Millikin University
College of Arts & Sciences
English Education Major Assessment Report
Dr. Karly Grice, Assistant Professor of English
Dr. Michael O'Conner, Associate Professor of English
July 1, 2018

Executive Summary

The learning goals for English Education students are that all students earning this degree will:

1. have an advanced understanding of a variety of literary genres, including an understanding of literatures' historical, intellectual, and diverse cultural contexts.
2. apply a variety of writing theories, including classical and contemporary rhetoric, to the teaching of writing.
3. be familiar with best practices in the methods of teaching the English language arts and formulate their own teaching methodologies.

To measure individual student learning with respect to these goals, the department will assess students in the program annually, using feedback from assessments at each level to guide programmatic improvement. Assessment methods will involve detailed scaled rubric sheets utilized to evaluate each of the chosen artifacts that measure each learning goal.

For the 2017-2018 academic year, the department has rated student learning in each of these areas as located somewhere between red, yellow and green. We examine accumulated data for trends that assist us in deciding on necessary programmatic changes, as needed.

Programmatic assessment methods include cumulative GPA scores in the major courses for each student, along with a test score in the content area developed by the Illinois Certification Testing System and given to English Education students across the state, for comparison against larger statewide baselines. Other assessments are generated by, scored, and housed in School of Education online portfolios (LiveText).

As data is collected over time and trends become apparent, we close the loop of assessment by refining our curriculum and our departmental teaching methodology in this major to better assist students in achieving success in mastering the designated learning goals and obtaining their degrees.

The English Education major continues to be strengthened through analysis of this assessment data and curricular adjustments discussed and approved by the department, the university, and the State of Illinois.

Goals and Mission of the English Education Major

Millikin University's English education major program continues to be comprehensive and rigorous, preparing future secondary school English language arts educators through utilizing the latest in classroom theory and practice. In addition to a solid background in literary studies, English education majors from Millikin develop advanced abilities in the teaching of writing and the use technology. Our unique EN470: Internship in the Teaching of Writing course prepares our students better than most comparable programs, allowing English education majors to work very closely with a single writing faculty professor and his or her students in a freshman-level writing course. Currently, our program utilizes NCATE NCTE Standards and is fully recognized by national accreditation bodies. Most graduates of this program immediately obtain meaningful positions as high school Language Arts instructors, guiding the next generation of students down the path to critical literacy, enhanced communication skills, and a better understanding of regional, national and global cultures gained through critical reading and writing.

Learning Outcome Goals

All English Education major students will:

1. have an advanced understanding of a variety of literary genres, including an understanding of literatures' historical, intellectual, and diverse cultural contexts.
2. apply a variety of writing theories, including classical and contemporary rhetoric, to the teaching of writing.
3. be familiar with best practices in the methods of teaching the English language arts and formulate their own teaching methodologies.

Snapshot

The English Education program is strongly tied to all English major programs by our central core of shared literature and writing course requirements. English Education students must be proficient in literary and cultural studies, writing and language studies, and educational methods for transferring these specific areas of knowledge and skill sets to others.

Faculty

English education students gain experience in completing their degree programs from a diverse English faculty at Millikin, each with unique teaching styles. Beyond literature and writing, learning about the varied methodologies and practices of teaching the language arts is what makes this major distinct from our other English degree programs.

Millikin's full-time English faculty for the 2017-18 academic year numbered eleven individuals (see Table 1). Seven are tenured faculty. Of the tenured professors, two are full professors, and five are associate professors. One professor is on tenure track, currently assistant rank, and one is just finishing her degree and will become tenure track upon completion. One adjunct professor is currently a professional secondary language arts teacher at a nearby school district.

Table 1: English Department Full Time Faculty, 2017-18				
Faculty	**Credentials**	**Rank**	**Tenure status**	**MU Service**
Bates, Julie	PhD, Illinois State U	Assist Prof	Tenure Track	2
Braniger, Carmella	PhD, Oklahoma State U.	Assoc Prof	Tenured	15
Brooks, Randy	PhD, Purdue U.	Professor	Tenured	27
Crowe, Judi	MA, Illinois State U.	Assist Prof	Contract	20
Frech, Stephen	PhD, U. of Cincinnati	Professor	Tenured	15
George, Michael	PhD, Michigan State U.	Assoc Prof	Tenured	17
Grice, Karly	PhD, Ohio State U.	Assist Prof	Tenure Track	1
Lambert, Scott	PhD, Southern Ill Uni Carb.	Assist Prof	Tenure Track	7
Magagna, Tony	PhD, Univ of Calif, Davis	Assoc Prof	Tenured	9
Matthews, Anne	PhD, Indiana U.	Assoc Prof	Tenured	15
O'Conner, Michael	PhD, U. of Missouri-Columbia	Assoc Prof	Tenured	22
Gilpin, Vicki	PhD, University of Phoenix	Adjunct	Adjunct	8

Teaching Environments

Millikin English majors have access to a wide array of on campus teaching environments. Many of our courses are taught in typical classrooms in Shilling Hall, where the department is housed. However, a rising number of our classes are being taught in technology-rich rooms and computer labs in locations like Staley Library (University Commons) and the ADM/Scovill Building. Also, for over fifteen years we have had access to the MAC Lab, a teaching space with seminar-style seating, a full multimedia teaching station, and computers for every student in the class, loaded with a full array of software. This space is available to our students, through card-swipe access, on a 24-hour basis. Our English Education students also spend a substantial amount of time in local area school environments, through practicums and internships.

Cohort History and Class Size

The number of students in the English Education degree program has fluctuated over the last ten years (see Table 2). In the last four years, especially, numbers in this degree program have dropped. Indications are that the incoming class of 2022 may reverse this trend.

Table 2: Total Counts of Majors, Fall 2006 to Fall 2017

	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
English Writing	47	32	31	26	25	25	29	28	26	19	18	19
English Education	**25**	**26**	**15**	**18**	**25**	**26**	**27**	**15**	**11**	**12**	**10**	**10**
English Literature	12	10	8	6	8	4	5	4*	8*	8*	10*	2
Total Majors	84	68	54	50	58	55	61	57	45	39	38	31

* English literature major count does not include majors who are also double-majoring in writing.

Class sizes for English Education students have been conducive to excellent faculty-student interaction. Writing classes in the department are capped at either 15 or 20 students. Our literature courses are capped at 25 with a few sections being taught with a larger enrollment of about 30 students. Courses specific to English Education majors are usually quite small. The sophomore level methods class, EN235, is capped at 20, though often enrolls half that number. Senior level methods courses, like EN425 and EN470 generally only have three to six students during any given year.

The Learning Story

The English Education program is developmental and consist of three major prongs, with a heavy emphasis on the combination of theory and practice. We strongly believe in a sense of "performance learning." Majors in this program take a full range of area content courses. These content course cover the core of literary studies and a range of courses in writing theory and practice, with a technology-writing component. Also, these students take major-specific methods courses within the department, along with additional literature requirements targeted toward future teaching content. Finally, each English Education major takes the full range of education courses required of secondary pre-professionals. In addition to this tripartite preparation, each Millikin student takes general education requirements that are both university-wide and assigned for students earning a BA in the College of Arts & Sciences. This approach lends itself to a well-rounded liberal education, preparing students to be adaptable lifetime critical thinkers and learners in a global environment. See the attached "Appendix: Advising Sheet for English Education Majors," for an overview of complete course requirements for this major.

English Ed majors, along with all Millikin students, are introduced to academic writing in the Critical Writing, Reading and Research sequence during their freshman year. During the sophomore and junior years, our majors obtain their core literature and writing content courses in our department and through the education sequence courses outside the department. They also take courses in the Communication Department, enhancing their knowledge and skills of speaking and orality content and instruction. In the sophomore or junior years, majors take EN425, a course in teaching the methods of language arts instruction. During the senior year, English Ed students take their capstone course in the major, EN470, Internship in the Teaching of Writing and they complete their educational experience with student teaching, typically in the spring semester of their senior year. English Education students then complete a second capstone course, ED488, which incorporates a near-professional performance component into the degree program.

Advising is accomplished through regular meetings and communications with academic advisors and the use of carefully crafted rubrics that clearly indicate when English Education students should be taking each of their required courses and continuing to the next steps of their education programs. Students are required to keep updated electronic versions of these advising sheets and bring them to advising appointments.

Students gain a sense of their learning community in the major by taking numerous courses together, almost as a cohort, in both their education courses and their English Education courses, especially in EN425 and EN470.

Assessment Methods

The English Education program has a long-established record of assessment related to State of Illinois requirements for tracking education student candidates in their performance and learning goals. The School of Education has been a strong partner is leading these assessment practices.

In 2013, Millikin revised and piloted a new system of assessments in the School of Education, entitled Embedded Signature Assessments. In Table 3, see a chart of these assessments, correlated to the course or courses they are assessed within in the School of Education.

Table 3: Education Department Embedded Signature Assessments Correlated to Course

EMBEDDED SIGNATURE ASSESSMENTS TO COURSE CORRELATION	
TITLE	**Course(s)**
ESA: Context of Learning	ED120 Introduction to Education (Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Secondary, Art and Physical Education
	ME251 Introduction to Music Education
ESA: Child Case Study	ED200 Human Development (Elementary Education)
	ED201 Human Development (Secondary Education and K-12 Specialists)
	ED232 Human Development (Early Childhood)
ESA: Functional Behavioral Analysis/Behavioral Intervention Plan	ED216 Instructional Strategies for Individuals with Learning Disabilities in K-12 Classroom (All students)
ESA: Classroom Management & Guidance Plan	ED310 Creating Communities of Learners (All students)
ESA: Philosophy of Teaching & Learning	ED310 Creating Communities of Learners (All students)
ESA: Cycle of Effective Teaching	ED312 Math Methods (Elementary Education)
	ED321 General Secondary Methods and Assessment (Secondary, Art, and Physical Education)
	ED332 Language Arts and Social Studies Methods (Early Childhood)
	ME341 Principles and Methods of Elementary Music Education (Music Education)

ESA: Comprehensive Literacy Plan	ED424 Teaching Literacy in the Content Area (Secondary Education and K-12 Specialists
	ED305 Literacy III: Teaching Methods in Reading (Elementary Education)
	ED435 Reading Methods in Early Childhood (Early Childhood)
ESA: The Teaching Portfolio	ED406 Multidisciplinary Instructional Design & Assessment (Elementary Education and Early Childhood)
	ED420 Instructional Analysis, Design & Assessment (Secondary Education and K-12 Specialists)
ESA: Entering the Profession	ED488 Education Senior Seminar (Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, Art, and Physical Education)
	ME 481 Instrumental and Vocal Education Senior Seminar (Music Education students)
All of the above Embedded Signature Assessments must be completed, submitted, and assessed in Live Text (an online portfolio/assessment tool) in order to become licensed in the State of Illinois.	

Recent Implementation of EdTPA Assessment

Millikin has been implementing the EdTPA or Education Teacher Performance Assessment system in the last four years. This section reports on that implementation.

The Education Department's Assessment Coordinator has worked for two years on development of formative assessments that scaffold the components and language of the EdTPA into our own assessment system. These new embedded signature assessments (ESAs) were presented to program faculty during assessment retreat and the faculty adjusted and revise these to fit into our English secondary education program model with an emphasis on performance learning and clinical practices.

These assessments were aligned to the English education and NCTE national standards as well as the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. The assessments have been implemented and assessed during the fall 2013, spring 2014, fall 2014, and spring 2015 semesters. Teacher candidates have received feedback for these embedded signature assessments and will use this feedback and guidance as they independently complete their own EdTPA. The implementation of the EdTPA in our unit has helped faculty encourage candidates to become innovators and to enhance student learning.

We have learned that buy-in from faculty supervisors and teacher candidates is extremely important with forward progress and development of assessment academic language and instruction of the EdTPA assessment process. We have participated in retreats, workshops and webinars regarding the EdTPA implementation and the EdTPA is a monthly topic at our department and committee meetings. This work has proven to us that we are producing a new generation of teachers and a new generation of educational leaders.

In addition to the Embedded Signature Assessment in the School of Education, students who are English Education majors take a range of Embedded Signature Assessments within the English Ed program itself, some of which overlap with the School of Education assessments listed above.

Table 4: English Ed Embedded Signature Assessments, Associated Courses and Standards

English Education ESA	Associated Course	NCTE/NCATE Standards for Preparation of Teachers
ESA 1: State Licensure Exams, State of Illinois Secondary Language Arts Content Area Test Scores	n/a	1-7
ESA 2: Major GPA	All major courses	1-7
ESA 3: Comprehensive Unit Plan	En425	1-4, 6-7
ESA 4: Student Teaching Evaluations	Ed477/478	1-7
ESA 5: The Teaching Portfolio, leading to the edTPA	Ed420	1-7
ESA 6: Literary Genre Analysis	En231 or En232	1
ESA 7: Comprehensive Plan for Literacy	En302	1-5, 7

Each of these major assessments are represented by an artifact and/or assessment score placed in the student's electronic portfolio, each of which are evaluated by an English Department faculty member or an Education faculty member with a scaled rubric assessment tool.

<u>English Education Learning Goals</u>

Finally, related to the assessments above, the English Department has established clear overarching learning goals for its English Education majors. Each goal is assessed through a corresponding artifact placed in a student's portfolio.

English Education Learning Goals (EELG):

- EELG1: students will have an advanced understanding of a variety of literary genres, including an understanding of literatures' historical, intellectual, and diverse cultural contexts.
- EELG2: students will apply a variety of writing theories, including classical and contemporary rhetoric, to the teaching of writing.
- EELG3: students will be familiar with best practices in the methods of teaching the English language arts and formulate their own teaching methodologies.

The previously collected artifacts for assessing each of these goals are listed below.

English Education Performance Goals: Student Performance Assessment Methods

EELG1 is assessed through ESA1, ESA2, and ESA6
EELG2 is assessed through ESA1, ESA2, ESA5, and the Culminating Journal for Teaching Writing Internship Rubric
EELG3 is assessed through ESA3, ESA4, ESA5, and ESA7

Content knowledge

English education teacher candidates take at least 27 credit hours of English core courses. The core courses are chosen to ensure candidates are exposed to a common core of historical and cultural literary traditions, advanced writing, and essential publishing technologies. Candidates are also required to take five English courses beyond the core focusing specifically in the areas of English language arts and English education. They take two communication courses to enhance skills in teaching oral communication, especially listening and speaking. See the Advising Checklist for English Education Majors appended below for details.

Pedagogical skills and knowledge

All secondary English teacher candidates are required to complete EN 425 advanced methods of teaching language arts and EN 470 teaching writing internship. In both courses teacher candidates work on instructional planning and are assessed on their work. The teacher candidates are monitored closely throughout the semester for overall progress and growth. Prior to each new offering of EN 470 and EN 425, data collected from the instructional planning assessments are reviewed to determine if any assessment revisions are needed or if instructional strategies for the courses may be revised to better develop teacher candidates' instructional skills and abilities.

In EN 425 advanced methods of teaching English the course focuses on pedagogical practices for teaching language arts within the common core state standards with the inclusion of appropriate technologies and 21st-century literacies. The course includes authentic teaching experiences. In this methods course the teacher candidates learn how to research and design relevant and meaningful comprehensive unit plans. They are provided authentic teaching experiences and structured feedback from peers the instructor. This course, in conjunction with EN470, gives the teacher candidates an opportunity to exercise their pedagogical techniques and classroom management skills as well as affords them the opportunity to revisit pedagogical and classroom management decisions and consider alternate choices for the future. Exercising these skills under the supervision of the methods professor allows for reflective discussion and growth.

In EN 470 Teaching Writing Internship candidates serve as teaching assistants to one of the full time English faculty in a freshman writing course. The student is required to attend the professor's writing class meetings, hold regular office hours, teach and co-teach multiple lessons, and perform other requirements as laid out by the faculty member. The student also meets weekly outside the first-year writing course with the EN470 instructor for seminar-style discussion and reflect. The purpose of the internship is for the student to become more familiar with applied rhetorical pedagogy, course management, assessment, classroom presentation, and

to grow as a tutor and teacher. Students record and reflect, via a comprehensive journal, how classical and contemporary rhetorical theory becomes integrated into classroom instruction.

