

Millikin University
College of Arts & Sciences
English Education Major Assessment Report
Dr. Michael O'Conner, Associate Professor of English
July 1, 2007

Executive Summary

The learning goals for English Education students are that all 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.

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 improvement. Assessment methods will involve detailed scaled rubric sheets utilized to evaluate each of the chosen artifacts that measure each learning goal.

For the 2006-2007 academic year, the department has rated student learning in each of these areas as located somewhere between red, yellow and green. However, the rubrics which have been developed to test these goals are new and have yet to be tested and refined.

Programmatic assessment methods also 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. These shall also be assigned a rating between red, yellow and green.

As more data is collected and trends become apparent, we shall close the loop of assessment to refine the curriculum and teaching methodology in the major to assist students in achieving success in mastering these designated learning goals.

This English Education major will be strengthened even more in the fall of 2007 by the addition of a full-time tenure-track Associate Professor, Dr. Jim Meyer. He has strong credentials in the area of English education and will be a welcomed addition to the department.

Goals and Mission of the English Education Major

Millikin's English education major program continues to be consistent and robust, 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 using 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. As this program shifts to NCATE Standards in the next year, it will soon be 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.

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.

Originally, the English Education major conceived of four learning outcome goals, but in practice we found one of the goals to be redundant. The goal "understand the cultural and literary traditions of diverse peoples from the United States" was dropped, and incorporated into Goal One by adding the word "diverse" before the phrase "cultural context." The redundancy of the dropped goal came mostly from current requirements in the MPSL that all Millikin students take for U.S. Studies. Multicultural elements are also duplicated in the Education Department's assessment program, specifically in "CA7: Instruction Plan for Inclusion." There was also a desire to streamline our learning outcome goals as much as possible due to the multiplicity of assessments for English Education students on all levels.

Snapshot

The English Education program is strongly tied to all English major programs by our central core of share 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 to others.

English education students will experience a wide variety of English faculty in completing their degree programs. Beyond literature and writing, the methodologies and practices of teaching the language arts are what makes this major distinct from the other English programs.

Millikin's full-time English faculty for the 2007-2008 academic year will number fourteen individuals (see Table 1). Three are tenured faculty. Of the tenured professors, one is a full professor, and two are associate professors. Eight professors are on tenure tracks, all currently assistant professors.

| Faculty | Credentials | Rank | Tenure status | MU Service |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|------------|
| Banerjee, Purna | PhD, Texas Christian U. | Assist Prof | Tenure Track | 2 |
| Braniger, Carmella | PhD, Oklahoma State U. | Assist Prof | Tenure Track | 4 |
| Brooks, Randy | PhD, Purdue U. | Professor | Tenured | 16 |
| Crowe, Judi | MA, Illinois State U. | Assist Prof | N/A | 9 |
| Dwiggins, Mary | MA, Eastern Illinois U. | Instructor | N/A | 7 |
| Frech, Stephen | PhD, U. of Cincinnati | Assist Prof | Tenure Track | 4 |
| George, Michael | PhD, Michigan State U. | Assist Prof | Tenured | 5 |
| Klotz, Lisa | PhD, University of N. Carolina | Assist Prof | Tenure Track | 2 |
| Matthews, Anne | PhD, Indiana U. | Assist Prof | Tenure Track | 4 |
| McKenna, Sandra | MA, U. of Illinois-Springfield | Instructor | N/A | 7 |
| Meddaugh, Priscilla | PhD, Wayne State U. | Assist Prof | Tenure Track | 4 |
| Meyer, Jim | DA, Illinois State | Assoc Prof | Tenure Track | 1 |
| O'Conner, Michael | PhD, U. of Missouri-Columbia | Assoc Prof | Tenured | 11 |
| Zhao, Peiling | PhD, U. of Southern Florida | Assist Prof | Tenure Track | 2 |
| | | | | 78 years |

Millikin English majors have access to a wide array of teaching environments. The majority 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 and the newly renovated ADM/Scovill Building. Also, for almost eight years we have had access to the MAC Lab in the basement of Staley, 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 students, through card-swipe access, on a 24-hour basis.

