

# **Texas A&M International University**

## **Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER)**

**Date Submitted** January 31, 2007

**Assessment Period Covered (2006)**

**Academic Program/AES Unit** Bachelor of Arts with a Major in English with Grades 8-12  
Certification in English Language Arts and Reading (BA)

**Person(s) Preparing Review** Sean Chadwell

### **Provide summary of the last cycle's use of results and changes implemented**

Because little data were collected--and because faculty feel we will learn most by looking at some trends over time--we made no programmatic changes in the last cycle.

## **Section I: Planning and Implementation**

### **Institutional Mission**

Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, prepares students for leadership roles in their chosen profession in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society ... Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University embodies a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

### **Academic Program or Administrative/Educational Support Unit Mission**

In unison with the institutional mission, the Department is dedicated to the promotion of intellectual and personal growth in students, with an emphasis on endowing them with flexibility to adapt to the ever-changing social, professional, economic, cultural, and political environments ushered in by this era of rapid technological change, information proliferation, and global interdependence. To achieve these aims, the Department is committed to the retention of a productive, professionally diverse and highly competent faculty involved in a wide range of academic endeavors.

### **Identify outcomes and the relationship to Strategic Plan**

#### **Outcome 1**

☒ **Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**

Graduates will be able to produce a portfolio of selected writings culled from their coursework in English that demonstrates writing effectiveness.

#### **Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 1**

Goal 1 Academics

**Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 1**

Implement an Institutional Effectiveness plan to evaluate academic and educational/administrative support units and track the use of results used to improve programs.

**Identify methods of assessment to be used**

As seniors, English majors will compile a portfolio of their writing from English coursework; this portfolio will be evaluated by program faculty according to the university rubric.

**Indicate when assessment will take place**

Annual

**Criteria/Benchmark**

100% of senior portfolios will score a "3" or above.

---

**Outcome 2**

☐ **Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**

Graduates will employ a range of literary tools to identify, analyze, and synthesize literary genres.

**Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 2**

Goal 1 Academics

**Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 2**

Implement an Institutional Effectiveness plan to evaluate academic and educational/administrative support units and track the use of results used to improve programs.

**Identify methods of assessment to be used**

Graduates will take a norm-referenced subject test of literature, namely the Major Field Assessment Test (MFAT).

**Indicate when assessment will take place**

Spring

**Criteria/Benchmark**

100% of Graduates will score at the 50th percentile or above overall.

---

**Outcome 3**

☐ **Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**

Graduates will validate their content knowledge of English by passing the state examination for secondary teachers of English.

**Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 3**

Goal 1 Academics

**Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 3**

Implement an Institutional Effectiveness plan to evaluate academic and educational/administrative support units and track the use of results used to improve programs.

**Identify methods of assessment to be used**

Throughout the year, students preparing to teach English Language Arts and Reading at the secondary level will take the TExES 131 exam for educator certification in this field.

**Indicate when assessment will take place**

Annual

**Criteria/Benchmark**

Within one year of graduation, including the two semesters preceding graduation, 80% or higher of graduates will, on their first or second attempt, pass the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) 131, in English Language Arts and Reading with scores above 235 in all domains of the exam.

**When (term/date) was assessment conducted?**

**Outcome 1**

Fall, 2006

**Outcome 2**

Fall, 2006

**Outcome 3**

Throughout 2006

---

**What were the results attained (raw data)?**

**Outcome 1**

Only 2 of 8 eligible students met the benchmark; three students scored an average of 2 (from 2 readers), well below an acceptable level.

**Outcome 2**

Five BA-ENGL-8-12 students tested, and the data vary widely. Only one student scored above the 50th percentile, nationally, with a 165, which put her in the 70th percentile. The others scored in the 40th, 10th, 5th, and bottom percentile. No trends were apparent in the subscores.

**Outcome 3**

Four BA-ENGL-8-12 graduates from 2006 took the TExES 131 exam, and all four passed, one student requiring a second attempt to do so. Scores were not above 235 in all domains for all testers: one student scored below 235 in domains three, four, and five; another in domain one; and a third in domain three. Because our students are historically very strong in domain three—and because this sample of four is so small—the low scores in this domain do not suggest a trend. No other trends could be discerned.

