Department of English Assessment Plan
Fall 2011

1. Goals for Student Learning at the Program Level
The Department of English has structured its undergraduate and graduate programs to provide students with opportunities to develop critical reading, writing and thinking strategies. In accordance with principles articulated by the Modern Language Association (MLA) and other professional organizations, English majors will:

- read attentively, closely, and critically;
- write thoughtfully, coherently, and persuasively;
- develop and challenge their own thinking through scholarly research.

- Candidates seeking initial certification will also meet NCTE standards for the preparation of teachers of English Language Arts.

2. Descriptions of methods demonstrating that students have learned:

2—A. B.A. in English, B.A. in English Adolescence Education

The Department of English utilizes a portfolio-based assessment system for all of its students. Undergraduate majors must submit a paper to their portfolio each semester during which they are enrolled in the program and taking an English class. Undergraduate portfolio papers must be at least two pages long (longer papers are preferable) and one submission, minimally, must demonstrate research. GPA is another measure used to assure student success. In Fall 2008, the department voted in a new requirement that all English majors and minors must earn a grade of C or better in all courses counted in English degree programs. This change took effect for students entering the major/minor in Fall 2009. Previously, students were expected to demonstrate a cumulative 2.0 showing proficiency in our course materials.

Our undergraduate portfolio review uses rubrics modified in Fall 2010 to better assess the sub-categories associated with our learning outcomes. Last year's findings and our rubrics are attached in Appendix B.

English Department Learning Outcomes and Portfolio Evaluation Criteria

1. Teach students to read attentively, closely, and critically

   1.1 Student makes effective use of primary texts through quotation and internal reference.
   1.2 Student draws conclusions and generalities beyond a given text.
   1.3 Student offers a clear critical approach in interpreting texts.

2. Teach students to write thoughtfully, coherently, and persuasively

   2.1 Student establishes a central point or focus.
   2.2 Student effectively uses evidence to support and develop the central point.

2.3   Student develops points in argument in an orderly manner.

2.4   Student demonstrates appropriate writing mechanics.

3.   Teach students to develop and challenge their thinking through scholarly research

      3.1   Student clearly delineates complex relationships among ideas.

      3.2   Student demonstrates scholarly engagement with secondary sources.

      3.3   Student clearly summarizes and paraphrases secondary texts.

      3.4   Student cites sources correctly.

Undergraduate portfolio reviews are now conducted by the Curriculum Committee and will take place assessing one goal every other year, with review of all three goals in years when a self-study is being prepared. The results of portfolio reviews are shared with the Department and documented in the Department's annual report; results pertinent to the English Adolescence Education major are also sent to the College of Education for its annual NCATE unit assessment report.

Another instrument used to measure student learning comes from our student exit surveys, implemented in our two Senior Seminars, ENGL 400 and ENED 450 (for certification students). We piloted these in Spring 2005, revised the survey instrument after the pilot, and first implemented the survey in Fall 2005 as standard practice in ENGL 400 and in ENED 450. Results of exit surveys since 2005 were tabulated in Spring 2008, and the curriculum committee was subsequently charged with revising the exit surveys to more adequately provide data needed for program revision. Results from the surveys are used to shape committee charges for subsequent years, and instigated the proposal of our writing minor in Fall 2008, as well as revisions to our Adolescence Education program in Fall 2008.

The Department holds an intersession each January, when we discuss data from our portfolio reviews and envision change for the department in response to that data. Our 2005 full portfolio review showed that we needed to focus in 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 on goal #3, "Develop and challenge [students'] own thinking through scholarly research." Our Intersession topic in January 2008 was how do we use theory, criticism and research in the curriculum? We also did a portfolio review to determine in which courses students were writing research papers. Our 2010 review shows that we still need to do more work on research, but also revealed that we needed to focus more on writing mechanics. We are currently discussing how to add a second course in writing to the English major, and are offering more 300-level courses in expository and argumentative writing forms.

2—B. B.A. in English Adolescence Education

The English Adolescence Education major also requires a portfolio, which supplements the tiered assessment conducted every year in keeping with the Unit Assessment Plan for the Professional Education Unit of the College of Education. This program undergoes its formal assessment review under the requirements of the College of Education and NCATE. Documents used in that process include:

- Program Action Plan: English Adolescence Education (Appendix C)
- Decision Making Matrix: English Adolescence Education (Appendix D)
- Undergraduate Candidate Assessment Plan (Appendix E)

To see the full 2010-2011 English Adolescence Education Committee Annual Report, please see the folder on annual report documents.

2—C. M.A. in English, M.A. 7-12 for certification, and M.S. Ed. 7-12 for certification[1]

The Department's Graduate Committee (GC) is responsible for initiating curricular and programmatic changes; these frequently originate with the university's Graduate Council, the College of Education, various accrediting agencies (NCTE, NCATE, Middle States) as well as faculty and graduate student dialogue at department meetings, informal discussions about policy and curriculum (the "Just Talking" and "Just Teaching" series) and portfolio review. Documents used in assessing the graduate program include:

- Program Action Plan: English Advanced Programs (Appendix F)
- Decision Making Matrix: English Advanced Programs (Appendix G)
- Graduate Candidate Assessment Plan (Appendix H)

To see the full 2010-2011 Advanced Program annual report, please see the folder on annual report documents.

Since 2003, the graduate program in the Department of English has also required portfolios for students enrolled in both the M.A. programs and the M.S. in Education-English 7-12 program. In Fall 2005, the Department articulated that our graduate program goals were the same as those for our undergraduate program. In Spring 2009, we reviewed those goals, the results of which are included in Appendix B. In Spring 2010, we revised the graduate program goals as part of a complete restructuring of our graduate program. The new goals are:

Students in the graduate program will:
- Broaden their understanding of English as a field and find their places within it;
- Think critically about language and the contexts in which it is produced and received;

---

[1] Another part of the restructuring is to stop accepting candidates into our M.S. Ed., thus the new program is designed with only two degrees: the M.A. in English and the M.A. in English Education 7-12.

- Engage with and apply multiple research methodologies in order to express themselves in written and other media.

Graduate portfolios differ for M.A. candidates and for M.A. 7-12 candidates. M.A. students not seeking certification must include an entry paper (this should be the personal statement in the student's graduate application); a minimum of three papers selected by the student, written for different graduate courses; and an exit paper addressing several points (see the 'Graduate Portfolio Guidelines' sheet for specifics). M.A. 7-12 candidates must include an entry paper (also the personal statement in the student's graduate application); a teacher work sample including documentation of a structured field experience; a minimum of three additional papers selected by the student, written for different graduate courses; and an exit paper addressing several points (see the 'Graduate Portfolio Guidelines' sheet for specifics).

Graduate portfolios are reviewed by the Graduate Committee once every three years. Our last reviews were in 2006, and 2009. The results of portfolio reviews are shared with the entire Department, articulated in our annual report, and shared with the College of Education for its NCATE accreditation report. Results are also used to set charges for the following years.

