

**Graduate Program Assessment
Annual Report
(2006-2007)**

Submitted by: Barbara O'Byrne

**Literacy Education Program
Graduate School of Education and Professional Development**

I. Descriptive Characteristics

A. Description of Program: The Literacy Education Program (LEP) offers a 36-hour Master of Arts Degree which leads to certification as a reading specialist, a 24-hour professional development program for candidates who already have a master's and wish to pursue certification as a reading specialist and an 18-hour certificate program that leads to certification as a highly qualified teacher of reading. The programs are designed to prepare teachers in three major areas: 1) classroom literacy instruction (k-12); 2) reading specialist who instructs students who are struggling readers; and 3) reading coach that serves schools with literacy demonstration teaching, literacy assessment and planning. Ten of the twelve courses required of the reading specialist relate directly to literacy content.

B. Program Goals: The goal of the LEP is to provide a coordinated, sequential program of study which results in candidates becoming highly qualified teachers of reading and leaders in their school and community in advocating for literacy. Through experience, collaboration, and continuing professional development, a reading specialist provides the essential services that enable schools to teach literacy to all children. In order to assess LEP's effectiveness, an assessment plan is in place that is multi-focal and data-driven.

C. Target Population: Primarily this program serves teachers of West Virginia and nearby states who desire to specialize as literacy teachers in their schools. Due to teacher shortages in Title 1 positions that require the Reading Specialist certification, the program supports school districts that lack credentialed teachers by bringing the program to their location.

D. Program Viability: The viability of the program can be seen through the numerous applications of candidates (101 candidates from May 15, 2006 to May 15, 2007) and the frequent request for support by school districts within RESAs I, II, III, IV, and V & VII representing 42 of West Virginia's 55 Counties. Table 1 demonstrates total program admission data over the last 7 years. Table 2 provides information on admission data for 06-07 for each program. The growth in admissions to the MA program in 2006-07 reflects the high percentage of certificate candidates who elected to with the full Master's in Reading Education.

Table 1 LEP Admission & Graduation Data

Categories	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
Applicants	81	131	109	96	69	23 ¹	101
Admits	66	87	23	95	53	33	94
Graduates	26	89	51	70	42	48	70
Praxis Passing Rates	85%	97%	93%	96%	91%	90.7%	NA

Table 2 Program Breakdown of Admission Data 06-07

Category	Applicants	Admits
36-hr MA	74	67
24-hr Prof. Devt	0	0
18-hr Certificate	27	27
Total	101	94

E. Admission scores: Candidate performance on admissions tests meets or exceeds program, unit, and institutional criteria. UGPA mean is 3.30; GRE writing analysis (3.86), GRE Analytical (467), Quantitative (428), Verbal (400), and MAT (393).

F. Program Productivity: Table 3 describes enrollment activity for Fall 2006 through Summer 2007 for program and professional development courses.

Table 3 Program & Professional Development Enrollment**Program Courses**

Semester	Enrollment	Sections	Credit Hours
Fall 2006	304	23	912
Spring 2007	277	20	831
Summer 2007	276	22	828

Professional Development Courses

Semester	Agencies	Staff Dev Enroll	Credit Hours
Fall 2006	7	132	386
Spring 2007	4	99	297
Summer 2007	5	121	87

G. Collaborative Programs: Between the Fall 2006 and Summer 2007, 10 county school districts have hosted cohorts to address needs for highly qualified literacy teachers and literacy specialists: The host counties are: Putnam, Mercer, Wood, McDowell, Mercer, Nicholas, Lincoln, Clay, Wood, and Wyoming. In addition, the LEP has worked out collaborative arrangements with WVU and Marietta College to accommodate candidates in meeting their practicum requirement.

H. Clinical Experiences: The LEP offered practicum sites for 3-credit hours from Fall 2006 to Summer 2007. The practicum is generally scheduled for the summer terms although adjustments are made to accommodate candidates employed in year-around schools. Table 4 describes the sites, number of candidates, and number of students served through the LEP practicum.

