

**Graduate Program Assessment  
Annual Report  
(2008-2009)**

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 (87) and admissions (85) and the frequent request for support by school districts within RESAs I, II, III, IV, V and VII representing 42 of West Virginia's 55 Counties. Table 1 demonstrates total program admission data over the last 9 years. Table 2 provides information on admission data for 08-09 for each program. The growth in admissions to the MA program in 2006-09 reflects the high percentage of certificate candidates who elected to continue with the full Master's in Reading Education upon completion of the 18- hour Certificate Program. The impact of new cohorts in Mingo and Logan Counties will be reflected in MA admissions next year.

**Table 1 LEP Admission & Graduation Data**

Categories	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09
Applicants	81	131	109	96	69	23 <sup>1</sup>	101	85	87
Admits	66	87	23	95	53	33	94	99	85
Graduates	26	89	51	70	42	48	70	21	15
Praxis Passing Rates	85%	97%	93%	96%	91%	90.7%	91.8%	90.2%	NA

**Table 2 Program Breakdown of Admission Data 08-09**

Category	Applicants	Admits
36-hr Master of Arts	56	54
24-hr Professional Development	2	2
18-hr Certificate Program	31	29
Total	87	85

**E. Admission scores:** Candidate performance on admissions tests meets or exceeds program, unit, and institutional criteria. UGPA mean is 3.35; GRE writing analysis (Deborah Wood), GRE Analytical (535), Quantitative (429), Verbal (412), and MAT (395).

**F. Program Productivity:** Table 3 describes enrollment activity for fall 2008 through summer 2009 for program and professional development courses.

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

Semester	Enrollment	Sections	Credit Hours
Fall 2008	231	18	693
Spring 2009	348	28	1044
Summer 2009	266	20	798

**Professional Development Courses**

Semester	Agencies	Staff Dev Enroll	Credit Hours
Fall 2008	3	46	138
Spring 2009	7	102	306
Summer 2009	2	27	81

**G. Collaborative Programs:** Between the Fall 2008 and Summer 2009, 10 county school districts have hosted cohorts to address needs for highly qualified literacy teachers

---

and literacy specialists: The host counties are: Mercer, Wood, McDowell, Mercer, Nicholas, Lincoln, Clay, Mingo, Logan, and Jackson. In addition, the LEP continued to work out collaborative arrangements with WVU to accommodate candidates in meeting their practicum requirement.

**H. Clinical Experiences:** The LEP offered the two practicum courses CIRG 643 Teaching Struggling Readers and CIRG 623 The Literacy Facilitator on several sites from fall 2008 to summer 2009. 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 2008-09 Practicum Experiences**

Site	Semester	Candidates
South Charleston Campus	Fall	6
Huntington Campus	Fall	9
Kanawha County Grace Bible (CIRG 643)	Spring	5
Raleigh County Mabscott Elementary	Spring	4
Kanawha County	Fall	6
Kanawha County Grace Bible	Summer	5
Caball County Harless Center	Summer	12
Kanawha County Andrew Jackson Middle School	Summer	11

**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 601, CIRG 653, CIRG 636, CIRG 644, CIRG 621, CIRG 614, CIRG 613, CIRG 622, CIRG 636 and CIRG 615. As of fall 2009, CIRG 637 Literacy Assessment is now available as a web-enhanced course. Clinical courses such as CIRG 623 and 643 are now supported by Blackboard and data stored to support program evaluation. Field-testing of WIMBA tools is underway to better enable distance candidates to complete supervised field experiences. In addition, the program has a

Blackboard site that houses and maintains all candidate data essential to the multi-focal assessment plan. Table 5 summarizes the LEP's electronic delivery of courses.

**Table 5 Electronically Delivered Courses**

Semester	Courses	Sections
Fall 2008	7	15
Spring 2009	5	17
Summer 2009	4	8

**J. Faculty:** The LEP has four full-time faculty positions on the South Charleston campus and three partially assigned positions on the Huntington campus. At present all full-time positions are filled. Advising duties are handled by full-time faculty. The advising load is heavy but manageable; each advisor supports approximately 80 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 and 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 LEP is currently preparing its NCATE SPA report.

