

English Language Arts Assessment Plan – Year One

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for Academic Programs

Please list all of the student learning outcomes for your program as articulated in the assessment plan.

1. Demonstrate the ability to think and write critically about clinical experiences.
2. Demonstrate the ability to use English language arts to help students become familiar with their own and others’ cultures, thereby promoting global citizenship.
3. Demonstrate knowledge of writing processes.
4. Demonstrate knowledge of and skills in use of the English Language, including effective speaking skills.
5. Demonstrate knowledge of the range and influences of print and nonprint media and technology in contemporary cultures.

Overview of Measures/Instruments

SLO(s) <i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i>	ULG*	Measures/Instruments <i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i>	How is the information Used? <i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i>	
1. Demonstrate the ability to think and write critically about clinical experiences.	C, W, R	Pedagogy Reflection (Clinical Experience) Essay Assessment given in ENG 3401, 3402, & 4801 assessed by the professor with the Pedagogy Reflection Rubric each time the course is offered. Results are shared with the English Education Committee & English Assessment Committee, and through the Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.	Aligned with NCTE Standards	Target Mean Score
			NCTE III.1	2.25/3.0
			NCTE III.6	2.25/3.0
			NCTE IV.4; V.1; V.2	2.25/3.0
			NCTE VI.1	2.25/3.0
			NCTE VI.2	2.25/3.0
			NCTE VII.1; VII.2	2.25/3.0
1. Demonstrate the ability to think and write critically about clinical experiences.	C, W, R	Student Teaching P-12 Assessment , assessed by Director of Education via Live Text Rubric at completion of Student Teaching. Results are shared with the English Education Committee & English Assessment Committee, and through the Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.	Aligned with NCTE Standards	Target Mean Score
			NCTE I.2; II.3	3.0/4.0

<p>SLO(s)</p> <p><i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i></p>	<p>ULG*</p>	<p>Measures/Instruments</p> <p><i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i></p>	<p>How is the information Used?</p> <p><i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i></p>	
			NCTE II.1	3.0/4.0
			NCTE III.2	3.0/4.0
			NCTE III.4	3.0/4.0
			NCTE IV.2	3.0/4.0
			NCTE V.2	3.0/4.0
			NCTE V.3	3.0/4.0
			NCTE V.4	3.0/4.0
			NCTE VII.1	3.0/4.0
			NCTE VII.2	3.0/4.0
<p>2. Demonstrate the ability to use English language arts to help students become familiar with their own and others' cultures, thereby promoting global citizenship.</p>	<p>C, W, R</p>	<p>Pedagogy Reflection Essay Assessment (see above) in these categories: “Candidate demonstrates a commitment to customizing instruction to draw upon students’ home and community languages, cultural backgrounds, individual differences, and literacy levels to create inclusive learning environments that contextualize curriculum and help students participate actively in their own learning in ELA” (NCTE IV.4, V.1, V.2); “Candidate articulates instructional plans that promote social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society” (NCTE VI.1); “Candidate skillfully analyzes learning environments and draws upon a range of theories and research to consider instructional approaches that are responsive to students’ local, national and international histories, individual identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender expression, age, appearance, ability, spiritual belief, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and community environment), and languages/dialects” (NCTE VI.2). Results are shared with the English Education Committee & English Assessment Committee, and through the Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.</p>	<p>Aligned with NCTE Standards</p>	<p>Target Mean Score</p>
			NCTE IV.4; V.1; V.2	2.25/3.0
			NCTE VI.1	2.25/3.0
			NCTE VI.2	2.25/3.0

