English [BA] [ENGL]

Cycles included in this report:
Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

Program Name: English [BA] [ENGL]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

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.

2018-2019:

A core group of faculty members met in September/October 2018 to discuss the review of BA Master Plan. We revised the mission and the SLOs connected to that mission. We also evaluated and revised benchmarks and evidence to seek more meaningful measures toward improvement. The most significant change in this regard was a response to data. Data indicated the department was not measuring our core goals, especially once realigned with the mission. Primarily, this change has altered capstone portfolio system and its rubric, which has been revised to provide more accurate measurements

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. After two years of data of Praxis scores, faculty members were briefed on possible holes in content knowledge and encouraged to make pedagogical changes to address the gaps.

2019-2020:
The most significant changes that occurred was the development of a BA assessment process and committee and the amendment of the capstone portfolio rubric.
The rubric was redesigned to align with program goals. For example, instead of one column assessing communication, the rubric split communication into writing, oral, and interviewing to reflect our core goals.
The BA assessment process was also developed. This new process collects sample assessment pieces from an initial-, interim-, and culminating-level courses. A rubric was developed to assess these samples. Finally, faculty members were appointed to assess the sample using the rubrics.

2020-2021:
The most significant changes that occurred was the review of the current curriculum and the on-going assessment process of our courses, their structures, and requirements. Due to internal concerns about student performance and abilities in upper-level courses, a departmental curriculum committee was formed. This committee will explore ways to improve the department's course offerings, structures, and requirements in order to address the following concerns (copied from the informal faculty inquiry that prompted this review):

"Someone has posed a question about the undergraduate lit class sequence. This person has noted that some students do not take British, American, and World Lit classes in that order. This means that students in 400-level courses do not enter those courses with a certain degree of aptitude.

These are the questions/comments/concerns that have come up in a string of emails about this topic:
- Is this [taking courses out of sequence] the rule now (or the exception)?
- Are students not required to follow a particular sequence? Why not?
- Is a sequence suggested? Is that enough?
- If the courses have the numbers they do simply for reasons of organization, that's definitely different than thinking of courses as intended for seniors in their last year or two of studies.
- Should course prerequisites include junior or senior standing?
- Many students don't really know how to form a simple argument or write a good thesis. As a result, writing workshops are needed in the senior course to help provide extra support.
- It might be helpful to have some structure in terms of when they take specific classes so that the students at least have some material in common.
- Should sophomore courses for our majors require a rigorous paper? Should each level's courses have more rigorous expectations?
- Some students take ENGL 200 their senior year. That doesn't make any sense. The catalog says this should be taken within the first 60 hours. Could this be even earlier?   Graduating student's comment: "…she's basically learning now in 200 and in this senior course what she should have learned years ago."
- It's hard to expect students coming straight from ENGL 102 to suddenly begin analyzing literature. The kind of writing we do in lit classes is more nuanced than what I understand is taught in comp classes. Students jump into ENGL 201–or Shakespeare or World Lit or American Lit—without a common background provided by the department to prepare them for the kind of reading and writing they will have to do. After all, ENGL 101/102 are Gen Ed

courses, right? So they're learning what students from across the university and across every kind of discipline are learning. That doesn't seem like enough preparation for their studies in English.
- Perhaps the solution isn't requiring a specific, strict sequence, but maybe offering ENGL 200 or another class (I wouldn't want all the burden to fall on any one specific professor) as a prerequisite to any other lit classes)."

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.

2018-2019:
Student/Program Highlights:
- Sigma Tau Delta active, two members attended national convention.
- The *Arena* was also published, with several pieces by McNeese students in various majors. The journal also was edited by a major.
- 'So You Like to Write', our undergraduate writing club, continues to attract and inspire students.
- One 2018-2019 graduate student entered a Ph.D. program (Texas Tech); Several recent graduates are teaching English and/or Foreign Languages in the area or nearby states. One 2018-2019 graduate has taken a teaching job in Japan. One 2018-2019 graduate has taken a youth ministry job in New York. Two 2018-2019 graduates have entered the MA program at McNeese. One 2018-2019 graduate has entered the MFA program.