**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 2009, 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 members are mentored and trained by full-time faculty 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 are 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. A summary and overview of the LEP assessments, including those specifically required by NCATE, shows when these assessments are administered (Appendix A).

Seven assessments measures address the five standards of the International Reading Association (IRA). Descriptions and the results as data collected in the past year demonstrate a robust, comprehensive assessment plan.

### Assessment A 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. This data is valuable to the program but does not serve as one the NCATE assessments.

**Table 6 Admissions Data**

Measure	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
UGPA	3.25	3.25	3.30	3.41	3.35
MAT	390	373	393	392	395
GRE Analytical	520	530	467	490	535
GRE Verbal	433	376	400	405	412

### Assessment 1 PRAXIS Test

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. For each of the last five years, over 90% of our candidates have been successful on this test. It is required by the WVDE and is administered and evaluated by Educational Testing Service (ETS). Program Admissions and Graduation Data in Table1 reflect results on PRAXIS tests. Data are distributed to the Program areas through the Dean's office.

## Assessment 2 Pre-Post Foundation Knowledge Tests

The Pre-Post Foundation Tests focus on content-based information and concepts. Multiple-choice items were aligned with IRA/NCATE Literacy Standards. These assessments feature a 'pre-post' design; together, they demonstrate candidate gains in core knowledge covered in foundation courses and readiness for advanced program courses. The names of these assessments have been changed to clarify their purpose in the program.

The Pre- Foundation test (formerly Foundation Test) was designed as a diagnostic test, and is used for advising purposes. It is available upon entry into the program using online technology. It has 40 items and, as the test is diagnostic, there are no unacceptable scores. Table 7 shows the analysis of candidates' scores from 2008-09.

An item analysis of this test has been conducted this past year and the results used to make adjustments to the test to ensure greater validity and reliability (see Appendix B). This year the program implemented a change in procedures to ensure that candidates complete the pre-test as part of the admissions process. This change should lead to more accurate data.

**Table 7 Accumulating Pre-Foundation Test Assessment Results Fall 2008 to Present**

Number	104
Mean	24
Median	24
Standard Deviation	4.17

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

The Post-Foundation Test (formerly Pre-Practicum) was developed to ascertain the preparedness of candidates for advanced program work and the impact of foundation courses on candidate knowledge. This test measures core knowledge and concepts and employs the same multiple-choice format and content base as the Pre-Foundation Test. The test has 50 items. The Pre- and Post -Foundation Tests provide tools for assessing progress in mastery of foundation knowledge and concepts. Appropriate interventions are implemented for candidates who are unsuccessful on the Post-Foundation Test, as measured as below more than one standard deviation from the scores. Table 8 shows the cumulative results on this test for the past year. Passing is required before entering Practicum and other advance courses.

**Table 8 Accumulating Post-Foundation Test Results Fall 2008 to Present**

Number	8
Mean	33.6
Medium	34.5
Standard Deviation	4.4

### **Assessment 3 Planning Instruction**

The program has designed a learning experience in CIRG 654 Aligning Assessment and Instruction as an NCATE required assessment showing mastery of planning instruction. This assessment has several pieces that confirm candidates' ability to conduct a wide range of literacy assessments and to develop plans to support the needs of diverse learners in a range of grouping options. Data from this assessment are currently being gathered and stored in a Blackboard shell. The results will be analyzed and presented in future program reports.

### **Assessment 4 Mastery of Practicum Experiences**

The program designed Section 4 of the portfolio as the assessment in which candidates will demonstrate mastery in practicum experiences, one of the six required NCATE assessments. LEP carefully monitors the range and depth of field and clinical experiences with numerous assessment tools. The portfolio submission enables candidates to assemble and reflect on their practicum learning experiences. This assessment is currently being field-tested. The assignment and rubric are aligned to NCATE/IRA professional standards (Appendix C). The rubric will be used to gather data in Portfolio section 4 fall 2009. The program will use data from this section of the portfolio to evaluate clinical experiences and to ensure the quality of clinical courses across different sites. Data from this assessment are currently being tabulated.

