College of Saint Mary
Rule 24 Section 3:
Use of Related Data and Information for
Continuous Program Improvement of Endorsement Program

Endorsement Program: Secondary English 7-12

Secondary English Majors are a part of the whole English program at College of Saint Mary. While MAT students come in with content complete undergraduate completers work within the program. Below are program changes and outcomes as outlined by the English Program Director. To ensure undergraduate privacy, data is not specific to one undergraduate completer.

Use of Related Data and Information for Continuous Program Improvement of Endorsement Program in the past three years.

The English program at College of Saint Mary has been committed to delivering courses that improve student writing and engage them in the study of literature. The English Department is directed by Dr. Amy Knox Brown, and the Composition Program is directed by Dr. Shannon McMahon. We believe that requiring a common syllabus and common text for all sections of ENG101 (Composition)—a required General Education course--has resulted in more consistent delivery of information to the students. In addition, we seek to cooperate with other programs by implementing instruction in both APA and MLA citation requirements in ENG101. Anecdotal evidence from other faculty suggests that students are, in fact, showing some improvement in their writing. Besides our composition courses, we offer a variety of classes in literature (American, British, and World) as well as creative writing (fiction writing and narrative nonfiction). Since 2014, the English Department has offered an annual interdisciplinary Senior Seminar that draws students majoring in English, English Education, General Studies, and Humanities. The following extractions from the Annual Report focus on our assessment of Composition courses and the Senior Seminar, drawing specifically from qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed during 2014-2015, since the Program made significant changes worth examining during this time.

Goals and Objectives for the English Program
Goal 1: All students in composition courses will develop basic writing skills.
Objectives:
1. Composition students will demonstrate an improvement in their writing skills (specifically, organization, logic, supporting details, language and grammar). We will compare the first paper of the semester with the final paper, which will be evaluated using the same rubric as we used during the 2014-2015 AY. We would like to see at least 90% of the students demonstrating overall improvement from their first paper to their last paper.
2. Composition students will also practice revision as a distinct part of the writing process. The emphasis on revision will come via feedback from the instructor and/or visits to the writing tutors in the Achievement Center
3. Composition students will also develop a greater level of comfort and confidence in their writing. The English department plans to use a rubric to gauge this element in 2015-2016.

Goal 2: ENGLISH MAJORS (including ENGLISH EDUCATION MAJORS) will develop expertise and proficiency above General Education requirements in literacy skills.
Objectives:
1. At least 90% of English majors will demonstrate proficiency in their critical thinking and writing skills by submitting a scholarly or creative paper that *exceeds expectations* in the area of structure/organization; control of language; understanding of craft; and scope of the project/research.
2. At least 90% of English majors will demonstrate expertise and proficiency in verbally communicating ideas by receiving a score that *exceeds expectations* on their presentation at either Student Scholar's Day or in the ENG 495 class.

Results of Assessment and Resulting Actions
Discussion of Assessment Data Related to Goal 1, Objective 1
47 students were enrolled in ENG 101 over three sections in the fall of 2014. Although there were three sections of ENG 101, the same syllabus and text, as well as the same format of the classes, was used by the 2 different teachers. The same rubric from the 2013-2014 assessment was reapplied with the following results: Of the 47 students, 85% scored in the Below or Far below in 3 of the 5 categories on the rubric on their first paper. Of those categories, the highest number of students fell negatively into the Grammar, Paragraphing and Supporting details, and Language. The greatest, most measurable improvement came in the category of Paragraphing and Supporting Details with 90% rising to at least the next highest category by the last paper of the semester. Grammar remained a stumbling block with 72% of students still making at least 7 major grammar mistakes by the last paper, but still one category better than the lowest one of 10+ mistakes. There were, however, some students whose writing trended negatively in the major categories. 10% of students in ENG 101 showed a loss of some skills by the end. This could be due to the last paper being the most difficult one: the Researched Argument and Persuasion paper, which includes emphasis on using MLA citation conventions. Conceivably, students should build their writing skills so that by the end, they have accumulated enough ability to measurably improve. Anecdotally, the students revealed in meetings a lot of trepidation about the finer elements of argument and persuasion (mostly about citation conventions), which impacted their scores overall. Beginning in fall 2015, students will take a test about their knowledge of MLA and APA citation conventions to gauge progress concretely, as well as earlier, in the semester.