2019-2020:
Student/Program Highlights:
- Sigma Tau Delta active, national convention cancelled due to COVID.
- The *Arena* was cancelled due to COVID.
- 'So You Like to Write', our undergraduate writing club, continues to attract and inspire students but was suspended in the spring due to COVID
- COVID prevented the tracking of graduates .

2020-2021:
Student/Program Highlights:
- Sigma Tau Delta was somewhat active, national convention cancelled due to COVID.
- Two issues of undergraduate journal published.
- Undergraduate writing club suspended due to COVID
- Two graduates were accepted into Law School. Two graduates earned teaching positions.
- The development of an undergraduate prize for research was implemented. The first two winners were named.

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: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

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%
2018-2019	—	—
2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021	—	—

ENGL 202:

	Students that

Academic Year	scored at least 60% on embedded questions	
	#	%
2013-2014	—	87%
2014-2015	—	95%
2015-2016	—	74%
2016-2017	—	94%
2017-2018	—	—
2018-2019	—	—
2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021	—	—

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%
2018-2019	—	—
2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021	—	—

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%
2018-2019	—	—
2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021	—	—

ENGL 401:

Academic Year	Students that scored at least 60% on embedded questions	
	#	%
2013-2014	—	88%
2014-2015	—	79%

2015-2016	—	—
2016-2017	—	100%
2017-2018	—	86%
2018-2019	—	—
2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021		

ENGL 402:

Academic Year	Students that scored at least 60% on embedded questions	
	#	%
2013-2014	—	81%
2014-2015	—	67%
2015-2016	—	—
2016-2017	—	100%
2017-2018	—	91%
2018-2019	—	—
2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021	—	—

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

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.

2018-2019:
A core group of faculty members met in fall 2018 and decided that selected embedded questions were not the most useful form of assessment. They were unequally distributed in various sections and were not an accurate assessment of content knowledge. It was decided that a more accurate measure of content knowledge would be to assess sample artifacts from

students at various key assessment points (initial, midpoint, capstone) and use a rubric to measure content knowledge as demonstrated through effective writing submitted in those courses. A random sampling of artifacts were collected throughout the fall 2018 and spring 2019 and using those samples, a rubric was devised. This rubric will be used to score future artifact samples. Attached is the plan and rubric that was piloted during 2018-2019 (artifacts collected fall 2018- spring 2019 and scored fall 2019).

2019-2020:
Samples were scored using the rubric during the fall. COVID prevented the scoring of samples during the spring. Hurricanes have made accessing these samples and rubrics difficult and the sharing of this material to faculty challenging, but in general, the rubric showed that students critical thinking was strong but students needed practice at explaining their line of thought. Faculty, especially in the capstone course, stressed this through presentations and other activities .

2020-2021:
Hurricanes prevented the collection of samples and rubrics in the fall. Samples were collected and scored using the rubric during the spring. The rubric showed that student critical thinking was strong but students needed practice at constructing arguments and writing. The 2020-2021 curriculum committee was formed and charged with their task partly in response to this interpretation of the data. The department also decided that collecting samples from an initial (ENGL 200), median (ENGL or FORL 301/302) and terminal course (ENGL 410) was a more streamlined approached to assessment. These have been collected and scored.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

2019 McNeese assessment rubric

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: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

ENGL 200 Essay Rubric

Outcome Links

Research [Program]
Students demonstrate proficiency with current research technologies and resources and with integrating sources in their writing.

Writing [Program]
Students are proficient in producing analyses, reflective writing, and/or research-based writing that is focused, well elaborated and supported, and well edited.

8.1 Data

Academic Year	Majors that received a rating of good or better on the 200 Portfolio research paper	
	#	%
2019-2020	17/20	85%
2020-2021	14/16	88%
2021-2022		
2022-2023		
2023-2024		
2024-2025		

	Majors that received a

Academic Year	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%
2018-2019	19/20	95%
2019-2020	6/7	86%
2020-2021	15/17	88%

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

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 zero. 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.

2018-2019:
Data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate, but a core group of faculty members met in September/October 2018 to discuss revising rubric to improve measurement of capstone research paper, in particular refining rubric to evaluate writing ability, content knowledge, and display of professional skills and dispositions separately.

