher of information skills makes use of a variety of instructional strategies and assessment tools. Candidates analyze the role of student interest and motivation in instructional design. Student learning experiences are created, implemented and evaluated in partnership with teachers and other educators.

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

**Comment:**
Assessment #3 does not pass muster, since it is a course grade which shows candidate's overall and comprehensive knowledge of the library program but does not specifically demonstrate candidate's ability to plan for instruction. The element is met with Assessment #4. It is difficult to master this element without providing some evidence that candidates develop and deliver instruction.

### Standard 2.3. Information literacy curriculum.

Candidates employ strategies to integrate the information literacy curriculum with content curriculum. Candidates incorporate technology to promote efficient and equitable access to information beyond print resources. Candidates assist students to use technology to access, analyze, and present information.

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

**Comment:**
Although the scoring guide for Assessment #2 provides a general direction for candidates to discuss the intended audience, the directions are not specific enough to ensure that candidates are integrating the pathfinder into content curriculum. Use of technology is required. Assessment #3 does not pass muster, since it is a course grade which shows candidate's overall and comprehensive knowledge of the library program but does not specifically demonstrate candidate's ability to plan. There is no evidence that Assessment #4 requires candidates to design and deliver instruction. Assessment #5 does not have any connection to K-12 student learning except as a model process. Assessment #6 describes a teaching event, but the scoring guide does not address whether or not the teaching event is just in theory, or actually occurs.

### Standard 3.1. Connection with library community.

Candidates demonstrate the potential for establishing connections to other libraries and the larger library community for resource sharing, networking, and developing common policies and procedures. Candidates articulate the role of their professional associations and journals in their own professional growth.

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

**Comment:**
Assessment #3 does not pass muster, since it is a course grade which shows candidate's overall and comprehensive knowledge of the library program but does not specifically demonstrate candidate's ability to plan for instruction. There is no evidence that Assessment #4 requires candidates to design and deliver instruction. Assessment #5 does not have any connection to K-12 student learning except as a model process. Assessment #6 describes a teaching event, but the scoring guide does not address information skills.
Comment:
Assessment #3 does not pass muster, since it is a course grade which shows candidate's overall and comprehensive knowledge of the library program but does not specifically demonstrate candidate's ability to plan. This element is met with Assessment #4. It is not evident that candidates are aware of or required to interact with other types of libraries.

**Standard 3.2. Instructional partner.** Candidates model, share, and promote ethical and legal principles of education and librarianship. Candidates acknowledge the importance of participating on school and district committees and in faculty staff development opportunities.

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

Comment:
Assessment #3 does not pass muster, since it is a course grade which shows candidate's overall and comprehensive knowledge of the library program but does not specifically demonstrate candidate's ability to plan. Met with Assessment #4.

**Standard 3.3. Educational leader.** Candidates are able to articulate the relationship of the library media program with current educational trends and important issues. Candidates recognize the role of other educational professionals and professional associations. Candidates translate for the school the ways in which the library program can enhance school improvement efforts. Candidates utilize information found in professional journals to improve library practice.

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

Comment:
Assessment #3 does not pass muster, since it is a course grade which shows candidate's overall and comprehensive knowledge of the library program but does not specifically demonstrate candidate's ability to plan. Met with Assessment #4.

**Standard 4.1. Managing information resources: selecting, organizing, using.** Candidates select, analyze, and evaluate print, nonprint and electronic resources using professional selection tools and evaluation criteria to develop a quality collection designed to meet diverse curricular and personal needs. Candidates organize the library media facility and its collections – print, nonprint and electronic – according to standard accepted practice. Candidates support intellectual freedom and privacy of users. Candidates plan for efficient use of resources and technology to meet diverse user needs.

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

Comment:
Assessment of collection development seems to be limited to articulation of the importance of collection development policies and procedures. Organization limited to comparison of software management programs. Emphasis in assessment is on efficient use of resources and technology.
Standard 4.2. Managing program resources: human, financial, physical. Candidates develop and evaluate policies and procedures that support the mission of the school and address specific needs of the library media program, such as collection development and maintenance, challenged materials and acceptable use policies. Candidates apply accepted management principles and practices that relate to personnel, financial and operational issues. Candidates plan adequate space for individuals, small groups and whole classes.

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

**Comment:**
Assessment #3 does not pass muster, since it is a course grade which shows candidate's overall and comprehensive knowledge of the library program but does not specifically demonstrate candidate's ability to plan. This element is met with Assessment #4.

Standard 4.3. Comprehensive and collaborative strategic planning and assessment. Candidates collaborate with teachers and administrators to develop a library media program plan that aligns resources, services and information literacy standards with the school's goals and objectives. Candidates use data for decision-making.

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

**Comment:**
Assessment #3 does not pass muster, since it is a course grade which shows candidate's overall and comprehensive knowledge of the library program but does not specifically demonstrate candidate's ability to plan. This element is met with Assessment #5, except that it is a very limited assessment, which does not address the comprehensive nature of the above.

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

**C.1. Candidates’ knowledge of content**
Assessment #2 is limited as a content assessment, but is effective for the content knowledge in those areas that it covers, which is just a small number of elements. An assessment that covered more than four elements would be more acceptable as a content assessment. The Praxis is questionable as well, since it is not clear if it is required of all candidates.

**C.2. Candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions**
There is no indication that candidates are evaluated on their ability to design and deliver instruction to students. Some evidence exists that candidates understand a research process (Assessment #5), as well as select resources in preparation for teaching (several assessments), but the integration of the resources to the instructional process is weak.

**C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning**
Assessment #5 has no evident connection with student learning except as an instructional model. The application, however, appears to address candidate learning, but that is not the focus of this area.

**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 provided evidence that assessment results are reviewed and discussed in relation to program strength.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

The program should rethink the application of its assessments to the standards. A replacement Assessment #2 should be included, in order to show a broad knowledge of content. In addition, the specific areas of Standards 1.2, 2.2, and 2.3 also need to be demonstrated with scoring guides that provide evidence that candidates have mastery of these standards.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

The context section showed that the program is well-organized and is aligned with the conceptual framework and the unit assessment system. Several team members commented on a lack of editing that may have hurt the program's ability to show that the assessments met the standards.

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

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- Program is nationally recognized. 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 before that review. 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.

- Program is nationally recognized with conditions. 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 below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

- The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM DD YYYY
02 / 01 / 2010
Subsequent action by the institution:* To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below. The program has up to two opportunities to address conditions within an 18 month period. The range of possible deadlines for submitting reports are 4/15/08, 9/15/08, 2/1/09, 4/15/09, or 9/15/09. Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 2/1/09 submission date.

*Note: for this semester only, programs who have been cited as Recognized with Conditions for a second time have been given one more opportunity to submit another Response to Conditions report. The report may be submitted April 15, 2008; Sept. 15, 2008, or Feb. 1, 2009.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM    DD    YYYY
09    /   15    /   2009

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

| Assessment #3 is not sufficient to show candidates ability to plan. Course grade(s) may only be used for content assessment #1 or #2, or an additional assessment (6-8); therefore Assessment #3 is not sufficient when used in this context. |
| It is difficult to ascertain the degree to which Assessments #4 or #5 require candidates to design and deliver instruction (Standard 2). |
| The descriptions of the assessments, with the exception of Assessment #2, were vague in the description of what candidates had to do and how the assessments met the standards. The team found it difficult to clearly understand candidate tasks, and therefore, what candidates were expected to know and be able to do. |

Please click "Next"

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