

English [BA] [ENGL]

**Cycles included in this report:**  
Jun 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018

## **Program Name: English [BA] [ENGL]**

**Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018**

### **1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?**

100% Traditional or less than 50% Distance/Traditional

### **2 Is this program offered at an off-site location?**

No

### **2.1 If yes to previous, provide addresses for each location where 50% or more of program credits may be earned.**

### **3 Example of Program Improvement**

2016-2017:

Our capstone course, ENGL 410, was thoroughly revised because of comments by the teacher, survey results, and personal experience with students applying to graduate school. The teacher of ENGL 410 in fall 2015 noted a substantial number of students who were not in their senior year. We therefore revised the prerequisite for the course to ensure that students had completed at least two 300+ level courses.

Because students who were recently applying to graduate schools informed the department head that they had been required to submit long writing samples (20+ pages), and because faculty occasionally still find papers in the senior portfolio to be weak, faculty members decided unanimously to turn the main focus of ENGL 484 into the production of a thesis.

Because of remarks on student exit surveys, we are changing one textbook and looking at changing others. We are also endeavoring to offer multiple sections of required survey courses because students have noted time conflicts.

At the request of the College of Education we were asked to change an English Education elective to one particular course. After consultation with students who highly praised ENGL 484 as useful for the Praxis Test, we chose that course.

2017-2018:

The department plans on meeting with a core group of faculty members in September/October 2018 to discuss the review of BA Master Plan. We plan on evaluating the mission and the SLOs connected to that mission. We will evaluate benchmarks and evidence to seek more meaningful measures toward improvement.

The meeting also plans to discuss redesign of the capstone experience to accommodate major program changes. One issue is a decision to our current capstone course into an ENGL Language Literature and Writing section and a separate Foreign Language section. The meeting will analyze the capstone portfolio system and its rubric. Data suggests faculty members should review the process, possibly editing the rubric to align with the departmental mission, master plan assessments/benchmarks, and with the various types of portfolio papers submitted in the capstone. One potential solution here might be clear training.

ENGL 200 (midterm) and 410 (capstone) will be assessed in meaningful ways for both BA master plan and QEP without these assessments dictating course content or burdening instructors unnecessarily.

At the request of the College of Education we were asked to redesign our English Education degree. This process involved a great deal of review. We are in the process of determining when to offer courses in order to align with Education course offerings and to comply with the needs of English Education majors taking the PRAXIS.

### **4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year**

2016-2017:

**Student/Program Highlights:**

- One student won the CODIFIL scholarship for summer study in Belgium; another student also studied in Belgium.
- Sigma Tau Delta active. Ten students attended the National Conference, and four delivered papers. The *Arena* was also published, with several pieces by our students, and was edited by one of our students. One student wrote a book review for *ECCB*, which has been accepted.
- Two students were hired as professional writers or webmasters for area businesses.
- Southern University presented a Law School Information Session that was co-hosted by our department.
- One former student entered a Ph.D. program (North Carolina State), and two continue to do well in Ph.D. Programs (Penn State, South Carolina). Several recent graduates are teaching English and/or Foreign Languages in the area or nearby states.

2017-2018:

**Student/Program Highlights:**

- Sigma Tau Delta active.
- Three students attended the National Conference, and one delivered a paper. The *Arena* was also published, with several pieces by McNeese students in various majors. The journal also was edited by one of our students.
- 'So You Like to Write', our undergraduate writing club, continues to attract and inspire students.
- One graduate entered the University of Minnesota Law School with a full scholarship. Another former graduate was accepted to a MFA program in Mankato. Our former graduate Alicia Rossano started in the Iowa MFA program for translation. Jessie Cortez received an assistantship in rhetoric at Texas A&M. Two other former graduates continue to do well in Ph.D. Programs (Penn State, South Carolina). Several recent graduates are teaching English and/or Foreign Languages in the area or nearby states.

**5 Program Mission**

The basic purpose of the Bachelor of Arts in English is to train students to understand and communicate in the English language. English courses give the training necessary for effective writing and correct speaking, acquaint students with the history of the English language and literature, encourage critical thinking, develop a perceptive approach to literature, and help examine human values that will enrich the intellectual life of individuals. Courses within the major, as well as electives and required courses outside the major, connect students with the world cultural heritage.

**6 Institutional Mission Reference**

The Bachelor of Arts in English program supports McNeese State University's fundamental mission to provide successful education of the undergraduate students and services to the employers and communities in its region.

**7 Assessment and Benchmark ENGL 201, 202, 301, 302, 401, and 402 Embedded Questions**

Assessment: Embedded Questions ENGL 201, 202, 301, 302, 401, and 402.

Benchmark: 70% of English majors will score at least 60% on the embedded questions in ENGL 201-202, 301-302, 401-402.

Files:

Embedded questions ENFL

F17 301 revised Embedded Questions

S18 302 revised Embedded questions-1

**Outcome Links****Content Knowledge [Program]**

Graduates demonstrate knowledge of major periods, texts, and movements in American, British, and world literature.

**7.1 Data**

## ENGL 201:

Academic Year	Students that scored at least 60% on embedded questions	
	#	%
2013-2014	-	90%
2014-2015	-	83%
2015-2016	-	89%
2016-2017	-	93%
2017-2018	-	92%

## ENGL 202:

Academic Year	Students that scored at least 60% on embedded questions	
	#	%
2013-2014	-	87%
2014-2015	-	95%
2015-2016	-	74%
2016-2017	-	94%
2017-2018	-	N/A

## ENGL 301:

Academic Year	Students that scored at least 60% on embedded questions	
	#	%
2013-2014	-	86%
2014-2015	-	100%
2015-2016	-	100%
2016-2017	-	60%
2017-2018	-	94%

## ENGL 302:

Academic Year	Students that scored at least 60% on embedded questions	
	#	%
2013-2014	-	94%
2014-2015	-	95%
2015-2016	-	100%
2016-2017	-	65%
2017-2018	-	75%

## ENGL 401:

Academic Year	Students that scored at least 60% on embedded questions	
	#	%

	#	%
2013-2014	-	88%
2014-2015	-	79%
2015-2016	-	N/A
2016-2017	-	100%
2017-2018	-	86%

## ENGL 402:

Academic Year	Students that scored at least 60% on embedded questions	
	#	%
2013-2014	-	81%
2014-2015	-	67%
2015-2016	-	N/A
2016-2017	-	100%
2017-2018	-	91%

### 7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Pilot new embedded questions. Raise benchmark score to 70%. The data supports that this is an achievable benchmark. Because numbers were a bit low this year in American Literature, the teacher will place greater stress on identifying periods and movements.

2017-2018:

During the four-year period before the fall semester of 2016, the assessment for course required in the ENGL majors used reading passages embedded in final exams for collecting data for assessing English degree plans. When the general education assessment changed to a rubric scored essay, we changed to a new course-related method of tracking English majors, so we moved away from the critical thinking reading passages and back to embedded questions concerning content knowledge covered in specific courses. We first considered using the embedded questions that were drawn up before 2007. However, since there was a lack of will to determine five specific questions all English majors should know upon exiting 201 and 202, in 2017 the faculty member coordinating this method of assessment allowed instructors to come up with their own embedded questions that related to what they actually focused on in their courses and what they thought any English major should know after taking 201 or 202. This clearly was not the best solution. Starting this semester or next, we must get all interested parties together to agree on a standard large set of possible embedded questions for each period involved so we can draw from these each semester, possibly randomly, so the questions don't become expected or develop a rubric that assesses content knowledge in a manner more reliable than embedded questions.

That being said, 301 and 302 did implement a standard set of embedded questions across all sections. Files of those revised questions have been uploaded in the assessment field.

## 8 Assessment and Benchmark ENGL 200 and 410 Portfolio Research Paper

Assessment: Portfolio research paper.

Benchmark: 80% of majors will receive a rating of good or better on the portfolio research paper.

Files:

ENGL 200 Essay Rubric

[Outcome Links](#)

**Research [Program]**

Graduates demonstrate ability to apply research methods as appropriate to the discipline of literature and language.

