

**APSU Teacher Unit
Annual Program Review (APR) Report
2013 – 2014**

English 7-12

I. Name of Program: English 7-12)

II. Provide a list of reviewers.

Dr. Linda Kay Davis, Academic Advisor for APSU English majors with a minor in Professional Education prepared this report and sent it to the following reviewers for input and comment:

Dr. David Guest, Chair, Department of Languages and Literature at APSU

Banks Lyons, Consulting Language Arts Teacher, Clarksville Montgomery County School System

Bill Locke, Secondary Supervisor, Robertson County Schools

Grant Brashears, graduate of APSU with a major in English and minor in secondary education, teacher in Cheatham County, Tennessee

Sara Willey, graduate of APSU with a major in English and minor in secondary education, teacher in Clarksville Montgomery County Schools

III. Program Description:

The Department of Languages and Literature offers an English major with a minor in Professional Education leading to licensure to teach English/Language Arts in grades 7-12. During 2013-2014, the number of undergraduate English majors with a minor in professional education fluctuated between 93 in the fall semester and 90 in the spring semester. We offer two courses specifically for English majors seeking licenses to teach in English/Language Arts in grades 7-12. These are ENGL 3420, The Adolescent Experience in Literature, and ENGL 4400/5400, Teaching English/Language Arts in the Secondary Schools. Otherwise, English majors with a Teaching Specialization enroll in the same courses as other English majors.

Statistically, English majors who were candidates for licensure in 2013-2014 are a diverse population who have earned commendable grades while at APSU. For example, during 2013-2014, ten undergraduate and four graduate (MAT) candidates were awarded initial licenses in English; two were awarded alternative licenses, and one added English as an endorsement to an existing license. Reported gender and ethnicities of candidates being awarded initial licenses respectively were as follows: nine females, five males, eleven Caucasians, one African American, one Hispanic, and one Other. These numbers represent increased positive progress toward greater diversity of gender and ethnicity among candidates awarded licenses to teach English in grades 7-12. The average GPA of undergraduate candidates awarded licenses increased from 3.14 in fall 2013 to 3.63 in spring 2014.

IV. Changes in Program

What changes have you made to the program during the past year? **What data drove the decision to change the program?**

The following data excerpted from 2012-2013 Annual Report, informed changes made to English 7-12 program to address areas of candidates' knowledge and skills needing improvement:

- 1) Scores on the fall 2012 edTPA point to some weaknesses that needed to be addressed and improved. A comparison to national scores for the Fall 2012 administration of the edTPA showed APSU secondary English/Language arts candidates scored below the national average on four categories (listed with national score/APSU scores): Engaging students (3.9/2.8); Deepening Student Learning (2.9/2.8); Analyzing Student Work (3.3/3.2); (Academic Language Demands (2.7/2.2). These scores are based on a 1-5 scale with 5 being the superior score. The goal is for students to score at least Level 3, which is considered a ready-to-teach score.

During 2012-2013 candidates scores indicated some need for improvement in the following areas in which they earn excessive average percentages at Levels 1 and 2:

Planning Assessment to Monitor and Support Learning: 11% at Level 1; 22% at Level 2; (Fall 2012) *

Analyzing Instruction: 40% at Level 3; 40% at Level 2; 20% at Level 1 (Fall 2012)*

Students' Use of Feedback: 60% at Level 2 (Spring 2013)

Using Feedback to Promote Learning: 33% at Level 2; 33% at Level 1 (Spring 2013)

Using Assessment to Inform Instruction: 20% at Level 1; 40% at Level 2 (Fall 2012)

Understanding Language Development: 44% at Level 2; 11% at Level 1 (Fall 2012)

Analyzing Language Students' Language Use and Subject Learning: 80% at Level 2. (Spring 2013)

Although Levels 3 and 4 may have good combined averages, our goal is that no student score at Levels 1 and 2.

Thus, the following action goals were established for short-term actions for fall 2013:

- 1) During Fall of 2013, students evaluated how well certain teaching practices related to the guidelines given as a basis for plans. For example, in ENGL 4400/5400 Teaching English in the Secondary School, Grades 7-12, candidates analyzed a lesson that Burke included in his textbook as an example of guidelines he had developed to determine how well the plan fulfilled the guidelines it purportedly followed.

In both ENGL 3420, The Adolescent Experience in Literature and in ENGL 4400/5400, candidates watched videos of teachers and determined effectiveness of the instructional practices in an effort to address the following data from 2012-2013:

Analyzing Instruction: 40% at Level 3; 40% at Level 2; 20% at Level 1 (Fall 2012)*

After first examining models of effective feedback, candidates practiced giving specific and constructive feedback on student essays they will assess as part of ENGL 4400/5400.

- 2) On October 4, 2013, as part of the Residency 1 seminars, all candidates enrolled in Residency 1 were required to attend a three-hour workshop on various aspects of assessment at the Clarksville-Montgomery Board of Education. This change addressed the following scores on Task 3 Assessment of the *Fall 2012 edTPA* because 45 percent of the English candidates scored at Level 1 or 2 although 55 percent scored 3 or above and this is an area of weakness for most candidates for licensure:

Using Assessment to Inform Instruction: 11% at Level 5; 11% at Level 4; 33% at Level 3 (Fall 2012)

- 3) Prior to the beginning of Residency 2 in Fall 2013, eight candidates--about four of them English majors-- did not take their Praxis II PLT soon enough to receive their scores in time to begin Residency 2 at the same time as most other candidates; thus, I began to require candidates to inform me the date they had registered to take the PLT exam. Early in the summer of 2014, I sent emails to remind candidates to take the PLT during the late September or early October testing windows of 2014. I also strongly encourage my advisees to take the Praxis II English Content Exam 5038 before entering Residency 1 in the fall 2014 semester. (Although this information is not on any data report received, I knew which of my advisees were remiss in taking the PLT in a timely fashion.)

- 4) Three review sessions for Praxis II English Content 5038 exam were offered during 2013-2014. This change addressed the need for candidates to pass the content exam in a timely manner and to pass it the first time it is taken.

- 5) There was an increased emphasis on deepening learning, academic language, and student engagement in ENGL 3420 and ENGL 4400/5400 and continue to model student engagement in classes by flipping some classes so that the class meeting time is devoted to more student engagement and modeling strategies for scaffolding and deepening learning. This change addressed the following Clinical Evaluation areas as indicated in the 2012-2013 data report:

Engaging students in learning (28% at Level 1)

Deepening student learning during instruction (29% at Level 1)

Thus, the following action goal was established for long-term action, spring 2013:

In the ENGL 3420 students were required to purchase the following book: Wadham, Rachel L., and Jonathan. Ostenson. *Integrating Young Adult Literature through the Common Core Standards*. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2013. Print. I chose this text because it addresses how to set objectives related to Common Core State Standards and how to create assessments that meet specific standards, an area that 26 percent of English 7-12 candidates had difficulty with on their ENGL 4400/5400 key assessment. This book also addresses how to determine quantitative and qualitative aspects of text complexity when selecting literary works as required when addressing CCSS English/Language Arts.

V. Program Strengths 2013-2014

From the data presented during the data retreat and other reports available to you, what are the identified strengths of this program?

Overall, on the 2013-2014 exit surveys, English 7-12 candidates ranked themselves as being prepared to teach, and their classroom and university mentors ranked them as outstanding and somewhere between outstanding and acceptable in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to teaching and professional behaviors.

Strengths as Shown on Teacher Candidates' Exit Surveys Related to Being Prepared to Teach

In the fall 2013 exit surveys from clinical teaching, teacher candidates reported their course work, field experiences, and clinical experience had prepared them quite well for professional teaching and related responsibilities as indicated by their ranking all 25 statements related to their preparation as either very prepared (4/4) or somewhere between very prepared and adequately prepared (3/4).

Fall 2013 candidates assigned the highest rankings of 4/4 to their preparation to collaborate with colleagues and administrators and to reflect on teaching practice by

continually evaluating the effects of instruction as 4.0 on a 4-point scale with 4 representing very prepared (1)

These clinical teaching candidates expressed having been prepared somewhere between very prepared and adequately prepared with scores of 3.83/4 assigned to 15 of the 25 the statements they were asked to rank. These areas included establishing goals and objectives to address student learning needs, planning developmentally appropriate experiences for student learning, and aligning these goals and objectives and assessments to standards. Others areas of preparation ranked as 3.83/4.0 included the knowledge of content, connecting students' learning to their prior knowledge, life experiences, and background through multiple strategies and concepts, preparing for and monitoring independent and small group learning, monitoring student learning, and maintaining accurate records to include assessments of student work and attendance records. Finally, licensure candidates in fall 2013 reported being prepared at a 3.38/4.0 level to communicate appropriately with all stakeholders and to use technology appropriately in the classroom.

Although 3.67/4.0 is a slightly lower ranking of preparation, it is still within the range between very prepared and adequately prepared. This was the ranking teacher candidates from Fall 2013 assigned to 8 areas including employing assessment strategies, instruments, and information appropriate to the learning expectations being evaluated and interpreting assessment data appropriately and use this information for instruction and evaluating student academic achievement and attitudes to determine the academic amount of progress as well as the amount of positive changes toward learning (3). Not only did they feel somewhat less prepared to interpret assessment but also to communicate student status and progress to the students, their parents, and appropriate others (4). Ironically, these English majors ranked their preparation to compose communication appropriate to the audience while using correct grammar and organizing information logically (4). Fall 2013 candidates also used the 3.67/4.0 ranking to indicate the level of preparedness to design instruction that encourages thinking, problem solving, and decision making (2).

Strengths as Shown by Mentors Clinical Evaluations

During fall of 2013, classroom and university mentors ranked candidates in English as having strengths in professional appearance and behavior, following school policies, modeling to demonstrate performance expectations, using clear and concise communication, and displaying enthusiasm. These mentors also ranked English 7-12 candidates as having other strengths related to assessment, growing and developing professionally, and teaching students to think.

During Spring 2014, classroom and university mentors perceived one particularly strong area to be “Growing and Developing Professionally” in which all scores were between 2.7 and 3.0 on a 3-point scale with three areas-- being prepared and prompt every day, demonstrating professional behavior, and following school policies--ranked 3/3. Mentors ranked other areas as strong by assigning ranks between 2.95 and 2.70 to the following indicators of professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes: professional appearance, being responsive to feedback from mentors, starting lessons promptly, setting high and demanding academic expectations for every student, attempting to implement new strategies, displaying enthusiasm, supporting learning objectives, demonstrating correct content knowledge, using appropriate language, having appropriate communication skills, taking action to improve their teaching performance, circulating to monitor student work, and structuring lessons with beginning, middle, and end, working with the cooperating teacher to create a safe and orderly learning environment, and being receptive to interests and opinions of students.

Strengths as Shown by Praxis Scores

Praxis scores for both English Language, Literature, Composition: Content Knowledge (0041) required in fall 2013 and English Language Arts: Content Knowledge (5038) required for the first time in spring 2014 show that undergraduate English licensure candidates knew their content. The eight candidates who took the 0041 exam in fall 2013 and the four who took it in spring 2014 passed the exam the first on the initial attempt. Candidates in fall 2013 passed their exam with an average score of 170, 13 points higher than the required score of 157. Although the required score on the 5038 exam increased to 167, candidates earned an average score of 184, or 17 points above the required passing score.

Likewise, all graduate MAT candidates seeking licenses to teach English in grades 7-12 passed their 0041 and 5038 exams on the initial attempt. The one graduate candidate who took the 0041 exam during fall 2013 earned a score of 185, 28 points above the passing score of 157, while the two graduate candidates taking the 0041 exam in spring 2014 passed their exam with an average score of 173 or 16 points above the minimum required score. The one spring 2014 graduate candidate who passed the 5038 earned a score of 183 or 16 points above passing.

Strengths as Indicated by Fall 2013-Spring 2014 *edTPA* Scores of Undergraduate Candidates

English 7-12 candidates enrolled in their Residency 2 clinical experience completed either the *Secondary English 7-12 edTPA* or the *Middle Childhood Language Arts edTPA* as determined where their clinical placements occurred. During the 2013-2014 school year, three undergraduate English 7-12 candidates completed the secondary assessment, and eight undergraduate 7-12 candidates completed the middle childhood assessment.

English 7-12 candidates who completed the *edTPA* in a high school in fall 2013 earned scores that exceeded the average national scores on all fifteen rubrics related to planning, instruction, and assessment. In addition, undergraduate English 7-12 candidates who completed their *edTPAs* while in placed in a middle childhood classroom during the fall semester of 2013, scores showed strengths in providing feedback to guide learning analyzing students' language use and subject-specific learning as indicated with a score that exceeded the national average on the associated assessment rubrics.

The one undergraduate high school candidate in spring 2014 earned scores exceeding the national scores in these areas: planning to support varied student learning needs and analyzing teaching effectiveness after instruction. This candidate met the national *edTPA* average scores in subject-specific pedagogy.

The two English 7-12 licensure candidates who completed Residency 2 in middle school settings in Spring 2014 exceeded the average *edTPA* scores and show strengths in 6 rubric areas:

Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs

Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning

Analysis of Student Learning

Providing Feedback to Guide Learning

Analyzing Student's Language Use and Subject Specific Learning

Using Assessment to Inform Learning

These candidates' scores also met the national average score on rubric three that measured the ability to use knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning. Two of their scores of 3/5 also indicated strengths in identifying and supporting language demands and planning assessments to monitor and support student learning.

Strengths According to Analysis of State Report Card Data 2013-2014

Of nineteen APSU graduates who were licensed in English between 2009 and 2012 and who taught English I and II during 2013 and 2014, 71 percent or 13 of these teachers had TVAAS scores of 3, 4, or 5, which means they had positive effects on their students' achievement as assessed by end-of-course exams. Of these teachers, 50 percent had students who made more progress than the state average progress of students. One of the nineteen teachers was teaching out of his or her licensure area. However, the data reports did not indicate whether this teacher had a positive or negative effect on student achievement.

- VI. Program Weaknesses:** From the data presented during the data retreat and other reports available to you, what are the identified weaknesses of this program?

Weaknesses Teacher Candidates Indicated on Exit Surveys Related to Preparedness to Teach

Candidates who completed exit surveys at the end of Residency 2 in the fall semester of 2013 did not report any areas in which they felt unprepared; in fact the average scores of responses related to the 25 statements related to preparedness to teach and to assume

professional responsibilities were scored as 3.67, 3.83, or 4.0 on a four-point scale. No areas were less than 91 percent.

Candidates who completed exit surveys at the end of Residency 2 in the spring semester of 2014 did not report the same level of preparedness as did candidates in the fall of 2013. In fact, their average scores in 15 areas were 2/4 on a 4-point scale. These rankings indicate a level of being only somewhat prepared to design instruction that matches goals and objectives, learning strategies, assessments, and student needs and that encourages thinking, problem solving, and decision making as well as to demonstrate their own content area and to connect students' learning to prior knowledge, backgrounds, and experiences. Six of the fifteen statements were ranked as 2.5/4 and represent areas of concern in these aspects of preparedness to teach:

- 1) using multiple representations and explanations and link them to students' prior knowledge
- 2) using multiple teaching strategies to create critical and creative thinking and to help students to identify and use learning resources
- 3) organizing and preparing students for and monitor individual and group work
- 4) using assessment strategies, etc. to gather from a variety of sources to make initial and ongoing decisions
- 5) interpreting assessment data appropriately and using this information for instruction and evaluation of academic achievement and attitudes to determine the academic amount of progress and well as the amount of positive change toward learning.
- 6) Using classroom management techniques that foster student self-control and self-discipline.

These rankings were unexpected because these two candidates were enrolled in the same cohort courses with the same professors in Residency 1 as were the candidates who were enrolled in Residency 1 during the fall semester of 2014 and were placed in schools in the same geographic area.

Weaknesses as Shown by Mentors' Clinical Evaluations

Although clinical teaching classroom and university mentors ranked all 62 indicators of knowledge, skill, or attitude somewhere between acceptable (2/3) and outstanding (3/3),

several ranking of indicators indicate areas needing some improvement. During the fall of 2013 and the spring of 2014, mentors evaluated candidates as needing to improve in two areas—handling transitional periods in lessons effectively and planning for diverse learners. Fall 2013 candidates also were a bit weak in anticipating students’ learning difficulties. Spring 2014 candidates needed to improve in three additional areas—sustaining student’s attention, using varied and high quality questioning, teaching students to create, design, imagine, and suppose (creative thinking), teaching students to solve problems, and providing differentiated instructional methods and content.

Weaknesses as Shown by Praxis Exams

Each semester of 2013-2014, Praxis exams showed **no** areas of weaknesses. All candidates passed with average score well above the minimum passing score for licensure in Tennessee.

Weaknesses as Shown by edTPA Scores

Analyses of edTPA scores from fall of 2013 and spring of 2014 indicated three areas that all candidates needed to improve: subject-specific pedagogy, analyzing teaching effectiveness, and student use of feedback. Another area of need as indicated by edTPA scores from spring of 2014 is deepening student learning. Although the rubric for planning assessment to monitor and support learning showed 40 percent of the candidates scoring at Level 2, 30 percent at Level 3, and 20 percent at Level 4 and although no candidates earned a score of 1 in the Spring 2014, more candidates scored at Level 2 than the combined number who scored at Levels 1 (11 percent) and 2 (22 percent) in Fall 2012—total of 33% and 40% respectively. Thus, this area of planning is a weakness also.

Weaknesses as Shown in Milestone 2 Reviews

Two candidates who met all requirements for Milestone 2 did not submit their applications for Milestone 2. Two 7-12 English majors have not passed Milestone 2 yet because they have not passed the CASE exam after one has taken it once and the other twice.

VII. Assessment of Candidates

What do the summarized reports (key assessments, milestone review, student teacher information, PRAXIS scores, program completion rates, exit surveys, employer survey, and graduate follow-up survey) data sets show about the performance of your candidates?

The English 7-12 program's number of graduates has dropped from 19 initial licenses during 2012-2013 to 14 initial licenses, two alternative licenses, and one add-on endorsement during 2013-2014 to bring the total number of licenses in English to 17 for 2013-2014. This drop may be a result of at least four students who could not earn passing scores on the Praxis I or CASE after taking it multiple times or the inability of one candidate to earn the GPA required for Milestone 2 and entry into Residency 1, which must be completed before Residency 2. However, the program has begun to attract students with higher ACT scores and GPAs. Exit surveys show that candidates enrolled in the same courses taught by the same professors and placed in similar Residency 2 mentor schools had different perspectives of their readiness for teaching after completing a minor in professional education. All English 7-12 majors are strong in their content area as indicated by their Praxis II scores.

The State Report Card indicated that 71 percent of 19 English 7-12 majors who graduated from APSU between 2009 and 2012 showed positive effectiveness on the progress on their students' achievement (21 percent average, 39 percent above average, and 11 percent most effective). Most English 7-12 passed the *edTPA* during 2013-2014 with scores indicating they plan for instruction within a given context, analyze student learning and provide feedback to guide learning, analyze students' language use, and use assessment to inform learning. However, some of the candidates' *edTPAs* indicated they had struggled with specific pedagogy, analyzing their own teaching effectiveness, and determining how students needed to use feedback to improve learning. Overall, the English 7-12 graduates are ready to enter classrooms and to be effective teachers who know how to instruct students so that they make progress in learning and how to behave in a professional manner.

What specific short-term actions will be taken during the 2013 – 2014 academic year in order to improve candidate performance? What are the long-term action implications? Please specify tasks and timelines for planned actions.

Short-Term Actions for 4400/5400:

Candidates will view videos of teachers in actual classrooms and will analyze the pedagogy-specific strategies being used. (Fall 2013 and spring 2014)

Candidates will practice giving feedback on essays and then discuss how the fictitious student could use the feedback to improve learning. (Fall 2013 and spring 2014)

Candidates will construct a data chart related to one assessment collected in the practice *edTPA* Task 2. (Fall 2013 and spring 2014)

Candidates in ENGL 3420 and ENGL 4400/5400 will write and analyze questions for higher-order thinking.

The long-term implications of these changes are that students will be better prepared to analyze their own teaching practices, to give feedback and to assist students in using feedback, and analyze data and use it to inform teaching and learning.

IX. Assessment of Program Operations

What do enrollment, exit survey, and graduate follow-up survey data sets show about the operations and quality of your program?

These data sets show the English, Grades 7-12 program to be overall an effective program to prepare teacher candidates that it is producing quality professional teachers ready to enter area classrooms. Also, these data sets show the program to be strong in teaching candidates how to plan for sequential instruction and create appropriate assessments. The data show that more emphasis needs to be placed on how candidates can help students use feedback to improve learning, and increased emphasis needs to be placed on candidates' using pedagogy-specific strategies based on theories and research related to teaching English/Language Arts in grades 7-12.

X. Summary of Proposed Changes

Based on the data provided, what changes are proposed for your program?

XI. Assessment System

What data do you need to better evaluate your candidates and/or program?

Based on the data provided, how can the Teacher Education Unit Assessment System be changed to provide more meaningful and useful evidence regarding candidate performance and program operations?

I would like to know how many of our graduates are employed during their first year after being awarded teaching licenses. Do we gather permanent addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses on our graduates as part of their exit from Residency 2?