One of the School of Education embedded signature assessments is the effective teaching cycle that is completed in ED321 General Secondary Methods and Assessment. As part of the assessment the teacher candidates plan instruction instructor lesson study the video of their teaching determine what students have learned diagnose student learning needs through their analysis of student work samples give feedback to students and identify the next steps in instruction for the individual student as well as the entire class.

Another embedded signature assessment is the teaching portfolio. This final ESA is administered and assessed in the final internship prior to student teaching and in the ED420 course. The teaching portfolio assesses the candidate's ability to study the context of learning within their clinical placement plan for instruction instructor series of learning experiences study their own instructional delivery through analysis of the video of their teaching and assess student learning.

Individual Student Progress within the Degree Program

At the end of each academic semester, teacher candidate's grades are reviewed for adequate progress by academic advisors. Grades of C or higher are required for IN150/IN151 and for all major courses in the English Education major. Students must carry a cumulative GPA of 2.7 or higher to enter and remain within the School of Ed Teacher Education program.

Throughout the academic year, advisors are alerted to other issues via Millikin's electronic academic alerts system and through the School of Education's Candidate Disposition Assessment Forms.

There is a detailed list of "Checkpoints" for candidates to follow in their School of Education Handbook. Academic Advisors assist candidates in knowing and following these checkpoints.

Annual Program Review

To ensure programmatic integrity within the department, at the beginning of each academic year the members of the English education subcommittee participate in a data analysis and review event. This report, the English Education Major Assessment Report, is completed on July 1 and distributed to the chair, the dean, and the English Education Major subcommittee. Teacher candidate embedded signature assessment results are reviewed and clinical internship evaluations are discussed. Potential changes in course requirements, assignment descriptions, and rubrics or internship evaluation forms are considered. If programmatic changes seem necessary, they are more formally discussed at the opening yearly departmental retreat by the departmental English Education Committee and later brought forward to the entire English Department for discussion during a monthly meeting. Curricular changes to the major proceed up the ladder through the English department, the Humanities Division, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Council on Curriculum. Changes often take place in consultation with the School of Education, as reported through the English Department's representative on the CTEP Committee.

Additionally, in August an annual DART event takes place in the School of Education CTEP Committee to review the program changes for the upcoming academic year and to implement the changes within all sections of the courses in that program.

Assessment Data and Reporting Methodologies

Curricular assessment is taken seriously at Millikin. For uniformity, each effectiveness measure receives a performance indicator using the following color-coded rubric:

- Green: an acceptable level or clearly heading in the right direction and not requiring any immediate change in course of action. Continuing support should be provided.
- Yellow: not an acceptable level; either improving, but not as quickly as desired or declining slightly. Strategies and approaches should be reviewed and appropriate adjustments taken to reach an acceptable level or desired rate of improvement.
- Red: current status or direction of change is unacceptable. Immediate, high priority actions should be taken to address this area.
- Blank: insufficient information available (or governance decision pending)

Each year, as data is collected and trends become apparent, we close the loop of assessment by refining the curriculum and teaching methodology in the major to assist students in achieving success in mastering our designated program learning goals.

Annual assessment reports for the English education major and future "trend" reports will continue to be shared with the entire English Department, and the University at large, on a yearly basis. An English Education major subcommittee will examine these reports in order to bring recommendations to the entire department if trends indicate that changes are required for program improvement.

Assessment Data, 2017-2018

Three English Education students graduated during the 2017-2018 school year and all have been assessed below to obtain this year's data points.

	ESA1	ESA2	ESA3	ESA4	ESA5	ESA6	ESA7	EELG2
Student1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Student2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Student3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Analysis of Assessment Results

The major English education degree program indicators for our three graduating students had no "red" category scores and only one yellow rating. All other scores were in the green (3) category, demonstrating good ongoing results in programmatic achievement of our learning goals.

ESA 1: State Licensure Exams, Illinois Secondary Language Arts Content Area Test Scores
This assessment indicates how our candidates perform on a state-wide, externally generated and scored examination. It is created and measured by the Illinois Licensure Testing System. A passaging score (240 or over) is required for teaching certification in the state. Each exam is composed of 125 multiple choice questions, with scores reported on a scale from 100 to 300. Each Language Arts Content Exam report carries an overall score and also produces four sub-scores in the areas of: Reading, Writing and Research, Speaking and Listening, and Literature.

Though 240 is a passing score for state teaching certification, the English Department sets a much higher standard by rating scores of 240 to 260 as yellow and 261 to 300 as green.

While ESA1 only examines the overall cumulative score on this exam, the English Education major subcommittee does study and reflect on sub-scores (Reading, Writing and Research, Speaking and Listening, and Literature) and their trends annually for information these scores may offer.

This year all of our three candidates scored in the green category and did well on this exam.

ESA 2: Major GPA
This overall assessment is not tied to any specific learning goals. In general, it qualitatively assesses how each candidate fared in learning content and demonstrating skills sets in the areas of literature, writing/theory, communication (listening and speaking), and pedagogy through their major coursework.

The School of Education sets am acceptable cumulative GPA threshold at 2.7 or higher to remain in the program. For this assessment, the English Department has categorized a major course GPA score between 2.7 and 2.9 as yellow, and a major course GPA of 3.0 and higher as green.

This year each of the candidates assessed earned well higher than a 3.0 grade point average, placing them in the green category.

ESA 3: Comprehensive Unit Plan
Currently, our English education majors obtain experience creating detailed, comprehensive unit plans in two classes, EN235 Methods and EN425 Advanced Methods. For this assessment, we score the unit plans created from the senior-level EN425 course within the department using the English Language Arts Unit Plan Rubric (see appendix).

This year each of the candidates assessed earned high scores on their unit plans, placing them in the green category.

ESA 4: Student Teaching Evaluations

This measure comes from the Entering the Profession Assessment Rubric (see appendix), directly related to the edTPA documents created for and during the student teaching experience.

This year each of the candidates assessed earned high scores on their Entering the Profession Rubric, placing them in the green category.

[Note: the major sub-committee compares these scores with grades assigned in courses, ED477, Supervised Student Teaching, and ED488, Senior Seminar, the College of Education capstone course.]

ESA 5: The Teaching Portfolio, leading to the edTPA
This measure comes from the Teaching Portfolio Rubric (see appendix),

This year each of the candidates assessed earned high scores on their Teaching Portfolio Rubric, placing them in the green category.

ESA 6: Literary Genre Analysis
The department uses this assessment as a snapshot of a candidate's developing knowledge and skill set in understanding and analyzing literature's historical, intellectual, and cultural contexts. The artifact is produced in one of our American Literature survey courses, EN231 or EN232, and scored within the department with the Genre Essay Literature Assignment Rubric (see appendix).

This year each of the candidates assessed earned high scores on their Literary Genre Analysis, placing them in the green category.

[Note: the major sub-committee compares these scores with grades earned in core literature courses and with the score in the state's Language Arts Content Exam "literature" category.]

ESA 7: Comprehensive Plan for Literacy
This assessment is scored from an artifact created and scored in the En302 course, Teaching Literacy in the Content Areas. The artifact is the Comprehensive Plan for Literacy and scored with the Comprehensive Plan for Literacy Rubric (see appendix).

This year each of the candidates assessed earned high scores on their literacy plans, placing them in the green category.

[Note: the major sub-committee compares these scores with grades earned in core literature courses and with the score in the state's Language Arts Content Exam "reading" category.]

EELG2: English Education Learning Goal 2
A final assessment measure we take centers on an artifact created in the EN470 course, Internship in the Teaching of Writing. Students keep a detailed comprehensive journal on their teaching writing experience, recording teaching methods observed and attempted, along with reflecting on a foundational rhetorical theory related to those experiences. The journal is scored with the Culminating Journal for Teaching Writing Internship Rubric.

This year each of the candidates assessed earned high scores on their Comprehensive Journal, placing them in the green category.

Program Changes/Upcoming Program Challenges

Program Changes

In consultation with the English Education major subcommittee, the department continues to make changes in this major to address ongoing challenges.

This last academic year we voted to eliminate our early methods course, EN235 and melded its content into our EN425, advanced methods of teaching English. We also renamed the course to reflect its content reaching down to those also seeking a Middle School endorsement in this field.

Ongoing Concerns and Potential Programmatic Changes

The English Education major requires a substantial number of credits to complete this degree program, and the department should continue to consider ways of streamlining the major.

As mentioned above, we have recently combined EN235 and EN425 into a single course, bringing us more into alignment with similar programs across the university and the state. However, more changes would be helpful.

Complicating the timely completion of this degree program are more and more students who arrive at Millikin less academically prepared than their predecessors. In the past, students often arrived with both more advance modern language skills and better quantitative reasoning skills. However, more recently a higher percentage of our majors are having to take the full sequence of modern language courses (11 credits as opposed to 7 or 3 credits, if they had been placed in a higher-level language class). They are also more often having to enroll in multiple math courses in order to achieve their quantitative reasoning requirement, sometime adding as many as 9 more credits into their degree program.

Additionally, we've seen more transfer students come into our program, who must not only deal with the challenges of modern languages and mathematics but must also often pick up a number of sophomore level education courses and MPSL general education requirements like IN250 and IN251.

One consideration may be to re-examine the two Communication courses required for this program in light of changing state and NCTE requirements. As both sets of language arts learning goals have evolved over the last decade, the emphasis on speaking and listening skills has either diminished or been refocused. We have also added significant content on speaking and listening in our own, and in the Education Department's, methods courses in recent years. We could also re-evaluate our need for requiring En470, the Internship in Teaching Writing. No other English education program in the state has such a requirement. It could be made an optional and recommended course for those who have room in their schedules to take it.

Conclusions

The English Education major remains strong in preparing candidates to teach the language arts. We continue to produce excellent professional who go on to rewarding careers in education. We will continue to seek solutions to allow our majors to obtain their degrees in a timely manner.

Rubrics Used to Compile this Year's Assessment Report

English ESA One – Major Embedded Signature Assessment One Rubric
Score on Illinois State Content Area Exam
English Education, Millikin University

Red - 1 points	Yellow - 2 points	Green - 3 points	Score Earned
Score on the content area exam for secondary English Language Arts is unacceptable and below passing. Cumulative Score 100 -239.	Score on the content area exam for secondary English Language Arts is passing Cumulative Score 240-260.	Score on the content area exam for secondary English Language Arts is passing and acceptable for future educator. Cumulative score 261 – 300.	

English ESA Two – Major Embedded Signature Assessment –Rubric
Cumulative Grade Point Average for all Major Courses
English Education, Millikin University

Red - 1 points	Yellow - 2 points	Green - 3 points	Score Earned
Major GPA is between 0.00 and 2.6 GPA for secondary English Language Arts professional is unacceptable, indicative of lack of success in content-area coursework.	Major GPA is between 2.7 and 2.9 GPA for secondary English Language Arts professional is just acceptable, indicative of some success in content-area coursework.	Major GPA is between 3.0 and 4.0 GPA for secondary English Language Arts professional is acceptable, and indicative of clear success in content-area coursework.	

English ESA SIX – Major Embedded Signature Assessment – Genre Literature Essay Assignment Rubric

English Education, Millikin University

Student: x

Assignment: x

Class, Semester, Professor: x

	RED (0 or 1 point)	YELLOW (2 points)	GREEN (3 points)	Score
A: Selection of the Genre Aspects and their Treatment	0-1 Little attempt to define the genre aspects chosen; the treatment of ideas is generally inappropriate to the assignment; the genre aspects chosen are generally not appropriate to the assignment; the genre aspects chosen have little focus; the treatment of ideas is generally not relevant to the genre aspects chosen or the assignment consists mainly of paraphrase or summary.	2 The genre aspects are defined and followed by a generally appropriate treatment of ideas; the genre aspects chosen are appropriate to the assignment; the genre aspects chosen have a specific and generally relevant focus; the treatment of ideas is relevant to the genre aspects chosen, and includes a personal response to the work(s).	3 Clearly defined genre aspects followed by a highly appropriate treatment of ideas; the genre aspects chosen are highly appropriate to the assignment; the genre aspects chosen have a specific and relevant focus	
B: Knowledge and Understanding of Work or Works, Diversity/Cultural Aspects	0-1 Little understanding of the work(s) studied; knowledge but little understanding of the aspects of the work(s) most relevant to the assignment; a few links between works, where appropriate; little appreciation of the diverse/cultural aspects relevant to the assignment, where appropriate.	2 Adequate understanding of the work(s) studied; knowledge and satisfactory understanding of the aspects of the work(s) most relevant to the assignment; meaningful linking of works, where appropriate; appreciation of the diverse/cultural aspects relevant to the assignment, where appropriate.	3 Excellent understanding of the work(s) studied; in-depth knowledge of, and very good insight into, the aspects of the work(s) most relevant to the assignment; meaningful and perceptive linking of works, where appropriate; excellent appreciation of the diverse/cultural aspects relevant to the assignment, where appropriate.	
C. Structure and Development of Essay	0-1 The formal structure and/or development of ideas are generally not effective; little evidence of a structure to the assignment selected; a few references to the work(s), but they are generally not pertinent to the assignment; where appropriate, the statement of intent provides few details about the aims of the assignment.	2 The formal structure and/or development of ideas are effective; adequate structure to the assignment; references are generally to the point; where appropriate, the presentation of aims in the statement of intent is generally clear and includes some details; the writer has remained within the prescribed word-limit.	3 The formal structure and/or development of ideas are highly effective; purposeful and effective structure to the assignment; precise and highly pertinent references to the work(s); where appropriate, the statement of intent is clear, detailed and highly relevant; the candidate has remained within the prescribed word-limit.	
D. Language	0-1 Little use of appropriate language; generally inappropriate audience recognition for language choices made; frequent lapses in the conventions of college-level writing.	2 Adequate use of appropriate language; appropriate audience recognition for language choices made; the conventions of college-level writing are generally followed; consistency and some clarity of expression.	3 Excellent use of appropriate language; the audience recognition choices in language effective and appropriate; careful attention is given to the conventions of college-level writing; clarity, consistency and fluency of style.	
Total Score (0 to 12)				Total:

Indicator for this individual:

RED, 0 to 3 pts YELLOW, 4 to 8 pts GREEN, 9 to 12 pts.