2019-2020:
Data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate the rubric was revised to improve measurement of capstone research paper, in particular refining rubric to evaluate writing ability, content knowledge, and display of professional skills and dispositions separately

2020-2021:
Data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate. ENGL 200 has shifted some of its assignments to confront deficiencies. The curriculum committee will review other means of emphasizing the correct sequencing of ENGL 200 in student degree plans. The revised 410 rubric is offering more specific data. In part, this data is being used to direct the curriculum committee's charge. The curriculum committee will use this info. to make recommendations.

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 Porfolio Evaluation.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

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%
2018-2019	20/20	100%
2019-2020	6/7	86%
2020-2021	13/17	76%

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 zero. 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.

2018-2019:
Data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate, but a core group of faculty members met in September/October 2018 to discuss revising rubric to improve measurement of capstone research paper, in particular refining rubric to define scholarship. A training session will be issued to discuss rubrics.

2019-2020:
Data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate, but a revised rubric was developed to improve measurement of capstone research paper, in particular refining rubric to separate writing. A training session was held to discuss the rubric. A new professor took over this course and developed a mock conference during which students are instructed by all faculty in attendance to help improve scholarship use and direction of research.

2020-2021:

Data suggests majors struggle with scholarship in regards to conducting deep research and providing critical content. COVID and the hurricanes prevented the mock conference from occurring. The curriculum committee is endeavoring to address this data.

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: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

senior evaluation

Outcome Links

Writing [Program]
Students are proficient in producing analyses, reflective writing, and/or research-based writing that is focused, well elaborated and supported, and well edited.

10.1 Data

Academic Year	Majors that received a rating of good or better for their writing skills on the Porfolio 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%
2018-2019	20/20	100%
2019-2020	6/7	86%
2020-2021	15/17	88%

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

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 zero. 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.

2018-2019:

Data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate, but a core group of faculty members met in September/October 2018 to discuss revising rubric to improve measurement of capstone research paper, in particular refining rubric to separate writing. A training session will be issued to discuss rubrics.

2019-2020:
Data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a high rate, but a revised rubric was developed to improve measurement of capstone research paper, in particular refining rubric to separate writing. A training session was held to discuss the rubric

2020-2021:
Data suggests majors are achieving this outcome at a moderately high rate. Writing and critical thinking seem to be the skills suffering the most due to the lack on intense face-to-face contact hours. The revised 410 rubric is offering more specific data to determine the exact issues. All students, even those scoring good in this category, produced papers that lacked in some aspect of writing. This data is being used to direct the curriculum committee's charge and that committee will not only use this data to make recommendations to the curriculum and instruction but will also access the artifact samples to make recommendations.

11 **Assessment and Benchmark** English Praxis

Program: English Traditonal
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.

11.1 **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%
	Mean	7	7				7.7

Constructed Response	Range	6-8	6-8				7-8
	% correct (12)	58%	58%				64%

English Education - Praxis Content #5039:

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5309 overall	Number	3	2			2	2
	Mean	176	178			173	171
	Range	168-181	175-180			172-174	168-174
	% Pass 1st attempt	33%	100%			50%	100%
#5309 breakdown:	Number	3	2			2	2
Reading	Mean	32	33.5			33.5	28
	Range	30-34	33-34			27-36	27-29
	% correct (40-41)	81%	82%			77%	68%
Language Use and Vocabulary	Mean	21	23			22.5	20
	Range	16-24	21-25			22-23	16-24
	% correct (28)	76%	72%			80%	71%
Writing; Speaking; Listening	Mean	31	32			29	28.5
	Range	27-36	32			27-31	26-31
	% correct (41)	75%	78%			71%	70%
Constructed Response	Mean	8	8			9	8
	Range	7-9	8			7-11	7-9
	% correct (12)	69%	67%			75%	67%

11.1.1 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.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
60% (3/5) of the candidates in the 2018-2019 AY passed the English Praxis Content Exam on the first attempt.