In spring of 2015, 20 students were enrolled in 2 sections of Advanced Composition (ENG 102). These classes were hybrid, incorporating both in-class and on-line elements. This class is structured around Rogerian argument and MLA/APA citation conventions. When Tool 1 was applied, it showed that these students already functioned at a much higher level than all of the students in ENG 101 in the fall. 82% of the students fell into at least Meets Expectations in 3 of the 5 categories. Grammar was again the lowest, but it did not dip measurably below Meets Expectations in that category by the end of the semester. 90% of the students scored in the Above Expectations or Exceeds Expectations in 3 out of the 5 categories on their last research papers. Compared to previous Advanced Composition classes, these two hybrid ones revealed that the emphasis on working independently, as well as allowing more one-on-one contact with me, garnered the highest level of achievement and satisfaction.

As the bulk of the data show, grammar was still the biggest problem for the majority of the composition students. The same grammar handbook was used in all 101 and 102 classes, which focused on smaller, more manageable exercises to remedy the most egregious mistakes. The English department is currently

creating a grammar pre and post quiz to measure progress in self-correcting grammar mistakes. This tool will be used and evaluated during the 2015-2016 AY.

Discussion of Assessment Data Related to Goal 1, Objective 2:
Tool 2 was used in 3 of the 4 ENG 101 class and in all of the ENG 102 classes in 2014-2015 AY. It was used to give students a grade range on their drafts to encourage revision. When this tool was presented to the students for every paper project, it was easy to see that 90% of students raised their grades by 1 grade level as outlined on the grid (see figure 1). Anecdotally, conversations with students using Tool 2 allowed the instructor to more concretely address concerns during a conversation with students.

Discussion of Assessment Data Related to Goal 1, Objective 3: The English department currently plans to administer a rubric to assess comfort and confidence in writing skills for all composition students beginning fall 2015.

What has improved in the English composition program based upon previous assessments?
The improvement in the ENG 101 classes can be connected to the consistency of content and delivery of the classes. When the same syllabus, text, format, and assignments was used in the face-to-face classes, it was easy to see clear progress in the three sections. The hybrid ENG 101 students struggled at times meeting the online deadlines, but the in-class time was productive, and the one-on-one meetings were 30% longer to reflect more face-to-face contact with Dr. Shannon McMahon. The hybrid Advanced Composition classes were successful in the way the students were able to work independently, to have more time out of class to write, and to see the instructor more frequently if they needed to. Perhaps the success is due to the intrinsic higher-level students who take this course generally, namely that they are prepared for the high expectations this class assumes.

Goal 2 and Associated Objectives
Background on the evolution of the Capstone Seminar: Because of the limited number of senior English majors, ENG 495—the Capstone Seminar--had traditionally been taught as a series of independent studies since there weren't normally enough students to make up a course. This process contradicted the notion of a seminar—a place where students gather together to share insights and debate ideas--- and also created an undue burden on faculty, who supervise independent studies without additional compensation. With these issues in mind, the English Department piloted an interdisciplinary senior seminar in Spring of 2014 (ENG/COM/HUM495) that would fulfill the credit needs of enough students to allow a class to "make." Dr. Brown developed a hybrid model that combined in-class work with online discussion boards, where students posted drafts of their projects and critiqued each other's work. This class has provided us with a useful tool to examine the quality of written and oral communication of English majors as it compares with the same qualities of students who have not taken as many English classes.

Discussion of Assessment Data Related to Goal 2, Objective 1
In Spring 2015, a total of eleven students were enrolled in the interdisciplinary Senior Capstone Seminar; five were English/English Education majors, and six were Humanities or BGS students. The Spring 2015 ENG/HUM/COM 495 course followed the format piloted in Spring 2014, in which students were required to complete a substantial (20 page) project to demonstrate their writing proficiency.

Four of the five English majors demonstrated exceptional accomplishment in the area of writing, whether they focused on scholarly or creative work. (See Figure 2 for Scholarly Paper Rubric and Figure

3 for Creative/Narrative Rubric). One of the English majors (who has since been dismissed from the college for academic reasons) did not turn in a final written project. If we consider only the students who submitted the required paper, then 100% of the English majors exceeded expectations in the area of writing. If we factor in the fifth student, who failed to submit a paper, then 80% of English majors demonstrated proficiency and expertise above the General Education requirements.

Discussion of Assessment Data Related to Goal 2, Objective 2.
In addition to a writing project, students gave a presentation (either at Student Scholars Day or an in-class teaching demonstration) to demonstrate their oral communication skills. The Student Scholar Day presentations were twenty minutes long, with ten minutes for questions, while the teaching demonstrations were fifty minutes long. Students were allowed to select which sort of presentation they'd like to make; some programs (the English/Education program, for instance) requires a Student Scholar Day presentation, while students in other programs had the option of offering a longer presentation to a smaller audience. The Teaching Demonstration option is a good one for students intending to apply to graduate programs, since it gives them experience that is useful for future Teaching Assistants.