English Education Learning Goal Two/– Departmental Major Assessment Rubric
Culminating Journal for Teaching Writing Internship Rubric
English Education, Millikin University

Element	Red - 1 points	Yellow - 2 points	Green - 3 points	Score Earned
Interactions with Cooperating Professor and Record/Analysis of Methods	Journal shows few instances of interaction with professor, with little evidence of analysis of professor's methods utilized in the course.	Journal shows some instances of interaction with professor, with some evidence of analysis of professor's methods utilized in the course.	Journal entries show clear record of interpersonal interaction with professor, providing evidence of a record and an analysis of the professor's chosen teaching methods utilized for the course.	
Writing Theory and Practice Observations	Journal entries show little or no indication of knowledge and understanding of classical/contemporary writing theory and little or no reflection of how theory works in actual practice.	Journal entries show some indication of knowledge and understanding of classical/contemporary writing theory and some reflection of how theory works in actual practice.	Journal entries show clear indication of knowledge and understanding of classical/contemporary writing theory and clear reflection of how theory works in actual practice.	
Practices and Methods of Diverse Set of Professors/Teachers	Journal entries show little to no evidence of recording diverse "best practices" from a few writing professors/teachers.	Journal entries show some evidence of recording diverse "best practices" from a range of writing professors/teachers.	Journal entries show clear evidence of recording diverse "best practices" from a wide range of writing professors/teachers.	
Reflection	Journal entries show little to no indication of reflection on the methods and practices recorded and discussed.	Journal entries show some indication of reflection on the methods and practices recorded and discussed.	Journal entries show a clear indication of extensive reflection on the methods and practices recorded and discussed.	
Development	Journal lacks enough development to discuss most of the elements above (generally below 10,000 words).	Journal is developed enough to display some engagement with all elements above (generally 10,000 – 14,000 words).	Journal is clearly developed so as to display a full semester of engagement with all elements above (generally above 14,000 words).	
Total Score (0 – 15)				

RED 0-5 Pts, YELLOW 6-10 Pts, GREEN 11-15 Pts

English ESA THREE – Major Embedded Signature Assessment
-English Language Arts Unit Plan Assessment Rubric

Criteria	Level 1 (0-1 pt)	Level 2 (2 pts)	Level 3 (3 points)	Score
Unit at a Glance (unit objectives – focus and learning goals, unit framework – logical sequence, objectives, materials, structuring, orchestrated activities, assessment strategies, resources)	Unit objectives are stated with no reference to overall focus and/or learning goals. Sequencing of lessons in unit framework does not appear to follow a logical order. Few or poor materials choices. Little structure or orchestration. Assessment strategies are inappropriate for the lessons and/or grade level. No reference is made to resources.	Unit objectives are stated with reference to essential questions and/or learning goals. Unit framework follows a logical sequence of lessons. Most elements of unit present and labeled. Assessment strategies are appropriate for the lessons and grade level. Some references are made to resources for students and teachers but are not very relevant.	Unit objectives are clearly stated, linked to essential questions and/or learning goals and demonstrates an understanding of the developmental stage of the students. Unit framework follows a logical and coherent sequence of lessons that scaffolds students' understanding of the concepts taught. Clear unit divisions: introduction, objectives, materials, structure, and orchestrated activities. A variety of assessment and evaluation strategies are included that are appropriate for the lessons and grade level. All resources and references are relevant, included in the plan and/or cited.	
Lesson Plans (statement of objectives/expectations, content demonstrates professional and pedagogical knowledge, clear and logical chronology, effective and purposeful use of strategies/methodologies, evidence of lessons' focus, resources)	Lessons not linked to specific objectives or expectations. Little professional or pedagogical knowledge is evident. Lesson chronology is unclear, timing and pacing are inefficient. Most lessons based on a single teaching strategy. Lesson focus is unclear.	Lessons linked to specific objectives or expectations. Professional and pedagogical knowledge is evident. Lesson chronology is apparent, timing and pacing are efficient. A variety of teaching strategies is evident and the lesson focus is clear.	Lessons are strongly linked to specific objectives and expectations. Professional and pedagogical knowledge is unmistakably present. Lessons follow a logical chronology, are well-planned and creative. Timing and pacing are excellent and allow for differences in students' abilities. A wide variety of teaching strategies is evident and demonstrates an excellent use of resources. The lesson has more than one focus which is clear and well-suited for the lesson.	
Assessment/Evaluation (reflects the goals of the unit, evidence of diagnostic, formative, and summative strategies, measures performance in focus areas)	Assessment strategies do not reflect the goals of the unit plan. There is no evidence of formal or informal strategies throughout the lessons. All assessment strategies address only one focus area.	Assessment strategies reflect some of the goals for the unit plan. There is little evidence of formal and/or informal assessment strategies throughout the lessons. Assessment strategies address two different focus areas.	A variety of assessment strategies are employed that reflect the goals of the unit plan. There is a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies throughout the five lessons. A variety of assessment strategies address two or more of the different focus areas.	
Overall (organization, grammar, neat and easy to follow, timing and pacing, use of most of the different language arts activities)	The assignment is not well organized and is difficult to follow. Numerous grammatical errors are present in the writing. Few different language arts activities used. Timing and pacing of individual lessons is inappropriate for the students, subject matter or goals of the unit.	The assignment is organized and is somewhat easy to follow. There are few grammatical errors present in the writing. Many language arts utilized. Timing and pacing of lessons is somewhat appropriate for the students, subject matter and for the goals of the unit.	The assignment is very well organized, clearly labeled, and is easy to follow. The unit is neatly presented and is well-written, using correct grammar, is neat and well orchestrated. Unit uses full range of language arts: reading, writing, speaking-drama, vocabulary, grammar-usage, critical thinking. Any materials, ideas or concept adapted or utilized are clearly cited in a references section.	
Total Score (between 0 and 12)				

1-RED, 0 to 4 pts 2-YELLOW, 5-8 pts 3-GREEN, 9-12 pts

English ESA SEVEN – Comprehensive Plan for Literacy Rubric

ESA: Comprehensive Plan for Literacy, Secondary/K-12 programs by School of Education **Assessment**
ESA: Comprehensive Plan for Literacy Rubric
ESA: Comprehensive Plan for Literacy Rubric

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	Changed Major (0.000 pt)	Withdrew (0.000 pt)	Not Proficient (1.000 pt)	Marginal (2.000 pts)	Proficient (3.000 pts)	Commendable (4.000 pts)
Unit Introduction (1.000, 6%)				Provides no commentary about the unit. Missing several key components of the introduction.	Provides little to no commentary about the unit. Missing key components of the introduction.	Provides minimal commentary about the unit. Missing one or more key components of the introduction.	Provides detailed commentary about the unit; includes all required components.
Reading Assessment (1.000, 6%)				Employs one individually administered diagnostic reading assessment. Does not provide a rationale for the assessment, and does not explain how the data from the assessment can inform instruction.	Employs one or two individually administered diagnostic reading assessments to collect data about student skills in one of the following areas: vocabulary, comprehension. Does not provide a strong rationale for the use of the assessment data, and/or does not thoroughly explain how the data from the assessment can inform instruction.	Employs two individually administered diagnostic reading assessments to collect data about student skills in two of the following areas: vocabulary, comprehension. Provides a description of the assessment results, a rationale for the use of the selected assessments, and discussion of how the data from these assessments can inform instruction.	Employs two individually administered diagnostic reading assessments (multiple measures) to collect data about student skills in two of the following areas: vocabulary, comprehension. Includes an additional interest/attitudinal inventory of reading. Uses academic language to provide thick description of the assessment results, a rationale for the use of selected assessments, and thick discussion of how the data from these assessments can inform instruction.
Selection of Text and Text Analysis (1.000, 6%)				Few of the selected texts are high quality or of appropriate complexity and range. Texts do not demonstrate a good balance of informational texts, narrative literature, and/or poetry. Does not provide summaries of texts used and/or does not provide a rationale for selected texts. Text analyses are not done or are unacceptable.	Few of the selected texts are high quality or of appropriate complexity and range. Texts may or may not be a good balance of informational texts, narrative literature, and/or poetry. Provides summaries of texts but the rationale for use of texts is weak. Text analyses are mediocre.	Most selected texts are high quality and appropriate complexity and range with a balance of informational texts, narrative literature, and/or poetry. Provides a summary and rationale of texts used in the unit. Analyzes texts based on complexity, quality, and range.	Selects a set of high quality texts of appropriate complexity and offers a range of texts with a balance of informational texts, narrative literature, and poetry. Provides a summary and rationale of texts used in the unit. Uses academic language to thoroughly analyze texts based on complexity, quality, and range.
All Lesson Plans (1.000, 6%) IL-PTS-2012.6.Q				Lesson plans are missing several of the key components. Does not provide commentary about pre-requisite skills needed or prior knowledge expected, and there is no consideration for ELLs, struggling readers, or the use of higher level thinking. Does not integrate technology into any of the lessons or	Lesson plans include some of the key components or key components are not well structured. Provides basic commentary about pre-requisite skills needed or prior knowledge expected, consideration for ELLs and struggling readers, and use of higher thinking. Integrates technology into one of the	Lesson plans include standards, learning objectives, materials and resources, instructional procedures, formal and/or informal assessment, and differentiation. Provides commentary about pre-requisite skills needed or prior knowledge expected, consideration for ELLs and struggling readers, and use of	Lesson plans include appropriate standards aligned with well-written learning objectives, materials and resources, instructional procedures, formal and/or informal assessment, and differentiation. Uses academic language to provide detailed commentary about pre-requisite skills needed or prior knowledge expected, consideration for ELLs, and use of

	integration is weak.	lessons.	higher level thinking. Integrates technology into at least two of the lessons.	higher level thinking. Integrates technology into at least three of the lessons.
Vocabulary Lesson (1.000, 6%) IL-PTS-2012.6.J	Creates a weak lesson on vocabulary or word consciousness that addresses at least one of the following strategies: dictionary use, contextual analysis, adept diction, word play, word histories, or word origins.	Creates an acceptable lesson on vocabulary or word consciousness that addresses at least one of the following strategies: dictionary use, contextual analysis, adept diction, word play, word histories, or word origins.	Creates a strong lesson on vocabulary or word consciousness that addresses at least one of the following strategies: dictionary use, contextual analysis, adept diction, word play, word histories, or word origins.	Creates a well-developed and detailed lesson on vocabulary or word consciousness that addresses at least one of the following strategies: dictionary use, contextual analysis, adept diction, word play, word histories, or word origins.
Comprehension Lesson: Literary Text (1.000, 6%) IL-PTS-2012.6.K	Creates a weak lesson on comprehension of literary text (or other text type appropriate for content area). Does not guide students through before, during, and after reading processes. Does not utilize strategies such as clarifying, predicting, asking questions, answering questions, connecting, imagining, summarizing, etc. Does not employ scaffolding tools or support close reading of text. Does not provide opportunities for meaning-making through creative or critical reader response techniques.	Creates an acceptable lesson on comprehension of literary text (or other text type appropriate for content area). Inconsistently provides before, during, and after reading processes. Haphazard utilization of comprehension strategies. Unevenly employs scaffolding tools. Unclear support of close reading of text, and provides little to no opportunity for meaning-making through creative or critical reader response techniques.	Creates a strong lesson on comprehension of literary text (or other text type appropriate for content area). Guides students through before, during, and after reading processes. Utilizes strategies such as clarifying, predicting, asking questions, answering questions, connecting, imagining, summarizing, etc. Employs scaffolding tools or support close reading of text, and provide opportunities for meaning-making through creative or critical reader response techniques.	Creates a well-developed and detailed lesson on comprehension of literary text (or other text type appropriate for content area). Guides students through before, during, and after reading processes. Utilizes strategies such as clarifying, predicting, asking questions, answering questions, connecting, imagining, summarizing, etc. Employs scaffolding tools, supports close reading of text, and provides opportunities for meaning-making through creative or critical reader response techniques.
Comprehension Lesson: Informational Text (1.000, 6%) IL-PTS-2012.6.N	Creates a weak lesson on comprehension of informational text. Does not guide students through before, during, and after reading processes. Does not utilize strategies such as clarifying, predicting, asking questions, answering questions, connecting, imagining, summarizing, etc. Does not employ scaffolding tools or support close reading of text. Does not provide opportunities for meaning-making through creative or critical reader response techniques.	Creates an acceptable lesson on comprehension of informational text. Inconsistently provides before, during, and after reading processes. Haphazard utilization of comprehension strategies. Unevenly employs scaffolding tools. Unclear support of close reading of text, and provides little to no opportunity for meaning-making through creative or critical reader response techniques.	Creates a strong lesson on comprehension of informational text. Guides students through before, during, and after reading processes. Utilizes strategies such as clarifying, predicting, asking questions, answering questions, connecting, imagining, summarizing, etc. Employs scaffolding tools or support close reading of text, and provide opportunities for meaning-making through creative or critical reader response techniques.	Creates a well-developed and detailed lesson on comprehension of informational text. Guides students through before, during, and after reading processes. Utilizes strategies such as clarifying, predicting, asking questions, answering questions, connecting, imagining, summarizing, etc. Employs scaffolding tools, supports close reading of text, and provides opportunities for meaning-making through creative or critical reader response techniques.
Writing Lesson (1.000, 6%) IL-PTS-	Creates a weak writing lesson based loosely on evidence-	Creates an acceptable writing lesson based on evidence-based	Creates a strong writing lesson that guides students	Creates a well-developed and detailed writing lesson that distinctly

2012.6.L IL-PTS-2012.6.M IL-PTS-2012.6.O	based and best practices. The connection to the writing process is not evident in the lesson. Genre of writing may vary depending on purpose.	and best practices. The connection to the writing process is somewhat evident in the lesson. Genre of writing may vary depending on purpose.	through the writing process using evidence-based and best practices. Genre of writing may vary depending on purpose.	connects and guides students through the writing process using evidence-based and best practices. Genre of writing may vary depending on purpose.
Alignment of Standards, Lesson Objectives, and Lesson Assessments (1.000, 6%) IL-PTS-2012.6.P	None of the lesson objectives and lesson assessments are aligned to CCSS for ELA or appropriate standards for content area. Only one or two of the following areas of the CCS-ELA is/are addressed: Reading Literature, Reading Informational, Speaking & Listening, Writing and Language Use. Learning objectives for the lessons do not align with lesson assessments.	Few of the lesson objectives and lesson assessments are aligned to CCSS for ELA or appropriate standards for content area. Only three or four of the following areas of the CCS-ELA are addressed: Reading Literature, Reading Informational, Speaking & Listening, Writing and Language Use. Few learning objectives for the lessons align with lesson assessments.	Most of the lesson objectives and lesson assessments are aligned to CCSS for ELA or appropriate standards for content area. All but one of the following areas of the CCS-ELA are addressed: Reading Literature, Reading Informational, Speaking & Listening, Writing and Language Use. Most learning objectives for the lessons align with lesson assessments.	All lesson objectives and lesson assessments are aligned to CCSS for ELA or appropriate standards for content area. Each of the following areas of the CCS-ELA is addressed: Reading Literature, Reading Informational, Speaking & Listening, Writing, and Language Use. All learning objectives for the lessons align with lesson assessments.
Literacy in the Content Areas (1.000, 6%)	Loosely links literacy for the unit to one other content area. Does not describe the content area connection.	Links literacy to only one content area. Vaguely describes the content area connections to the unit.	Links literacy to at least two areas. Describes the content area connections of the unit.	Authentically links literacy to at least two content areas - ELA, science, social studies, math, technology or technical subjects, fine arts, and physical education and/or health. Uses academic language to describe the content area connections of the unit.
Peer Review (1.000, 6%)	Does not complete a peer review or only provides scores for peer review with no comments and no discussion for peer partner.	Partners with a class colleague to complete a peer review of the literacy unit. Scores literacy unit based on rubric, but does not provide comments. Ensures that own literacy unit is peer reviewed as well. Does not engage in discussion with peer partner about scores and comments.	Partners with a class colleague to complete a peer review of the literacy unit. Scores literacy unit based on rubric and writes a few comments to assist peer review partner in interpreting scores. Ensures that own literacy unit is peer reviewed as well. Does not engage in discussion with peer partner about scores and comments.	Partners with a class colleague to complete a peer review of the literacy unit. Scores literacy unit based on rubric and writes several comments to assist peer review partner in interpreting scores. Ensures that own literacy unit is peer reviewed as well. Engages in discussion with peer partner about scores and comments on peer review.
Self-Assessment (1.000, 6%)	Does not complete a self-assessment.	Uses the rubric to assess (score) one's own work on the literacy unit.	Uses the rubric to self-assess (score) one's own work on the literacy unit. Sketches a plan of action for improving literacy unit before the submission date.	Uses the rubric to self-assess (score) one's own work on the literacy unit. Uses academic language to devise a plan of action for improving the literacy unit before the submission.
Reflection (1.000, 6%) IL-PTS-2012.6.R IL-PTS-2012.6.S	Reflects on the ways in which this candidate assessment has impacted his or her growth and	Reflects on the ways in which this candidate assessment has impacted his or her growth and	Reflects on the ways in which this candidate assessment has impacted his or her growth and	Uses academic language to reflect on the ways in which this candidate assessment has impacted his or her growth and

	development as a teacher. Reflects upon the candidate assessment based on only one organizing theme of the conceptual framework for Millikin University's School of Education. Does not align to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards.	development as a teacher. Reflects upon the candidate assessment based on two organizing themes of the conceptual framework for Millikin University's School of Education. Haphazardly aligns to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards.	development as a teacher. Reflects upon the candidate assessment based on three organizing themes of the conceptual framework for Millikin University's School of Education. Aligns to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards.	development as a teacher. Reflects upon the candidate assessment based on all four organizing themes of the conceptual framework for Millikin University's School of Education. Aligns to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. Includes a strong opening and closing statement.
Conventions (1.000, 6%)	Level of writing is unacceptable for college due to multiple mechanical and grammatical errors in all sections of the candidate assessment. There is no evidence that the document has been proofread or taken to the Writing Center.	College level writing is inconsistent as evidence by several errors on all or some sections of the candidate assessment. There is no evidence that the document has been proofread or taken to the Writing Center.	College level writing is evidenced by few errors in standard use of English mechanics, which includes spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar and usage, syntax, sentence structure, paragraphing, etc. Document has been proofread and edited and taken to the Writing Center.	College level writing is evidenced by the standard use of English mechanics, which includes spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar and usage, syntax, sentence structure, paragraphing, etc. Work is virtually error-free. Document has been proofread, edited, and taken to the Writing Center.
Format (1.000, 6%)	Follows few or none of the formatting guidelines.	Follows some of the formatting guidelines.	Follows most formatting guidelines.	Follows all formatting guidelines (see MLA/APA). No sections of the candidate assessment are missing. Includes a cover sheet with the name of the pre-service teacher, the assignment, the semester, and the profession. Use appropriate pagination. Name electronic file with your first initial, last name and CA9 (e.g., MCook_CA9).