The number of students in the English Education degree has shown a tendency to fluctuate over the last six years, however all signs show that steady growth in the program may be expected (see Table 2).

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| English Education | 17 | 22 | 34 | 32 | 24 | 26 | ?? |

Classes sizes for English Education students have been conducive to excellent faculty-student interaction. Writing classes in the department are capped at 20 students. Our literature courses are capped at 26 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. Senior level methods courses, like EN425 and EN470 generally only have four 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. 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 lifetime critical thinkers and learners in a global environment. See the attached "Appendix: Advising Sheet for English Education Majors," for a full 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 years. In the sophomore year, students are introduced formally to their chosen major in our specific secondary methods course, EN235. 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. During the senior year, English Ed students take their capstone course in the major, EN470, Internship in the Teaching of Writing, a second advanced specific methods course, EN425, and they complete their educational experience with student teaching, typically in the spring semester of their senior year. English Education students actually complete a second capstone course, ED488, which incorporates a near-professional performance component into the degree program.

Generally, Learning Goal One is completed in many of our many literature core courses or survey courses. Learning Goal Two is accomplished through taking our EN310 Applied Writing Theory course, then applying the theory from that course to practice in our EN470 capstone course. Finally, Learning Goal Three is indicated through created teaching unit plans designed in courses like EN235 and EN425, executed during the student teaching experience, and analyzed in ED488.

Advising is accomplished through regular meetings and communications with 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 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 EN235, 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. Through the use of a long-standing portfolio system, our students complete eleven "candidate assessments" (CAs), placed in their education portfolios and evaluated with scaled rubrics by Millikin faculty (see Appendix: Candidate Assessment Alignment to Standards). The Education Candidate Assessments include:

- CA1: Professional Growth Narrative
- CA2: Disposition Self-Assessment and Reflection
- CA3: Case Study on Student Learning
- CA4: Web Quest
- CA5: Classroom Management and Discipline Plan
- CA6: Evolving Philosophy of Teaching and Learning
- CA7: Instruction Plan for Inclusion
- CA8: Literacy in the Classroom
- CA9: Functional Behavioral Analysis
- CA10: Teacher Work Sample
- CA11: Student Teaching Analysis

These 11 assessments measure the full range of learning goals and standards from the Millikin Teaching Standards (MTS), the Core Language Arts Standards (CLA), and the Core Technology Standards (CTECH).

In addition, each English Education candidate is assessed with six Major Assessments (MAs), which measure the mastery of skills and knowledge specifically in the major. These include the following:

- English Education MA1: Secondary Language Arts Content Area Test Score
- English Education MA2: GPA in Major Courses
- English Education MA3: Language Arts Teaching Unit Plans
- English Education MA4: Student Teaching Evaluations by Cooperating Teacher and Supervising Professor [also CA11: Student Teaching Analysis]
- English Education MA5: Teacher Work Sample [also CA10: Teacher Work Sample]
- English Education MA6: Capstone Journal

Each of these major assessments are represented by an artifact placed in the student's portfolio, each evaluated by English Department faculty with a scaled rubric assessment tool.

The combination of these candidate assessments and major assessments will hopefully lead to Millikin's acceptance as an NCATE school for this degree program, giving our program national standards accreditation.

English Education Learning Goals

Finally, in addition 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 artifacts for assessing each of these goals are listed below.

Student Performance Assessment Methods

After the Spring semester, English faculty on the English Education Major Committee will review the English Education electronic portfolios evaluating the quality of learning demonstrated for each learning goal, using the portfolio review rubric.

EE Portfolio Artifact 1: a genre essay related to literary genre and contextual factors (including an understanding of literatures' historical, intellectual, and cultural contexts)

EE Portfolio Artifact 2: artifact demonstrating theory and practice of teaching writing [also MA6: Capstone Journal]

EE Portfolio Artifact 3: artifact demonstrating methods of teaching English language arts through constructed unit plans

The department shall also gather data on the following scores to assist in overall programmatic review of success in achieving learning goals.

Additional Program Review Assessment Methods

Portfolio Artifact 4 [also MA1: State of Illinois Secondary Language Arts Content Area Test Score]

Portfolio Artifact 5 [also MA2: Student Cumulative GPA in English Major Courses at Millikin]

Assessment Data

Four English Education students graduated during the 2006-2007 school year and each was assessed upon completion of their degrees. Two graduated in December 2006 and two in May of 2007. All students were assessed to obtain this year's data.

Table 4: 2006-2007 English Education

Graduates

| Student, Grad date | EE1 | EE2/MA6 | EE3/MA3 | MA1 | MA2 |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Student One | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Student Two | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Student Three | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Student Four | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |

Raw Scores

| | | | | IL | Pgpa |
|---------------|----|----|----|-----------|-------------|
| Student One | 12 | 15 | 12 | 261 | 3.707 |
| Student Two | 12 | 15 | 12 | 286 | 3.947 |
| Student Three | 11 | 13 | 9 | 259 | 3.253 |
| Student Four | 11 | 12 | 11 | 260 | 3.318 |

Conversion Scales

EE1, literary genre/contextual analysis, RED 1 PT 0-3, YELLOW 2 PT 4-8, GREEN 3 PT 9-12

EE2/MA6, theory-practice of teaching writing, Capstone Journal, RED 1 PT 0-5, YELLOW 2 PT 6-10, GREEN 3 PT 11-15

EE3, methods of teaching lang arts, Teaching Unit Plans, RED 1 PT 0-3, YELLOW 2 PT 4-8, GREEN 3 PT 9-12

MA1, Ill State Content Area Exam, RED 1 PT 0-239, YELLOW 2 PT 240-260, GREEN 3PT 261-300

MA2, Millikin cum. major program gpa, RED 1 PT 0.00 to 2.6, YELLOW 2 PT 2.7 to 2.9, GREEN 3 PT 3.0 to 4.0

Analysis of Assessment Results

Our three major English education degree program indicators are all in the Green zone this year.

Goal One – Green

EE Portfolio Artifact 1: a genre essay related to literary genre and contextual factors (including an understanding of literatures' historical, intellectual, and cultural contexts)

All students assessed performed extremely well on this item. Two made a raw score of 12 out of 12 and two made raw scores of 11 out of 12 on the assessment rubric. Raw scores ranging from 9 to 12 on the assessment rubric are in the Green zone. As this is the first year of our sampling data, we must be careful about drawing conclusions drawn from the data at this point. We will need to see how scores compare over the next few years to draw substantive conclusions. However, with this small sampling, at this point, the results are very positive on this indicator.

Goal Two – Green

EE Portfolio Artifact 2: artifact demonstrating theory and practice of teaching writing [also MA6: Capstone Journal]

All students assessed performed well on this item. Two made a raw score of 12 out of 12 and two made raw scores of 12 and 13 out of 15 on the assessment rubric. Raw scores ranging from 11 to 15 on the assessment rubric are in the Green zone. As this is the first year of our sampling data, we must be careful about drawing conclusions drawn from the data at this point. We will need to see how scores compare over the next few years to draw substantive conclusions. However, with this small sampling, at this point, the results are positive on this indicator.

Goal Three – Green

EE Portfolio Artifact 3: artifact demonstrating methods of teaching English language arts through constructed unit plans

All students assessed performed well on this item. Two made a raw score of 12 out of 12 and two made raw scores of 9 and 11 out of 12 on the assessment rubric. Raw scores ranging from 9 to 12 on the assessment rubric are in the Green zone. One score was just barely above the Yellow zone. As this is the first year of our sampling data, we must be careful about drawing conclusions drawn from the data at this point. We will need to see how scores compare over the next few years to draw substantive conclusions. However, with this small sampling, at this point, the results are positive on this indicator.

Two other indicators are also useful here in helping to evaluate the program.