<p>SLO(s)</p> <p><i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i></p>	<p>ULG*</p>	<p>Measures/Instruments</p> <p><i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i></p>	<p>How is the information Used?</p> <p><i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i></p>	
		<p>Student Teaching Approval Portfolio, assessed by the English Education Committee for final student teaching approval, in the rubric category: “Candidate is knowledgeable about texts (e.g. print and non-print texts, media texts, classic texts and contemporary texts, young adult) that represent a range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different identities (e.g. genders, ethnicities, social classes); he/she is able to use literary and pedagogical theories to interpret and critique a range of texts” (NCTE I.1). Results are shared with the English Education Committee & English Assessment Committee, and through the Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.</p>	<p>NCTE Standards</p>	<p>Mean Score</p>
			<p>NCTE I.1</p>	<p>3.5/5.0</p>
		<p>Unit Plan assessed by method instructors in ENG 3401, ENG 3402, and ENG 4801 each time the course is taught via Live Text Rubric, pertinent rubric category: “Candidate plans and implements English language arts and literacy instruction that promotes social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society” (NCTE VI.1). Results are shared with the English Education Committee & English Assessment Committee, and through the Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.</p>	<p>Aligned with NCTE Standard</p>	<p>Target Mean Score</p>
			<p>NCTE VI.1</p>	<p>3.5/4.0</p>
<p>3. Demonstrate knowledge of writing processes.</p>	<p>C, W</p>	<p>Student Teaching Approval Portfolio (see above), assessed through these categories:</p> <p>“Candidate knows the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics); candidate’s teaching philosophy and instructional material attend to the concept of dialect, the history of the English language, and/or relevant grammar systems, and indicate an understanding of the principles of language acquisition and the impact that language has on society” (NCTE II.2); “Candidate is knowledgeable about writing processes (i.e. how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments)” (NCTE II.3). Results are shared with the English Education Committee & English Assessment Committee, and through the</p>	<p>Aligned with NCTE Standard</p>	<p>Target Mean Score</p>
			<p>NCTE II.2</p>	<p>3.5/5.0</p>
			<p>NCTE II.3</p>	<p>3.5/5.0</p>

<p>SLO(s)</p> <p><i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i></p>	<p>ULG*</p>	<p>Measures/Instruments</p> <p><i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i></p>	<p>How is the information Used?</p> <p><i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i></p>				
		<p>Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.</p>					
<p>3. Demonstrate knowledge of writing processes.</p>	<p>C, W, Q</p>	<p>English Language Arts Content Exam & EdTPA Exam. Results shared by COE to English Education Director and then shared with English Education & Assessment Committees, and through Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.</p>	<p>Target Mean Scores: 80% or better pass rate on both tests</p>				
<p>4. Demonstrate knowledge of and skills in use of the English Language, including effective speaking skills.</p>	<p>S, R</p>	<p>Disposition Evaluations Completed by Methods Instructors & Student Teaching Coordinators, pertinent criterion: “Effective Communication” (NCTE VII.1). Results are shared with the English Education Committee & English Assessment Committee, and through the Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.</p>	<p>80% of Teacher Candidates Receiving “Acceptable” or higher on this Evaluation during Methods Course Work; 100% of Candidates receiving “Acceptable” or higher during Student Teaching.</p>				
<p>4. Demonstrate knowledge of and skills in use of the English Language, including effective speaking skills.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Faculty Evaluations sheets for Final Student Teaching Approval assessed in the category “Speaking Skills.” Faculty evaluations for our teacher certification candidates take place in every course that counts toward this major. Results are shared with the English Education Committee & English Assessment Committee, and through the Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.</p>	<p>100% of Teacher Candidates Receiving “Acceptable” or Higher on this evaluation criterion prior to Student Teaching Placement.</p>				
<p>5. Demonstrate knowledge of the range and influences of print and nonprint media and technology in contemporary cultures.</p>	<p>C, W, R</p>	<p>Student Teaching Approval Portfolio (see above), Rubric Category: “Candidate is knowledgeable about texts (e.g. print and non-print texts, media texts, classic texts and contemporary texts, young adult) that represent a range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different identities (e.g. genders, ethnicities, social classes); he/she is able to use literary and pedagogical theories to interpret and critique a range of texts” (NCTE 1.1). Results are shared with the English Education Committee & English Assessment</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1091 1533 1349 1661"> <p>Aligned with NCTE Standard</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1349 1533 1544 1661"> <p>Target Mean Score</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1091 1661 1349 1734"> <p>NCTE I.1</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1349 1661 1544 1734"> <p>3.5/5.0</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Aligned with NCTE Standard</p>	<p>Target Mean Score</p>	<p>NCTE I.1</p>	<p>3.5/5.0</p>
<p>Aligned with NCTE Standard</p>	<p>Target Mean Score</p>						
<p>NCTE I.1</p>	<p>3.5/5.0</p>						