Standards

IL-PTS-2012.6.A	K: TCT understands appropriate and varied instructional approaches used before, during, and after reading, including those that develop word knowledge, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and strategy use in the content areas;
IL-PTS-2012.6.B	K: TCT understands that the reading process involves the construction of meaning through the interactions of the reader's background knowledge and experiences, the information in the text, and the purpose of the reading situation;
IL-PTS-2012.6.C	K: TCT understands communication theory, language development, and the role of language in learning;
IL-PTS-2012.6.D	K: TCT understands writing processes and their importance to content learning;
IL-PTS-2012.6.E	K: TCT knows and models standard conventions of written and oral communications;
IL-PTS-2012.6.F	K: TCT recognizes the relationships among reading, writing, and oral communication and understands how to integrate these components to increase content learning;
IL-PTS-2012.6.G	K: TCT understands how to design, select, modify, and evaluate a wide range of materials for the content areas and the reading needs of the student;
IL-PTS-2012.6.H	K: TCT understands how to use a variety of formal and informal assessments to recognize and address the reading, writing, and oral communication needs of each student; and

IL-PTS-2012.6.I	K: TCT knows appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word knowledge, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and strategy use in the content areas.
IL-PTS-2012.6.J	P: TCT selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced readers);
IL-PTS-2012.6.K	P: TCT uses assessment data, student work samples, and observations from continuous monitoring of student progress to plan and evaluate effective content area reading, writing, and oral communication instruction;
IL-PTS-2012.6.L	P: TCT facilitates the use of appropriate word identification and vocabulary strategies to develop each students'understanding of content;
IL-PTS-2012.6.M	P: TCT teaches fluency strategies to facilitate comprehension of content;
IL-PTS-2012.6.N	P: TCT uses modeling, explanation, practice, and feedback to teach students to monitor and apply comprehension strategies independently, appropriate to the content learning;
IL-PTS-2012.6.O	P: TCT teaches students to analyze, evaluate, synthesize, and summarize information in single texts and across multiple texts, including electronic resources;
IL-PTS-2012.6.P	P: TCT teaches students to develop written text appropriate to the content areas that utilizes organization (e.g., compare/contrast, problem/solution), focus, elaboration, word choice, and standard conventions (e.g., punctuation, grammar);
IL-PTS-2012.6.Q	P: TCT integrates reading, writing, and oral communication to engage students in content learning;
IL-PTS-2012.6.R	P: TCT works with other teachers and support personnel to design, adjust, and modify instruction to meet studentsâ□™ reading, writing, and oral communication needs;
IL-PTS-2012.6.S	P: TCT stimulates discussion in the content areas for varied instructional and conversational purposes.

ESA5: The Teaching Portfolio Rubric by School of Education **Assessment**

Context for Learning Rubric

Context for Learning Rubric

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	Changed Major (0.000 pt)	Withdrew (0.000 pt)	Not Proficient (1.000 pt)	Marginal (2.000 pts)	Proficient (3.000 pts)	Commendable (4.000 pts)
Context for Learning Form Completion (1.000, 16%)				Responses to questions are vague or not completed.	Responses are done, but not explained.	Most responses are complete and explained.	All responses are completely answered and expanded.
Demographical Information (1.000, 16%)				Demographical information is not present.	Demographical information is just listed as information.	Demographical information is explained.	Demographical information is explained and connected to the students with a clear understanding of how this may impact their learning.
Academic Development (1.000, 16%)				Candidate has little to no understanding of students' prior knowledge regarding the subject area.	Candidate provides students' prior knowledge.	Candidate has an understanding of what student's exposure to the areas associated to the central focus of the subject but does not clearly articulate the connection from the past to the central focus.	Candidate clearly understands students' prior knowledge in all areas connected to the central focus of the subject and how this effects the planning
Language Development (1.000, 16%)				Language development is not addressed in the context for learning segment.	Language development is mentioned, but is vague.	Candidate explains student's oral and written language abilities.	Candidate clearly understands the student's abilities in oral and written language including specifics about the range within the class. English Language Learners are addressed, if present
Social Development (1.000, 16%)				Candidate has no understanding of the social development skills of the students	Candidate has a vague understanding of the social development skills of the students	Candidate has understanding of social development skills within classroom, but does not make clear connection to the impact on instruction and/or planning.	Candidate has clear understanding of social development and related factors that influence the classroom. Problem solving, students
Family and Community Contexts (1.000, 16%)				Candidate has no understanding of the family and community background.	Candidate has little understanding of the family and community background.	Candidate has an understanding of the family and community circumstances, but does not make clear connection to the effect on the planning and instruction.	Candidate has clear understanding of and the effect that family and community background play in classroom planning and instruction.

Planning Commentary Rubric

Planning Commentary Rubric

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	Changed Major (0.000 pt)	Withdrew (0.000 pt)	Not Proficient (1.000 pt)	Marginal (2.000 pts)	Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)	Commendable (4.000 pts)
Focus (1.000, 14%)				Central focus is not stated or not clear	Central focus is stated but vague and loosely tied with learning objectives	Central focus is stated but not explained its relevance to the students other than being a part of curriculum or standards.	Candidate clearly justifies central focus and its connection to the curriculum or standards.
Theoretical Framework (1.000, 14%)				Theoretical framework is not explained.	Theoretical framework is explained, but is not connected with the strategies	Theoretical framework / research is presented or connected with the strategies planned for developing student's	Theoretical framework is justified and research is aligned with the instructional strategies planned for developing student's

				planned for developing student's knowledge and abilities	knowledge and abilities.	knowledge and abilities.
Strategies to Build Student Learning (1.000, 14%)			Plans do not build upon each other or are not connected to the central focus.	Plans vaguely build upon each other and are connected to the central focus.	Plans for instruction clearly build on each other to support learning.	Plans for instruction build on each other to create rich and meaningful learning and connections to the central focus.
Instructional Strategies and Student Knowledge (1.000, 14%)			Candidate's justification of tasks is missing or not aligned with students' needs.	Instructional strategies are explained and connected with learning objectives and central focus. The needs of the class as a whole are mentioned.	Candidate explains why learning tasks are appropriate and mentions research connected with strategy. Knowledge of specific individuals or groups of students with similar needs are addressed	Candidate justifies why learning tasks are appropriate and uses examples of prior academic learning and makes connection to relevant research and/or theory. Knowledge of common misconceptions by students is addressed.
Academic Language (1.000, 14%)			Language demands are not identified or connected with the central focus or objectives.	Language demands and vocabulary are identified and supports are addressed.	Candidate explains vocabulary, language function and one additional language demand through language supports needed by students.	Candidate identifies vocabulary, language function and additional language demands as well as specific supports to meet the needs of students. Candidate's supports are designed to meet the needs of students with different levels of language learning.
Assessments (1.000, 14%)			Formal and informal assessments only provide limited evidence of students' use of skills. Adaptations for IEP or 504 plans are not mentioned.	Assessment provide limited evidence to monitor students' progress during the learning segment Adaptations for IEP or 504 plans are addressed.	Formal and informal assessments provide evidence of students' use of skills, understanding of concepts or essential strategy and interpretations throughout the learning segment.	Formal and informal provide multiple forms of evidence to understand students' use of strategies and essential skills throughout the learning segment. Assessments allow individuals or groups with specific needs demonstrate their learning. Assessments are differentiated in order for students to demonstrate understanding in a variety of ways.
Adjustments for Students with Special Needs (1.000, 14%)			Adjustments are only made for students with IEPs.	Instructional strategies are not diversified and only aimed at one level within in the classroom.	Instructional strategies and supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus for the class as a whole with students with special needs mentioned.	Instructional strategies are designed for the variety of needs and their levels of learning.

Lesson Plans for Learning Segment

Lesson Plans for Learning Segment

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	**Changed Major (0.000 pt)**	**Withdrew (0.000 pt)**	**Not Proficient (1.000 pt)**	**Marginal (2.000 pts)**	**Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)**	**Commendable (4.000 pts)**
Lesson Plan 1 (1.000, 25%)				Lesson plan is vague with missing details and explanations.	Most lesson plan components are present and explained.	All lesson plan components are present and most clearly explained.	All Lesson plan components are all present and expanded. Components are detailed and aligned with central focus of learning segment.
Lesson Plan 2 (1.000, 25%)				Lesson plan is vague with missing details and explanations	Most lesson plan components are present and explained.	All lesson plan components are present and most clearly explained.	All Lesson plan components are all present and expanded. Components are detailed and aligned with central focus of learning segment
Lesson Plan 3				Lesson plan is	Most lesson plan	All lesson plan	All Lesson plan components

(1.000, 25%)	vague with missing details and explanations	components are present and explained.	components are present and most clearly explained.	are all present and expanded. Components are detailed and aligned with central focus of learning segment
Instructional Materials (1.000, 25%)	No Instructional materials are referenced or included.	Instructional materials are referenced, but not included	Instructional materials are present and referenced, but not complete	All instructional materials are included and referenced

Instructional Commentary Rubric

Instructional Commentary Rubric

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	**Changed Major (0.000 pt)**	**Withdrew (0.000 pt)**	**Not Proficient (1.000 pt)**	**Marginal (2.000 pts)**	**Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)**	**Commendable (4.000 pts)**
Video Clip (s) Length and Clarity (1.000, 20%)				Video clip was not present.	Video clip was longer or shorter than guidelines. Candidate and/or students were not visible or heard clearly.	Video clip meets portfolio requirements for length and clarity. Students and candidate were generally visible and Heard through the clip.	Video clip meets all portfolio requirements for length and clarity. Students and candidate are clearly visible and heard through the entire clip.
Background Information for Video Clips (1.000, 20%)				No background information for the video clip.	Information provided was irrelevant to the video clip.	Candidate either demonstrates or describes the learning support for a type of learner; candidate's commentary lacks proposed changes that address both the individual and collective learning needs of the central focus; candidates connection to research and/or threory to support improvement proposal to instruction is included but not explained	Candidate demonstrates in video and describes in commentary the learning support for multiple types of learners; proposes changes that address individual and collective learning needs related to the central focus; candidate makes connections to research and/or theory to support improvements to instruction to improve student learning
Routines or Working Structures				Routines and/or structures of the class were not present or routines/ working structures were not relevant to the video clip.	Candidate vaguely explains routines/working structures but does not explain how prepared the class for the lesson.	Candidate explains the routines or structures of the class and vaguely mentions how prepared class for the lesson.	Candidate clearly describes the routines and structures of the class that are related to the video clip. Preparation of the students is specifically explained.
Strategies to Develop Students' Knowledge and Skills (1.000, 20%)				Candidate's explanation of strategies to develop knowledge and skills of students is not present or irrelevant to the video clip.	Explanation of strategies is vague and does not address individual needs of specific students.	Candidate explains general strategies used to further the students' knowledge and skills as well as engage them. Addressing individual needs of specific students is vague.	Candidate describes the general strategies used to deepen students' knowledge and skills as well as engage them intellectually during the video clip. Specific strategies used for individual students and their specific needs are clearly explained.
Academic Language (1.000, 20%)				Candidate does not refer to the information from the Context for Learning to expand on the students understanding of the content and academic language that is a part of the central focus in the video clip.	Academic language needs of the classroom are mentioned but not explained or connected to video clip.	Candidate refers to the Context for Learning information and explains how the understanding of the content and academic language is seen in the video clip.	Candidate connects the Context for Learning information to what is seen in the video clip and explains how the academic language and content of the lesson is strengthened through instruction and support in engaging students.

Monitoring Student Learning (1.000, 20%)			Strategies used to monitor student learning during the learning task in the video are not present and/or not explained.	Strategies used to monitor student learning during the video clip are vaguely described. Specific examples are not provided.	Strategies are explained and connected to the video clip as well as related to the assessment(s).	Candidate clearly explains strategies used to monitor student learning during the video clip and relates it to the assessments for the lesson that is aligned with the learning objectives. One or two specific examples are cited of what students said or did during the video clip.

Daily Lesson Reflections

Daily Lesson Reflections

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	Changed Major (0.000 pt)	Withdrew (0.000 pt)	Not Proficient (1.000 pt)	Marginal (2.000 pts)	Proficient (3.000 pts)	Commendable (4.000 pts)
Lesson 1 Reflection (1.000, 33%)				Reflection not present.	Candidate only restates what occurred in the lesson.	Candidate reflects on lesson and vaguely connects it with best professional practices.	Reflection connects best professional practice and outcomes with self-evaluation.
Lesson 2 Reflection (1.000, 33%)				Reflection not present.	Candidate only restates what occurred in the lesson.	Candidate reflects on lesson and vaguely connects it with best professional practices.	Reflection connects best professional practice and outcomes with self-evaluation.
Lesson 3 Reflection (1.000, 33%)				Reflection not present.	Candidate only restates what occurred in the lesson.	Candidate reflects on lesson and vaguely connects it with best professional practices.	Reflection connects best professional practice and outcomes with self-evaluation.