Constructed Response has been the lowest scoring section on the exam each year. In the 2018-2019 AY, the percentages correct were 69% (F18) and 67% (S19). The other three categories scored a mean of 72% or higher in both semesters.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
90% of English Education majors will achieve a passing score on the English Praxis Exam (#5039) on the first attempt. The passing score required in Louisiana is 168.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- Praxis workshops for Secondary English content will be offered through the Burton College of Education beginning in the spring 2020 semester.
- English faculty will create a plan for improvement within coursework for the Constructed Response section of the Praxis exam.

2019-2020:
- Praxis workshops for Secondary English content were offered through the Burton College of Education beginning in the spring 2020 semester. key members of the ENGL faculty developed these workshops.
- English faculty shown PRAXIS scores. Sample PRAXIS exams were shared with faculty as well as material that helps students do weel on constructed responses. PD activity Constructed Response section of the Praxis exam held during faculty meeting.

2020-2021:
The benchmark for the 2020-2021 academic year was not met. 75% (3/4) of the candidates passed the Praxis English content exam on the first attempt. The candidates in the spring 2021 semester score higher percentages correct in all four subcategories on the exam than did those in the fall 2020 semester. The percentage of correct answers ranges from 67% to 80% for the two semesters.

The EPP will help candidates to prepare for the Praxis content exam by reviewing test material and subject content within coursework. Advisors and faculty will provide study materials and resources for candidates during advising sessions, EDUC 510 and when reviewing the EDUC 599 packet.

12 **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.

12.1 **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 Mean	Range	#	Spring 2018 Mean	Range	#	Fall 2018 Mean	Range	#	Spring 2019 Mean	Range
5.1	0			3	3.59	3.13-3.88	3	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00
5.2	0			3	3.65	3.38-3.88	3	4.00	4.00	1	3.75	3.75
5.3	0			3	3.61	3.13-4.00	3	4.00	4.00			
5.4	0			3	3.38	2.88-4.00	3	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00
5.5	0			3	3.33	2.50-4.00	3	4.00	4.00			
5.6	0			3	3.44	2.75-4.00	3	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00
5.7	0			3	3.24	2.13-2.83	3	4.00	4.00			
5.8	0			3	3.48	2.88-3.88	3	3.96	3.88-4.00	1	4.00	4.00

English Education - Content-specific components on FEE III:

Component	#	Fall 2019 Mean	Range	#	Spring 2020 Mean	Range	#	Fall 2020 Mean	Range	#	Spring 2021 Mean	Range	% Prof.
5.1							0			2	3.63	3.50-3.75	100%
5.2										2	3.13	2.75-3.50	50%
5.3										2	3.25	3.00-3.50	100%
5.4										2	3.25	3.00-3.50	100%
5.5										2	3.75	3.50-4.00	100%
5.6										2	3.25	3.00-3.50	100%
5.7										2	2.75	2.00-3.50	50%
5.8										2	3.50	3.50	100%
TECH 1										2	3.50	3.25-3.75	100%
TECH 2										2	3.44	3.13-3.75	100%
TECH 3										2	3.25	2.75-3.75	50%

12.1.1 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 five.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
Of the four candidates who received scores on Domain five of the FEE rubric, all scored at
the *Effective: Proficient* or *Highly Effective* level.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Mentors and University Supervisors will be encouraged to look for opportunities to score candidates on Domain five of the FEE rubric. In addition, Secondary Education faculty and English Education faculty should revisit and revise (if needed) the elements of Domain five to ensure that they are aligned to appropriate content standards.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
Secondary Education faculty and English Education faculty will meet in the spring 2020 semester to review and revise (if necessary) the elements of Domain five to ensure that the elements are aligned to current content standards.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met for Components 5.2, 5.7 and TECH 3. It is important to note, however, that only 2 out of the 6 completers were scored on the domain 5 elements during the 2020-2021 academic year.

During the summer 2021 semester, EPP faculty will meet with content faculty to update the domain 5 rubric components to align the correct and current standards.

13 **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.