Four of the five English majors presented at Student Scholar Day. All of the four demonstrated exceptional presentation skills, with an average presentation score of 96% (see Figure 4 for the Student Scholars Day rubric). The fifth student (who happened to be the one noted above who failed to turn in a final project) offered a teaching demonstration, and received a score of 80%. As was the case with the written project, 80% of the students demonstrated exceptional oral communication skills. This number is lower than the goal noted in the objectives, but I don't believe it reflects a clear picture of the English program. For one, the number of graduating students in the major was small (five); four of them performed exceedingly well, both on their writing projects and during the oral presentations; and the one student who failed to complete the required work for the course was also performing poorly in her other courses (which suggests a student problem, rather than a program problem). Again, for the most part, the evidence suggests that the English program has been successful in enhancing students' oral communication skills.

Assessment Tools
Figure 1 for ENG101 (Composition)
Instructor Evaluation Grid
Based on this draft, the following are some strengths and weaknesses in your writing. It is important that you work on any weaknesses noted.

D-level	C-Level	B-Level	
_____	_____	_____	1. The writing clearly takes audience into account.
_____	_____	_____	2. Voice/persona suits assignment well.
_____	_____	_____	3. Introduction is interesting.
_____	_____	_____	4. Thesis sentence is concise and focused.
_____	_____	_____	5. Conclusion offers a satisfying sense of closure
	_____	_____	6. Paragraphs have clear topic sentences, and each sentence in the paragraph clearly contributes to the main idea of the paragraph.
_____	_____	_____	7. Paragraphs are well developed.
_____	_____	_____	8. Writing is coherent; transitional devices are used effectively for good flow.
_____	_____	_____	9. Main ideas are organized in a logical manner.
_____	_____	_____	10.Writing contains interesting, provocative ideas.
_____	_____	_____	11.Writing has satisfied focus requirements.

Your editing skills are weak in the following areas: (You may need extra help to address these problems in your writing.)

_____   Sentence clarity (incorrect structure, omitted words, etc.)
_____   Appropriate word choice
_____   Word confusion
_____   Preposition confusion
_____   Sentence fragments
_____   Run-on sentences, comma splices
_____   Pronoun agreement, reference
_____   Verb tense
_____   Verb agreement
_____   Commas
_____   Apostrophes
_____   Capitalization, abbreviations, numbers, underlines
_____   Spelling
_____   Other

What are implications for overall unit improvement initiatives to the endorsement program?

Several programmatic changes in the Unit have had an impact on the endorsement program.

- These include use of the statewide Clinical Practice evaluation format, updated CSM Student Outcomes, the Case Study project requirement and changes in Praxis II requirements.

- The use of the statewide NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation had impact upon this endorsement program. The evaluation is built on InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards. The CSM Student Outcomes have been aligned with the InTASC standards.

- The Case Study project was developed to provide an authentic assessment tool in addition to the clinical evaluation. This additional tool provides opportunity to use multiple measures of student performance in assessing, planning, implementing and evaluating students. Students complete the case study during Clinical Practice.

- The standard lesson plan template used by the program for many years was revised to two formats: a Lesson Plan with Analysis and Lesson Plan with Reflection. It was developed in fall 2013 to be used across methods courses program-wide when students are able to plan, implement and evaluate lessons in field experience settings. There have been limited opportunities for students to conduct lessons that allow for collection of data and detailed analyses. This has resulted from restricted opportunities for students to take leading roles in classroom instruction due to reluctance of classroom teachers to relinquish responsibility to students, because of the pressures of testing. The unit plans to solicit partnerships with specific schools and classrooms to allow students to complete at least one detailed Lesson Plan with Analysis as part of their preparation.

- The requirement that all teacher education students must pass the Praxis II content exam for certification has had an impact on the Teacher Education program. Teacher Preparation faculty have collaborated with content area faculty to ensure that course content is consistent with the content of the exam.

- Teacher Preparation Faculty keep directors of secondary content areas informed of changes in endorsement requirements. Decisions will be made in collaboration between the content area program director and Teacher Preparation Faculty. Shared advising of students by content program faculty and Teacher Preparation Faculty ensures that students complete all requirements for both programs.

- There has been continual work on dispositional reflection by all individual Teacher Education candidates as well as faculty input on dispositions from across the coursework prior to clinical practice.

- Short and long form field experience evaluations have been adopted. The long form evaluation reflects standards used in the NDE Clinical Practice evaluation and also addresses professional characteristics/dispositions.

- The Clinical Practice application was updated and now includes disposition reflection and assessment of strengths and weakness in dispositional areas.