Other procedures for assessing the progress of degree candidates include evaluating candidates upon admission to the program, at three transition points, and upon completion of the program. The entrance point review ensures that all entering candidates have sufficient background in literature and writing to successfully complete the program. All candidates seeking professional certification are required to submit proof of initial certification at that point. All candidates enroll in English 500 (Introduction to Graduate Studies) during their first semester, so they not only receive the guidance and preparation that will help them successfully complete the program, but they are also subject to an early form of assessment. All candidates must receive a final grade of a B or higher in all graduate courses, or they will automatically be placed on departmental probation, which requires a student to meet with his or her academic advisor and to raise his or her GPA to a 3.0 or higher the following semester. After completing 9-12 credits, all candidates are screened via the department's mid-point review, which evaluates candidates' progress toward completing required core courses, English Education courses, portfolio requirements, and their required structured field experiences. In conjunction with individual advisors' reviews of candidate progress, the graduate director and/or advanced program coordinator evaluates the latter two requirements as candidates approach the end of their graduate studies. All applications for graduation are reviewed by advisors, the graduate director, and the department chair.

Please see our portfolio guidelines (Appendices J and K), the description and guidelines for our structured field experience (Appendix L), and the rubric for assessing our structured field experiences (Appendix M).

3. Times lines for assessment practice

Our assessment plans are detailed in the attached assessment plans for our certification students. Our Department Assessment Plan in grid form details our rotation for assessment in a multi-year plan (Appendix A).

In terms of portfolios, the Department takes several measures to ensure that students complete their portfolios for graduation. Students must sign up for portfolio completion (ENGL 401 for undergraduate majors) concurrently with Senior Seminar (ENGL 400 or ENED 450). Students complete their portfolios by writing the required exit paper in senior seminar. As part of

the graduation review process for undergraduates in both majors, each applicant's portfolio is screened by the faculty advisor to ensure that it is complete and meets all requirements. Graduate degree candidates complete the portfolio while enrolled in ENGL 695 Graduate Seminar in Professional Studies. They work on the portfolio by inserting papers during their enrollment in the program, but final assembly and writing the exit paper is overseen in ENGL 695. The Department conducts undergraduate and graduate portfolio assessment every other year, and looks at undergraduate and graduate exit surveys in the interim years. File reviews happen each spring for undergraduates, and each semester for graduate students who are at the mid-point in their degree program.

4. Assignments of responsibility for carrying out the assessment plan – described above

5. Record-keeping to allow access to student learning data by all institutional units relevant to their area

All assessment results are now housed on the Department Angel site, and can be accessed by different committees as they review their charges and action plans. Administrators at the unit level are given access to the site when they need to review and copy department assessment materials. All assessment results are copied to the Dean of the College of Education for aggregation at the unit level.

6. Processes for using assessment results to improve learning and evidence of change

The policy-making committees (Curriculum Committee, English Education Committee, and the Graduate Committee) are charged yearly with review of the curriculum and program requirements based on assessment findings. The Department engages in a January "Intersession" meeting, during which program assessment issues are frequently discussed together with other issues related to teaching and learning.

The Department's committee structure allows for substantive discussion of pedagogical issues among the faculty that then come before the entire Department for review and action. Program changes are taken to the appropriate bodies outside the department—Professional Education Council for certification-related issues; the General Education Program committee for general education issues; Academic Affairs Committee for all undergraduate course and program issues; Graduate Council for graduate program issues—before moving to the appropriate dean and then to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. All program review decisions are documented in our annual committee and departmental reports to the Deans of the College of Arts and Sciences and of the College of Education and the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research.

Our undergraduate and graduate certification programs chart their assessment activities onto Action Plans and Decision Making Matrices, which are then used to make data-based decisions in the following year. The chair collects information from annual reports, makes charges, and committee chairs plug charges into their action plans.

Appendix A:

Department of English Assessment Plan: 2003-2015

Academic Year	Department Review/ General Assessment tasks	English Ed/Grad file reviews and NCATE: New and ongoing assessment	Middle States/Annual assessment task	CCC
2003-2004		Site Visit for Initial NCATE Accreditation		CCC-Critical Thinking (F03)
2005-2006	5-yr self-study/external review (S06)		UG portfolio review of all three departmental goals (F05). Grad portfolio review of all three departmental goals (S06).	
2006-2007		Prepare SPA report: English Ed.	Review of Grad exit surveys (GC) (F06).	CCC-V Humanities for SUNY GEAR (F06)
2007-2008	Theory in the curriculum (intersession 08); research in the grad program; Global lit (MLW)	Spa Revisions; SFE Rubric; Grad Decision Making Matrix (F07)	Review of undergraduate senior exit surveys (rotation).	CCC I Written Assessment: Comp Coordinator.
2008-2009	Global lit core, continued; research in the undergrad programs (intersession 09).	NCATE Site Visit for Cont. Accreditation (F08); Revise SPA report (EE).	Graduate portfolio review (GC).	
2009-2010	Review/discussion of teaching evals, use of online evals, and writing and research in the English major.	NCATE response to conditions report for Advanced Programs. Submit revised SPA report.	UG portfolio review: (CC) Grad program surveys (GC).	
2010-2011		NCATE data collection for grad and undergrad programs.	UG portfolio review (CC)—complete review begun in Spring 2010 (F10).	CCC-IV Arts and V Humanities
2011-2012	5-yr self-study (F11)/external Review (S12)(postponed from AY 2010-2011)	NCATE data collection for grad and undergrad programs.	UG and Grad exit surveys (F11)(CC/GC)	CCC-Critical Thinking (may change); I Writ.Com.; VIII Am. Hist.; IX Western Civ
2012-2013			Graduate Portfolio Review (GC) (F12)	CCC X World/Non-Western
2013-2014		Prepare SPA report (EE); Prepare Advanced Program Rpt for NCATE (GC);	UG portfolio review (CC/GC). (S14)	CCC IV Arts and V Humanities
2014-2015			Grad portfolio review (GC); Review senior & grad exit surveys: (CC, GC)	CCC-Critical Thinking; I Written Communication; VIII American History; IX Western Civ

Using assessment results: assessment data are to be collected by the chair and filed hard-copy in the office and electronically on the department's Angel site, in addition to being recorded in the individual committee's minutes. The chair will use results to set committee charges for the next year in terms of making program changes, and committee chairs and event organizers will be expected to consult assessment results to inform decisions about departmental discussions, events, and planning so that assessment leads to a stronger program. Intersession discussions will be a key place where we ask questions about what we value, consult assessment data, and make decisions about changes we'd like to make.

Appendix B: Curriculum Committee Review of Undergraduate Portfolios: Nov. 2010

DEPARTMENTAL LEARNING OUTCOMES AND PORTFOLIO EVALUATION CRITERA

1. Teach students to read attentively, closely, and critically

    1.1 Student makes effective use of primary texts through quotation and internal reference.
    1.2 Student draws conclusions and generalities beyond a given text.
    1.3 Student offers a clear critical approach in interpreting texts.

