

DATA Reflections for ENGLISH 2011-2012

Assessment	Description / Analysis	Action?
STANDARD 1 – KNOWLEDGE OF VARIETY OF TEXT, HOW LEARNERS CREATE/DISCOVER MEANING		
6 – II498-9 Capstone	Students are scoring in the competent or above range for this assessment.	We need to require Ed students to do an actual paper/lesson and not a creative product
7 – MFT	In recent years, our students scores are dropping. Not all of that can be attributed to their “blowing off” the test. I should also comment that the education student who took the MFT in 2011-2012 did not take any literature content area classes at Sterling.	Dr. Gannon (prof. emeritus) suggested that we reinstitute the literary trivia game. Our department discussed it, and we don’t want our students knowing “trivia.” We want them to be strong in their content area. We will continue to push them to take the MFT seriously and to do well in their content area courses.
1a Praxis II Sub-score I	Middle half to highest quartile.	No action required.
STANDARD 2 – HISTORY, STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE & USE OF LANGUAGE TO INFLUENCE		
5A LL344	The student who did very poorly in LL344 has dropped the education endorsement. The others did well.	No action required.
1a Praxis II Sub-score II	Students scored well enough in this area.	No action required.
STANDARD 3 – EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION FOR VARIOUS AUDIENCES / PURPOSES		
5B LL315	The student who did very poorly in LL315 has dropped the education endorsement. The others did well.	No action required.
1a Praxis II Sub-score III	Students scored well enough in this area.	No action required.
STANDARD 4 – CURRENT METHODS OF TEACHING READING, WRITING, LISTENING, T, AND VIEWING		
5C ED415	Students are doing only passably well in this course.	The entire course needs to be revamped. I don’t know how much power I have to make that happen. The current syllabus/objectives/assignments address the first three standards but not this fourth standard. The focus of this course needs to be methods , not content.
2 – KPTP Task 2	Students are doing fine.	The assessment does not demonstrate any competency for this standard, and if the rubric cannot be adapted or supplemented, the assessment should be removed.
3 – CTE	Used for the first time in Spring 2012.	We used the content addendum

Rubric ?		for the first time this Spring. If we keep it, we will have to rely on the cooperating teacher to pay careful attention to all five of these elements. I am not confident that will happen. A content area person visiting just one day will not see all of these in action. Possibly the first four, but not the last. In any case, as content people, we don't have the expertise to comment on whether or not the candidate is using "current methods."
-----------------	--	--

Documentation of Department Discussions

Strengths of the Program

We are covering the content area very well. If students transfer into our program with most of their literature content completed, they don't do as well. I think that speaks to the strength of our program.

Areas to Improve

Standard 4 is inadequately covered. As content people, we do not have the expertise to address all five of the elements of the standard. We must rely on the education faculty, methods instructor, and the cooperating teacher to assess. This puts the department in a very awkward and precarious position for maintaining this licensure area. We have no room for weakness in the other three standards.

Changes / Updates / Topics for Discussion

(syllabi, college catalog, curriculum, specific courses, specific assessments, etc.)

ED415 must be reorganized – the syllabus needs to be updated and clarified; the course objectives need to be relevant to all five areas listed in standard 4 (not just “associated with” as the syllabus currently states), and the assessments need to be tied closely to the relevant course objectives, stating specifically that students will have practice demonstrating their knowledge of “current methods” in reading, writing, listening, thinking, and viewing.