---

**Who (specify names) conducted analysis of data?**

**Outcome 1**

Sean Chadwell, Robert Haynes, Wanda Creaser, Faridoun Farrokh, Kevin Lindberg

**Outcome 2**

Sean Chadwell, Robert Haynes, Wanda Creaser, Faridoun Farrokh, Kevin Lindberg

**Outcome 3**

Sean Chadwell, Robert Haynes, Wanda Creaser, Faridoun Farrokh, Kevin Lindberg

---

**When were the results and analysis shared and with whom (department chair, supervisor, staff, external stakeholders)? Submit minutes with data analysis to [assessment@tamiu.edu](mailto:assessment@tamiu.edu) (Please use Minutes Template located on the [Project INTEGRATE](#) web page.)**

The department chair sits on this committee and was involved in the analysis of data on Friday, January 26, 2007 and Tuesday, January 30, 2007.

**NOTE: Submit all assessment documentation (i.e., surveys, rubrics, course exams with embedded questions, etc.) to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.**

**Use of Results: Indicate whether criteria were met/not met and what changes, if any, have been identified based on the data collected?**

**Outcome 1**

☐ Met   ☒ Not Met

**Provide narrative:** The committee agreed that this looks dire. What it suggests is that our BA-ENGL-8-12 majors are not getting enough writing instruction or practice. Importantly, the major difference between this group and their peers in the standard ENGL degree (70% of whom met this benchmark) is that these majors take 24 fewer hours of ENGL courses.

Aside from the changes identified in response to Outcome 3, below (which would give students more one-on-one with their professors), the committee can identify no other specific programmatic changes at this time, especially given the difficulty of adding coursework hours to a certification degree that is already 132 hours.

In fact, the committee wants officially here to express its concern that, should the state mandate 120-degree programs, the department will be asked to require even fewer hours of ENGL. Surely this would not help our students in this major.

**Outcome 2**

☐ Met   ☒ Not Met

**Provide narrative:** The primary outcome criterion was met--exceeded, even, as 100% of the students passed the exam on their first or second attempt. The secondary outcome was not met, as fewer than 50% of the students scored above a 235 in every domain of the exam. The committee agrees that, because students are passing the exam at an excellent rate overall and because no trends could be observed in the domain scores, we should avoid any programmatic changes this year and reconsider the data--using the same criteria--for 2007.

**Outcome 3**

☐ Met   ☒ Not Met

**Provide narrative:** 1 of 5 students scored at the 50th percentile or above. While this does not meet the outcome goal, data--given the small sample of only five students--were in no way consistent or revealing enough to draw programmatic conclusions. Instead the committee's

analysis focused on how we might use the exam more effectively by 1) better understanding its organization and format; 2) talking with students after the exam about their experiences taking it; 3) considering comparing our data—at extra cost—against specific selected schools in addition to the national average.

---

**How have these data-based changes improved your program/unit?** No data-based changes have been implemented.

Enter text here

### Section III: Programmatic Review

**Are resources affected by the changes identified in Section II?** ☒ Yes ☐ No

**If so, specify the effect(s) using the chart below:**

Funding	Physical	Other
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New resources required	<input type="checkbox"/> New or reallocated space	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primarily faculty/staff time
<input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation of current funds		<input type="checkbox"/> University rule/procedure change only
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other: Enter text here

**Provide a narrative description and justification for requested resources (include linkage to Strategic Plan)**

The program committee is requesting a one-course release each semester for a program faculty member (ideally a different person to be chosen by the program committee for each semester) to spend time one-on-one with ENGL-8-12 majors in an advising/mentoring capacity. This will enable majors better to choose coursework; develop an understanding of the academy and profession; and perceive themselves as connected members of the department. This plan is most closely linked to Strategic Plan subsection 1.8: "Provide support programs, services, and activities that promote student learning and enhance student development."

**NOTE:** this section will be redundant with the BA-ENGL AIER. The committee is recommending—for both programs—a single course release each semester.

**Identify proposed outcomes for the next assessment cycle:**

Continuation of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for continuation):

The committee feels we will benefit by continuing to collect the same data next year so that we might begin to see year-to-year trends. Within a given year, our samples are generally too small to indicate much.

New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below):

Enter text here

Modification of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for modification):

Enter text here

**\*\*\*\* This section to be completed by dean/director/vice-president \*\*\*\***

**Are resources requested a priority for the academic program/AES unit?**

☐ Yes ☐ No

**Comments:**

Enter text here

**If funding, physical or other resources were requested, what is the impact of the budget decisions on the academic program/AES unit?**

Enter text here