2. Teach students to write thoughtfully, coherently, and persuasively

    2.1 Student establishes a central point or focus.
    2.2 Student effectively uses evidence to support and develop the central point.
    2.3 Student develops points in argument in an orderly manner.
    2.4 Student demonstrates appropriate writing mechanics.

3. Teach students to develop and challenge their thinking through scholarly research

    3.1 Student clearly delineates complex relationships among ideas.
    3.2 Student demonstrates scholarly engagement with secondary sources.
    3.3 Student clearly summarizes and paraphrases secondary texts.
    3.4 Student cites sources correctly.

NOVEMBER 2010 PORTFOLIO REVIEW RESULTS
N=15 portfolios from Spring 2009 graduating seniors (9=323 majors; 6 =120 majors)
Score reflects average of the two reviewers' marks for each goal

Goal	Below <1.75	Approaching 1.75-1.99	At Target 2.00	Above 2.01-2.74	Well Above >2.74	N/A
1.1	2 = 13%	1 = 7%	6 = 40%	5 = 33%	1 = 7%	0
1.2	2 = 13%	0	6 = 40%	6 = 40%	1 = 7%	0
1.3	1 = 7%	2 = 13%	8 = 53%	4 = 27%	0	0
2.1	0	2 = 13%	8 = 53%	4 = 27%	1 = 7%	0
2.2	0	3 = 20%	6 = 40%	5 = 33%	1 = 7%	0
2.3	0	1 = 7%	11 = 73%	2 = 13%	1 = 7%	0
2.4	4 = 27%	2 = 13%	4 = 27%	3 = 20%	2 = 14%	0
3.1	1 = 7%	5 = 33%	5 = 33%	3 = 20%	1 =7%	0
3.2	3 = 20%	5 = 33%	4 = 27%	3 = 20%	0	0
3.3	1 = 7%	3 = 20%	7 = 47%	4 = 27%	0	0
3.4	4 = 27%	0	6 = 40%	4 = 27%	0	1

NOVEMBER 2010 PORTFOLIO REVIEW RESULTS
N=15 portfolios from Spring 2009 graduating seniors (9=323 majors; 6 =120 majors)
Score reflects average of the two reviewers' marks for each goal

Goal	Below <2.00	At Target 2.00	Above >2.00	N/A
1.1	3 = 20%	6 = 40%	6 = 40%	0
1.2	2 = 13%	6 = 40%	7 = 47%	0
1.3	3 = 20%	8 = 53%	4 = 27%	0
2.1	2 = 13%	8 = 53%	5 = 33%	0
2.2	3 = 20%	6 = 40%	6 = 40%	0
2.3	1 = 7%	11 = 73%	3 = 20%	0
2.4	6 = 40%	4 = 27%	5 = 33%	0
3.1	6 = 40%	5 = 33%	4 = 27%	0
3.2	8 = 53%	4 = 27%	3 = 20%	0
3.3	4 = 27%	7 = 47%	4 = 27%	0
3.4	4 = 27%	6 = 40%	4 =27%	1

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM NOVEMBER 2010 REVIEW

1. Our department is equally strong in developing learning outcome #1 (teaching students to read attentively, closely, and critically) and outcome #2 (teaching students to write thoughtfully, coherently, and persuasively), with the exception that 40% of student essays fall below target in the use of correct writing mechanics.

2. We recommend that our department develop specific strategies for improving writing mechanics and implement them as appropriate in as many courses as possible, not limited to ENGL 100 and courses designated for the Writing Minor.

3. We recommend striving to connect writing mechanics to the skills of attentive and close reading and credible and meaningful expression (*e.g.*, make such connections explicit on assignment sheets and in comments on written work).

4. Undergraduate research papers are not meeting departmental expectations, especially on the criteria of demonstrating engagement with scholarly sources and citing sources correctly and completely.

5. We suggest developing some standardized set of goals and grading criteria for what the department considers research papers, and delineating courses (*e.g.*, period, author) in which a formal research paper should be expected.

Appendix C: English Education Action Plan 2010-2011

ADOLESCENCE ENGLISH EDUCATION
YEARLY REFLECTION AND ACTION PLAN DEVELOPMENT
FOR 2010-2011

Data Sources Reviewed for	Division/Program Strengths & Needs	Priorities to be Addressed	Data Based Action Plan for 2010-11 Steps to be Taken	Decision Made and future actions
Unit & Program Performance 1. Spa Assessments 2. English Education Committee Charges 3. English Education Committee deliberations 4. Feedback from File review forms 2008-2011 5. Department of English Annual Report. 6. Data from COE	**Strengths:** **1.** Most candidates score very well on state tests and other SPA assessments, learn to be good teachers in the program and demonstrate their competence in student teaching. 2. Review of candidates' progress through the major each semester, providing feedback to them, and creating plans for helping candidates fix deficiencies. 3. Extensive feedback from English faculty regarding candidates' dispositions. _____ **Needs:** 1. Consider other methods of assessing candidate impact on student learning; potential program assessment for cultural responsiveness. 2. Obtain even more disposition data through a unit-wide process.	1. Monitoring NYSTCE Performance. 2. User-friendly dispositions system that allows for "buy in" and input from department faculty as well as easy draw down and compilation of data from the instructor-initiated database.	1. Obtain NYSTCE scores from COE. 2. Complete candidate program reviews in fall 2010 and spring 2011. 3. Continue attempts to create user-friendly, functional dispositions database (coordinate with COE). 4. Coordinate assessment efforts with the Graduate Committee.	1. Completed 2. Completed 3. Ongoing 4. Completed and ongoing

Candidate Quality & Effectiveness in Public Schools & Agencies **1. SPA Assessments** **2. English Education Committee Charges** 3. English Education Committee deliberations 4. Discussions with Cooperating Teachers	**Strengths:** **1.** The program continues to have excellent relationships with cooperating teachers. 2. Ability to incorporate feedback from area teachers and schools into our curriculum and planning for each year. 3. After several years, we have a developed sense of who will struggle in the Professional Year. Personalized responses to the interview provides feedback and guidance to candidates. 4. Endowed scholarships and financial awards for excellence in our programs. **Needs:** **1.** We need to include disposition data from faculty and hold candidates accountable in meaningful ways to dispositional concerns. 2. Provide more information before screening about the event itself and the possible outcomes. Very time-consuming event. 3. Ability to communicate changes in English Adolescence Education major to area two-year colleges.	1. Partnerships with area schools and cooperating teachers 2. Professional development opportunities for practitioner colleagues in the field. 3. Candidate performance on SPA assessments 4. Ensure that those candidates going forward are well able to work with students and cooperating teachers. 5. Recognize excellent work by candidates; provide financial assistance for those in the professional year 6. Communication with area two-year colleges.	1. Advertise and encourage cooperating teachers to attend the Clinical Field Supervision training offered by the Office of Field Experiences, March 2011. 2. Collect data for SPA assessments. 3. Conduct the screening interviews for juniors seeking to enter the professional year – input should come from all department faculty; invite additional faculty to sit on screening committee as warranted. 4. Hold a pre-screening meeting for these students, either in December or January. 5. Select junior and senior winners of scholarship and excellence in student teaching awards 6. Coordinate an advising session on the 2120 major in October with the DAC committee. 7. Coordinate the annual file reviews and rescreening remediation files in Fall and Spring. 8. Plan and conduct meeting for student teachers a day or two before beginning student teaching.	1. Completed 2. Completed 3. Completed 4. Completed 5. Completed 6. Completed 7. Completed 8. Completed