Assessment Commentary

Assessment Commentary

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	Changed Major (0.000 pt)	Withdrew (0.000 pt)	Not Proficient (1.000 pt)	Marginal (2.000 pts)	Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)	Commendable (4.000 pts)
Student Work Sample 1 (1.000, 11%)				Student work sample is not provided.	Student work sample is provided, but unclear which group represents.	Student work sample is provided, but does not clearly connect with the summary of what students generally understood or were still struggling to understand.	Student work sample is provided and represents what students generally understood or what students were still struggling to understand.
Student Work Sample 2 (1.000, 11%)				Student work sample is not provided.	Student work sample is provided, but unclear which group represents.	Student work sample is provided, but does not clearly connect with the summary of what students generally understood or were still struggling to understand.	Student work sample is provided and represents what students generally understood or what students were still struggling to understand.
Student Work Sample 3 (1.000, 11%)				Student work sample is not provided.	Student work sample is provided, but unclear which group represents.	Student work sample is provided, but does not clearly connect with the summary of what students generally understood or were still struggling to understand.	Student work sample is provided and represents what students generally understood or what students were still struggling to understand.
Rubric or Evaluative Criteria (1.000, 11%)				Not provided OR not aligned to the standards and learning objectives of the planned	Rubric or evaluative criteria is brief and lacks description for full understanding of the assessment measurement	Rubric or description of evaluative criteria measures the learning objectives and aligns to the standards chosen for the planned lesson(s)	Rubric or description of evaluative criteria clearly connects to the learning objectives and standards chosen for the planned lesson(s); informative source of

	lesson(s)			information for child/student and parent understanding of the evaluation criteria
Standards Used in Assessment (1.000, 11%)	Standards are not measured or are not aligned with central focus of lesson.	Objectives/standards are listed.	Candidate provides vague explanation of objectives/ standards used.	Objectives used in the assessment are identified, aligned with the central focus and are measurable.
Summary of Student Learning and Misunderstandings (1.000, 11%)	Summary of student learning is not present or vague.	Summary of student learning across the whole class is present. Misunderstandings and changes from what was planned are vague.	Candidate presents the results of student learning across the whole class relative the evaluative criteria. Changes are described from what was planned. Misunderstandings are explained. Graphic organizer in the form of table or chart is provided or a narrative. This should explain what students did right AND wrong. It is supported with evidence from student work samples.	Candidate summarizes the learning and misunderstanding as well as possible needs (including greater challenges) for most students. Evidence from student work samples is cited to support summary. A graphic organizer in the form of a table or chart or a narrative is also included. Quantitative and qualitative learning patterns are clearly explained using specific work sample examples to demonstrate patterns.
Two Students' Analysis of Learning (1.000, 11%)	Analysis of two specific students' learning is not present.	Candidate explains one student's prior knowledge of the content, individual learning strengths and challenges. Conclusion is present and supported.	Candidate explains two students' prior knowledge, individual strengths and challenges. Conclusions are present, but vague and not clearly connected or supported with specific evidence.	Candidate explains two students, if possible including one English Learner, their prior knowledge of the content, individual learning strengths and challenges. Conclusions about their learning are clear and supported with specific evidence from the work samples and/or other assessments.
Feedback to Student Work Samples and Ideas for Guiding Student Learning and Improvement (1.000, 11%)	Feedback is unrelated to the learning objectives OR is inconsistent with the analysis of the student's learning	Feedback addresses only errors OR strengths generally related to the learning objectives	Feedback primarily focuses on either errors OR strengths related to specific learning objectives, with some attention to the other	Candidate describes how s/he will guide focus students to use feedback to evaluate their own strengths and needs
Planning Next Steps in Instruction (1.000, 11%)	Next steps do not follow from the analysis; OR next steps are not relevant to the standards and learning objectives assessed; OR next steps are not described in sufficient detail to understand them.	Next steps focus on repeating instruction, pacing, or classroom management issues; little attention to the substance of learning	Next steps propose general support that improves children's learning; next steps are loosely connected with research and/or theory	Next steps provide both general support for the group as well as targeted support to individuals or groups to improve their learning; next steps are connected with research and/or thoery
Reflecting on Teaching and Learning				

Reflecting on Teaching and Learning

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	Changed Major (0.000 pt)	Withdrew (0.000 pt)	Not Proficient (1.000 pt)	Marginal (2.000 pts)	Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)	Commendable (4.000 pts)
Explanation of Learning and Differences (1.000, 20%)				Learning differences in students' development is not mentioned or relevant to central focus of learning segment.	Learning differences of students' is briefly mentioned but not connected to the central focus of learning segment.	Learning differences of students' content learning and development of their academic language is explained.	Learning differences of student's content learning and development of their academic language is clearly explained and connected to the central focus of the learning segment.
Relevant Research or Theory Cited for Above Criteria (1.000, 20%)				Research or theory for learning differences is not mentioned.	Research or theory is mentioned.	Research or theory that explains conclusions about learning differences is mentioned, but not clearly connected to conclusions.	Research or theory is explained and connected to conclusions about student's learning differences. Specific examples from planning are cited.
Students as Learners of this Subject (1.000, 20%)				Candidate does not discuss what they learned about their students as learners from this learning segment.	Candidate briefly discusses what they learned about their students as learners during the learning segment.	Candidate discusses what they learned about their students as learners during the learning segment. Examples are vaguely cited.	Candidate discusses what they learned about their students as learners and provides specific examples to support analysis are explained. All required materials submitted and organized professionally and clearly; uploaded to LiveText as requested and by due date
Relevant Research or Theory Cited for Above Criteria (1.000, 20%)				Research supporting what knowledge candidate gained from their students during learning segment was not present	Research is briefly mentioned but is not clearly connected with knowledge gained from students as learners during the learning segment.	Research/theory is cited that connects with candidate's observations about students as learners during learning segment	Research/ theory is connected and supports conclusions that the candidate developed about students as learners during learning segment.
Changes to Improve the Learning of Students (1.000, 20%)				Candidate does not indicate any changes to the learning segment are needed.	Changes are primarily focused on repeating instruction, pacing or classroom management issues.	Candidate indicates changes that will deepen student learning related to focus of lesson. Changes are loosely related to principles from relevant research or theory.	Candidate specifies changes in the lesson that will strengthen and deepen student learning related to the lesson objectives. Changes are directed towards whole class as well as individual supports that are needed. Changes are related to relevant theories or research.

ESA document and Submission

ESA document and Submission

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	Changed Major (0.000 pt)	Withdrew (0.000 pt)	Not Proficient (1.000 pt)	Marginal (2.000 pts)	Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)	Commendable (4.000 pts)
Use of Academic Language in writing (1.000, 33%)				Does not use academic language in general or content-specific ways in written form	Developing the ability to use general and/or content-related academic language in written form	Exhibits proper written language and academic vocabulary; content-specific language not yet developed	Fluently exhibits proper written language and vocabulary used for academic purposes and for content-specific purposes
Writing conventions (grammar, spelling, format, etc) (1.000, 33%)				Significant errors; Not college level writing;	Errors distract the reader's understanding of the document; multiple minor errors; Writing Center appointment and rewrite required	Error(s) do not distract the reader's understanding of the document; minor errors are present	No significant errors and few minor errors

ESA Completion (1.000, 33%)	Not all required materials for this ESA are complete; upload to LiveText was late or did not happen	Some required materials not clearly labeled or placed in proper order; uploaded to LiveText; not turned in by requested due date	All required materials submitted; uploaded to LiveText as requested and by due date	All required materials submitted and organized professionally and clearly; uploaded to LiveText as requested and by due date

Standards

IL-PTS-2012.1.C	K: TCT understands how teaching and student learning are influenced by development (physical, social and emotional, cognitive, linguistic), past experiences, talents, prior knowledge, economic circumstances and diversity within the community;
IL-PTS-2012.1.G	K: TCT understands how to identify individual needs and how to locate and access technology, services, and resources to address those needs.
IL-PTS-2012.1.H	P: TCT analyzes and uses student information to design instruction that meets the diverse needs of students and leads to ongoing growth and achievement;
IL-PTS-2012.1.I	P: TCT stimulates prior knowledge and links new ideas to already familiar ideas and experiences;
IL-PTS-2012.1.J	P: TCT differentiates strategies, materials, pace, levels of complexity, and language to introduce concepts and principles so that they are meaningful to students at varying levels of development and to students with diverse learning needs;
IL-PTS-2012.1.L	P: TCT uses information about students' individual experiences, families, cultures, and communities to create meaningful learning opportunities and enrich instruction for all students.
IL-PTS-2012.2.A	K: TCT understands theories and philosophies of learning and human development as they relate to the range of students in the classroom;
IL-PTS-2012.2.B	K: TCT understands major concepts, assumptions, debates, and principles; processes of inquiry; and theories that are central to the disciplines;
IL-PTS-2012.2.C	K: TCT understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning (e.g., critical and creative thinking, problem-structuring and problem-solving, invention, memorization, and recall) and ensures attention to these learning processes so that students can master content standards;
IL-PTS-2012.2.D	K: TCT understands the relationship of knowledge within the disciplines to other content areas and to life applications;
IL-PTS-2012.2.E	K: TCT understands how diverse student characteristics and abilities affect processes of inquiry and influence patterns of learning;
IL-PTS-2012.2.F	K: TCT knows how to access the tools and knowledge related to latest findings (e.g., research, practice, methodologies) and technologies in the disciplines;
IL-PTS-2012.2.G	K: TCT understands the theory behind and the process for providing support to promote learning when concepts and skills are first being introduced;
IL-PTS-2012.2.I	P: TCT evaluates teaching resources and materials for appropriateness as related to curricular content and each students' needs;
IL-PTS-2012.2.J	P: TCT uses differing viewpoints, theories, and methods of inquiry in teaching subject matter concepts;
IL-PTS-2012.2.K	P: TCT engages students in the processes of critical thinking and inquiry and addresses standards of evidence of the disciplines;
IL-PTS-2012.2.L	P: TCT demonstrates fluency in technology systems, uses technology to support instruction and enhance student learning, and designs learning experiences to develop student skills in the application of technology appropriate to the disciplines;
IL-PTS-2012.2.M	P: TCT uses a variety of explanations and multiple representations of concepts that capture key ideas to help each student develop conceptual understanding and address common misunderstandings;
IL-PTS-2012.2.N	P: TCT facilitates learning experiences that make connections to other content areas and to life experiences;
IL-PTS-2012.2.P	P: TCT adjusts practice to meet the needs of each student in the content areas;
IL-PTS-2012.3.A	K: TCT understands the Illinois Learning Standards (23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.Appendix D), curriculum development process, content, learning theory, assessment, and student development and knows how to incorporate this knowledge in planning differentiated instruction;

IL-PTS-2012.3.B	K: TCT understands how to develop short- and long-range plans, including transition plans, consistent with curriculum goals, student diversity, and learning theory;
IL-PTS-2012.3.C	K: TCT understands cultural, linguistic, cognitive, physical, and social and emotional differences, and considers the needs of each student when planning instruction;
IL-PTS-2012.3.D	K: TCT understands when and how to adjust plans based on outcome data, as well as student needs, goals, and responses;
IL-PTS-2012.3.E	K: TCT understands the appropriate role of technology, including assistive technology, to address student needs, as well as how to incorporate contemporary tools and resources to maximize student learning;
IL-PTS-2012.3.F	K: TCT understands how to co-plan with other classroom teachers, parents or guardians, paraprofessionals, school specialists, and community representatives to design learning experiences; and
IL-PTS-2012.3.G	K: TCT understands how research and data guide instructional planning, delivery, and adaptation.
IL-PTS-2012.3.H	P: TCT establishes high expectations for each learning and behavior;
IL-PTS-2012.3.I	P: TCT creates short-term and long-term plans to achieve the expectations for student learning;
IL-PTS-2012.3.J	P: TCT uses data to plan for differentiated instruction to allow for variations in individual learning needs;
IL-PTS-2012.3.K	P: TCT incorporates experiences into instructional practices that relate to a students' current life experiences and to future life experiences;
IL-PTS-2012.3.L	P: TCT creates approaches to learning that are interdisciplinary and that integrate multiple content areas;
IL-PTS-2012.3.M	P: TCT develops plans based on student responses and provides for different pathways based on student needs;
IL-PTS-2012.3.P	P: TCT works with others to adapt and modify instruction to meet individual student needs;
IL-PTS-2012.3.Q	P: TCT develops or selects relevant instructional content, materials, resources, and strategies (e.g., project-based learning) for differentiating instruction.
IL-PTS-2012.4.A	K: TCT understands principles of and strategies for effective classroom and behavior management;
IL-PTS-2012.4.B	K: TCT understands how individuals influence groups and how groups function in society;
IL-PTS-2012.4.I	P: TCT creates a safe and healthy environment that maximizes student learning;
IL-PTS-2012.4.J	P: TCT creates clear expectations and procedures for communication and behavior and a physical setting conducive to achieving classroom goals;
IL-PTS-2012.4.K	P: TCT uses strategies to create a smoothly functioning learning community in which students assume responsibility for themselves and one another, participate in decision-making, work collaboratively and independently, use appropriate technology, and engage in purposeful learning activities;
IL-PTS-2012.4.M	P: TCT organizes, allocates, and manages time, materials, technology, and physical space to provide active and equitable engagement of students in productive learning activities;
IL-PTS-2012.4.N	P: TCT engages students in and monitors individual and group-learning activities that help them develop the motivation to learn;
IL-PTS-2012.5.A	K: TCT understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning;
IL-PTS-2012.5.B	K: TCT understands principles and techniques, along with advantages and limitations, associated with a wide range of evidence-based instructional practices;
IL-PTS-2012.5.C	K: TCT knows how to implement effective differentiated instruction through the use of a wide variety of materials, technologies, and resources;
IL-PTS-	K: TCT understands disciplinary and interdisciplinary instructional approaches and how they relate to life and career experiences;

2012.5.D	
IL-PTS-2012.5.E	K: TCT knows techniques for modifying instructional methods, materials, and the environment to facilitate learning for students with diverse learning characteristics;
IL-PTS-2012.5.F	K: TCT knows strategies to maximize student attentiveness and engagement;
IL-PTS-2012.5.G	K: TCT knows how to evaluate and use student performance data to adjust instruction while teaching;
IL-PTS-2012.5.H	K: TCT understands when and how to adapt or modify instruction based on outcome data, as well as student needs, goals, and responses.
IL-PTS-2012.5.I	P: TCT uses multiple teaching strategies, including adjusted pacing and flexible grouping, to engage students in active learning opportunities that promote the development of critical and creative thinking, problem-solving, and performance capabilities;
IL-PTS-2012.5.J	P: TCT monitors and adjusts strategies in response to feedback from the student;
IL-PTS-2012.5.K	P: TCT varies his or her role in the instructional process as instructor, facilitator, coach, or audience in relation to the content and purposes of instruction and the needs of students;
IL-PTS-2012.5.L	P: TCT develops a variety of clear, accurate presentations and representations of concepts, using alternative explanations to assist students' understanding and presenting diverse perspectives to encourage critical and creative thinking;
IL-PTS-2012.5.M	P: TCT uses strategies and techniques for facilitating meaningful inclusion of individuals with a range of abilities and experiences;
IL-PTS-2012.5.N	P: TCT uses technology to accomplish differentiated instructional objectives that enhance learning for each student;
IL-PTS-2012.5.P	P: TCT uses student data to adapt the curriculum and implement instructional strategies and materials according to the characteristics of each student;
IL-PTS-2012.5.Q	P: TCT uses effective co-planning and co-teaching techniques to deliver instruction to all students;
IL-PTS-2012.5.R	P: TCT maximizes instructional time (e.g., minimizes transitional time);
IL-PTS-2012.5.S	P: TCT implements appropriate evidence-based instructional strategies.
IL-PTS-2012.6.C	K: TCT understands communication theory, language development, and the role of language in learning;
IL-PTS-2012.6.E	K: TCT knows and models standard conventions of written and oral communications;
IL-PTS-2012.6.F	K: TCT recognizes the relationships among reading, writing, and oral communication and understands how to integrate these components to increase content learning;
IL-PTS-2012.6.G	K: TCT understands how to design, select, modify, and evaluate a wide range of materials for the content areas and the reading needs of the student;
IL-PTS-2012.6.H	K: TCT understands how to use a variety of formal and informal assessments to recognize and address the reading, writing, and oral communication needs of each student; and
IL-PTS-2012.6.I	K: TCT knows appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word knowledge, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and strategy use in the content areas.
IL-PTS-2012.6.J	P: TCT selects, modifies, and uses a wide range of printed, visual, or auditory materials, and online resources appropriate to the content areas and the reading needs and levels of each student (including ELLs, and struggling and advanced readers);
IL-PTS-2012.6.K	P: TCT uses assessment data, student work samples, and observations from continuous monitoring of student progress to plan and evaluate effective content area reading, writing, and oral communication instruction;
IL-PTS-2012.6.L	P: TCT facilitates the use of appropriate word identification and vocabulary strategies to develop each student's understanding of content;
IL-PTS-2012.6.P	P: TCT teaches students to develop written text appropriate to the content areas that utilizes organization (e.g., compare/contrast, problem/solution), focus, elaboration, word choice, and standard conventions (e.g., punctuation, grammar);