SLO(s) <i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i>	ULG*	Measures/Instruments <i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i>	How is the information Used? <i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i>	
		Committee, and through the Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.		
5. Demonstrate knowledge of the range and influences of print and nonprint media and technology in contemporary cultures.	C, W	Student Teaching Evaluation , rubric category “Candidate is knowledgeable about how adolescents read and compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments” (NCTE I.2, II.3). Results are shared with the English Education Committee & English Assessment Committee, and through the Annual ISBE Report (as needed) and CAEP Accreditation Report.	Aligned with NCTE Standards	Target Mean Score
			NCTE I.2, II.3	3.0/4.0

**Please reference any University Learning Goal(s) (ULG) that this SLO, if any, may address or assess. C=Critical Thinking, W=Writing & Critical Reading; S=Speaking and Listening; Q=Quantitative reasoning; R=Responsible Citizenship; NA=Not Applicable*

NCTE Standards Referenced Above

Content Knowledge
I. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes literature and multimedia texts as well as knowledge of the nature of adolescents as readers.
Element 1: Candidates are knowledgeable about texts—print and non-print texts, media texts, classic texts and contemporary texts, including young adult—that represent a range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different genders, ethnicities, and social classes; they are able to use literary theories to interpret and critique a range of texts.
Element 2: Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents read texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.
Content Knowledge
II. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes language and writing as well as knowledge of adolescents as language users.
Element 1: Candidates can compose a range of formal and informal texts taking into consideration the interrelationships among form, audience, context, and purpose; candidates understand that writing is a recursive process; candidates can use contemporary technologies and/or digital media to compose multimodal discourse.
Element 2: Candidates know the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics); they understand the concept of dialect and are familiar with relevant grammar systems (e.g., descriptive and prescriptive); they understand principles of language acquisition; they recognize the influence of English language history on ELA content; and they understand the impact of language on society.
Element 3: Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.
Content Pedagogy: Planning Literature and Reading Instruction in ELA
III. Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for reading and the study of literature to promote learning for all students.
Element 1: Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences utilizing a range of different texts—across genres, periods, forms, authors, cultures, and various forms of media—and instructional strategies that are motivating and accessible to all students, including English language learners, students with special needs, students from diverse language and learning backgrounds, those designated as high achieving, and those at risk of failure.
Element 2: Candidates design a range of authentic assessments (e.g., formal and informal, formative and summative) of reading and literature that demonstrate an understanding of how learners develop and that address interpretive, critical, and evaluative abilities in reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and presenting.
Element 3: Candidates plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences in reading that reflect knowledge of current theory and research about the teaching and learning of reading and that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and a variety of reading strategies.
Element 4: Candidates design or knowledgeably select appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about student interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes.