Curriculum Refinement & Development 1. Departmental minutes for 2009-2011 2. College catalog 3. English Education program reports 2008-2011 5. English Education Committee Charges 6. Senior Exit Survey, Spring 2010, 2011	**Strengths:** 1. Program provides a very strong background in global literature. Candidates take a number of specialized pedagogy courses with focus on the ELA curriculum. 2. Faculty with expertise and ability to develop curriculum. 3. Demand from second BA population. 4. Administrative support. **Needs:** 1. Continued expansion of candidate experiences in American and British literature. 2. Increase candidates' opportunities to write. 3. Take advantage of faculty strengths. 4. Identifying State Ed. ELA requirements.	1. Recognize difference between pedagogy-based and literature, language and writing focused courses. 2. Introduce space in the curriculum for new requirements and electives to strengthen candidates in areas of literature and writing 3. Capitalize on faculty strengths and departmental experience with pedagogy courses.	1. Review results of Spring 2011 senior exit survey and discuss implications for program. 2. Discuss effectiveness of new Adolescence English Education major requirement changes in English Education meetings and in English Department meetings, consider possible modifications. 3. Determine best means of assuring that the Landmarks courses address the needs of 2120 majors. 4. Discuss ways to address the need for improved research skills for 2120 majors who are not required to take ENGL 106. 5. Propose ENED special topics course(s) to curriculum committee. 6. Identify which courses count as second writing course for 2120 majors. 7. Refine ENED 452 and consider ramifications of students who fail that course but pass ENED 453.	1. Completed 2. Completed 3. Completed 4. To be completed in 2011-12 5. To be completed in 2011-12 6. To be completed in 2011-12 To be completed in 2011-12
Faculty Quality/Development Staffing data; 2009-2011 Department Year-end Report	**Strengths:** 1. Highly qualified faculty members with varying scholarly interests. 2. Dedicated faculty members willing to mentor advisees and candidates.	1. Provide professional development opportunities to faculty. 2. Course release time to compensate faculty members for extra teaching and service responsibilities (beyond contractual obligations and normal teaching load).	1. Hold Mary Louise White Symposium. 2. Communicate with Arts and Humanities Dean John Kijinski.	1. Completed 2. To be completed in 2011-12

	Needs: Relief for faculty members from the ever increasing burden of assessment, extra teaching responsibilities and other workload demands			

Appendix D:

<div align="center">

Program Decision Making Matrix
COE-Professional Education Program/Department Level
Program Coordinator: Scott Johnston
English Adolescence Education
2010-11

</div>

Changes Made to Program	*Rationale for Changes Made*	*Evidence Used & Documentation for Program Changes Made*
Revised File Review Process: will pull ALL 2120 files in Fall to make sure we can create an up-to-date "master list" of candidates. Will review appropriate sophomore and junior files in the fall, all others in the Spring	To avoid missing files that should have been reviewed.	English Education Committee deliberations regarding results of reviews conducted in previous years
Decided not to include portfolios in file reviews. Portfolio issues will be handled during advising, screening, and Senior Seminar	Too much inconsistency among reviewers.	English Education Committee deliberations regarding results of reviews conducted in previous years
Created a course planning guideline handout for advisors and majors	Careful course planning required for talking courses necessary for passing screening.	English Education Committee deliberations regarding candidate preparation for screening
Decided to allow sophomores into ENED 356 rather than restrict it to juniors and seniors	Needed to ensure that candidates can take ENED 356 before screening	English Education Committee deliberations regarding candidate course planning

Moved screening to April rather than February	High number of transfer students who were in ENED 356 and ENED 357 during the screening semester have a better chance of passing screening	English Education Committee deliberations regarding candidate preparation or screening
Made END 450 and ENED 451 enrollment based in instructor approval	To keep people who fail screening from enrolling in ENED 450 and 451	English Education Committee deliberations regarding screening process
Will require candidates who have a transfer equivalence for ENED 101 to attend first two weeks of the course	Candidates will be able to participate in curriculum planning and intro to the major work necessary for successful completion of the major	English Education Committee deliberations regarding ENED 101 transfer equivalents
Added a professional portfolio to ENED 452 course requirements	To help candidates with their job searches	English Education Committee Charges English Education Committee deliberations regarding modification of ENED 452
Clarified guidelines to include frequently taught novels in the British and American Literary Landmarks courses	To better prepare candidates to teach frequently required texts	English Education Committee Charges English Education Committee deliberations regarding Landmarks requirements Conversations with area cooperating teachers

Initial Credential Program
Adolescence Education: English Program Assessment Plan 2011-2012

Educational Assessment Outcomes (Evaluation Questions)	Data Sources and Instruments	Frequency of Data Collection	Data Use Person(s) Responsible for:			Data Based Decisions and Timeline	Dissemination and Timeline
			Collection	Aggregation	Analysis		
CANDIDATE COMPETENCE							
Applicant Qualifications:							
How is applicant qualification measured at program entry?							
T-0 Admission	• SAT ≥ 1050 • High School GPA ≥ 85% • Internal Transfers: GPA≥2.75 and C+ in all English and ENED Courses • External Transfer: • < 30 credit hours, GPA ≥ 2.5 • ≥30 credit hours, GPA ≥ 2.75 • Second BA • GPA ≥ 2.75 • Initial screening interview with English Ed Program Coordinator	Annual	**Admissions Office**			**For Fall admissions – Letter sent in Spring prior to beginning program.**	Letter sent in Spring prior to beginning program.
Candidate Qualifications:							
How is the candidate progressing in the demonstration of the needed k/s/d and influence on certification area student learning? Measured at the following checkpoints:							
a. Early coursework and fieldwork T-1	freshman year annual review • GPA in English and ENED courses (minimum of C+ in each English and ENED course) • GPA in Education courses (minimum average 2.5) • Overall GPA of 2.5 or higher • Portfolio Submission	**Each February**	English Dept. English Education Committee	English Education Coordinator	English Education Coordinator	Semester Completion **1= successful file review** 0= remediation with advisor, second unsuccessful review, student advised out of major	February
b. Advancement T-2	**sophomore year annual review** **• GPA in English and ENED courses (minimum of C+ in each English and ENED course)** **• GPA in Education courses (minimum average 2.5)** **• Overall GPA of 2.75 or higher** **• Portfolio Submissions**	**Each October and February**	English Dept. English Education Committee	English Education Coordinator	English Education Coordinator	Semester Completion 1 = successful file review 0= remediation with advisor, second consecutive unsuccessful review, student advised out of program	Each October and February
c. Admission to	a. annual review		English Dept.	English	English	Semester prior to	Each October and February