IL-PTS-2012.6.Q	P: TCT integrates reading, writing, and oral communication to engage students in content learning;
IL-PTS-2012.6.R	P: TCT works with other teachers and support personnel to design, adjust, and modify instruction to meet students' reading, writing, and oral communication needs;
IL-PTS-2012.6.S	P: TCT stimulates discussion in the content areas for varied instructional and conversational purposes.
IL-PTS-2012.7.A	K: TCT understands the purposes, characteristics, and limitations of different types of assessments, including standardized assessments, universal screening, curriculum-based assessment, and progress monitoring tools;
IL-PTS-2012.7.B	K: TCT understands that assessment is a means of evaluating how students learn and what they know and are able to do in order to meet the Illinois Learning Standards;
IL-PTS-2012.7.C	K: TCT understands measurement theory and assessment-related issues, such as validity, reliability, bias, and appropriate and accurate scoring;
IL-PTS-2012.7.D	K: TCT understands current terminology and procedures necessary for the appropriate analysis and interpretation of assessment data;
IL-PTS-2012.7.E	K: TCT understands how to select, construct, and use assessment strategies and instruments for diagnosis and evaluation of learning and instruction;
IL-PTS-2012.7.F	K: TCT knows research-based assessment strategies appropriate for each student;
IL-PTS-2012.7.G	K: TCT understands how to make data-driven decisions using assessment results to adjust practices to meet the needs of each student;
IL-PTS-2012.7.H	K: TCT knows legal provisions, rules, and guidelines regarding assessment and assessment accommodations for all student populations;
IL-PTS-2012.7.I	K: TCT knows assessment and progress monitoring techniques to assess the effectiveness of instruction for each student.
IL-PTS-2012.7.J	P: TCT uses assessment results to determine student performance levels, identify learning targets, select appropriate research-based instructional strategies, and implement instruction to enhance learning outcomes;
IL-PTS-2012.7.K	P: TCT appropriately uses a variety of formal and informal assessments to evaluate the understanding, progress, and performance of an individual student and the class as a whole;
IL-PTS-2012.7.M	P: TCT maintains useful and accurate records of student work and performance;
IL-PTS-2012.7.N	P: TCT accurately interprets and clearly communicates aggregate student performance data to students, parents or guardians, colleagues, and the community in a manner that complies with the requirements of the Illinois School Student Records Act [105 ILCS 10], 23 Ill. Adm. Code 375 (Student Records), the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 USC 1232g) and its implementing regulations (34 CFR 99; December 9, 2008);
IL-PTS-2012.7.O	P: TCT effectively uses appropriate technologies to conduct assessments, monitor performance, and assess student progress;
IL-PTS-2012.7.P	P: TCT collaborates with families and other professionals involved in the assessment of each student;
IL-PTS-2012.7.Q	P: TCT uses various types of assessment procedures appropriately, including making accommodations for individual students in specific contexts;
IL-PTS-2012.8.A	K: TCT understands schools as organizations within the larger community context;
IL-PTS-2012.8.B	K: TCT understands the collaborative process and the skills necessary to initiate and carry out that process;
IL-PTS-2012.8.C	K: TCT collaborates with others in the use of data to design and implement effective school interventions that benefit all students;
IL-PTS-2012.8.G	K: TCT understands the various models of co-teaching and the procedures for implementing them across the curriculum;
IL-PTS-2012.8.J	P: TCT works with all school personnel (e.g., support staff, teachers, paraprofessionals) to develop learning climates for the school that encourage unity, support a sense of shared purpose, show trust in one another, and value individuals;

IL-PTS-2012.8.K	P: TCT participates in collaborative decision-making and problem-solving with colleagues and other professionals to achieve success for all students;
IL-PTS-2012.8.L	P: TCT initiates collaboration with others to create opportunities that enhance student learning;
IL-PTS-2012.8.M	P: TCT uses digital tools and resources to promote collaborative interactions;
IL-PTS-2012.8.N	P: TCT uses effective co-planning and co-teaching techniques to deliver instruction to each student;
IL-PTS-2012.9.A	K: TCT evaluates best practices and research-based materials against benchmarks within the disciplines;
IL-PTS-2012.9.E	K: TCT is cognizant of his or her emerging and developed leadership skills and the applicability of those skills within a variety of learning communities;
IL-PTS-2012.9.I	P: TCT models professional behavior that reflects honesty, integrity, personal responsibility, confidentiality, altruism and respect;
IL-PTS-2012.9.J	P: TCT maintains accurate records, manages data effectively, and protects the confidentiality of information pertaining to each student and family;
IL-PTS-2012.9.K	P: TCT reflects on professional practice and resulting outcomes; engages in self-assessment; and adjusts practices to improve student performance, school goals, and professional growth;
IL-PTS-2012.9.N	P: TCT collaborates with other teachers, students, parents or guardians, specialists, administrators, and community partners to enhance students learning and school improvement;

ESA: Effective Teaching Cycle, Rubric, by School of Education**, Assessment Context for Learning Rubric**

Context for Learning Rubric

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	Changed Major (0.000 pt)	Withdrew (0.000 pt)	Not Proficient (1.000 pt)	Marginal (2.000 pts)	Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)	Commendable (4.000 pts)
Description of Placement (1.000, 25%) IL-PTS-2012.8.A IL-PTS-2012.8.J				Incomplete; Insufficient	Did not address all four topics	Addressed all four topics with general information	Addressed all four topics with sufficient information
Special Features of School/Classroom (1.000, 25%) IL-PTS-2012.8.M IL-PTS-2012.9.A				Incomplete; Insufficient	Attempt to list or describe the special features of the classroom and distinct teacher expectations shows a level of non-understanding	Listed only general features of classroom that affects teacher decisions	Listed special and specific features of classroom that affects teacher decisions (ex: themed magnet, charter, co-teaching, PBL)
Instructional Resources (1.000, 25%) IL-PTS-2012.8.M IL-PTS-2012.9.A				Incomplete; Insufficient	Attempt to list or describe instructional resources and time in class is not clear nor inclusive	Listed some resources used in the classroom for instruction of this subject or general daily instruction and showed understanding of time avaialable for instruction	Identified resources used for instruction in the classroom including textbook or instructional program publisher information as well as other instructional resources and was clear on time available for instruction of this topic/subject
Demographic Information (1.000, 25%) IL-PTS-2012.8.A IL-PTS-2012.8.J				Incomplete; Insufficient	Did not address all four topics	Addressed all four topics with general information	Addressed all four topics with sufficient information

Planning Rubric

Planning Rubric

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	Changed Major (0.000 pt)	Withdrew (0.000 pt)	Not Proficient (1.000 pt)	Marginal (2.000 pts)	Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)	Commendable (4.000 pts)
Lesson Plan Completion (1.000, 16%)				Lesson plan lacking much needed information	Some elements of the lesson plans are incomplete; lack of academic or content specific language	All elements of the lesson plan for each lesson are complete; use of academic and content specific language is attempted; passable level of varied instructional strategies and differentiation included	All elements of the lesson plan for each lesson are complete; academic and content-specific language used; exceptional effort to plan varied and differentiated teaching strategies described
Description of Learning Segment's Purpose and Standards (1.000, 16%)				Fails to link objectives to standards OR to justify the purpose of the lesson(s)	Connection between learning objectives, Common Core/ILS, and planned instructional decisions is weak or thinly portrayed	Describes connection between learning objectives and Common Core/ILS standards; explains how the planned instructional strategies support the objectives and standards	Solid connection to Common Core/ILS standards; describes connection between chosen standards and written objectives and the planned instructional strategies; webs a clear connection between these elements of planning
Understanding of Students' Prior Knowledge and Experiences (1.000, 16%)				Candidate's justification of learning tasks either is missing OR represents a deficit view of children and	Candidate justifies learning tasks with limited attention to students'/children's prior learning OR personal, cultural,	Candidate justifies why planned learning tasks are developmentally appropriate using examples of children's/student's prior learning	Candidate justifies why planned learning experiences are developmentally appropriate for the age and lesson topic using examples of

	their backgrounds.	community assets.	OR examples of Personal, cultural, community assets	children's/student's prior learning AND examples of Personal, cultural, community assets
Use of Theory/Research to support Instructional Decisions (1.000, 16%)	Candidate does not make any qualified connection to research and/or theory	Candidate makes superficial connections to research and/or developmental theory.	Candidate makes connections to research and/or developmental theory.	Candidate's justification for planned teaching is supported by principles from research and/or developmental theory.
Academic Language Function and Use (1.000, 16%)	Language demands identified by the candidate are not consistent with the selected language function task; OR language supports are missing or are not aligned with the language demand(s) for the learning task.	Candidate identifies vocabulary as the major language demand associated with the language function; Attention to additional demands is superficial; Language supports primarily address definitions of vocabulary	Candidate identifies new vocabulary and additional language demand(s) associated with the language function; Plans include general support for use of vocabulary as well as additional language demand(s)	Candidate identifies new vocabulary and additional language demand(s) associated with the language function; Plans include targeted support for use of vocabulary as well as additional language demand(s); possibly, the candidate designed supports to meet the needs of students/children with different levels of language learning
Planning for Assessment (1.000, 16%)	Assessments are not aligned with the central focus of the lesson and/or the standards for the lesson(s)	Planned assessments provide limited evidence to monitor students' progress toward understanding the skills/learning objectives	Planned assessments provide evidence to monitor children's/students' progress toward mastering the skills/learning objectives	Planned assessments provide multiple forms of evidence to monitor children's/students' progress toward mastering the skills/learning objectives

Instruction Rubric

Instruction Rubric

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	**Changed Major (0.000 pt)**	**Withdrew (0.000 pt)**	**Not Proficient (1.000 pt)**	**Marginal (2.000 pts)**	**Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)**	**Commendable (4.000 pts)**
Video Permission Obtained for All Children/Adults in Video (1.000, 20%)				Video permission slips were not accounted for; OR students who did not have returned permission slips are in the video	NA	NA	Video permission slips obtained for all students participating in the video; any students who were not permitted in video are absolutely not in the video and their names are not said aloud
Video Clip Length and Clarity (1.000, 20%)				Video length exceed maximum time allowed and is thereby disqualified from assessment; OR audio is not present; OR video is unviewable	Video length does not exceed maximum time allowed; viewer must strain to see and/or hear the details of the instruction presented in the video clip; some manipulation of the video camera and audio settings needed to be made	Video length does not exceed maximum time allowed; Video and audio must be watched and listened to carefully to see and hear the instruction happening in the classroom	Video length does not exceed maximum time allowed; Video viewing is sharp and audio is clear; video clip frames the instruction happening in the classroom
Instruction Commentary: Student Engagement (1.000, 20%)				Students/Children are observed in learning tasks that are developmentally inappropriate; little or no evidence that	Students/Children are participating in learning tasks that focus on skills but lack development of the lesson objectives;	Children/Students are engaged in learning tasks that address understandings of lesson topic concepts, procedures; some support	Children/Students are engaged in learning experiences and tasks that promote and develop the understandings of the

			the candidate can link human development with new learning	vague support of active learning; candidate makes vague or superficial links between human development and new learning	of active learning is present; candidate links prior academic learning to new learning	lesson objectives; multiple modalities that support the active nature of learning are used; Candidate links children's development, prior academic learning, and personal, cultural, or community assets to new learning
Instruction Commentary: Strategies to Deepen Student Understanding (1.000, 20%)			Candidate does most of the talking and the students provide few responses; commentary can only address this direct teaching style of instruction	Through video clip and commentary, candidate primarily asks surface-level questions and evaluates student responses as correct or incorrect.	Through the video and the commentary, candidate elicits and then builds on students' responses to develop understanding of lesson concepts and promote their understanding and active development of key lesson objectives	Through the video and the commentary, candidate demonstrates facilitation of interactions among students/children so they can evaluate their own abilities to actively develop language, reasoning, and procedures related to the topic concepts and lesson objectives
Instruction Commentary: Support for Differentiated Learning (1.000, 20%)			Candidate suggests changes unrelated to evidence of student learning.	Candidates proposed changes are focused primarily on improving directions for learning tasks or task/behavior management	Candidate demonstrates moderate support for more than one special learning need; proposes changes that address students' collective learning needs related to the central focus; candidate makes superficial connections to research and/or theory to support improvements to instruction and student learning.	Candidate demonstrates in video and describes in commentary the learning support for multiple types of learners; proposes changes that address individual and collective learning needs related to the central focus; candidate makes connections to research and/or theory to support improvements to instruction to improve student learning
Total Points						60 Points

Assessment Rubric

Assessment Rubric

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	**Changed Major (0.000 pt)**	**Withdrew (0.000 pt)**	**Not Proficient (1.000 pt)**	**Marginal (2.000 pts)**	**Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)**	**Commendable (4.000 pts)**
Rubric or Evaluative Criteria (1.000, 16%)				Not provided OR not aligned to the standards and learning objectives of the planned lesson(s)	Rubric or evaluative criteria is brief and lacks description for full understanding of the assessment measurement	Rubric or description of evaluative criteria measures the learning objectives and aligns to the standards chosen for the planned lesson(s)	Rubric or description of evaluative criteria clearly connects to the learning objectives and standards chosen for the planned lesson(s); informative source of information for child/student and parent understanding of the evaluation criteria
Graphic Organizer and Narrative of Whole Class Assessment Summary (1.000, 16%)				Graphic organizer is not clear or complete; narrative is not provided	Graphic organizer in the form of table or chart provided OR a narrative that describes the whole class assessment results, but not both	Table or chart provided of whole class assessment results; analysis of this graphic organizer focuses on what students did right AND wrong and is supported with evidence	Table or chart provided of whole class assessment results; analysis of this graphic organizer includes a narrative identifying some quantitative and

				from the work samples	qualitative learning patterns within and across learners; sites specific examples from the work samples to demonstrate patterns of student learning
Student Work Samples (1.000, 16%)			Did not submit 3 student work samples	3 student work samples chosen do not represent varied learning patterns or allow the candidate to analyze appropriately	Provided 3 student work samples; one of which is from a student with specific documented learning needs	Provided 3 student work samples that represent patterns of learning with one sample from a student with specific documented learning needs
Feedback to Student Work Samples and Ideas for Guiding Student Learning and Improvement (1.000, 16%)			Feedback is unrelated to the learning objectives OR is inconsistent with the analysis of the student's learning	Feedback addresses only errors OR strengths generally related to the learning objectives	Feedback primarily focuses on either errors OR strengths related to specific learning objectives, with some attention to the other	Candidate describes how s/he will guide focus students to use feedback to evaluate their own strengths and needs
Ideas for Guiding Student Learning and Improvement (1.000, 16%)			Opportunities for applying feedback are not described; OR candidate provides limited or no feedback to inform children's learning	Candidate provides a vague explanation for how focus children will use feedback to support subsequent learning	Candidate describes how focus children will be able to apply feedback on their strengths and needs to support and increase understandings and related skills	Candidate describes how s/he will support focus students to apply feedback on their strengths and needs to support and increase understandings and related skills
Identified Language Function Use and Specific Language Use of Concept (1.000, 16%)			Candidate identifies language use that is superficially related or unrelated to the language demands (function,9 vocabulary, and additional demands). OR Candidate does not address students' repeated misuse of vocabulary.	Candidate provides evidence that students/children are introduced or use vocabulary associated with the language function.	Candidate explains and provides evidence of students'/childrens' use of the language function as well as vocabulary OR additional language demands associated with the learning experience	Candidate explains and provides evidence of students' use of the language function, vocabulary, and additional language demand(s) in ways that develop content understandings associated with the learning experience.
Planning Next Steps in Instruction			Next steps do not follow from the analysis; OR next steps are not relevant to the standards and learning objectives assessed; OR next steps are not described in sufficient detail to understand them.	Next steps focus on repeating instruction, pacing, or classroom management issues; little attention to the substance of learning	Next steps propose general support that improves children's learning; next steps are loosely connected with research and/or theory	Next steps provide both general support for the group as well as targeted support to individuals or groups to improve their learning; next steps are connected with research and/or theory

ESA document and Submission

ESA document and Submission

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	**Changed Major (0.000 pt)**	**Withdrew (0.000 pt)**	**Not Proficient (1.000 pt)**	**Marginal (2.000 pts)**	**Evolving/Proficient (3.000 pts)**	**Commendable (4.000 pts)**
Use of Academic Language in writing (1.000, 33%)				Does not use academic language in general or content-specific ways in written form	Developing the ability to use general and/or content-related academic language in written form	Exhibits proper written language and academic vocabulary; content-specific language not yet developed	Fluently exhibits proper written language and vocabulary used for academic purposes and for content-specific purposes

Writing conventions (grammar, spelling, format, etc) (1.000, 33%)	Many significant errors; Not college level writing;	Multiple significant errors that distracts the reader's understanding of the document; many minor errors; Writing Center appointment and rewrite required	Significant error(s) that distracts the reader's understanding of the document; some minor errors	No significant errors and few minor errors
ESA Completion (1.000, 33%)	Not all required materials for this ESA are complete; upload to LiveText was late or did not happen	Some required materials not clearly labeled or placed in proper order; uploaded to LiveText	All required materials submitted; uploaded to LiveText as requested and by due date	All required materials submitted and organized professionally and clearly; uploaded to LiveText as requested and by due date