<p>Element 5: Candidates plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language—structure, history, and conventions—to facilitate students’ comprehension and interpretation of print and non-print texts.</p>
<p>Element 6: Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials.</p>
<p>Content Pedagogy: Planning Composition Instruction in ELA</p>
<p>IV. Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for composing texts (i.e., oral, written, and visual) to promote learning for all students.</p>
<p>Element 1: Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant composing experiences that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and contemporary technologies and reflect an understanding of writing processes and strategies in different genres for a variety of purposes and audiences.</p>
<p>Element 2: Candidates design a range of assessments for students that promote their development as writers, are appropriate to the writing task, and are consistent with current research and theory. Candidates are able to respond to student writing in process and to finished texts in ways that engage students’ ideas and encourage their growth as writers over time.</p>
<p>Element 3: Candidates design instruction related to the strategic use of language conventions (grammar, usage, and mechanics) in the context of students’ writing for different audiences, purposes, and modalities.</p>
<p>Element 4: Candidates design instruction that incorporates students’ home and community languages to enable skillful control over their rhetorical choices and language practices for a variety of audiences and purposes.</p>
<p>Learners and Learning: Implementing English Language Arts Instruction</p>
<p>V. Candidates plan, implement, assess, and reflect on research-based instruction that increases motivation and active student engagement, builds sustained learning of English language arts, and responds to diverse students’ context-based needs.</p>
<p>Element 1: Candidates plan and implement instruction based on ELA curricular requirements and standards, school and community contexts, and knowledge about students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds.</p>
<p>Element 2: Candidates use data about their students’ individual differences, identities, and funds of knowledge for literacy learning to create inclusive learning environments that contextualize curriculum and instruction and help students participate actively in their own learning in ELA.</p>
<p>Element 3: Candidates differentiate instruction based on students’ self-assessments and formal and informal assessments of learning in English language arts; candidates communicate with students about their performance in ways that actively involve them in their own learning.</p>
<p>Element 4: Candidates select, create, and use a variety of instructional strategies and teaching resources, including contemporary technologies and digital media, consistent with what is currently known about student learning in English Language Arts.</p>
<p>Professional Knowledge and Skills</p>
<p>VI. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how theories and research about social justice, diversity, equity, student identities, and schools as institutions can enhance students’ opportunities to learn in English Language Arts.</p>
<p>Element 1: Candidates plan and implement English language arts and literacy instruction that promotes social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society.</p>
<p>Element 2: Candidates use knowledge of theories and research to plan instruction responsive to students’ local, national and international histories, individual identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender expression, age, appearance, ability, spiritual belief, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and community environment), and languages/dialects as they affect students’ opportunities to learn in ELA.</p>
<p>Professional Knowledge and Skills</p>
<p>VII. Candidates are prepared to interact knowledgeably with students, families, and colleagues based on social needs and institutional roles, engage in leadership and/or collaborative roles in English Language Arts professional learning communities, and actively develop as professional educators.</p>
<p>Element 1: Candidates model literate and ethical practices in ELA teaching, and engage in/reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA.</p>
<p>Element 2: Candidates engage in and reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA that demonstrate understanding of and readiness for leadership, collaboration, ongoing professional development, and community engagement.</p>

Improvements and Changes Based on Assessment

[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK – FOR USE IN FUTURE YEARS]

1. Provide a short summary (1-2 paragraphs or bullets) of any curricular actions (revisions, additions, and so on) that were approved over the past four years as a result of reflecting on the student learning outcomes data. Are there any additional future changes, revisions, or interventions proposed or still pending?
2. Please provide a brief description or bulleted list of any improvements observed/measured in student learning over the past four years. Be sure to mention any intervention made that has not yet resulted in student improvement (if applicable).
3. Using the form below, please document annual faculty and committee engagement with the assessment process (such as the review of outcomes data, revisions/updates to assessment plan, and reaffirmation of SLOs).

History of Annual Review		
Date of Annual Review	Individuals/Groups who Reviewed Plan	Results of the Review (i.e., reference proposed changes from #1 above, revised SLOs, etc..)

Dean Review & Feedback

Dean or designee

Date

Academic Affairs – Review & Feedback

Date

Date

CLAS Deans' comments on ENG B.A.-TL (accredited) report

Reviewer: Christopher Mitchell

Please note: This is a **STARTING POINT** for conversation, with no rubric per se. We will be developing a rubric collaboratively (amongst chairs, Associate Deans, and our new EIU Assessment Coordinator, Yvette Smith) in the spring of 2021 based on peer/aspirant institution models, then we'll evaluate it by that. Meanwhile, if you'd like to modify your document based on these comments, feel free. We appreciate your patience with this process as it evolves!

1. SLOs are generally clear and measurable, using language appropriate to the goals/the discipline and also language that uses middle levels of Bloom's Taxonomy ("demonstrate" in each one).
2. Measures/instruments generally have clear sense of when administered throughout— exceptions are:
 - a. in the 1st block of the column (the one for ENG 3401, 3402, and 4801)— is the Pedagogy Reflection exercise done at the completion of the courses noted?
 - b. In the 6th block of the column (the Unit Plan)— same question
3. Of course syncing to NCTE standards is appropriate— I like that you give an enumeration of them at the bottom of the document. You might put a "see below" or footnote marker so that an external reader knows where to find it. Is it possible to note most recent state means for these, since you (again, appropriately) give the target number? Might help external readers see what we aim for as an institution.

On the whole, the plan seems comprehensive and ready for data collection.