Table 4 2006-07 Practicum Experience

County Board of Education	Candidates	Students with 10 or more lessons
Kanawha	17	15
Nicholas	14	12
McDowell	18	15
Huntington	7	NA
Total	56	42

I Technology Utilization: Technology has aided in curriculum delivery and integration. This has resulted in the LEP extending the program to sites throughout the state without giving day-to-day onsite supervision and contact with the candidates. It also enabled the program to provide courses to support the programs of Special Education, School Psychology and Masters of Arts in Teaching. Electronic delivery is available for CIRG 653, CIRG 636, CIRG 644, CIRG 621, CIRG 614, CIRG 613, CIRG 622, CIRG 636 and CI 550. CIRG 637 and CIRG 654 use computer enhancing features. In addition, the program has a VISTA site that houses and maintains all candidate data essential to the multi-focal assessment plan. Table summarizes the LEP's electronic delivery of courses. We are able to offer all but one of the certificate courses electronically, and anticipate electronic delivery of CIRG 637 Literacy Assessment will be available within a year.

Table 5 Electronically Delivered Courses

Semester	Courses	Sections
Fall 2006	7	13
Spring 2007	7	11
Summer 2007	9	12

J. Faculty: The LEP has four full-time faculty positions on the South Charleston campus and two partially assigned positions on the Huntington campus. A position is currently open on each campus; one-year replacements are assisting with program duties. Ten to fifteen part-time faculty members are employed each semester to assist in the delivery of the program. Advising is handled by full-time faculty. The advising load is heavy but manageable; each advisor supports approximately 100 candidates on the South Charleston site. The Huntington faculty serves fewer graduate candidates but this is offset by their undergraduate advising responsibilities. The Literacy Education faculty in Huntington is involved in various projects supported by the June Harless Center for Rural Educational Research and Development. Its mission is to provide leadership for the state of West Virginia and the Appalachian region by improving rural education and community development. Both South Charleston and Huntington faculty are providing professional development courses funded from county funds from "Reading First" grants.

K. Program Approval Information: During the academic year 2006-2007 the Subcommittee on assessment favorably reviewed the LEP in all review categories. The program has received approval (program re-filing) from the WVDE and is NCATE accredited.

L. Summary: The above information supports continuing of the LEP. The number of program graduates exceed the number of employment slots for reading specialist in the

geographical area being served, yet the demand for LEP graduates continues. Many graduates elect to remain in the classroom, and some leave West Virginia to serve in other states. To meet the need for “highly qualified” reading teachers, an 18 credit hour program was designed using the foundation courses of the master’s program. As of summer 2007, admissions into the Literacy Education Program keep pace with the demand voiced by West Virginia Department of Education through the County School Systems. Presently, the demand exceeds the resources of the full-time faculty; however the LEP has been able to draw upon local professional literacy educators to teach and supervise candidates that participate in our programs throughout West Virginia. Technology has been used extensively in the delivery of the program curriculum. Part-time faculty are mentored and trained by full-time faculty mentorship for coherent, consistent delivery of live and electronic courses.

II. Candidate Performance

NCATE requires six to eight assessments as evidence of program effectiveness. The assessments are categorical and can be comprised of several measures or observations. The LEP has developed a multi-focal, comprehensive assessment plan that tracks candidates’ performance as they move through the program. The assessment plan includes entry data, objective pre- post knowledge tests, a cross-program electronic portfolio, qualitative data from advanced courses, an assessment of the impact of on student learning, and exit data from PRAXIS Tests. The assessments are housed within a VISTA/WebCT shell to enhance access and record keeping.

Seven assessments measure or provide support to address the five standards of the International Reading Association (IRA). Descriptions and the results as of Summer 2007 demonstrate a robust, comprehensive assessment plan.

Assessment 1 Admission Scores

The admissions process uses several measures to gain knowledge about candidates entering the program. These data are reviewed and the results used to make program decisions. Table 6 shows the admission data from the last three years.

Table 6 Admissions Data

Measure	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
UGPA	3.25	3.25	3.30
MAT	390	373	393
GRE Analytical	520	530	467
GRE Verbal	433	376	400

Assessment 2 Pre-Post Foundation Knowledge Tests

The Foundation and Pre-practicum Assessments focus on content-based information and concepts. Multiple-choice items were aligned with IRA Standards 1, 2 and 3. The content of this test is mainly conceptual but several items require procedural knowledge & experience. These assessments feature a ‘pre-post’ design; together, they demonstrate candidate gains in core knowledge related to the foundation courses. The foundation assessment was designed as a diagnostic test, and is used for advising purposes. It is available upon entry into the program using online technology. Table 7 shows the analysis of candidates’ scores from 2004-07.

Adjustments are being considered to ensure that this course is taken in the first semester of course work. An item analysis of this test has been conducted and the results are currently being used to make adjustments to the test to ensure greater validity and reliability.

Table 7 Accumulating Foundation Assessment Results from Fall 2004 to Summer 2007*

Number	102
Mean	23.79
Median	24
Range	13-36
Standard Deviation	4.53

*Scores may be affected by number of courses taken prior to exam.

The Pre-Practicum Test was developed to ascertain the preparedness of candidates for advanced program work. This test measures core knowledge and concepts and employs the same multiple-choice format and content base as the Foundation Test. Together, the Foundation and Pre-Practicum Tests provide a tool for assessing progress in mastery of foundation knowledge and concepts. Appropriate interventions are implemented for candidates who are unsuccessful on the Pre-Practicum Test. Table 8 shows the results on this test for the past year. Passing is required before entering Practicum and other advance courses.

Table 8 Distribution on Scores on the Pre-Practicum for Spring 06- Summer 07

Highly Successful (Raw Score of 38 and above)	Average (Raw Score of 28 to 37)	Unsuccessful (Raw score of 27 and below)
6	23	8

N=37

Table 9 provides a more refined analysis of scores on the Pre-practicum assessment got 06-07.

Table 9 Pre-practicum Assessment Results Spring 2006-Summer 07

Number	37
Mean	32.16
Median	23
Range	23-41
Standard Deviation	4.99

Assessment 4 Electronic Portfolio

An electronic portfolio assessment was designed to enable candidates to reflect and make sense of their experiences during the program and to create a five-year, post-program professional development plan. Completed as candidates move through the program, the portfolio provides a dynamic series of snapshots of candidate performance and program effectiveness. Portfolio components are keyed to IRA/LEP standards and are reviewed annually, based on feedback from candidates and faculty. Data below represents both candidates who started the LEP prior to Fall 2004 (designated Old Program) and from Fall 2004 to Summer 2007(new program). It is expected that candidates from the old program will end in one or two years. Table 10 describes candidates' performance on the four sections of the portfolio across three semesters. Table 11 summarizes the capstone results of candidates from the old program.

Table 10 Portfolio Results New Program

Term	Portfolio 1		Portfolio 2		Portfolio 3		Portfolio 4	
	Pass	Revise	Pass	Revise	Pass	Revise	Pass	Revise
Fall 06	6	2	6	2	4	1	3	3
Sp 07	30	1	13	4	6	4	2	2
Sum 07	14	0	13	2	14	1	14	14

Table 11 Portfolio Results Old Program

Term	Submissions	Pass
Fall 2006	29	29
Spring 2007	3	3
Summer 2007	1	1

Assessment 5 Monitoring Field and Clinical Experiences

The LEP carefully monitors the range and depth of field and clinical experiences with three assessment tools. The Record of Field Experiences provides information on the range of candidate field experiences, categorized from pre-k to adult. Two assessments are used for collecting the data from the clinical experiences, a case report and the clinical supervisor's lesson checklist. In both cases, the candidates' performances are monitored and supported until acceptable performances are verified. Data analysis for these three assessments is in progress.

Assessment 6 Improving Literacy Learning for Students

This assessment is designed to ascertain the effectiveness of candidates in improving students' literacy performance. The data has been collected during CIRG 643 Teaching Struggling Readers: A practicum. The results for Summer 2007 are described in Table 12.

Table 12 Positive Literacy Behavior Shifts during the 2007 Summer Practica.

*Site	Students receiving 10 or more lessons	Average Number of Positive shifts in reading behaviors	Average Number of Positive shifts in writing behaviors
Kanawha	15	3.8	1.7
Nicholas	12	3.8	3.3
McDowell	15	7.3	3.7
Total	42	5.0	2.9

*Huntington data unavailable

Positive shifts were noted in each site. Further analysis will be conducted to disaggregate data into developmental categories of Emergent, Beginning, Transitional, Intermediate, and Advanced Readers. Trend analysis will be conducted to determine relationships that relate to intervention procedures, as well as needs to adjust curriculum content in the literacy courses related to instructional methods.

Assessment 7

This assessment deals with licensure and addresses content knowledge that is found in IRA standards 1, 2, 3 and 4. It is administered and scored outside of the LEP program by Educational Testing Services. LEP uses Praxis II--Reading Specialist Test results for meeting this requirement as it is one WVDE requirement for an endorsement to the teaching certificate. Many candidates take this exam at or near the end of their program. Copies of this instrument are not available. It is administered by WVDE and is evaluated by Educational Testing Service (ETS). (See Program Admissions and Graduation Data in Table 1). Data is distributed to the Program areas through the Dean's office.