Standards

IL-PTS-2012.1.C	K: TCT understands how teaching and student learning are influenced by development (physical, social and emotional, cognitive, linguistic), past experiences, talents, prior knowledge, economic circumstances and diversity within the community;
IL-PTS-2012.6.E	K: TCT knows and models standard conventions of written and oral communications;
IL-PTS-2012.8.A	K: TCT understands schools as organizations within the larger community context;
IL-PTS-2012.8.B	K: TCT understands the collaborative process and the skills necessary to initiate and carry out that process;
IL-PTS-2012.8.J	P: TCT works with all school personnel (e.g., support staff, teachers, paraprofessionals) to develop learning climates for the school that encourage unity, support a sense of shared purpose, show trust in one another, and value individuals;
IL-PTS-2012.8.L	P: TCT initiates collaboration with others to create opportunities that enhance student learning;
IL-PTS-2012.8.M	P: TCT uses digital tools and resources to promote collaborative interactions;
IL-PTS-2012.9.A	K: TCT evaluates best practices and research-based materials against benchmarks within the disciplines;
IL-PTS-2012.9.I	P: TCT models professional behavior that reflects honesty, integrity, personal responsibility, confidentiality, altruism and respect;

ESA: Entering the Profession Assessment Rubric

Rubric

	Failed Course (0.000 pt)	Withdrew (0.000 pt)	Not Proficient (1.000 pt)	Marginal (2.000 pts)	Proficient (3.000 pts)	Commendable (4.000 pts)
Descriptions of successes, with evidence (1.000, 20%) IL-PTS-2012.7.D IL-PTS-2012.7.E IL-PTS-2012.7.F IL-PTS-2012.7.G IL-PTS-2012.7.H IL-PTS-2012.7.I IL-PTS-2012.7.J IL-PTS-2012.7.K IL-PTS-2012.7.L IL-PTS-2012.7.M IL-PTS-2012.7.N IL-PTS-2012.7.O IL-PTS-2012.7.P IL-PTS-2012.7.Q IL-PTS-2012.7.R			Little or no discussion of success	Mentions success, but discussion is brief with few details	Success discussed; evidence provided, but not expanded upon. Problem solving and decision making process mentioned.	Success discussed in depth and evidence adequately described and discussed. Problem solving and decision making explained in- depth.
Challenges of teaching (1.000, 20%)			Discussion of challenges limited with little depth of thought	Challenge discussion shared some description but lacked details and evidence.	Challenge discussed, but evidence and discussion limited with no reference to integrity or ethical standards.Two challenges adequately addressed	Challenge discussed in depth and evidence adequately described and related to challenge. Professionalism related to problem solving and high ethical standards. Two challenges addressed in detail with thoughtfulness and reflection
Impact of developing the edTPA (1.000, 20%)			Little explanation of what was learned from producing the edTPA	Explanation of learning outcomes from creating the edTPA described, but impact on future not discussed.	Explanation and impact of building the edTPA developed , partially addressing the role it will play in the future.	Impact and growth discussed in depth with the role it will play in the future.
Collaboration with others, reflection upon yourself and leadership skills as an educator (1.000, 20%)			Collaboration with others and reflection upon self was vague.	Collaboration and reflection was addressed. Self-evaluation was not used or discussed.	Addressed collaboration reflection and leadership skills addressed. Self-evaluation mentioned.	Collaboration, reflection and leadership skills clearly explained and self-evaluation tool used as guide.
Connection with the edTPA and the IPTS (1.000, 20%)			No clear connection between the edTPA and the ILPTS. Weaknesses and strengths not mentioned. Some discussion of connections, but lacks details and evidence. Weaknesses and strengths mentioned briefly.	Some discussion of connections, but lacks details and evidence. Weaknesses and strengths mentioned briefly.	Good discussion of connections between edTPA and ILPTS. Strengths and weaknesses discussed but not connected to the edTPA or ILPTS connections	Strong, clear connections made between the edTPA and the ILPTS. Strengths and weaknesses with specific details connected to the edTPA and ILPTS connections.

Standards

IL-PTS-2012.7.A	K: TCT understands the purposes, characteristics, and limitations of different types of assessments, including standardized assessments, universal screening, curriculum-based assessment, and progress monitoring tools;
IL-PTS-2012.7.B	K: TCT understands that assessment is a means of evaluating how students learn and what they know and are able to do in order to meet the Illinois Learning Standards;
IL-PTS-2012.7.C	K: TCT understands measurement theory and assessment-related issues, such as validity, reliability, bias, and appropriate and accurate scoring;
IL-PTS-2012.7.D	K: TCT understands current terminology and procedures necessary for the appropriate analysis and interpretation of assessment data;
IL-PTS-	K: TCT understands how to select, construct, and use assessment strategies and instruments for diagnosis and evaluation of

2012.7.E	learning and instruction;
IL-PTS-2012.7.F	K: TCT knows research-based assessment strategies appropriate for each student;
IL-PTS-2012.7.G	K: TCT understands how to make data-driven decisions using assessment results to adjust practices to meet the needs of each student;
IL-PTS-2012.7.H	K: TCT knows legal provisions, rules, and guidelines regarding assessment and assessment accommodations for all student populations;
IL-PTS-2012.7.I	K: TCT knows assessment and progress monitoring techniques to assess the effectiveness of instruction for each student.
IL-PTS-2012.7.J	P: TCT uses assessment results to determine student performance levels, identify learning targets, select appropriate research-based instructional strategies, and implement instruction to enhance learning outcomes;
IL-PTS-2012.7.K	P: TCT appropriately uses a variety of formal and informal assessments to evaluate the understanding, progress, and performance of an individual student and the class as a whole;
IL-PTS-2012.7.L	P: TCT involves students in self-assessment activities to help them become aware of their strengths and needs and encourages them to establish goals for learning;
IL-PTS-2012.7.M	P: TCT maintains useful and accurate records of student work and performance;
IL-PTS-2012.7.N	P: TCT accurately interprets and clearly communicates aggregate student performance data to students, parents or guardians, colleagues, and the community in a manner that complies with the requirements of the Illinois School Student Records Act [105 ILCS 10], 23 Ill. Adm. Code 375 (Student Records), the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 USC 1232g) and its implementing regulations (34 CFR 99; December 9, 2008);
IL-PTS-2012.7.O	P: TCT effectively uses appropriate technologies to conduct assessments, monitor performance, and assess student progress;
IL-PTS-2012.7.P	P: TCT collaborates with families and other professionals involved in the assessment of each student;
IL-PTS-2012.7.Q	P: TCT uses various types of assessment procedures appropriately, including making accommodations for individual students in specific contexts;
IL-PTS-2012.7.R	P: TCT uses assessment strategies and devices that are nondiscriminatory, and take into consideration the impact of disabilities, methods of communication, cultural background, and primary language on measuring knowledge and performance of students.
IL-PTS-2012.8.A	K: TCT understands schools as organizations within the larger community context;
IL-PTS-2012.8.B	K: TCT understands the collaborative process and the skills necessary to initiate and carry out that process;
IL-PTS-2012.8.C	K: TCT collaborates with others in the use of data to design and implement effective school interventions that benefit all students;
IL-PTS-2012.8.D	K: TCT understands the benefits, barriers, and techniques involved in parent and family collaborations;
IL-PTS-2012.8.F	K: TCT understands the importance of participating on collaborative and problem-solving teams to create effective academic and behavioral interventions for all students;
IL-PTS-2012.8.G	K: TCT understands the various models of co-teaching and the procedures for implementing them across the curriculum;
IL-PTS-2012.8.J	P: TCT works with all school personnel (e.g., support staff, teachers, paraprofessionals) to develop learning climates for the school that encourage unity, support a sense of shared purpose, show trust in one another, and value individuals;
IL-PTS-2012.8.L	P: TCT initiates collaboration with others to create opportunities that enhance student learning;
IL-PTS-2012.8.M	P: TCT uses digital tools and resources to promote collaborative interactions;
IL-PTS-2012.8.O	P: TCT collaborates with school personnel in the implementation of appropriate assessment and instruction for designated students;
IL-PTS-	P: TCT develops professional relationships with parents and guardians that result in fair and equitable treatment of each student to

2012.8.P	support growth and learning;
IL-PTS-2012.8.Q	P: TCT establishes respectful and productive relationships with parents or guardians and seeks to develop cooperative partnerships to promote student learning and well-being;
IL-PTS-2012.8.R	P: TCT uses conflict resolution skills to enhance the effectiveness of collaboration and teamwork;
IL-PTS-2012.9.A	K: TCT evaluates best practices and research-based materials against benchmarks within the disciplines;
IL-PTS-2012.9.D	K: TCT identifies paths for continuous professional growth and improvement, including the design of a professional growth plan;
IL-PTS-2012.9.E	K: TCT is cognizant of his or her emerging and developed leadership skills and the applicability of those skills within a variety of learning communities;
IL-PTS-2012.9.F	K: TCT understands the roles of an advocate, the process of advocacy, and its place in combating or promoting certain school district practices affecting students;
IL-PTS-2012.9.H	K: TCT understands the importance of modeling appropriate dispositions in the classroom.
IL-PTS-2012.9.I	P: TCT models professional behavior that reflects honesty, integrity, personal responsibility, confidentiality, altruism and respect;
IL-PTS-2012.9.K	P: TCT reflects on professional practice and resulting outcomes; engages in self-assessment; and adjusts practices to improve student performance, school goals, and professional growth;
IL-PTS-2012.9.L	P: TCT communicates with families, responds to concerns, and contributes to enhanced family participation in student education;
IL-PTS-2012.9.M	P: TCT communicates relevant information and ideas effectively to students, parents or guardians, and peers, using a variety of technology and digital-age media and formats;
IL-PTS-2012.9.N	P: TCT collaborates with other teachers, students, parents or guardians, specialists, administrators, and community partners to enhance studentsâ™ learning and school improvement;
IL-PTS-2012.9.O	P: TCT participates in professional development, professional organizations, and learning communities, and engages in peer coaching and mentoring activities to enhance personal growth and development;
IL-PTS-2012.9.P	P: TCT uses leadership skills that contribute to individual and collegial growth and development, school improvement, and the advancement of knowledge in the teaching profession;
IL-PTS-2012.9.Q	P: TCT proactively serves all students and their families with equity and honor and advocates on their behalf, ensuring the learning and well-being of each child in the classroom;

Department of English
Advising Checklist for English Education Majors

NAME: **YEAR ENROLLED:**

ADVISOR: **CAREER INTEREST:**

To successfully graduate from Millikin University, a student must complete 124 credit hours, distributed among University Requirements, College requirements, and Major requirements. Of these 124 credits, 39 must be in courses numbered 300 or above.

University Requirements for MPSL

Course	Credits	Recommended for	Course/Semester Taken
University Seminar	3	Year 1, Semester 1	
Critical Reading & Writing I (C or better required)	3	Year 1, Semester 1	
Critical Reading & Writing II (C or better required)	3	Year 1, Semester 2	
CO200 Oral Communication	3	Years 1-2	
IN250 US Studies (HI203 or HI204)	3	Year 2	
IN251 US Studies	3	Year 2	
IN350 Global Studies	3	Year 3	
Quantitative Reasoning (C or better req) (any MA except 100 or 106 counts)	3	Years 1-4	
ICS 1* (see language proficiency)	3-4	Years 1-3	
ICS 2*	3-4	Years 1-3	
Creative Arts	3	Years 1-3	
Natural Science w/ lab	4	Years 1-3	
TOTAL	**37-39**		

* As an Arts & Science BA student**,** this requirement will typically be met by taking 2 semesters of a modern language. There are exceptions; consult with your advisor to determine if you are one of them.

Arts and Science Distribution and BA Language Proficiency Requirements

Literature (any EN lit class)	3	Years 1-4	any literature
Historical Studies (HI203/204 class)	3	Years 1-3	
Modern Language 103**	4	Years 1-4	
Modern Language 114	4		
Modern Language 223	4		
TOTAL	**9-18**		

** Students are placed at the appropriate level of language based on amount of previous work and grades received in secondary school. Proficiency required. Note that the University ICS requirement specifies 6-8 credits. Students placed at the language 223 level will still need to take another ICS course for the MPSL.

Upper Division Hours

List courses numbered 300 or above. Graduates must have 39 upper division hours for graduation.

Requirements for a Major in English Education:
All English Education majors take 18 hours in literary traditions and an additional 14 hours of required English Education courses, including a 3 hour senior capstone internship in teaching writing. English Education majors are required to take 6 hours of advanced writing courses and 3 hours in publishing technology. In addition, they take 6 additional hours of communication courses. To prepare for professional success as a teacher, English Education majors complete 32 hours of education courses.

1 Credit, Introduction to the Major

Requirement	Course #	Course title	Credit	Semester taken
Intro to the Major	EN105	Introduction to English Studies	1	

Traditions Courses: Required of all English Majors - C or better is required for courses listed below.

Requirement	Course #	Course title	Credit	Semester taken
History of the English Language	EN375	The English Language - fall	3	
Shakespeare	EN325	Studies in Shakespeare	3	
British Literature	EN321 or EN322	Major English Authors I or II	3	
International Literature	EN335	International Literature	3	
American to 1900 usually EN231	EN231	American Lit through Twain – fall only	3	
Literature after 1900	EN232	American Lit after 1900 – spring only	3	

Advanced Studies in English Education & Senior Capstone- C or better is required for courses listed below.

Requirement	Course #	Course title	Credit	Semester taken
Adolescent Lit	EN222	Adolescent Lit	3	
Specific methods	EN235	Methods for Teaching Middle and Secondary Language Arts, Grades 5-12– fall only	3	
Writing Theory	EN310	Applying Writing Theory – spring only	3	
Adv. specific methods	EN425	Advanced Methods Teaching Lang Arts – fall only	2	
Teaching Writing Intern – senior capstone	EN470	Teaching Writing Internship [capstone] – fall only	3	

Advanced Writing & Publishing Courses- C or better is required for courses listed below.

Requirement	Course #	Course title	Credit	Semester taken
writing course 1	EN202	Writing About Literature	3	
writing course 2	EN302	Methods Teach Literacy in Content	3	
publishing course	EN305	Web Publishing	3	

6 Hours of Communication Courses

Requirement	Course #	Course title	Credit	Semester taken
Communication	CO200	Public Speaking	3	
Communication	CO310	Small Group Comm.	3	

34 Hours of Education Courses- C or better is required for courses listed below.

Requirement	Course #	Course title	Credit	Semester taken
history of education	ED120 & lab	Introduction to American Education	4	
internships	ED170 or ED172	Education Internships	1	
development	ED201	Human Development 6-12 & K-12	3	
special/gifted ed	ED115 (was 216)	Instructional Strategies for Individuals with Learning Disabilities (OK to take as Frosh)	3	
educational psych	**ED310**	**Creating Community Learners**	**3**	
general methods	**ED321**	**General Secondary Teaching Methods**	**3**	
standards	ED420	Instructional Analysis, Design, Assess.	2	
student teaching	ED477-478	Supervised Student Teaching	12	
ed capstone	ED488	Senior Seminar	3	

Bold above: **Junior block courses taken simultaneously, Spring ONLY T/R 8 AM to Noon**

_____ Current Total Credits. Must have 124 credits to graduate.

<u>Optional</u> Special Education Endorsement: 18 hours
- C or better is required for courses listed below.

Requirement	Course #	Course title	Credit	Semester taken
Freshman	ED215	Learning Differences in Individuals with Mild to Moderate Edu Learning Needs	3	
Sophomore (Block): Fall only	ED115	Instructional Strategies for Individuals with Learning Disabilities	3	
Sophomore: Spring only	ED220	Introduction to Educating Individuals with Diverse Abilities	3	
Junior: Fall only	ED301	Access to the General Curriculum and IEPs	3	
Junior: Spring only	ED 408	Diagnosis & Assessment of Learners with Exceptional Learning Needs	3	
Senior: Fall only	ED479	Supervised Clinical Experience in Special Education	3	

<u>Optional</u> English as a Second Language (ESL) Endorsement: 18 hours
- C or better is required for courses listed below.