### **Assessment 5 Impact on student learning**

This assessment is designed to ascertain the effectiveness of candidates in improving students' literacy performance. The data are collected during CIRG 643 Teaching Struggling Readers: A practicum. 2009 practicum was held in three locations: Kanawha County, Raleigh County and Cabell County. Data were collected on 38 students using the behaviors on the student progress record (SPR). Pilot data was collected on 5 students using a different set of observations. Twenty-six sets of behaviors are used in reading ranging developmentally from Kindergarten to Eighth Grade. These behaviors are used with permission from the Scholastic Guided Reading Program. Five sets of writing behaviors are also used. These sets were developed from candidates in earlier practicum sections.

Results Based upon assessment data (Observation Survey, Qualitative Reading Inventory IV): students were placed on instructional levels from level A (kindergarten) to level X (seventh grade). Table 12 shows this instructional continuum.

**Table 9 Instructional Levels of Students**

GRL Level	students	GRL Level	students	GRL Level	students
A	3	H	3	P	1

B	2	I	1	S	5
C	2	J	3	X	1
D	1	K	1		
E	2	L	1		
F	4	N	2		
G	2	O	2		

The gains made by these students during the practicum were captured by a student progress record (SPR) that showed positive changes in reading and writing behaviors. Table 12 shows the results for 2008-09. The ages of students ranged from 5 years 5 months to 16 years 2 months.

**Table 10 Student Literacy Behavior Shifts 2009 Reading Clinic Practica**

Site	Semester	Students with 10 or more lessons	Average number of positive shifts in reading	Average number of positive shifts in writing
Kanawha County Grace Bible	Spring	5	7.4	2.8
Raleigh County Mabscott Elementary	Spring	5	5.5	2.0
Kanawha County Grace Bible	Summer	5	5.0	1.2
Caball County Harless Center	Summer	22	5.1	2.1

Reading: Positive shifts (reading growth) ranged from 1 shift to 9 shifts with the average student making 5.26 shifts during an average of 14.3 days of instruction. Writing: Positive shifts (writing growth) ranged from 0 to 6 shifts with the average student making 2.03 shifts during the 14.3 days of instruction. It should be noted that there are fewer behaviors being monitored in writing as opposed to reading.

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.

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.

### **Assessments 6 The Reflective Practitioner**

An electronic portfolio assessment was designed to enable candidates to reflect and make sense of their learning experiences. Completed in four sections 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/NCATE standards and are reviewed annually, based on feedback from candidates and faculty. Table 9 describes candidates' performance on the four sections of the portfolio for the last year.

**Table 11 Portfolio Results 2008-2009**

Term	Portfolio 1		Portfolio 2		Portfolio 3		Portfolio 4	
	Pass	Revise	Pass	Revise	Pass	Revise	Pass	Revise
Fall 08	24	1	22	3	12	1	12	0
Sp 09	10	0	18	2	15	2	5	0

This year, the program decided to look closely at the data gathered by the portfolio and to key these data to specific IRA/NCATE standards. The goal was to better use the portfolio data to support NCATE/IRA assessments. The LEP has decided to disaggregate portfolio data to better show how it meets two distinct NCATE/IRA assessments; the evaluation of clinical experiences will be the goal of portfolio section 4. Assessment 6 will demonstrate that candidates are using reflecting, integrating and extending their content knowledge acquired in program courses. Portfolio sections 1-3 will be used to evaluate competence in this area.