Portfolio Artifact Four – Green/Yellow

Portfolio Artifact 4 [MA1: State of Illinois Secondary Language Arts Content Area Test Score]

Two students assessed on this external validation score well and were in the Green zone, while two scored in the Yellow zone. One in the green zone scored high in that zone, while the other three were right on the borderline between the green and yellow designations. These scores will bare close watching in the coming years as more data comes in. This external state-wide indicator will be useful in seeing how these scores compare directly with the internal data generated by our assessment measures.

Portfolio Artifact Five – Green

Portfolio Artifact 5 [MA2: Student Cumulative GPA in English Major Courses at Millikin]

This indicator has all four students scoring in the Green zone. Two were in the high end of the Green zone and two in the lower end. These scores are useful in determining students success in a broad range of content-related coursework, essential knowledge of future success in their careers as educators.

Improvement Plans

It is too early in the assessment process to recommend significant improvement plans at this time. According to our original set of data generated in this year, we seem to be heading in the right direction, overall. As more data becomes available in the next few years, a clearer picture will emerge that will help with our improvement plans. In the future, we will continue to utilize the following broad indicators below.

Each effectiveness measure will receive a performance indicator using the following 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: our 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)

As more data is collected and trends become apparent, we shall close the loop of assessment of refine the curriculum and teaching methodology in the major to assist students in achieving success in mastering these designated learning goals.

The English Education major will be strengthened in the fall of 2007 by the addition of a full-time tenure-track Associate Professor, Dr. Jim Meyer. He has strong credentials in the area of English education and will be a welcomed addition to the department.

Some changes in the program within the coming academic year seem inevitable. As we continue to adjust the curriculum to obtain NCATE status from the NCTE, we will need to make refinements in program offerings that meet the newer NCTE learning goals we are adopting. Due to the very packed nature of the curriculum, some trade-offs may be required. Some previously required coursework may have to be dropped in order to create room for course offerings in History of the English Language and linguistics. We will also need to consult with our partners in the Communication department to better meet the needs of our English language arts students in speaking and oral communication learning goals. It is essential to make any curricular change as soon as possible, so that our assessment data remains consistent over the coming years.

| English Education Assessment Artifact Curriculum Map | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Name | EE Course(s) |
| Portfolio Artifact 1: a genre essay related to literary genre and contextual factors (historical, intellectual, diverse cultural contexts) | Lit Traditions EE1 Core Courses |
| Portfolio Artifact 2: artifact demonstrating theory and practice of teaching writing [also MA6: Capstone Journal] | EE2 EN470 |
| Portfolio Artifact 3: artifact demonstrating methods of teaching English language arts (unit plans) | EE3 EN235, EN425 |
| Portfolio Artifact 4: [MA1: State of Illinois Secondary Language Arts Content Area Test Score] | External State exam |
| Portfolio Artifact 5: [MA2: Student Cumulative GPA in English Major Courses at Millikin] | All English courses |

Artifact Collection Points for Student Performance Assessment

There are typical associations with each of these artifact collection points and identified classes in the curriculum where these artifacts will be specifically assigned and gathered. These collection points are made evident in Table Three below. The **bolded** course numbers indicate a specific required course for English Education majors that contains an assignment guaranteed to produce the artifact. However, some of these artifacts, especially Artifact One, could equally be produced in most of the other courses listed in the first row of courses. It is the student's choice of assignment to become each artifact, as long as the artifact meets correct standards and requirements.

| Table 3: collection | Artifact 1 | Artifact 2 | Artifact 3 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| EN202, EN220, EN222, EN231, EN232 , EN233, EN234, EN241, EN242, EN321, EN322, EN325, EN340, EN350, EN360, EN366 | X | | |
| EN310, EN470 | | X | |
| EN235, EN425 | | | X |

Collection Points for Program Review Assessment Indicators

Artifact Five is taken from content area test scores given by the State of Illinois.
Artifact Six is taken for the cumulative grade point average of each student's grades in their major courses.

MA One – Major 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 0 -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. | |

MA Two – Major Assessment Two 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. | |

EE One – 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.

EE Two/MA Six – Major Assessment Six Rubric
Culminating Journal for Teaching Writing Internship
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

EE3-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