13.1 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
Essential Questions		Number	2	2	3	2	0	2
		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%
Modeled, Guided, Collab, & Ind. Practice	7k	Number						
		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%		

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
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%

English Education - Lesson Plan Data from EDUC 333/412:

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
Essential Questions		Number	0	0				
		Mean						
		Range						
		% Proficient or Higher						
Content Standards		Number	1	2				
		Mean	3.00	4.00				
		Range	3.00	4.00				
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				
Student Outcomes	4n	Number	1	2				
		Mean	2.00	3.50				
		Range	2.00	3.00-4.00				
		%						

		Proficient or Higher	0%	100%					
Technology	5l	Number	1	2					
		Mean	4.00	2.50					
		Range	4.00	1.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	50%					
Educational Materials		Number	1	2					
		Mean	4.00	4.00					
		Range	4.00	4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%					
Procedures	3k	Number	1	2					
		Mean	2.00	3.50					
		Range	2.00	3.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%					
Lesson "Hook"	8j	Number	1	2					
		Mean	2.00	4.00					
		Range	2.00	4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%					
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	8i	Number	1	2					
		Mean	2.00	3.00					
		Range	2.00	2.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%					
Modeled, Guided, Collab, & Ind. Practice	7k	Number							
		Mean							
		Range							
		% Proficient or Higher							
Closure		Number	1	2					
		Mean	3.00	4.00					
		Range	3.00	4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%					
		Number							

Formative/Summative Assessment	6j	Mean							
		Range							
		% Proficient or Higher							
Relevance & Rationale	2j	Number	1	2					
		Mean	1.00	3.50					
		Range	1.00	3.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%					
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1e	Number	1	2					
		Mean	4.00	4.00					
		Range	4.00	4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%					
Differentiation	7j	Number	1	1					
		Mean	4.00	4.00					
		Range	4.00	4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%					
Interdisciplinary Connections		Number	1	2					
		Mean	4.00	4.00					
		Range	4.00	4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%					
Whole Group Methods		Number	1	2					
		Mean	3.00	2.50					
		Range	3.00	3.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%					
Collaborative Practice Methods		Number	1	2					
		Mean	2.00	4.00					
		Range	2.00	4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%					
Independent Practice Methods		Number	1	2					
		Mean	2.00	4.00					
		Range	2.00	4.00					
		% Proficient	0%	100%					

		or Higher							
Informal Assessment		Number	1	2					
		Mean	3.00	3.50					
		Range	3.00	3.00-4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%					
Formal Assessment		Number	1	2					
		Mean	3.00	4.00					
		Range	3.00	4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%					
Student Use of Technology		Number		1					
		Mean		4.00					
		Range		4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher		100%					
Teacher Use of Technology		Number		1					
		Mean		4.00					
		Range		4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher		100%					
Differentiation by Content		Number		1					
		Mean		4.00					
		Range		4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher		100%					
Differentiation by Learning Environment		Number		1					
		Mean		4.00					
		Range		4.00					
		% Proficient or Higher		100%					
Post lesson Reflection		Number		1					
		Mean		3.00					
		Range		3.00					
		% Proficient or Higher		100%					

2020-2021:
Data table attached.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

ENGL_ Lesson Plan Data_20-21

13.1.1 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.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
For the 2018-2019 AY, data was collected on three completers for the lesson plan. Several categories had candidates scoring below the proficiency level (3.00). The following categories had 67% of the candidates scoring at or above proficiency: Student Outcomes, Technology, Procedures, Lesson Hook, Relevance and Rationale, Collaborative Practice Methods, and Independent Practice Methods. There were 33% of the candidates (n=1) that scored at or above proficiency level on Pre-Planned SEED Questions.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
Pre-Planned SEED Questions has been a category that yields lower results across a number of programs. However, additional instruction and attention has been paid to this area (among others) in methods coursework and we expect candidates to reach benchmark in this element on the rubric.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
The lesson plan template has been revised. The breakdown of categories provides a clearer insight into areas of improvement for candidates. The required lesson planning course will be revised to address the components of the lesson that present the most difficulty for secondary majors.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met for the 2020-2021 academic year. Over half (12/22) of the categories has at least one candidate who did not score at the proficiency level.

Future completers enrolled in the redesigned program with the one year residency are required to enroll in *EDUC 318: Planning and Instruction in the Content Area* early in the program (Term 4, spring). This course is designed to teach candidates the importance of planning for instruction, taking into consideration the students within the P-12 courses and the objectives and content that needs to be covered. This course will provide a foundation for understanding the components of the plan utilized in methods coursework. Additionally, future data will include a progression of lesson plan data from the initial work in EDUC 318 to the teacher residency semester.

14 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.

14.1 Data

2017-2018:
Data table is attached.

2018-2019:
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
Data table is attached.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

English Education_FEE_17-18
English Education_FEE_18-19
English Education_FEE_20-21

14.1.1 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.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was not met. The following elements, although they had an overall mean above 3.00, had candidates who scored below the 3.00 benchmark. For element 2.2.1 and 3.3.4, 67% of the candidates scored above the benchmark during the fall 2018 semester. All candidates scored at or above benchmark in the spring 2019 semester.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
FEE scores for candidates in their student teaching semester were good overall. Focus for improvement will be on ensuring that the scoring for candidates is reliable.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
- University supervisors, professors, and mentor teachers will participate in trainings with the FEE to ensure inter-rate reliability.
- University supervisors, professors, and mentor teachers will participate in professional development opportunities concerning differentiation and academic feedback.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met. Domains 2 and 3 both had less than 100% of candidates meeting proficiency during the 2020-2021 academic year. There was 100% proficiency achieved in all categories for the fall 2020 semester (N=2). However, in spring 2021, 50% of

the candidates (N=2) met proficiency in all three sub-components in 2.2 (2.2.1, 2.2.3, and 2.2.4) and sub-components 3.3.4. Additionally, 0% of candidates scored at proficiency or above for sub-component 3.1.3 in spring 2021.

It is important to note that data may reflect the challenges of the candidates student teaching experience and pre-service semesters which were impacted by the extraordinary circumstances of COVID-19 and the impact of the fall 2020 hurricanes.

Faculty and University Supervisors have begun to conduct pre- and post- conferences (POP Cycles) with candidates to discuss expectations for lesson being taught and to evaluate the success of the lesson after. In preparation for the fall 2021 semester and to work toward meeting the benchmark in all components, EPP Secondary faculty will distribute and implement components of the POP Cycle with coursework. This will assist in increasing understanding, usefulness, and implementation expectations to prepare candidates to achieve higher scores on the assessment during teacher residency. The EPP will provide training and opportunities to establish inter-rater reliability and norming of the FEE rubric.

15 **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.

15.1 **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%
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.50		4.00
	Range	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	100%	100%		100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.50		4.00
	Range	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient						

	or Higher	0%	100%	100%	100%		100%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00
	Range	2.00-3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	100%	100%	100%		100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number						
	Mean	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.50		4.00
	Range	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	100%	100%	100%		100%
Response to Interventions	Number						
	Mean	1.00	2.50	4.00	4.00		4.00
	Range	1.00	100-4.00	4.00	4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	0%	50%	100%	100%		100%

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

Criteria		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number	2				0	2
	Mean	3.00					3.50
	Range	2.00-4.00					3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%					100%
Pre-assessment	Number	2					2
	Mean	3.50					3.50
	Range	3.00-4.00					3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					100%
Post-assessment	Number	2					2
	Mean	3.50					3.50
	Range	3.00-4.00					3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number	2	1				2
	Mean	2.50	4.00				3.00
	Range	2.00-3.00	4.00				2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	50%	100%				50%
	Number	2					2

Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Mean	3.50					3.50
	Range	3.00-4.00					3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					100%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number	2					2
	Mean	4.00					3.50
	Range	4.00					2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%					100%
Response to Interventions	Number	2	1				2
	Mean	4.00	4.00				3.50
	Range	4.0	4.00				3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher	100%	100%				100%
Content Standards	Number		1				
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Strength: Data to Determine	Number		1				
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Weakness: Data to Determine	Number		1				
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Analysis	Number		1				
	Mean		3.00				
	Range		3.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				
Application	Number		1				
	Mean		4.00				
	Range		4.00				
	% Proficient or Higher		100%				

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Assessment is a weakness. We are revamping the lesson plan template and rubric, and we are rewriting the education assessment course.

2017-2018:
Analysis of Data: Candidates scored 4.00 out of 4.00 on all elements evaluated in the Teacher Candidate Work Sample. Since fall 2016, scores for English Education completers have been consistently high.

Changes will be made in the Teacher Candidate Work Sample rubric for the upcoming AY to create more clearly defined expectations.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
Data for the fall 2018 semester came from the previous version of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric and for the spring 2019 semester from the revised Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric. Alignment of Lesson Evidence, which is included on both versions had 67% of the candidates scoring at the proficiency level or above. All other categories that were on both assessments or on the revised rubric had 100% of candidates scoring at proficiency or above.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
The Teacher Candidate Work Sample is being replaced by the Teaching Cycle which provides specific expectations and increased rigor with scaffolded support to improve candidate abilities to evaluate student learning and plan for instruction.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
The Teaching Cycle will be scaffolded throughout the program and the Senior Residency Portfolio will include the entire Teaching Cycle. During the Senior Residency Portfolio course candidates will be assigned a mentor professor to assist them, answer questions, and guide them through the full process.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was not met as there was one criteria *Alignment of Lesson Evidence* that did not have 100% of candidates meeting benchmark. There was no data collected on this assessment during the fall 2020 semester due to COVID-19 restrictions and local hurricanes.

This data captures the one time collection of Teaching Cycle data in the performance portfolio at the end of the program. Moving forward the EPP faculty will use at least two data points within the program to analyze progression in the Teaching Cycle criteria at the proficiency level.

At the end of each academic year, EPAC faculty will review the Teaching Cycle. Faculty will then collaborate on ways to address the areas for improvement/ concern.

16 Assessment and Benchmark English - Praxis PLT

Assessment: Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam
English Education candidates must pass the Praxis PLT#5624 before student teaching. The Louisiana qualifying score is 157.

Benchmark: 80% of the candidates will pass the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam on the first attempt.

16.1 Data

EnglishEducation - Praxis PLT #5624:

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
	Number	2	2	3	2	0	3
	Mean	174	188	176	174		165.3
#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%

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5624 overall	Number	3	2			2	2
	Mean	175	180			174.5	171
	Range	166-184	175-184			164-185	162-180
	% Pass 1st attempt	100%	100%			100%	100%
#5624 breakdown:	Number	3	2			2	2
Students as Learners	Mean	15	16			16.5	16
	Range	13-16	14-18			14-19	14-18
	% correct (21-25)	71%	76%			83%	80%
Instructional Process	Mean	14	14			16	15
	Range	11-17	12-15			16	15
	% correct (18-21)	65%	64%			80%	75%
Assessment	Mean	10	12			10	9
	Range	7-12	11-13			7-13	6-12
	% correct (14)	69%	86%			71%	69%
Professional Development Leadership and	Mean	10	11			9	9.5
	Range	8-12	10-11			6-12	9-10
	% correct						

Community	(12-14)	69%	81%			64%	68%
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean	13	13			11.5	8.5
	Range	12-13	13			11-12	7-10
	% correct (16)	79%	81%			72%	53%%

16.1.1 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.

2018-2019:
Analysis of Data:
The benchmark was met. 100% of the candidates (n=5) passed the Praxis PLT on the first attempt. The Students as Learners category showed significant improvement from the last two years with F18 at 71% and S19 at 76% answered correctly. Percent of questions answered correctly in the Instructional Process category fell below 70% for both semesters.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:
With the redesign of the new program, courses are aligned to ensure that candidates receive appropriate knowledge to continue to perform well on the exam and exceed the benchmark.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:
Advisors and course faculty will encourage candidates to take the PLT exam after the appropriate coursework is successfully completed Secondary education faculty will monitor pass rates of candidates in order to ensure alignment and proper sequence. Scores for

2019-2020:

2020-2021:
The benchmark was met, 100% of candidates passed the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching exam on the first attempt. For percentage of questions answered correctly, scores ranged from 53% to 83%. EPP faculty will analyze the Praxis PLT results across secondary programs to identify trends and areas for improvement. Based on findings, changes in instruction, course content, study materials, etc. will be made.

End of report