Candidate Assessment Summary

The assessment system and components above were focused upon the relative success of individual candidates and did not require disaggregating data to specify a specific IRA standards and elements. This type of data was used in the NCATE approved 2002 accreditation review and the successful 2004 NCATE BOE visit. Since that time, the NCATE review process has become focused upon programs assessing candidate performances specifically related to the standards and elements of the IRA. This means that the above assessments need to be modified so that data matches each IRA standard and element if the program is to become accredited during the 2009 NCATE visit.

III. Summary Statement of Program Changes

Extensive efforts have resulted in the design of a program assessment system and its components. This activity has been in process since this requirement was manifest in the 2002 NCATE program review submitted to IRA. Along with curriculum and assessment innovations comes the need for introducing and retraining of faculty respective to unfamiliar components. A Hedrick Award supported a collaborative faculty to rationalize portfolio assignments and rubrics. Since last year, the program has developed and implemented a new course, CIRG 601 Guidance for the Literacy Specialist. This elective course introduces candidates to the program's assessment system and provides learning experiences and guidance that promote professional success. The program is continuing to refine the data gathering tools associated with each assessment piece so that these can be easily assessed for program renewal discussions and NCATE. Further, these changes resulted in faculty stepping up and serving as mentors to part-time faculty as well as being involved with recruiting of part-time faculty who were willing to venture into online course delivery. The LEP has regular training for part-time staff and actively recruits new part-time faculty.

IV. Plans for Next Year and Beyond

As indicated in the above, much is to be done to complete the efforts of this past year. Crucial will be putting the plans into operation in a way that do not over tax the staff and faculty. Data from the assessment system must be examined carefully to make sure the right questions are being raised and the information being collected is useful for supporting candidates and informing the program. The new practicum course, CIRG 623, had now been taught at several sites. The LEP plans a seminar at which instructors will share what has been learned about course delivery and mentor new instructors preparing to deliver this course. Adjustments to the portfolio are anticipated to better match this tool with related learning and assessment objectives. Given the increase in number of literacy courses, several courses will need to be examined to see

if they can be delivered through the Internet. Part-time faculty will need to be recruited and trained to teach the new courses or to use the VISTA technology to deliver courses, particularly in cohorts at long distances from the main campuses. Mentoring and support of part-time faculty must be continued in order to bring curriculum consistency to candidates. Without this consistency, evaluation of the assessment system will be compromised. The LEP assessment plan will be reviewed and refined to ensure it is meeting program goals and is consistent with NCATE guidelines.

Appendix A.

Assessment of Candidate Outcomes

Candidate Outcome	Responsibility	Assessment Tool or Approach	Standards/Benchmark	Results/Analysis	Action Taken
1. Candidates will meet admissions criteria of program	Admission Office Program Director Program Advisors	1)UGPA 2)MAT /GRE score 3)WVDE Tchr. Cert.	Min. 2.5 Min. 20 %tile/800 Denied program admissions with scores below 20 %tile or equivalent	95 % meets Criteria 5% fails to meet criteria	No action required Provisional status if meet partial standards Added monitoring of WVDE teaching certificate
2. Candidates will demonstrate content knowledge as required in program of study	Program Faculty Program Advisors Program Director	1)Foundation Assessment 2)Pre-practicum assessment	1)Scores in average range or above 2) Scores in average range or above	41 met criteria 5 failed to meet criteria 11 met criteria 3 failed to meet	No action required Advisor conference with plan for improvement/program monitoring to determine relationship with successful program completion No action required Denied access to advance LEP courses until competence is demonstrated (1 of the 3 candidates has demonstrated competence to continue).
3. Candidate will provide evidence of performance competence respective to IRA standards.	Program Faculty	Portfolio Sections: 1, 2, 3, & 4 and scoring guides	Performance evaluations criteria	100% met criteria for portfolio 1 80% met criteria for portfolio 2 20% failed to meet criteria	No action required No action required Candidates will be given an additional opportunity to correct for this in a subsequent semester.
4. Candidates will demonstrate performance competence related to assessment, planning, instructing and communicating student literacy progress.	CIRG 643 Instructors	Tutoring Checklist Case Reports Student Progress Records	Acceptable ratings determined by instructors	95 % met criteria on first attempt 100% met criteria by 2 nd attempt	No action required

4. Candidates will demonstrate performance competence related to assessment, planning, instructing and communicating with classroom colleagues and school administrators.	CIRG 623 Instructors	Professional Development documents, e.g., power-point presentation, school assessment plan with plan of action.	Acceptable ratings	Instructor dependent	Program to review implementation and design assessment tools to gain consistency among instructors.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------