**Writing [Program]**

Students will demonstrate facility in writing appropriate to the rhetorical context.

**8.1 Data**

Academic Year	Majors that received a rating of good or better on the 410 Portfolio research paper	
	#	%
2013-2014	18/19	94.7%
2014-2015	15/15	100%
2015-2016	15/18	89%
2016-2017	14/16	88%
2017-2018	13/15	87%

Files:

ENGL 200 Sample - Dancing

ENGL 200 sample-universe

**8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2016-2017:

Data indicate that majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate. Faculty will continue to stress research methodology in appropriate courses, beginning in ENGL 200. By increasing prerequisites for ENGL 410, we hope to attain an even higher number.

2017-2018:

While data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate, a few rubrics did score research papers as N/A. This type of response was recorded as 0. Review of the portfolio system and rubric suggests faculty members should review the process, possibly editing the rubric to align with the departmental mission, master plan assessments/benchmarks, and with the various types of portfolio papers submitted in ENGL 410. The department plans on meeting with a core group of faculty members in September/October 2018 to discuss these matters.

**9 Assessment and Benchmark ENGL 410 Portfolio Scholarship**

Assessment: Rating on scholarship section of portfolio.

Benchmark: 80% of majors will receive a rating of good or better for their scholarship on the Portfolio Evaluation.

Files:

senior evaluation

**Outcome Links****Content Knowledge [Program]**

Graduates demonstrate knowledge of major periods, texts, and movements in American, British, and world literature.

**9.1 Data**

Academic Year	Majors that received a rating of good or better for their scholarship on the Portfolio Evaluation	
	#	%
2013-2014	16/19	84.2%

2014-2015	15/15	100%
2015-2016	18/18	100%
2016-2017	14/16	88%
2017-2018	12/15	80%

### 9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Data indicate that majors are achieving this outcome. The department will continue to stress scholarship in all major courses. No action needed at this time. We will also check with the ENGL 410 teacher to see if the form should be revised to meet the changes made to that course, especially the addition of thesis.

2017-2018:

While data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate, a few rubrics did score research papers as N/A. This type of response was recorded as 0. Review of the portfolio system and rubric suggests faculty members should review the process, possibly editing the rubric to align with the departmental mission, master plan assessments/benchmarks, and with the various types of portfolio papers submitted in ENGL 410. In particular, faculty members need to determine if this is a key measurable and if so, how this applies in majors submitting creative or foreign language papers. The department plans on meeting with a core group of faculty members in September/October 2018 to discuss these matters.

## 10 Assessment and Benchmark ENGL 410 Portfolio Writing Skills

Assessment: Rating on writing skills section of portfolio.

Benchmark: 80% of majors will receive a rating of good or better for their writing skills on Portfolio Evaluations.

Files:

senior evaluation

### Outcome Links

#### Writing [Program]

Students will demonstrate facility in writing appropriate to the rhetorical context.

### 10.1 Data

Academic Year	Majors that received a rating of good or better for their writing skills on the Portfolio Evaluation	
	#	%
2013-2014	19/19	100%
2014-2015	15/15	100%
2015-2016	18/18	100%
2016-2017	14/16	88%
2017-2018	14/15	93%

Files:

ENGL 410 Sample - Rumi

### 10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement analysis

2016-2017:

The data indicate that students are achieving this outcome. Faculty will continue to work on writing skills across the major curriculum. No action needed at this time. We will also check with the ENGL 410 teacher to see if the form should be revised to meet the changes made to that course, especially the addition of thesis.

2017-2018:

While data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate, a few rubrics did score research papers as N/A. This type of response was recorded as 0. Review of the portfolio system and rubric suggests faculty members should review the process, possibly editing the rubric to align with the departmental mission, master plan assessments/benchmarks, and with the various types of portfolio papers submitted in ENGL 410. An additional issue with the writing section of the rubric is that it is assessed in conjunction with oral communication, and faculty members often provide a combined instead of a separate rating for each form of communication. The department plans on meeting with a core group of faculty members in September/October 2018 to discuss these matters. One potential solution here might be clear training.

## 11 Assessment and Benchmark ENGL 410 Departmental Exam

Assessment: ENGL 410 Departmental Exam.

Benchmark: 80% of all English majors will score at least 75% on the departmental exam, administered in ENGL 410.

### Outcome Links

#### Content Knowledge [Program]

Graduates demonstrate knowledge of major periods, texts, and movements in American, British, and world literature.

### 11.1 Data

Academic Year	Students that scored at least 75% on the ENGL 410 departmental exam	
	#	%
2013-2014	N/A	N/A
2014-2015	3/14	21%
2015-2016	3/8	38%
2016-2017	N/A	N/A
2017-2018	N/A	N/A

#### 11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

The department has chosen to eliminate this assessment in favor of embedded questions. Since multiple faculty teach different sections of courses (e.g., ENGL 401: World Literature), faculty members determined that it was more appropriate to assess this outcome at the course level by emphasizing embedded questions.

2017-2018:

The department has chosen to eliminate this assessment in favor of embedded questions, but this may be a potential problem since it doesn't offer a capstone assessment of content knowledge. A core group of ENFL department member will meet to determine if assessing content knowledge aligns with the department's mission and if so, consider which method of assessment might offer a more reliable method of collecting appropriate and reflective data.

## 12 Assessment and Benchmark English Praxis

Program: English Traditional

Assessment #1: Praxis Content

Exam #: 5039

The English Education, Grades 7-12 Praxis Content Exam is #5039. This exam must be passed prior to student teaching.

Benchmark: 90% of English Education majors will achieve a passing score on the Praxis English



Education Exam (#5039) on the first attempt. The passing score required by the state for 2017-2018 is 168.

## 12.1 Data

English Education - Praxis Content #5039:

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5309 overall	Number	2	2	3	2	0	3
	Mean	169	178	173	175		170.6
	Range	159-178	175-181	168-177	169-181		170-171
	% Pass 1st attempt	50%	100%	0%	100%		67%
#5309 breakdown:	Number	2	2	3	2	0	3
Reading	Mean	31	36	30	35		31.3
	Range	27-34	35-36	29-30	33-37		28-35
	% correct (41)	76%	88%	73%	85%		76%
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean	22	24	21	22		21.7
	Range	20-23	24	18-23	19-25		20-23
	% correct (28)	79%	86%	75%	79%		78%
Writing; Speaking; Listening	Mean	27	31	31	34		29.3
	Range	23-31	25-37	28-34	33-34		29-30
	% correct (38)	71%	82%	82%	89%		77%
Constructed Response	Mean	7	7				7.7
	Range	6-8	6-8				7-8
	% correct (12)	58%	58%				64%

### 12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Although 100% of students passed prior to student teaching, only 66% passed on the first attempt. There was an N value of 2, but this was an improvement from the past two fall semesters.

Because of the low enrollment numbers, we will continue to monitor student progress.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: In 2017-2018, 67% of the completers (2/3) achieved a passing score on the Praxis Content Exam on the first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: In reviewing the three previous years of data, the "Constructed Response" category consistently has the lowest percentage correct for candidates (58%, 58%, 64%). English faculty will analyze the requirements for this section of the exam and determine methods and materials to better prepare candidates for this portion of the exam.

## 13 Assessment and Benchmark FEE Content

Assessment: The Field Experience Evaluation Domain 5 measures the Content Specific Components related to teaching observations.

The FEE Scoring Scale is as follows: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 90% of the candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of Domain 5 (Content Specific Components) on the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric.