### **Assessment 7 Effective Conferencing in Writing Workshop**

The LEP decided this year to use an assessment from CIRG 615 Writing in an Integrated Literacy Framework as a seventh assessment for NCATE. This assessment demonstrates the commitment of the LEP to a robust program that sees value in integrating reading and writing into a common curriculum. The assessment evaluates the ability to plan and conduct writing conferences within a writing workshop. Appendix D shows this assignment and the rubric used to assess learning. This assessment is common to all sections of this course. Data have been collected and stored on Blackboard shells for three years. Plans are being made to import these data into the LEP program shell. Data from this assessment will be available fall 2009.

## **II Candidate Assessment Summary**

The Summary of Candidate Outcomes provides an overview of program assessments, related assessment tools, and of candidate outcomes for each assessment (Appendix F). Where needed, the program has initiated action to better prepare candidates.

## **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. 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. The type of data was used in the NCATE approved 2002 accreditation review and the successful 2004 NCATE BOE visit did not require disaggregation of data to demonstrate mastery of specific NCATE/IRA standards. 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. The program is modifying and shifting its assessment pieces to align more closely with IRA/NCATE standards. A matrix shows our progress towards this goal and preparedness for the upcoming SPA submission and NCATE visit (Appendix E). The accomplishments this year include:

- Identification of the assessments that will be used for the NCATE SPA report (Appendix A)
- Cross-referencing all items on the pre- post- foundation test with NCATE/IRA standards (Appendix B)
- Construction of assessment 3evaluating candidate ability to plan instruction, an assessment required by NCATE
- Redesign and designation of portfolio section 4 as the practicum assessment required by NCATE (Appendix C)
- Designation of portfolio sections1-3 as the reflective practitioner assessment required by NCATE
- Designation of a common assignment in CIRG 615 Writing in an Framework as the seventh NCATE assessment (Appendix D)
- Construction of a matrix that aligns program assessments with NCATE/IRA required assessments (Appendix E)
- Refinement of the outcome chart demonstrating program action based on annual assessment data (Appendix F)

## **IV. Plans for Next Year and Beyond**

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. An important goal for the upcoming year is to

complete the articulation between the program assessment plan and the assessments expected by NCATE. Data from the pre-post foundation tests have been revised to more accurately reflect IRA/NCATE standards. This analysis will allow the program to develop a bank of test items to serve this assessment. Similarly, the portfolio sections, already linked to IRA/NCATE standards, will be refined to more closely meet the needs of the reading professional. Adjustments to the portfolio are anticipated to better match this tool with related learning and assessment objectives and NCATE/IRA standards. 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. Assessments field tested this year will need to be carefully monitored to ensure the reliability and validity of their data.

Part-time faculty will need to be recruited and trained to teach the new courses or to use the Blackboard 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**  
**Summary of Literacy Education Program Assessments**

	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment Is Administered
	<b>Entrance tests ( will not be used as an assessment for NCATE)</b>	Varied	Entry into program
1	<b>PRAXIS II</b>	Multiple choice test	Completion of program
2	<b>Pre-Post foundation test</b>	Multiple choice tests	Entry into program End of foundation courses
3	<b>Planning Instruction</b>	Analytic rubric keyed to essential components of the assignment	During CIRG 654 Aligning Assessment and Instruction
4	<b>Assessment of Practicum</b>	Analytic rubric keyed to essential components of the portfolio submission	After completion of both practicum courses CIRG 643 Reading Clinic for Struggling Readers and CIRG 623 The Literacy Facilitator
5	<b>Student Progress record: effect on learning</b>	Descriptive statistics to represent qualitative data	After completion of CIRG 643 Reading Clinic for Struggling Readers
6	<b>The Reflective Practitioner</b>	Analytic rubrics keyed to essential components of the portfolio sections 1-3 submissions	Section I: end of first semester Section II: completion of at least four foundation courses Section III: completion of at least two advanced courses
7	<b>Conferencing with students in writing workshop</b>	Holistic rubric keyed to essential components of the assignment	During CIRG 615 Writing in the Literacy curriculum
8	<b>Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (optional)</b>		

**Appendix B**  
**Alignment of Pre-Post Foundation Test Items and NCATE/IRA Standards**

I. Foundational Knowledge	II. Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials	III. Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation	IV. Creating a Literate Environment	V. Professional Development
A1; A2; A13; D1; D2; D3;	D9, D17, D23, D24, D25, 4-1	A3; A4; A5; A6; A7; A8;	A9; A12; 4-5;	
D4; D5; D6, D7, D8, D10,	B5, B6, B7, B8, B9, B10	A10; A11; A15; A16; A17;	B13, B15, B17	
D11, D12, D13, D14, D15,	B11, B12, B14, B16, B18	A18; A19; A20; A21; A22;		
D16, D18, D20, 4-3, 4-7, 4-8,	B19, B20, B21, B22, B25, B27, B28	A23; A24;A25;A26; D19; D21; D22; 4-2; 4-4; 4-6;		
D4-9		B23, B24, B26		
B1, B2, B3, B4				
28 Items for Category I.	24 Items for Category II	29 Items for Category III	6 Items for Category IV	0 Item for Category V

**Appendix C**  
**Literacy Education Portfolio**  
**Section Four: Evaluating and Reflecting the Literacy Practicum**

**Rationale**

The purpose of this section of the portfolio is to give candidates an opportunity to demonstrate successful participation in the program practicum courses and mastery of many IRA standards associated with practicum experiences.

**Audience**

The audience of the presentation is the faculty of the literacy education program.

**Description of the Assignment**

This section of the portfolio provides the candidate with an opportunity to gather artifacts from particular components of practicum experiences as evidence of successful mastery of learning experiences from the program practicum courses: CIRG 623 Reading Instruction for the Literacy Facilitator and CIRG 643 Teaching Struggling Readers To complete this portfolio activity, each candidate will gather and submit artifacts from the practicum learning experiences and assignments that demonstrate competence in:

1. Analysis of student performance

Systematic record keeping through informal and formal assessment procedures (i.e., observation assessments, standardized tests, informal reading inventories, developmental spelling inventories, student work samples and pretest-posttest data.)

Suggested artifacts:

623 summer enrichment team assessment data, pre-post DIBELS data, sample of student report card

623 Huntington: NA

643 scanned images of 2-3 different assessments, student progress record

2. Instruction methods and materials

Develop lessons that incorporate systematic procedures and self-reflections to gauge student performance and instructional effectiveness. Artifacts should reflect meeting the needs and interests of learners with different abilities.

Suggested artifacts:

623 summer enrichment: small group lesson plans, sample of team reflections, photo essay of literate environment, sample of supervisor observation sheet.

623 Huntington: NA

643 three samples of one-on-one lesson plans for struggling readers, student interest inventories, evidence(list) of range of books to motivate the reader through list of titles/authors

Sample of clinic supervisor observation sheet

### 3. Analytic-reflective coaching

Develops and implements demonstration lessons, and receives and responds to peer and supervisor feedback.

Suggested artifacts:

623 summer enrichment: two exemplars of coaching response sheets, sample of feedback sheet from supervisor,

623 Huntington: professional development video and reflection. (A five-minute sample of the video would suffice)

### 4. Commitment to ongoing professional development

Organize, participates and documents professional growth and dispositions, conference notes, team meeting notes

Suggested artifacts:

623 summer enrichment: one workshop prepared for teachers and sample of peer feedback, samples of two team reflections, artifact showing participation professional development workshop during enrichment, artifacts showing collaboration with other professionals

623 Huntington: literacy plan for school, evidence of engaging in investigation of relevant literacy topic, evidence of providing and receiving feedback on coaching

### 5. Effective communication of assessment results for intended audiences

Final reports clearly describe the learner, summarize assessment data and successful instructional approaches and make recommendations for professionals and parents.

Suggested artifacts

623 summer enrichment: sample of report to parents, letters to parent

623 Huntington: evidence of sharing the literacy plan with the school

643 sample of final report and related communications with parents

## **Admission Submission Procedures to Section Four**

Candidates are eligible to submit section four of the portfolio upon completion of:

1. The six-hours of the literacy practicum, CIRG 623 Reading Instruction for Literacy Facilitators: A Practicum and CIRG 643 Teaching Struggling Readers: A Practicum
2. Section Three of the Portfolio.