Professional Year and Student Teaching T-3	• GPA in English and ENED courses (minimum of C+ in each English and ENED course) • GPA in Education courses (minimum average 2.5) • Overall GPA of 2.75 or higher • Portfolio Submissions b. screening interview (pass, fail, pass with conditions) i. candidates must have completed at least 2 of the following courses before being eligible for screening: ENED 250, ENED 355, ENED 356 and ENED 357; ii. Additional coursework, including retaking courses, may be required for candidates identified as "pass with conditions" In some cases, this may require an additional year in the program	**Each October and February** **Each Mar/Apr**	English Education Committee Panel of English Adolescence Faculty.	Education Coordinator English Education Coordinator	Education Coordinator English Education Coordinator	entrance into candidacy [normally Fall of Senior year] 1 = Progress 0 = remediation of deficiencies prior to entrance to professional year, advised out of program	
d. Program Completion T-Exit	S Grade in Student Teaching) • Graduation Review GRADUATION: Successful completion of Program (i.e., Acceptable grades in professional Sequence Courses Pass Seminar Overall GPA ≥ 2.75	**Spring semester**	**Course instructor** **Student Teaching supervisors** **Cooperating teachers**	**English Education Coordinator**	**English Education Coordinator** **Office of Field Experiences** **English faculty**	**Completion of final semester** **1= Recommended for certification** **0= Repeat student teaching experiences; retake licensure exam(s)**	May
e. Post Graduation	CERTIFICATION: State Licensure exams (LAST, ATS-W, English CST)	**Annual**	**NYSED**	**NYSED**	**UAC**		Ongoing

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT & REFINEMENT

Quality and Availability of Curricula:

1) How do courses and field experiences adequately prepare candidates to be effective beginning educators?

2) Are courses available to meet the needs of candidates?

	• **Student course evaluations** • **Annual Meeting with Student Teachers** • **Annual Meeting with Cooperating Teachers** • **Exit survey**	**Each fall and spring**	English Dept. English Education Committee	English Education Coordinator	English Education Coordinator	Semester completion	Each fall and spring
	Cool Query	Each semester	English Dept. Chair	English Education Coordinator	English Education Coordinator		Each semester

FIELD EXPERIENCES

How does the program work with school partners to design, implement, and evaluate field experiences that allow candidates to develop and demonstrate k/s/d necessary to help all students learn?

	Cooperating Teacher Annual Meeting	**Every other May depending on Cooperating Teacher interest**	**English Education Coordinator**	**English Education Coordinator**	**English Adolescence Faculty** **Chair of the English Dept.**	**Completion of semester**	Each May
	Conferences with Cooperating Teachers	**Two to six conferences per placement**	**Student Teacher Supervisors**	**English Department English Education Committee**	**English Department English Education Committee**	**Ongoing**	English Education Committee meetings and Year-end Report English Department meetings

Appendix F: **Completed Action Plan for English Advanced Programs: Submitted to College of Education**

ENGLISH PROGRAM ACTION PLAN FOR 2009-2010 (YEARLY REFLECTION AND ACTION PLAN DEVELOPMENT) FALL 2009

Data Sources Reviewed for	Division/Program Strengths & Needs	Priorities to be Addressed	Data Based Action Plan for 2009-1010 Steps to be Taken	Steps Taken in 2009-2010
Unit & Program Performance 2007-2008 Graduate Committee Action Plan and Reports M.A. and M.S. in Ed File Reviews and Graduate Portfolio Report Findings	**Strengths:** The program continues to admit strong undergraduate students and teacher candidates	Refine and evaluate current assessment plans and practices	• Develop new scoring rubric for graduate portfolio assessment (Fall 2008) and conduct graduate portfolio review (Spring 2009) • Review mid-point screening forms and results from February 2009 M.A. students and M.S. in Ed. Candidates screenings • Conduct file reviews for all active M.A. students and M.S. in Ed. Candidates who have completed between 9-12 credit hours (September 2009/ February 2010)	• Conducted mid-point review of all students in graduate programs. • Retained original portfolio assessment rubric for ALL MA and MS in Ed candidates (to satisfy Middle States/ internal assessment goals)
	Needs: • We need to assess whether mid-point transition points for evaluating students' and candidates' progress through their respective programs are effective or not. • Grad committee needs to develop new scoring rubric based on NBPT standards for portfolio review to meet NCATE requirements			• Changed mid-point screening transition point to 9-12 credits • Conducted file reviews for all candidates
Candidate Quality & Effectiveness in Public Schools & Agencies Graduate Student/Candidate Surveys; File Reviews; Department Meeting Minutes; Graduate Council Minutes and Materials	**Strengths:** • The program continues to enroll former SUNY Fredonia English Adolescence Education majors, who have had excellent pedagogical and content preparation and close field experience and placement supervision. • Excellent relationships with cooperating teachers.	• Continue to maintain strong relationships with local schools and cooperating teachers	• Work with English Education Committee to ensure that strong relationships with cooperating teachers are being maintained • Review all applications for admission in conjunction with Department Chair • Advertise and select graduate award winners (in conjunction with DAC) to reward excellence in graduate coursework and assignments (Spring 2009)	•Reviewed all applications for admission •Revised on-line application system to clarify eligible programs for students • Selected graduate award winners • Participated in first Annual Graduate School Recruitment Fair
	Needs: • Review structured field experience assignments and guidelines for M.A. students or M.S. in Ed. Candidates. • TA positions for 2009-2010 need to be filled in Spring 2009	•Assess structured field experience assignments, rubrics, and requirements for all M.A. and M.S. in Ed candidates seeking professional certification.	• Evaluate and refine structured field experience procedures	• Adopted TWS rubrics for English 554 SFE assessment

Curriculum Refinement & Development **Graduate Student/Candidate Surveys; Department Meeting Minutes**	**Strengths:** Recently created courses introduce students and candidates to relevant professional debates, disciplinary concerns, and graduate studies in general (English 500) and help foster professional growth and development (English 600)	Continue faculty visits to English 500 and increase the number of workshops/presentations on relevant graduate student issues	• Offer workshops on applying to PhD and other graduate programs, writing personal statements, and exploring advanced degrees in Education (Fall 2009—ENGL 500)	• Offered series of workshops on various professional development topics ENGL 600 students participated in the Big Read in a community-based program
	Needs: Students would like more extensive graduate course offerings (both during the year and in summer)	• Review Graduate Program • Expand regular course offerings •Explore regular scholarships for graduate study-abroad experiences	• Conduct catalog revisions • Explore options as committee and department for expanding graduate course offerings • Undertake significant review of Graduate Programs	• Made several significant catalog revisions (for clarity and improved organization) • Experimented with offering courses at different times to avoid overlap • Conducted faculty and student surveys about graduate programs • Revised English Graduate Goals
Faculty Quality/Development **Staffing data; 2007-2008 Department Year-end Report; Graduate Student/Candidate Surveys**	**Strengths:** • Dedicated faculty members with varying scholarly interests • Dedicated faculty members willing to mentor teaching assistants and other graduate students/candidates	• Hold Mary Louise White Symposium on Electra (spring 2009)	Invite graduate students to participate Mary Louise White Symposium events.	• Incorporated English 500 and English 600 in MLW symposium events
	Needs: Relief for faculty members from the ever increasing burden of assessment, extra teaching responsibilities and other workload demands	Course release time to compensate faculty members for extra teaching and service responsibilities (beyond contractual obligations and normal teaching load)	As a committee, explore systems for awarding course release time to compensate professors for extra teaching responsibilities.	• Ongoing

Appendix G: Advanced Program Decision Making Matrix (forthcoming for 2011-2012)

Advanced Credential Program
English Graduate Program Assessment Plan
2011-2012

Educational Assessment Outcomes (Evaluation Questions)	Data Sources and Instruments	Frequency of Data Collection	Data Use Person(s) Responsible for:			Data Based Decisions and Timeline	Dissemination and Timeline
			Collection	Aggregation	Analysis		
CANDIDATE COMPETENCE							
Applicant Qualifications: Does the applicant have the background knowledge, skills, & dispositions necessary for successful completion of the program? Does the candidate have the enough background in literature and writing for successful completion of the program?							
T-0 Admission	• BA in English (or equivalent coursework) • Statement of intent • Writing sample • Completed application • 2 recommendation letters • GPA of 3.0 or higher preferred •Copy of initial certification	Rolling Basis— applications processed by graduate committee as they come in	Graduate Committee, Committee Chair, and Advanced Program Coordinator	Graduate Committee Chair, and Advanced Program Coordinator	Graduate Committee Chair, and Advanced Program Coordinator	• Acceptance • Conditional acceptance • Rejection April 15th application deadline. However, applications are processed by graduate committee as they come in	Candidates notified of admission status via a letter within several weeks of application
Candidate Qualifications and Impact on P-12 Pupil Performance: • Is the candidate making adequate progress in the program to predict successful completion within the allotted timeframe? • What is the specified "structured field experience" course in which candidates will demonstrate application of learned knowledge or skills to classroom settings and demonstrate their impact on pupil performance and how are candidates performing? Measured at the following checkpoints: (Sufficient monitoring should be present to justify any academic standing recommendations to the COE-PEU Head)							
T-1 Mid-point program review (completion of 9-12 graduate credits)	• 3.0 GPA or higher (grades of B or better in all required courses) • Successful completion of ENGL 500 • Initial dispositions (measured by English 500 instructor)	Twice yearly— September and February	Graduate Committee, Committee chair, and Advanced Program Coordinator	Graduate Committee Chair and Advanced Program Coordinator	Graduate Committee Chair, and Advanced Program Coordinator	• Advance • Department probation Graduate Committee reviews relevant files in September and February	Candidates are notified of program progress via a letter within several weeks of file review
T-2 Structured field experience	• Structured field experience paper and registration for ENED 601 • Departmental SFE rubric, which incorporates elements of TWS rubrics(Teacher	Usually once per year (ENGL 695 oversees portfolio completion	ENGL 695 instructor	ENGL 695 instructor	Graduate Committee chair and advance program coordinator	•Advance • Remediation plan for successful completion	Rubrics and observations completed and filed by end of semester. Candidates receive course /SFE feedback

	Work Sample Portfolio—Evidence of and Critical Reflection on Impact on Student Learning and TWS Instructional Decision-Making, Analysis of Student Learning, Reflection and Response Rubrics	and inclusion of SFE)				SFE can occur in any course during the degree program (with sponsoring teacher/mentor/ faculty observations by end of semester)	by end of semester.
T-3 Portfolio completion	• Successful completion of all required coursework and porfolio requirements	Usually once per year—April	English 695 instructor	English 695 instructor	Graduate Committee chair and Advance Program Coordinator	•Advance • Remediation plan for successful completion	Candidates receive course /portfolio feedback by end of semester.
T-Exit Recommendation for graduation & certification?	• 3.0 GPA or higher (grades of B or better in all required courses) • Documentation and evaluation of and reflection on structured field experience • Completed portfolio	Usually once per year—April	Faculty Advisor and Department Chair	Faculty Advisor and Department Chair	Department Chair, Graduate Committee Chair, and Advance Program Coordinator	• Graduation • Remediation plan for successful completion	Candidates are notified of graduation status via a form/letter within several weeks of graduation review

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT & REFINEMENT

Quality and Availability of Curricula:

How do courses and field experiences adequately prepare candidates to be effective professional educators?	• Documentation and evaluation of and reflection on structured field experience • Reflective exit paper • Candidate exit surveys • Graduate Committee Annual Report • Program Action Plan and Decision Making Matrix	Portfolio review and English 695 exit surveys Usually once per year—April	Graduate Committee, Graduate Committee Chair, and Advanced Program Coordinator	Graduate Committee, Graduate Committee Chair, and Advanced Program Coordinator	Graduate Committee, Graduate Committee Chair, and Advanced Program Coordinator	• Evaluation and assessment of ENED 601, English 695 and other program requirements	Standard departmental/university timelines

FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS & DEVELOPMENT

Faculty Qualifications:

How does the program attract qualified applicants for faculty positions?	Employment ads; number and quality of applicants	Employment ads; number and quality of applicants	Department	Department's Personnel Committee	Department's Personnel Committee	Standard university hiring timeline (generally over course of spring semester)	Standard university hiring timeline (generally over course of spring semester)

Faculty Development:

Do new faculty receive appropriate mentoring and professional support?	Reappointment documents; travel forms; annual reports	Annual	Department Chair	Department Chair	Department Chair Dean of AS	Reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion decisions	Standard university hiring timelines
In what ways are faculty engaged in scholarship and professional development?	Annual Reports	Annual	Department Chair	Department Chair	Department Chair	Review of faculty activity reports, travel and requests for sabbatical leave, etc.	Standard university timelines

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Program Operations:

How does the program ensure that the necessary resources are available to support the program?	Five-year program review	Every 5th year	Department	Department Chair	Department	Discussion of external review	Standard university timelines
How does the program ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to support	• Graduate Committee report to Chair and Deans • Graduate Committee minutes	Annual	Department Chair	Department	Department Chair and Dean of AS	Discussion of relevant reports	Standard departmental/university timelines

candidates and programs?							
How does the program work with school partners to design, implement, and evaluate itself that allow candidates to develop and demonstrate k/s/d necessary to help all students learn?	• Minutes/reports from meetings with cooperating teachers • English Education reports and committee minutes	Annual	Chair of English Adolescence Education Committee	Chair of English Adolescence Education Committee	Chair of English Adolescence Education Committee	Discussion of relevant reports	Standard departmental/university timelines
DIVERSITY							
What is the nature of candidates' opportunities to work with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students?	• Completed CREDE observations sheet/rubric • Completed SFE rubric	Annual— ENED 601 SFE	English 695 instructor	English 695 instructor	English 695 instructor	•Advance • Remediation plan for successful completion	Rubrics and observations completed and filed by end of semester. Candidates receive course /SFE feedback by end of semester.
TECHNOLOGY							
How are candidates prepared to use technology in their profession?	Completed ISTE rubrics	Annual— English 695	English 695 instructor and/or Advanced Program coordinator	English 600 instructor and/or Advanced Program coordinator	English 600 instructor and/or Advanced Program coordinator	•Advance • Remediation plan for successful completion	Candidates receive course /portfolio feedback by end of semester.

Appendix I:

Graduate Portfolio Assessment

SUMMARY: ENGL 600 portfolios, Spring 2009 (4 of 10 = certification students)
(10 portfolios reviewed by Jeanette McVicker, 5.24.09, on behalf of the Graduate Committee)

Standards reflect work appropriate to graduate-level study:

5 = Outstanding
4 = Good
3 = Satisfactory
2 = Approaching Satisfactory
1 = Substandard
NA = Not applicable

Goal 1: Read attentively, closely, and critically

Criteria:	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Clearly summarizes and paraphrases other texts	2	7	1			
Researches the allusions and the historical/cultural contexts of the primary literary texts	3	4	2	1		
Offers a clear critical approach in interpreting texts	3	4	2	1		

Goal 2: Write thoughtfully, coherently, and persuasively

Criteria:						
Establishes a central point/focus	3	3	4			
Effectively uses evidence to support/develop the central point	5	1	3	1		
Develops points/arguments in an orderly manner	3	3	4			

Uses correct mechanics (capitalization, punctuation, spelling, grammar)	5	3	2			
Demonstrates a developing consciousness of, and skill in, artful expression						
	2	6	1	1		

Goal 3: Develop and challenge their own thinking through scholarly research

Criteria:						
Clearly delineates complex relationships among ideas	4	4	1	1		
Approaches writing as heuristic (as a process of discovery or investigation)	7	1	2			
Uses secondary sources correctly	6	2	1	1		
Cites sources correctly	6	3		1		
Draws conclusions and generalizes beyond a give text	5	3	1	1		
Gives an overall sense of one's educational experience/growth in English	6	2	1	1		

The results demonstrate that students are excelling at their use of secondary research, ability to cite sources properly, draw conclusions, approach writing as a heuristic process, and draw conclusions beyond the primary text/assignment. Students continue to sputter a bit in their ability to offer 'clear critical approaches' and find a more complex way to organize a thesis-drive seminar paper. The results of the portfolios should be seen in conjunction with the very specific comments students provided in their exit papers, and the handful of graduate exit surveys turned in. ~ J. McVicker

Department of English
Graduate Portfolio Guidelines
Non-Professional Certification Candidates
(For Candidates Beginning in Fall 2007 or later)

All graduate candidates seeking degrees in English (M.A. and M.S. in Ed.) must complete a Graduate Portfolio as part of the requirements for graduation. The department believes that candidates' conscious reflection upon their learning can help expand their understanding of how they learn and how particular ways of thinking inform the educational process. One of the goals of the English Department is that candidates develop the ability to interrelate their studies, to put the English curriculum into a perspective relative to their other studies and professional experiences. With this in mind, the English Department has chosen to use student portfolios to assess the extent to which this and other goals are achieved. The requirements of the portfolio are as follows:

—An Entry Paper. This is the same as your personal statement (part of your application to the graduate program). It will automatically go into your portfolio file.

—A Minimum of Three Additional Papers selected by the candidate, written for different graduate courses. Papers should be turned in with the exit paper.

—An Exit Paper, minimum 5 pages, **due the fifth week of the candidate's final semester** (or as determined by the instructor of ENGL 600) and addressing these four points, as the candidate deems them relevant:

1.   The central purpose in writing each of the papers; the extent to which the candidate thinks the paper was successful; perhaps why one was more successful than another; and a discussion of the critical approach(es) used to examine or teach the texts.

2.   A discussion of the interrelationships between graduate core courses and electives; to what extent was the course work an integrated graduate experience? A discussion of the relationship of the graduate program to the student's undergraduate coursework and experiences. Did it largely repeat the undergraduate experience, or did it go significantly beyond into further, deeper, more complex studies in literature and theory?

3.   A self-evaluation of the candidate's judgment of intellectual and professional growth resulting from graduate study.

4. Any further comment the candidate wishes to make on the nature or success of the graduate program; any suggestions the candidate would like to make about improving the graduate experience.

The graduate degree will be approved only after a complete portfolio is submitted and accepted by the candidate's graduate advisor, or the instructor of ENGL 600.

Candidates should keep copies of ALL coursework completed in their graduate classes. In addition, candidates should keep a copy of everything submitted to their portfolio, including course papers.

Rev. March 2009

Department of English
Graduate Portfolio Guidelines
Professional Certification Candidates
(For Candidates Beginning in Fall 2007 or later)

All graduate candidates seeking degrees in English (MA and MS in Ed.) must complete a Graduate Portfolio as part of the requirements for graduation. The department believes that candidates' conscious reflection upon their learning and teaching can help expand their understanding of how they learn and how particular ways of thinking inform the educational process. One of the goals of the English Department is that candidates develop the ability to interrelate their studies, to put the English curriculum into a perspective relative to their other studies and professional experiences. With this in mind, the English Department has chosen to use student portfolios to assess the extent to which this and other goals are achieved. The requirements of the portfolio are as follows:

—An Entry Paper. This is the same as your personal statement (part of your application to the graduate program). It will automatically go into your portfolio file.

—Teacher Work Sample. These materials should include your structured field experience paper; documentation of and rubrics from the structured field experience; and ENGL 554 and ENGL 600 assignments and other teaching materials that demonstrate cultural responsiveness (i.e., ability to work with linguistically and culturally diverse pupils and students with exceptionalities) and thoughtful, appropriate integrations of computer and other telecommunication technologies.

—A Minimum of Three Additional Papers selected by the candidate, written for different graduate courses. Papers should be turned in with the exit paper.

—An Exit Paper, minimum 5 pages, **due the fifth week of the candidate's final semester**, and addressing these 5 points, as the candidate deems them relevant:

1.   The central purpose in writing each of the papers; the extent to which the candidate thinks the paper was successful; perhaps why one was more successful than another; and a discussion of the critical approach(es) used to examine or teach the texts.