### 13.1 Data

English Education - Content-specific components on FEE III:

Component	Fall 2015			Spring 2016			Fall 2016			Spring 2017		
	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	2	3.77	3.88	2	3.88	3.88	3	3.71	3.63-3.88	2	3.75	3.50-4.00
5.2	2	3.94	3.88-4.00	2	3.94	3.88-4.00	3	3.92	3.88-4.00	2	3.75	3.50-4.00
5.3	2	4.00	4.00	2	3.88	3.88	3	3.67	3.50-3.88	2	3.88	3.75-4.00
5.4	2	4.00	4.00	2	3.92	3.83-4.00	3	3.67	3.50-3.88	2	3.57	3.25-3.88
5.5	2	4.00	4.00	2	3.92	3.83-4.00	3	3.54	2.88-4.00	2	3.57	3.38-3.75
5.6	2	4.00	4.00	2	3.94	3.88-4.00	3	3.83	3.75-3.88	2	3.82	3.63-4.00
5.7	2	4.00	4.00	2	3.88	3.75-4.00	2	3.82	3.75-3.88	2	3.40	3.13-3.67
5.8	2	3.94	3.88-4.00	2	3.94	3.88-4.00	1	3.75	3.75	2	3.51	3.13-3.88

Component	Fall 2017			Spring 2018			Fall 2018			Spring 2019		
	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	0			3	3.59	3.13-3.88						
5.2	0			3	3.65	3.38-3.88						
5.3	0			3	3.61	3.13-4.00						
5.4	0			3	3.38	2.88-4.00						
5.5	0			3	3.33	2.50-4.00						
5.6	0			3	3.44	2.75-4.00						
5.7	0			3	3.24	2.13-2.83						
5.8	0			3	3.48	2.88-3.88						

#### 13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

This benchmark has been met or exceeded.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. 100% of the candidates scored above benchmark on all elements measured in Domain 5 of the Field Experience Evaluation.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Education faculty will continue to instruct candidates on the importance of the elements measured in domain 5.

### 14 Assessment and Benchmark inTASC Standards - Lesson Planning

Assessment: Lesson Plan elements are aligned to InTASC standards.

Lesson Plan Rubric scoring scale: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 100% of the candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Lesson Plan Rubric.

#### 14.1 Data

English Education - Lesson Plan Data from EDUC 412:

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
		Number	2	2	3	2	0	2

Essential Questions		Mean	3.00	2.50	1.67	2.00		
		Range	3.00	2.00-3.00	1.00-2.00	1.00-3.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%	0%	50%		
Content Standards		Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.33	3.50		
		Range	3.00	3.00	2.00-3.00	3.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	33%	100%		
Student Outcomes	4n	Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	1.67	3.00		4.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-2.00	2.00-4.00		4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	0%	50%		100%
Technology	5l	Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.67	4.00		4.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	2.00-3.00	4.00		4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	67%	100%		100%
Educational Materials		Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	2.33	4.00		
		Range	3.00	3.00	2.00-3.00	4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	33%	100%		
Procedures	3k	Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	1.67	2.00		4.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-2.00	2.00		4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	0%	0%		100%
Lesson "Hook"	8j	Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	1.67	2.50		3.50
		Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-2.00	2.00-3.00		3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	0%	50%		100%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	8i	Number						
		Mean	2.50	2.00	2.00	3.00		4.00
		Range	2.00-3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00		4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	50%	0%	0%	100%		100%
		Number						

Modeled, Guided, Collab, & Ind. Practice	7k	Mean	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.50		4.00
		Range	1.00-3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00-3.00		4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	50%	100%	0%	50%		100%
Closure		Number						
		Mean	2.50	2.50	2.00	3.50		
		Range	2.00-3.00	2.00-3.00	2.00	3.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	50%	50%	0%	100%		
Formative/Summative Assessment	6j	Number						
		Mean	3.00	2.50	2.00	3.00		4.00
		Range	3.00	2.00-3.00	2.00	3.00		4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%	0%	100%		100%
Relevance & Rationale	2j	Number						
		Mean	3.00	3.00	1.67	2.50		4.00
		Range	3.00	3.00	1.00-2.00	1.00-4.00		4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%	0%	50%		100%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1e	Number						
		Mean	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00		4.00
		Range	2.00	2.00	1.00-3.00	2.00		4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	33%	0%		100%
Differentiation	7j	Number						
		Mean	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.50		4.00
		Range	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00-2.00		4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	0%	0%	0%		100%

#### 14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Essential Questions will be removed from the lesson plan rubric because they do not align to P-12 classroom instruction of completers.

