



January 31, 2007

Ms. Bonnie Rockafellow
Higher Education Coordinator
Office of Professional Preparation Services
Michigan Department of Education
608 W. Allegan Street
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Bonnie:

I am writing to provide University of Detroit-Mercy's response to the review panel's recommendations regarding our English endorsement program as dated July 6, 2006.

Reviewers were most concerned that:

"...since neither the major nor the minor utilizes a core sequence of required courses, the referenced courses most frequently represent various electives, which an individual candidate may or may not take. This results in many standards that are, without question, addressed within the English department course offerings, but may not be met within the selection of courses actually completed by a candidate. The institution is asked to focus responses in ways that show how *all* candidates meet each standard, regardless of their choice of elective."

We took these comments seriously and, as a result, have spent the last several months working closely with our colleagues in the English Department to re-think what is required for the English major and minor. We now require specific courses and, when we do offer students more than one option for fulfilling a requirement, have greatly limited those options, so that we can ensure that all courses meet the MDE standards.

We invite reviewers to revisit the *Summary of Course Requirements* for both our major and minor to better understand the changes we have made.

We feel that, in the course of addressing the above concern on the part of reviewers, we were also able to effectively address concerns about the following specific standards:

- 2.3 *English teachers demonstrate professional practices when they develop students' effective use of oral, written, and visual literacy in their daily lives.*
- 2.4 *English teachers demonstrate professional practices when they develop students' effective use*

of critical thinking.

- *3.1.2 English teachers will know and understand the instructional application of the acquisition and development processes of first and second language learners in speaking, reading, and writing.*
- *3.1.5 English teachers will know and understand the instructional application of the history and evolution of the English language.*
- *3.2.2 English teachers will know and understand the instructional application of a wide variety of quality contemporary and classic (works which have been widely recognized over time for their excellence) literature appropriate for different developmental levels and student needs, including multicultural/world literature, literature by women, and literature for young adults.*
- *3.2.5 English teachers will know and understand the instructional application of varied critical approaches to textual analysis.*
- *3.2.6 English teachers will know and understand the instructional application of the historical/social contexts of and relationships among texts.*
- *The matrix response indicates that the ‘instructional application’ component of the three standards above are addressed in the education department’s methods courses. Describe how the program ensures that methods course instructors (particularly in EDU469) are qualified to guide and evaluate English candidates’ efforts to plan instruction regarding these discipline-specific learning objectives.*
- *3.2.8 English teachers will know and understand the instructional application of issues of censorship.*
- *The issue of censorship is not mentioned in syllabi for any of the cited courses. Describe how and when every candidate is made aware of the implications of censorship within classrooms and schools.*
- *3.3.1 English teachers will know and understand the instructional application of grammars and conventions of English, e.g., morphology, phonology, semantics, and syntax.*
- *3.3.2 English teachers will know and understand the instructional application of differences between descriptive and prescriptive conventions of usage.*
- *3.3.7 English teachers will know and understand the instructional application of writing processes, including inventing, revising, and publishing.*
- *3.4.1 English teachers will demonstrate a mastery of and understand the instructional application of the effective use of the English language, both written and oral, in a variety of rhetorical contexts, including the mechanical and technical conventions of standard written and spoken English (e.g. grammar, punctuation, and spelling).*
- *3.4.5 English teachers will demonstrate a mastery of and understand the instructional application of the processes of and strategies for reading and writing.*
- *4.2.1 English teachers will be able to use discussion for a variety of purposes, e.g., to engage students in literacy tasks, to develop interpretations and understanding of multiple points of view, to promote critical thinking, and to promote an understanding of their own and others’ perspectives and experiences.*
- *4.2.2 English teachers will be able to ask questions as a means of probing for learner understanding, helping students articulate their ideas and thinking processes, promoting risk taking and problem-solving, facilitating recall of information, encouraging convergent and divergent thinking, stimulating curiosity, and helping students to question.*
- *4.2.3 English teachers will use small group work and collaborative learning to facilitate critical thinking as students construct meaning in the English language arts, i.e., peer revision,*

collaborative group writing, dramatic performance, readers' theatre, and literature discussion groups.

- *4.2.4 English teachers will be able to work with students individually through such activities as conferencing and facilitating independent projects.*
- *4.2.5 English teachers will be able to present or explain information to support literacy learning, i.e., assignments, criteria for evaluation, information about an author or period, terms or concepts in language, rhetorical strategies, revision strategies, etc.*

Additionally, reviewers will better understand how some of these standards are met because we are now including three key Education syllabi in our English submission (EDU 469 – General methods; EDU 474 – English methods; and EDU 478 – Literacy). We invite reviewers to examine these syllabi and the relevant narrative in our revised Standards Matrix.

Our response for English, dated January 30, 2007, can be viewed at:
<http://www.udmercy.edu/accredreport/english.html>

We look forward to receiving comments from reviewers and the Michigan Department of Education regarding our English endorsement program.

Sincerely,

Kathy T. Bush
Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Education
and Interim Chair, Education Department
(313) 578-0401
bushkt@udmercy.edu