Requirement	Course #	Course title	Credit	Semester taken
Sophomore: Fall only	ED209	Foundations of Bilingual Education	3	
Sophomore: Spring only	ED238	Child Language Development & Linguistics	3	
Junior: Fall only	ED325	Assessment of English Language Learners	3	
Junior (Block): Spring only	ED304	Methods and Materials for the ESL Classroom	3	
Senior: Fall only	ED401	Integrating Culture in the Classroom	3	
Elective of your choice related to ***CULTURE***			3	

Sample eight semester schedule for English Education major (updated Spring 2016)
Your schedule may vary substantially
(•) bullet = sequenced required courses *to be offered and taken only* in that semester
(**) stars = courses typically offered every other year – plan carefully for these and take during your sophomore or junior years

Fall – Semester One (18)	**Spring – Semester Two (17)**
• EN105 Introduction to MU English, 1 • IN140 University Seminar, 3 • IN150 Critical Writing, 3 Quantitative Reasoning, 3 ICS, modern language, 4 ED120, Intro to Education/ED 170, 4	CO200, Public Speaking, 3 • IN151 Critical Writing, 3 Natural Science with LAB, 4 ICS, modern language, 4 ED201, Human Development, 3
Fall – Semester Three (16)	**Spring – Semester Four (15)**
• EN231 American Lit to Twain, 3 • EN235 Methods, 3 ** (or EN375) • EN202 Writing about Literature, 3 • ED115 Instr. Strat. Learn Disabilities, 3 (was 216) BA Modern Language proficiency, 3	EN222 Adolescent Literature, 3 • EN232 AM Literature after 1900, 3 IN250 US Cultural Studies (HI203/204), 3 IN251 US Structural Studies, 3 Fine Arts, 3
Fall – Semester Five (15)	**Spring – Semester Six (15)**
IN350 Global Studies, 3 CO310 Small Group Communication, 3 • EN375 The English Language, 3 ** (or EN235) • EN305 Web Publishing, 3 EN302 Literacy in Content Areas, 3	• EN310 Applying Writing Theory, 3 • EN322 Major English Authors II, 3 EN325 Shakespeare, 3 • **ED310 Create Community Learners, 3** • **ED321 Gen Secondary Methods, 3** - **bold** above are Junior block courses
Fall – Semester Seven 10 PLUS ELECTIVES)	**Spring – Semester Eight (15)**
EN335, International Literature, 3 • EN425 Adv. Methods Lang Arts, 2 • EN470 Teaching Writing Internship, 3 • ED420 Instructional Analysis, Design, Assess, 2 XXXXX, ELECTIVE XXXXX, ELECTIVE (for EN470 - must schedule for an IN150 class)	ED477 Supervised Student Teaching, 12 ED488 Senior Seminar, 3
NOTE: This sample 8-semester plan includes 121 credits (124 are required to graduate). Sample does not take into account prerequisites building up to quantitative reasoning.	

English Education advising and coordination issues:
The IN250 requirement and the CAS Historical Studies requirement are double-dipped and fulfilled by taking one of these two US History courses: HI203 or HI204.
English Education students should not take En120 nor En220 courses.
English Education students are required to earn a C or better in specific courses. Be aware of which ones.
English Education students must maintain a minimal 2.7 cum GPA for all courses and a minimal 2.7 cum GPA in all English courses, in order to remain in the Teacher Education Program.
English Education students must fulfill all the requirements for the Teacher Education Program.

Special Note for Transfer Students, Typically Arriving at the Junior Level

Transfer Students may have challenges beyond just completing what is listed in the four final semesters of course work above

If starting fresh with Modern Languages, 11 credits in extra coursework is required
Language 103, 4 credits
Language 114, 4 credits
Language 223, 3 credits
[requirements: two ICS classes, including Modern Language proficiency (223 or higher)]

Two Public Speaking classes are required,
CO200, 3 credits
CO310, 3 credits

Quantitative Reasoning may sometimes slow students down, adding 3 to 6 to 9 credits
Though it may require a single 3-credit course, numbered MA109 or above, some students may need to take a series of math courses to work up to the final quantitative reasoning course, adding three or six credits to the overall total.

Natural Science with LAB, a four-credit science course with a lab component, 4 credits

Sequential MPSL course may need to be added:
IN250 US Cultural Studies (historical), 3 credits – must be an American history course HI203/204
IN251 US Structural Studies, 3 credits

Specific English Courses are required beyond those listed in the last four semesters, including:
En105, Intro to English, 1 credit
En231, American Lit through Twain, 3 credit
En232, American Lit after 1900, 3 credits
En202, Writing about Literature, 3 credits
En222, Adolescent Literature, 3 credits

Early English Education course that cycle every other year
EN235 Methods, 3 credits
EN375 The English Language, 3 credits

A range of early Education courses
ED120, Intro to Education/ED 170, 4 credits
ED216 Instr. Strat. Learn Disabilities, 3 credits
ED201, Human Development, 3 credits

Please take these into account, when planning your complete curriculum at Millikin

NCTE/NCATE Standards for Initial Preparation of Teachers of Secondary English Language Arts, Grades 7-12 Approved October 2012 Millikin Curriculum Map

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;

- En231 American Literature Through Twain
- En232 American Literature After 1900
- En321 or En322, Major English Authors I or I
- En325 Studies in Shakespeare
- En335 International Literature

They are able to use literary theories to interpret and critique a range of texts.

- En202, Writing About Literature

Element 2: Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents read texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.

- En222 Adolescent Literature

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.

- In150 or Hn150, Critical Writing, Reading, and Research I
- In151 or Hn151, Critical Writing, Reading, and Research II

Element 2: Candidates know the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics);

- In150 or Hn150, Critical Writing, Reading, and Research I
- In151 or Hn151, Critical Writing, Reading, and Research II
- En375 The English Language

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.

- En375, The English Language

Element 3: Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.

- En305 Web Publishing
- En470 Internship in the Teaching of Writing

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.

- Ed201 Human Development (along with the courses bulleted below)
- Ed310 Creating a Community of Learners (along with the courses bulleted below)

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.

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.

Element 6: Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials.

All Six Elements Above Covered in these Courses

- En235 Methods for Teaching Middle and Secondary Language Arts, Grades 5-12
- En310 Applying Writing Theory
- En302 Methods of Teaching Literacy in the Content Areas
- Ed321 General Secondary Methods
- Ed420 Instructional Analysis, Design, and Assessment
- En425 Advanced Methods of Teaching Language Arts
- En477-78 Supervised Student Teaching

Content Pedagogy: Planning Composition Instruction in ELA

IV. Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for composing texts (i.e., oral, written, and visual) 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 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.

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.

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.

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.

All Four Elements Above Covered in these Courses

- En235 Methods for Teaching Middle and Secondary Language Arts, Grades 5-12
- En310 Applying Writing Theory
- En302 Methods of Teaching Literacy in the Content Areas
- Ed321 General Secondary Methods
- Ed420 Instructional Analysis, Design, and Assessment
- En425 Advanced Methods of Teaching Language Arts
- En477-78 Supervised Student Teaching

Learners and Learning: Implementing English Language Arts Instruction

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

All Four Elements Above Covered in these Courses

- En235 Methods for Teaching Middle and Secondary Language Arts, Grades 5-12
- En310 Applying Writing Theory
- En302 Methods of Teaching Literacy in the Content Areas
- Ed321 General Secondary Methods
- Ed420 Instructional Analysis, Design, and Assessment
- En425 Advanced Methods of Teaching Language Arts

- En477-78 Supervised Student Teaching

Professional Knowledge and Skills

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.

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.

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.
Both Elements Above Covered in these Courses

- En235 Methods for Teaching Middle and Secondary Language Arts, Grades 5-12
- Ed321 General Secondary Methods
- Ed420 Instructional Analysis, Design, and Assessment
- En425 Advanced Methods of Teaching Language Arts
- En477-78 Supervised Student Teaching

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.

Element 1: Candidates model literate and ethical practices in ELA teaching, and engage in/reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA.

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.

Both Elements Above Covered in these Courses

- En235 Methods for Teaching Middle and Secondary Language Arts, Grades 5-12
- Ed321 General Secondary Methods
- Ed420 Instructional Analysis, Design, and Assessment
- En425 Advanced Methods of Teaching Language Arts
- En470 Internship in the Teaching of Writing
- En477-78 Supervised Student Teaching
- En488 Senior Seminar

Millikin Middle Grades Literacy Endorsement

The endorsement is aimed at secondary English Edu majors who want to teach on the Middle School Level (5-8) and Elementary Education majors who wish to teach Language Arts beyond the 4th grade level but not at the secondary level.

Context: Education wants us to create a Middle School Literacy Endorsement Program. The requirements are pretty specific, but I've cobbled together a draft of a program based upon a U of I model that I found. We'd need to rename our methods class. Also note that Elementary Education majors who take the endorsement are also automatically picking up an English minor.

Necessary content in the development of ELA teacher education programs [for a full secondary certificate] can be divided into eight general areas:

a. language development,
b. language history and analysis,
c. written discourse and composition;
d. oral discourse and composition;
e. reading;
f. literature;
g. media discourse and composition;
h. and research and theory

For Middle Schools Literacy Endorsement the Illinois State Board of Education requires 21 credits in content area with 3 being specific to middle school English methods. (English Ed currently has two methods courses and one could be renamed and retooled to be middle school specific while the other remained secondary specific)

Rename ONE COURSE
EN235: Methods for Teaching Middle and Secondary Language Arts, Grades 5-12 (3 credits) - e. and d. and h.

the other 18 credits of English content required for the Middle Grades endorsement (to total the required 21)
EN 202. Writing about Literature (3) - f. and h.
EN 222. Contemporary Adolescent Literature (3) - f.
EN 231. American Literature through Twain **or** EN 232. American Literature from 1900 to the Present (3) - f.
EN 305. Web Publishing (3) - g.
EN 310. Applying Writing Theory (3) - c
EN 375. The English Language (3) - a. and b.

Total 21 credits

Appendix, Course Change Proposal Form

MILLIKIN UNIVERSITY

NEW OR REVISED COURSE PROPOSAL

1. Title and Number of new course or revised course:
Methods of Teaching and Assessment in Literacy and Language Arts for grades 5th-12th: EN425

2. College/School & Department: Arts & Sciences/English

3. Proposed Effective Date: August, 2018

4. ( ) New Course
(X) Revised Course
( ) change in credit hours from 02 to 03
( ) cross-listed in to
(X) course content change
(X) same content; change in title from Advanced Methods of Teaching Language Arts

5. New or revised catalog description:
Methods and materials for teaching listening, speaking, reading, and writing with an emphasis on language and literacy development across the curriculum. Helps students combine theory, research, and practice into sound strategies for teaching English in grades 5-12. Students begin to develop a philosophy of secondary Language Arts teaching and learn how to plan instruction that is consistent with that philosophy and with various national, state, and school district standards and guidelines. Course assessments, including planning and organizing a multi-part unit of instruction for implementation during student teaching, will provide a foundation for students' Teaching Portfolio development later in their program. Also included are research opportunities for identifying instructional resources and understanding the diverse needs of varied student populations in the ELA classroom. Pre-requisite: IN151 or consent..

6. Course learning outcome goals (connected to learning goals of major and/or university):

7. Frequency of offering: Fall X Spring Summer _____ Alternate years

8. Prerequisites (listed by number and title): IN151 or consent

9. Credit hours: 03

For variable credit hours: Minimum ___ to Maximum

Graded _____X_____ OR Pass/fail _____ (Must check one for any course)

Can it be repeated for additional credit? ____N___ If yes, # of credits _____

10. Faculty expected to teach course: Dr. Karly Grice
Other faculty qualified to teach course from various departments: Dr. Michael O'Conner

11. Fulfills a University Studies requirement? Yes No X

If yes, for which requirement?
Please indicate the applicable area of the University Studies:

IN250	IN251
_____ Quantitative Reasoning	_____ Fine Arts
_____ International Cultures & Structures	_____ IN350
_____ IN140	_____ Natural Science
_____ IN150, 151	Oral Communication

All of the following must be completed and a syllabus must be attached

12. Provide context and rationale for request: We currently have two methods courses, EN235 for 3 credits and EN425 for 2. We are reducing that to a single methods course for English Education majors, since there was a good bit of overlap between the two courses. This better aligns us with other secondary education programs at Millikin. In addition, the change in title and content enable students to seek licensure in our Middle Grades Education-Literacy Program.

13. How is this change a reflection of your program's assessment?
Assessment data show a good bit of overlap between these two courses. In our assessment reports, EN235 is not mentioned as a course associated with the Embedded Signature Assessments. EN425 is. The content of both courses can be provided by a single course. It also brings us into line with other secondary education programs at Millikin and remedies staffing issues.

14. Relation of this course to present offerings, i.e., part of a sequence, broaden study, introduces new area, possible overlap: This course is an integral part of our English Education major and will be a major component of our Middle Grades Education Literacy Program.

15. What resources are needed to support this course? Check all that apply:

___ Library materials (books/subscriptions) ___ Equipment and/or technology

___ Special space(s) required (e.g. computer lab) ___ Other

Please provide details on what is needed and who was consulted about its availability:

16. Address the impact of this proposal: Change in present offerings, its impact on other majors, etc.

17. Other pertinent information or comments.

Appendix, Degree Program Change Form

MILLIKIN UNIVERSITY

PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL

1. College/School & Department: Arts & Sciences/English

2. Name of Program Affected: English Education

3. Proposed Effective Date: August, 2018

4. ( ) New Major (Name_____)
( ) New Concentration in Major (Name_____)
(X) Change in Major Program (Name_English Education_____)
( ) Change in Minor Program (Name_____)
( ) Change in Certificate Program (Name_____)
( ) New Minor (Name_____)
( ) New GPA Requirement
( ) Change in Major Concentration (Name_____)
( ) Elimination of major/minor (Name_____)
( ) Other:_____

5. What is the nature of the change? We are combining our two methods courses (EN235 and EN425) into one—EN425. This will be the only methods course required for the English Education major and reduce the credit requirements by 2.

6. New or revised catalog description:

None. For the new EN425 course description, see the course change proposal.

7. Program learning outcome goals (connected to learning goals of major and/or university):

1. have an advanced understanding of a variety of literary genres, including an understanding of literatures' historical, intellectual, and diverse cultural contexts.
2. apply a variety of writing theories, including classical and contemporary rhetoric, to the teaching of writing.

3. be familiar with best practices in the methods of teaching the English language arts and formulate their own teaching methodologies.

8. Please supply a summary table and brief narrative description of changes including total number of credit hours.

This change will reduce the methods credit hours from 5 to 3.

9. Faculty expected to teach in program: Dr. Karly Grice, occasionally

Other faculty qualified to teach in this program from various departments: Dr. Michael O'Conner

10. How does this program fulfill College/School distribution requirements? N/A

The following must be completed:

11. Provide context and rationale for request: English Education has had two methods courses for several years. EN235 is our basic 3-hour methods course. EN425 is our advanced, 2-hour methods course. The courses have had a good bit of overlap in content. In surveying the secondary education programs at Millikin, we realized that most secondary education programs have only one methods course housed within the major program. This change aligns us with such secondary education programs as Social Science, Biology, and Mathematics. The change in title and course content for EN425 (see proposal form) will make that course part of the new Middle Grades Education-Literacy Program.

Staffing EN425 has also become an issue. For the past several years, the course had to be offered on a directed-study basis because we have had so few graduating seniors. This has placed an unfair burden on our English Education specialists, since directed studies do not count as part of our regular teaching load. Moving to one English-specific methods course will alleviate this situation.

12. Discuss how this change is a reflection of your program's assessment data:
Assessment data show a good bit of overlap between these two courses. In our assessment reports, EN235 is not mentioned as a course associated with the Embedded Signature Assessments. EN425 is. The content of both courses can be provided by a single course.

13. Relation of this program to present offerings, i.e., part of a sequence, broaden study, introduces new area, possible overlap:
The elimination of one methods courses eliminates existing overlap between the two current courses. A methods course is a necessary part of the English Education major; requiring two methods courses is superfluous.

14. What resources are needed to support this program? Check all that apply:

___ Library materials (books/subscriptions) ___ Equipment and/or technology

___ Special space(s) required (e.g. computer lab) ___ Other

Please provide details on what is needed and who was consulted about its availability:

15. Please summarize discussions with other departments and attach pertinent comments:

None

16. Other pertinent information or comments: