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**PART ONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations? | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared? |
| 1. Demonstrate the ability to think and write critically about clinical experiences. | Pedagogy Reflection (Clinical Experience) Essay Assessment given in ENG 3401, 3402, & 4801 assessed by the professor with the Pedagogy Reflection Rubric each time the course is offered.  Student Teaching P-12 Assessment, assessed by Director of Education via Live Text Rubric at completion of Student Teaching. | A mean score of 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale in all rubric categories.  A mean score of 3.0 or above on a 5-point scale in all rubric categories. | |  |  | | --- | --- | | NCTE Standards | Mean Score | | NCTE III.1 | 2.806 | | NCTE III.6 | 2.613 | | NCTE IV.4; V.1; V.2 | 2.645 | | NCTE VI.1 | 2.645 | | NCTE VI.2 | 2.613 | | NCTE VII.1; VII.2 | 2.871 |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | NCTE Standards | Mean | | NCTE I.2; II.3 | 4.000 | | NCTE II.1 | 4.071 | | NCTE III.2 | 4.214 | | NCTE  III.4 | 3.786 | | NCTE  IV.2 | 4.071 | | NCTE V.2 | 3.786 | | NCTE  V.3 | 4.214 | | NCTE  V.4 | 4.143 | | NCTE VII.1 | 4.714 | | NCTE VII.2 | 4.643 | | English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed)  English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed) |
| 2. Demonstrate the ability to use English language arts to help students become familiar with their own and others’ cultures, thereby promoting global citizenship. | Pedagogy Reflection Essay Assessment (see above) in these categories: “Candidate demonstrates a commitment to customizing instruction to draw upon students’ home and community languages, cultural backgrounds, individual differences, and literacy levels to create inclusive learning environments that contextualize curriculum and help students participate actively in their own learning in ELA” (NCTE IV.4, V.1, V.2); “Candidate articulates instructional plans that promote social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society” (NCTE VI.1); “Candidate skillfully analyzes learning environments and draws upon a range of theories and research to consider instructional approaches that are responsive to students’ local, national and international histories, individual identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender expression, age, appearance, ability, spiritual belief, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and community environment), and languages/dialects” (NCTE VI.2).  Student Teaching Approval Portfolio, assessed by the English Education Committee for final student teaching approval, in the rubric category: “Candidate is knowledgeable about texts (e.g. print and non-print texts, media texts, classic texts and contemporary texts, young adult) that represent a range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different identities (e.g. genders, ethnicities, social classes); he/she is able to use literary and pedagogical theories to interpret and critique a range of texts” (NCTE I.1)  Unit Plan assessed by method instructors in ENG 3401, ENG 3402, and ENG 4801 each time the course is taught via Live Text Rubric, pertinent rubric category: “Candidate plans and implements English language arts and literacy instruction that promotes social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society” (NCTE VI.1) | A mean score 2.0 or above on a 3-point scale in these categories.  A mean score 3.0 or above on a 5-point scale in these categories.  A mean score 3.0 or above on a 5-point scale in these categories. | |  |  | | --- | --- | | NCTE Standards | Mean Score | | NCTE IV.4; V.1; V.2 | 2.645 | | NCTE VI.1 | 2.645 | | NCTE VI.2 | 2.613 |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | NCTE Standards | Mean Score | | NCTE I.1 | 4.667 |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | NCTE Standard | Mean | | NCTE VI.1 | 3.591 | | English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed)  English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed) Final Student Teaching Approval  English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed) Final Student Teaching Approval |
| 3. Demonstrate knowledge of writing processes.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  4. Demonstrate knowledge of and skills in use of the English Language, including effective speaking skills.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  5. Demonstrate knowledge of the range and influences of print and nonprint media and technology in contemporary cultures. | Student Teaching Approval Portfolio (see above), assessed through these categories:  “Candidate knows the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics); candidate’s teaching philosophy and instructional material attend to the concept of dialect, the history of the English language, and/or relevant grammar systems, and indicate an understanding of the principles of language acquisition and the impact that language has on society” (NCTE II.2); “Candidate is knowledgeable about writing processes (i.e. how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments)” (NCTE II.3)  English Language Arts Content Exam & EdTPA Exam  Disposition Evaluations Completed by Methods Instructors & Student Teaching Coordinators, pertinent criterion: “Effective Communication” (NCTE VII.1).  Faculty Evaluations sheets for Final Student Teaching Approval assessed in the category “Speaking Skills.” Faculty evaluations for our teacher certification candidates take place in every course that counts toward this major.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Student Teaching Approval Portfolio (see above), Rubric Category: “Candidate is knowledgeable about texts (e.g. print and non-print texts, media texts, classic texts and contemporary texts, young adult) that represent a range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different identities (e.g. genders, ethnicities, social classes); he/she is able to use literary and pedagogical theories to interpret and critique a range of texts” (NCTE 1.1).  Student Teaching Evaluation, rubric category “Candidate is knowledgeable about how adolescents read and compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments” (NCTE I.2, II.3). | A mean score of 3.0 or above on a 5-point scale in this category.  80% or better pass rate on both tests  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  80% of Teacher Candidates Receiving “Acceptable” or higher on this Evaluation during Methods Course Work; 100% of Candidates receiving “Acceptable” or higher during Student Teaching.  100% of Teacher Candidates Receiving “Acceptable” or Higher on this evaluation criterion prior to Student Teaching Placement.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  A mean score of 3.0 or above on a 5-point scale in this category.  A mean score of 3.0 or above on a 5-point scale in this category. | |  |  | | --- | --- | | NCTE Standard | Mean | | NCTE II.2 | 3.222 | | NCTE II.3 | 4.222 |   Data: 100% Pass Rate for both  2016-17 edTPA Data Breakdown:  Total Students=13  Passed=13 (all passed on first attempt)-100%  Mean Task 1 Score=15.08  Mean Task 2 Score=15.15  Mean Task 3 Score=14.85  Mean Total Score=45.08  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Data: 100% (30 of 30) Methods Students Reached this Goal; 100% of Student Teachers (10 of 10) Reached this Goal.  Data: 100% (13 of 13) Reached this Goal  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   |  |  | | --- | --- | | NCTE Standard | Mean | | NCTE I.1 | 4.667 |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | NCTE Standards | Mean | | NCTE I.2, II.3 | 4.00 | | English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed)  English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed); Final Student Teaching Approval  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed); Final Student Teaching Approval  All English Faculty, English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed); Final Student Teaching Approval  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed); Final Student Teaching Approval  English Education Committee & Minutes; NCATE/CAEP Report; Annual ISBE Report (as needed); Final Student Teaching Approval |

|  |
| --- |
| **NCTE Standards Referenced Above** |
| **Content Knowledge**  **I. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes literature and multimedia texts as well as knowledge of the nature of adolescents as readers.**  Element 1: Candidates are knowledgeable about texts—print and non-print texts, media texts, classic texts and contemporary texts, including young adult—that represent a range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different genders, ethnicities, and social classes; they are able to use literary theories to interpret and critique a range of texts. |
| Element 2: Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents read texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments. |
| **Content Knowledge**  **II. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes language and writing as well as knowledge of adolescents as language users.**  Element 1: Candidates can compose a range of formal and informal texts taking into consideration the interrelationships among form, audience, context, and purpose; candidates understand that writing is a recursive process; candidates can use contemporary technologies and/or digital media to compose multimodal discourse. |
| Element 2: Candidates know the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics); they understand the concept of dialect and are familiar with relevant grammar systems (e.g., descriptive and prescriptive); they understand principles of language acquisition; they recognize the influence of English language history on ELA content; and they understand the impact of language on society. |
| Element 3: Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments. |
| **Content Pedagogy: Planning Literature and Reading Instruction in ELA**  **III. Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for reading and the study of literature to promote learning for all students.**  Element 1: Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences utilizing a range of different texts—across genres, periods, forms, authors, cultures, and various forms of media—and instructional strategies that are motivating and accessible to all students, including English language learners, students with special needs, students from diverse language and learning backgrounds, those designated as high achieving, and those at risk of failure. |
| Element 2: Candidates design a range of authentic assessments (e.g., formal and informal, formative and summative) of reading and literature that demonstrate an understanding of how learners develop and that address interpretive, critical, and evaluative abilities in reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and presenting. |
| Element 3: Candidates plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences in reading that reflect knowledge of current theory and research about the teaching and learning of reading and that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and a variety of reading strategies. |
| Element 4: Candidates design or knowledgeably select appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about student interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes. |
| Element 5: Candidates plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language—structure, history, and conventions—to facilitate students’ comprehension and interpretation of print and non-print texts. |
| Element 6: Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials. |
| **Content Pedagogy: Planning Composition Instruction in ELA**  **IV. Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for composing texts (i.e., oral, written, and visual) to promote learning for all students.**  Element 1: Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant composing experiences that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and contemporary technologies and reflect an understanding of writing processes and strategies in different genres for a variety of purposes and audiences. |
| Element 2: Candidates design a range of assessments for students that promote their development as writers, are appropriate to the writing task, and are consistent with current research and theory. Candidates are able to respond to student writing in process and to finished texts in ways that engage students’ ideas and encourage their growth as writers over time. |
| Element 3: Candidates design instruction related to the strategic use of language conventions (grammar, usage, and mechanics) in the context of students’ writing for different audiences, purposes, and modalities. |
| Element 4: Candidates design instruction that incorporates students’ home and community languages to enable skillful control over their rhetorical choices and language practices for a variety of audiences and purposes. |
| **Learners and Learning: Implementing English Language Arts Instruction**  **V. Candidates plan, implement, assess, and reflect on research-based instruction that increases motivation and active student engagement, builds sustained learning of English language arts, and responds to diverse students’ context-based needs.**  Element 1: Candidates plan and implement instruction based on ELA curricular requirements and standards, school and community contexts, and knowledge about students’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds. |
| Element 2: Candidates use data about their students’ individual differences, identities, and funds of knowledge for literacy learning to create inclusive learning environments that contextualize curriculum and instruction and help students participate actively in their own learning in ELA. |
| Element 3: Candidates differentiate instruction based on students’ self-assessments and formal and informal assessments of learning in English language arts; candidates communicate with students about their performance in ways that actively involve them in their own learning. |
| Element 4: Candidates select, create, and use a variety of instructional strategies and teaching resources, including contemporary technologies and digital media, consistent with what is currently known about student learning in English Language Arts. |
| **Professional Knowledge and Skills**  **VI. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how theories and research about social justice, diversity, equity, student identities, and schools as institutions can enhance students’ opportunities to learn in English**  **Language Arts.**  Element 1: Candidates plan and implement English language arts and literacy instruction that promotes social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society. |
| Element 2: Candidates use knowledge of theories and research to plan instruction responsive to students’ local, national and international histories, individual identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender expression, age, appearance, ability, spiritual belief, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and community environment), and languages/dialects as they affect students’ opportunities to learn in ELA. |
| **Professional Knowledge and Skills**  **VII. Candidates are prepared to interact knowledgeably with students, families, and colleagues based on social needs and institutional roles, engage in leadership and/or collaborative roles in English Language Arts professional learning communities, and actively develop as professional educators.**  Element 1: Candidates model literate and ethical practices in ELA teaching, and engage in/reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA. |
| Element 2: Candidates engage in and reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA that demonstrate understanding of and readiness for leadership, collaboration, ongoing professional development, and community engagement. |

**PART TWO**

*Describe what your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.*

Since our last assessment report all three of our methods courses (ENG 3401, 3202, 4801) have been through substantial revisions in order to align with the revised National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE) Standards, the new Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS), and the Common Core Standards. The revised methods courses now provide students with preparation to teach all of the Language Arts Common Core Standards for grades 9-12 and the program assessments now fulfill all of the IPTS and NCTE Standards. The course that underwent the most revision is ENG 4801 – the capstone methods course. In comparing the previous iteration of this course with the revised one, the most obvious improvements include: 1) substantial focus speaking and listening as well as connections between reading and writing, 2) more skill coverage for connecting English Language Arts to other disciplines with a Cross-Curricular Lesson Plan assignment (e.g. connecting language arts instruction with historical documents, scientific texts), 3) increased attention to social justice issues in the classroom with the addition of our Social Justice Lesson Plan assignment, 4) additional attention to reading, writing, speaking, and listening assessment, particularly in conjunction with the Unit Plan assignment, 4) more time dedicated to standards related to genre, media, visual analysis, classroom management, social issues, textual variety (particularly the inclusion of more non-fiction texts), and connections to other content areas. These changes resulted in revised course assignments: 1) a revision of the unit plan, 2) the addition of the speaking/listening mini-lesson/presentation, 3) the addition of the Social Justice and Cross-Curricular lesson plans.

During the time since our last assessment report our program (in conjunction with the English major as a whole) has also undergone a revision. Many of the new course requirements reflect the revised expectations for English Language Arts Teacher Candidates. For example, to increase our students’ breadth of literary study we now require two Transatlantic Literature Courses (ENG 2950 and ENG 2960) within our core courses. A multimodal composition course (ENG 3008) and a genre studies course is now also required in order to prepare candidates for 21st Century teaching practices.

We use 5 Live Text Assessments; 2 Exam Assessments; and 3 Departmental Pen & Paper Assessments to evaluate our program. In order to assess our program against the new standards mentioned above, revisions were made to the majority of our assessments and addendum were added to assessments previously assessed outside our department during Student Teaching in order to assess students’ skills in regard to English-specific (NCTE) Standards. Below is an overview of the ten assessments (with areas covered on the left and our assessments on the right). The assessments with an asterisk has undergone a revision since our last assessment report.

**1. (Required)-CONTENT KNOWLEDGE:** The **English Language Arts Content Exam**

**2. (Required)-CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Comprehensive, Professional Portfolios\***

**3. (Required)-PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS**: **Unit Plans** from ENG 3401, 3402, and 4801 (Live Text)\*

**4. (Required)-PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Student Teaching Assessment,** (Live Text)\*

**5. (Required) – PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, and DISPOSITIONS: Dispositions Assessment** (Live Text)\*

**6. (Required) – PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, and DISPOSITIONS: Dispositions Evaluation from Cooperating Teachers\***

**7. (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Student Teaching Unit/P-12 Assessment Analysis** (Live Text)\*

**8. (Required)** – **EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: EdTPA Teacher Certification Exam**\* (not revised by us but newly implemented by the state)

**9.** **(Required): Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards**: **Pedagogy Reflection (Clinical Experience) Essay** Assessments from ENG 3401, ENG 3402, and ENG 4801 (Live Text)\*

**10.** **(Optional): Additional assessment that addresses NCTE standards: Yellow Sheet Faculty Reference Evaluations**

In lieu of detailing all of the revisions made to the above assessments, allow the following to serve as an example of our work during this time period. The Student Teaching Approval Portfolio is a key assessment that relates to content knowledge. The portfolios contain the following artifacts, which demonstrate the development of our teacher certification candidates throughout their professional coursework. The items marked below with an asterisk were revised to better assess our students.

* Table of Contents
* Résumé
* Completed “Checklist for English Majors”
* Comprehensive Teaching Philosophy\*
* Literature Narrative
* 3 writing samples-- one from a Methods course, one from a Multicultural Literature Course, and one from anther English course\*
* Unit plans from ENG 3401, ENG 3402, and ENG 4801\*
* Evidence of professional organization membership
* Evidence of presentation at English Studies Student Conference (i.e. program)
* Pedagogy Reflection (Clinical Experience) Essays from ENG 3401, ENG 3402, and ENG 4801\*

The changes made to the Portfolio assignment have allowed for students to better express their pedagogical beliefs in regard to teaching all of the English Language Arts (ELA) Strands (e.g. reading, writing, speaking, listening). The previous version of this assessment only found candidates reflecting on their teaching philosophies for composition and literature. The revised unit plans (as described in better detail above), now assess a wider range of ELA Strands as well. Changes made to the required writing statement (now requiring one essay from a Multicultural Literature course) allow candidates to better showcase their breadth and depth of literary knowledge. And changes made to the Pedagogy Reflection Essay allow students to reflect on various aspects of the professional, for example their beliefs on teaching for social justice (as required by various NCTE Standards).

**PART THREE**

*Summarize changes and improvements in* ***curriculum, instruction, and learning*** *that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?*

We have implemented various changes throughout the past three years based on our assessment data. For example, during Fall 2014 we implemented a revision of the English Language Arts Unit Plan requiring more engagement with Common Core (CCSS) reading, writing, speaking, listening, and technology-related standards and added a speaking/listening mini-lesson assignment as well as other lesson plan assignments listed earlier that better address CCSS. Scores for the Unit Plan Revision, Pedagogy Research/Presentation, and Professional Portfolio increased from Fall 2014 to Spring 2015. Increased emphasis on tying assessments directly to the CCSS in the assessment section appears to have improved the candidates' assessment sections within the unit and lesson plans. We now require candidates to include sections, with headings, that cover teaching writing, reading, and speaking/listening processes in alignment with CCSS and ILPTS. These sections have clarified how candidates will plan for student learning that addresses these vital areas of English language arts in relation to the relevant standards.

The Unit Plan revision, Speaking/Listening (Pedagogy Research/Presentation) mini-lesson, Cross-Curricular Lesson Plan, and Social Justice Lesson Plan indicate positive results for all of our candidates. For example, The Spring 2015 Unit Plan scores averaged 3.66% higher than the Fall 2014 scores. Also, the Spring 2015 Speaking/Listening (Pedagogy Research/ Presentation) mini-lesson scores are .89% higher than the Fall 2014 scores. Every candidate in ENG 4801 in Spring 2015 passed the course with a C or better, and most students earned Bs or As, which illustrates improvement in meeting the increased expectations for designing lesson and unit plans that meet the CCSS.

We have added a sheet to the Unit Plan assignment that requires candidates to illustrate exactly which assessments align with which standards that will add a clearer visual component along with the current narrative component. In the Pedagogy Reflection Essay, we will require more references to current research in English language arts to better prepare our candidates for the edTPA Exam. Our 100% pass rate indicates that our students exit our program with the competence needed to fulfill strict certification (and teacher retention) standards.

As can be seen in the charts above, data from the most recent academic year (2016-2017) prove that our students are meeting (and exceeding) all of our program goals. Still, we have two target areas for continued improvement. Although the average score met our goal of 3.0/5.0, candidates continue to score slightly lower in the NCTE II.2 assessment category (“Candidate knows the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics); candidate’s teaching philosophy and instructional material attend to the concept of dialect, the history of the English language, and/or relevant grammar systems, and indicate an understanding of the principles of language acquisition and the impact that language has on society” ) compared to other areas. (The mean score was 3.22/5.00 in this category.) We plan to revise an assignment given in ENG 3401 (the Grammar/Language Mini-Lesson) in order to help improve these scores. We will also be requiring a section devoted to language pedagogy in the ENG 3401 and ENG 4801 Unit Plans.

Another target area for improvement is connected to social justice pedagogy (NCTE VI.1, “plans and implements English language arts and literacy instruction that promotes social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society”). During 2016-2017 students scored 3.591/5.00 which is higher than in years past. We credit this improvement to revisions made to the Social Justice Lesson Plan (assigned in ENG 4801) and additional Social Justice Instructional Activities integrated into ENG 4801 (e.g. guest speakers, workshops, collaborative endeavors with the Social Science Secondary Methods Students). These scores still have room for growth and we will continue our own professional development in order to find instructional strategies that will yield better outcomes in these areas. (It is worth noting that our faculty, both the English Education faculty specifically and the English Faculty more broadly, have been actively organizing and participating in Social Justice Pedagogy Workshops at the department and college-levels.)

Going forward we will continue to analyze our program by focusing primarily on data from ENG 4801 (the capstone methods course) and Student Teaching—the two experiences that fall at the end of our program. However, watching for patterns of growth (or lack thereof) between the three methods courses is useful as well. Since students progress through our methods courses in a set sequence, analyzing the data on assessments that appear in each course (e.g. the Unit Plan, the Pedagogy Reflection Essay, the Disposition Evaluations) allows us to monitor the growth of students individually and as a cohort. Our program data over the past few years have consistently demonstrated higher scores in ENG 4801 indicating that our scaffolded curriculum is having the desired effects. The data obtained from the student teaching stage (e.g. Student Teaching Approval Portfolios, Disposition Evaluations, P-12 Assessment) provide us with additional insight into our program’s strengths. These assessments fall at the close of our program and are completed by a wider range of people (e.g. the entire English Education Committee, Student Teaching Cooperative Teachers); therefore, these data allow for an objective outside assessment of our teacher candidates and program.