Categories below benchmark are being addressed through the revision and clarification of the lesson plan instructions.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The data for the candidates reported indicated a score of 4.00 on all of the elements except "Lesson Hook" which was still above benchmark with a 3.50 mean.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Plans for lesson plan inter-rater reliability will assist in establishing more equitable grading on the lesson plans across the program. A revised lesson plan rubric is also being piloted and will go into effect in 2018-2019.

#### 15 Assessment and Benchmark FEE - Specific inTASC Standards

Assessment: The Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) measures the following elements: Domain 1: Planning and Preparation; Domain 2: Classroom Environment; Domain 3: Instruction, and Domain 4: Professionalism.

Benchmark: 90% of candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element in the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric for Domains 1-4.

The following scoring scale is used: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

**15.1 Data**

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

Files:

English Education\_FEE\_17-18

**15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2016-2017:

This benchmark has been met.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. Domain 1, Domain 2, and Domain 3 all fell below the 90% proficient benchmark. For Domain 1, each element was below benchmark. For Domain 2, three of the seven elements were below benchmark. For Domain 3, nine of the 11 elements were below benchmark.

It is important to note that the mean average for each element and domain, was above benchmark. Due to the low N value (3), having just one candidate score below benchmark on an element caused the benchmark of 90% scoring proficient to not be reached.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Candidates will continue to be evaluated using the FEE rubric. Inter-rate reliability and more clearly defined elements will provide better guidance for candidates and evaluators scoring the lessons in the field.

**16 Assessment and Benchmark Outcomes - TCWS**

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

The scoring scale for the Teacher Candidate Work Sample is: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will score a 3.00 or above on each of the elements on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric.

**16.1 Data**

English Education - Teacher Candidate Work Sample (data from EDUC 412):

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Choice of Assessment	Number	2	2	3	2	0	2
	Mean	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00
	Range	1.00-3.00	2.00-4.00	4.00	4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	50%	100%	100%		100%
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean	2.00	2.50	4.00	4.00		4.00
	Range	2.00	2.00-3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%	100%	100%		100%
	Number						



#5624 overall	Range	165-183	179-196	170-182	171-176		159-175
	% Pass 1st attempt	50%	100%	100%	100%		100%
#5624 breakdown:	Number	2	2	3	2	0	3
Students as Learners	Mean	20	19.5	15	15		14.7
	Range	17-23	18-21	13-17	14-16		12-20
	% correct (25)	80%	78%	60%	60%		59%
Instructional Process	Mean	17	18	16	16		14
	Range	17	18	15-17	16		12-15
	% correct (18)	94%	100%	89%	89%		78%
Assessment	Mean	9.5	12.5	12	9.5		7
	Range	9-10	12-13	11-13	9-10		5-10
	% correct (14)	68%	89%	86%	68%		50%
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean	8.5	11.5	10	9.5		7.3
	Range	7-10	10-13	9-10	9-10		6-8
	% correct (12)	71%	96%	83%	79%		61%
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	7.5	11.5	11	10.5		10.7
	Range	5-10	8-15	7-13	10-11		9-12
	% correct (16)	47%	72%	69%	66%		67%

### 17.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Although 100% of students passed prior to student teaching, only 75% passed on the first attempt. We will see if requiring ENGL 484 will help increase the passage rate of the test on the first attempt.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. 100% of the candidates passed the Praxis PLT on the first attempt. In the past three years, 11/12 (92%) of the candidates passed the PLT on the first attempt.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The "Students as Learners" category mean scores have consistently decreased over the past three years (80% to 59%). Education faculty should analyze the topics covered in this area and ensure that those topics are being sufficiently covered in the scope and sequence.

### Program outcomes

#### Content Knowledge

*Graduates demonstrate knowledge of major periods, texts, and movements in American, British, and world literature.*

#### Research

*Graduates demonstrate ability to apply research methods as appropriate to the discipline of literature and language.*

**Writing**

*Students will demonstrate facility in writing appropriate to the rhetorical context.*

**Foreign Language Concentration**

*Graduates demonstrate advanced-level comprehension, analysis, and interpretation in their selected target language.*



End of report