2.   A discussion of the interrelationships among graduate courses and between core courses and the structured field experience; to what extent was the course work an integrated graduate experience?; how did the structured field experience allow you to integrate course content from ENGL 554 and other required classes?

3.   A discussion of the relationship of the professional certification program to the student's initial certification coursework and experiences. Did it largely repeat the undergraduate experience, or did it go significantly beyond into further, deeper, more complex studies in literature, theory and pedagogy?

4.   A self-evaluation of the candidate's judgment of intellectual and professional growth resulting from graduate study, with emphasis on your growth as a teacher.

5.   Any further comment the candidate wishes to make on the nature or success of the graduate program; any suggestions the candidate would like to make about improving the graduate experience.

The graduate degree will be approved only after a complete portfolio is submitted and accepted by the candidate's graduate advisor.

Candidates are responsible for completing their structured field experience prior to the portfolio completion deadline.

Candidates should keep copies of ALL coursework completed in their graduate classes. In addition, candidates should keep a copy of everything submitted to their portfolio, including course papers.

The ideal portfolio will demonstrate growth and professional outcomes in the following areas:
• Engaging literary, theoretical, and pedagogical texts in English
• Working with diverse group of learners in culturally responsive ways
• Planning and designing instruction that builds on students' strengths, needs, prior experiences and other contextual factors
• Reflecting on, responding to, and assessing student learning in meaningful ways
• Integrating technology in creative, ethical, and thoughtful ways

Rev. February 1, 2009

Appendix L:
Department of English Structured Field Experience Description

The Structured Field Experience (SFE) provides students seeking professional certification through the M.A. in Education 7-12 program with an opportunity to develop teaching materials that apply the concepts, approaches, or content of core coursework in Fredonia's graduate program to a secondary or middle school classroom, teach the unit to students, track its effectiveness, document student learning and reflect on this process. As you develop more conceptual and theoretical tools, you can develop new kinds of units to introduce your students to the richness of the English Language Arts.

The graduate program's structure allows students the autonomy to pursue areas of professional interest within the three major streams of "Texts, Contexts and Theories" and develop relevant culminating experiences. The SFE has also been designed to maximize student autonomy and relevance. Candidates may elect to complete their SFE using content from any class in the program. Some instructors may include it as a course option. For those who do not, it is still possible to develop and teach the unit as part of your graduate work.

To ensure that students satisfy the Structured Field Experience requirement, candidates seeking professional certification will be required to submit their project and papers to their departmental portfolios prior to graduation. Students must also sign up for the 0-credit ENED **601**, Structured Field Experience Completion course. This small administrative check ensures that students are mindful of the work required in the program and attentive to its timely completion as part of their degree work. Ultimately, candidates are responsible to make sure that all degree requirements have been met.

Guidelines
These guidelines are intended to provide some structure for students who are not completing the SFE as a specific course option or requirement. These guidelines also lay out the minimum required work for any student doing the SFE, whether for a course or not. You are encouraged to both personalize and extend these efforts to ensure maximum benefit for the students you teach.

Select a text or concept from your course and develop a realistic and workable short unit for teaching that concept or text in a secondary or middle school classroom. The unit should cover at least one week's instructional time. For teachers who have their own classrooms, longer units, carefully integrated into the ongoing instruction are preferable.

Consider carefully your goals for the unit, aligning them where appropriate with relevant standards.

As you develop materials, think carefully about what schema you must build or activate with your students as well as what information or vocabulary you will need to introduce before you teach your lesson(s).

As in all good planning, you should consider how diversity will impact your teaching (diverse learners, diverse backgrounds etc.), and find a meaningful role for technology in your teaching where relevant.

You must develop an authentic assessment that will tell you whether or to what extent your students met your objectives.

You can and should draw on class discussions, expand on questions, and target your own students. Then, you will teach your plan in your classroom (or a classroom of a colleague if you don't have one of your own).

Keep a teaching journal if you don't usually during this experience and reflect carefully on what works according to plan and where you may need to make some changes before teaching this material again.

For your SFE, you will document the experience by turning in your unit plan, evidence of learning outcomes, and a short paper in which you reflect on the field experience, your ability to adapt the course content to an appropriate classroom setting, the pedagogical and critical concerns that arose while developing and teaching the lesson, and what the students learned from the lesson or unit, with supporting data. The paper (or a supplementary assessment document, which you can attach to the paper) should demonstrate that the students learned the central concept(s) outlined in the lesson.

The assignment will be evaluated using the attached Structured Field Experience rubric. It is your responsibility to attach this rubric to your project when you submit it to your program portfolio. Failure to do so will mean that the SFE is considered incomplete.

Appendix M:
Structured Field Experience Rubric
This rubric is derived from the "Analysis of Student Learning" Task Prompt and Rubric from the Renaissance Partnership Improving Teacher Quality Project

Candidate's Name:_____

Date:_____

Grade→ Indicator ↓	Fail Does Not Meet Standard	Pass Meets Standard	High Pass Target
Clarity and Accuracy of Paper	Paper is not clear and accurate; it does not accurately document the field experience and/or has poor mechanics and organization	Paper is generally clear and accurate; it accurately documents the field experience and has sound mechanics and good organization.	Paper is completely clear and fully accurate; it contains no errors of representation and has excellent mechanics and organization.
Alignment with Learning Goals	• The candidate fails to adapt graduate course content to the 7-12 classroom in ways appropriate to his/her students' ages, abilities, and learning styles. • Analysis of student learning is not aligned with learning goals.	• The candidate adapts graduate course content to the 7-12 classroom in ways appropriate to his/her students' ages, abilities, and learning styles. • Analysis of student learning is partially aligned with learning goals and/or fails to provide a comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the goals for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	• The candidate adapts graduate course content to the 7-12 classroom in pedagogically sound, interesting, and thoughtful ways. • Analysis is fully aligned with learning goals and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.
Interpretation of Student Assessment Data	Interpretation is inaccurate, and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.	Interpretation is technically accurate, and conclusions are supported by data.	Interpretation is penetrating, and insightful conclusions are drawn from the data.
Reflection on and Evidence of Impact on	• The candidate fails to provide thoughtful reflection on the	• The candidate offers thoughtful reflection on the pedagogical and	• The candidate offers exceptionally thoughtful reflection on the

Student Learning	pedagogical and critical concerns that arose while developing and teaching the lesson/unit. • Analysis of student learning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.	critical concerns that arose while developing and teaching the lesson/unit. • Analysis of student learning includes some evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.	pedagogical and critical concerns that arose while developing and teaching the lesson/unit. • Analysis of student learning includes thorough evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal.

High Pass = Three or more indicators are at target level.
Pass = At least three indicators meet standards or are at target level.
Fail = Two or more indicators do not meet standards.
Grade (Please circle one):   Fail   Pass   High Pass

Graduate Instructor's Signature:_____