Candidates submit this assignment as a set of Word and JPEG files to the LEP Blackboard site. Each area should have a cover sheet that identifies the artifacts. Artifacts should be submitted to address each of the five areas of the practicum learning experiences: analysis of student performance, instructional methods and materials, analytic-reflective coaching, commitment to ongoing professional development, effective communication of results for intended audiences.

### **Evaluation**

A rubric is used to assess this section of the portfolio. Candidates must obtain a rating of successful or highly successful on all five components of this portfolio reflection on the practicum assessment to pass this section of the portfolio. Candidates are encouraged to include a brief paragraph to precede the artifacts for each of the five components of the practicum assessment that explains how the artifacts match with the specific criteria of the five-part rubric.

**ASSESSMENT #4 Portfolio Section 4  
Practicum Experiences and the Literacy Specialist  
Assessment Rubric**

IRA Standard	Outstanding (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Score
Part 1 Analysis of student performance				
3.1 Uses a wide range of assessment tools	Effectively uses, interprets, and recommends assessment tools and practices to analyze student performance and growth. Provides consistent, evidence of collaboration with practicum participants.	Uses, interprets and recommends assessment tools and practices to describe student performance. Provides some examples of collaboration with practicum participants.	Uses some relevant assessment tools but mastery of the tools is not evident and/or consistent. Collaboration is impeded by faulty or incomplete assessment practices.	/3
3.2 Places students along a developmental continuum and identifies students' proficiencies and difficulties.	Effectively and confidently assesses individual students to determine an accurate literacy profile that identifies strengths and weaknesses.	Assesses individual students to determine a literacy profile that identifies strengths and weaknesses.	Assesses individual students but cannot identify or explain strengths and weaknesses.	/3
3.3 Uses assessments to plan, evaluate and revise instruction to meet the needs of diverse students	Evaluates the results of assessment data in designing, scaffolding, and modifying instruction to meet the unique needs of learners.	Analyzes the results of assessment data in designing and modifying instruction to meet the unique needs of learners.	Makes incomplete or inaccurate use of assessment data in designing instruction.	/3
Part 2 Instructional	Outstanding (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Score

lessons and materials				
2.1 Uses instructional groupings as appropriate for accomplishing given purposes.	Effectively selects, implements and modifies grouping options to meet the needs of learners.	Selects and implements grouping options to meet the unique needs of learners.	Decisions about grouping options are not evident in instructional practice.	/3
2.2 Uses appropriate instructional practices to meet the diverse needs of learners at different stages of development.	Effectively and consistently uses a wide array of appropriate instructional practices to meet the needs of learners.	Uses different instructional practices to meet the individual needs of learners.	Uses instructional practices that do not match the needs of learners.	/3
2.3 Uses appropriate instructional materials to meet the needs of learners at different stages of development	Creates, modifies and selects instructional materials to meet the unique needs of learners.	Selects and uses appropriate instructional materials to meet the unique needs of learners.	Use of instructional material does not adequately meet the unique needs of learners.	/3
4.1 Uses student interests, reading abilities, and backgrounds as foundation for reading instruction.	Effectively and consistently selects materials that align with the student's reading levels, interest, and needs.	Consistently selects materials that align with the student's reading level, interests and needs.	Selects materials that do not align with the student's reading level and/or interests or needs.	/3
4.2 Uses a range of books and instructional resources to address the needs of diverse learners.	Gathers and selects from range of developmentally appropriate books and resources that reflect the unique needs of learners.	Selects from a range of developmentally appropriate books and resources that reflect the unique needs of learners.	Books, materials are not consistently available and/or evident in meeting the unique needs of learners.	/3
4.3 Models	Enthusiastically	Models	Authentic reading	/3

reading and writing as valued lifelong activities.	and consistently models authentic and positive interactions with students and other professionals.	authentic reading interactions with students and other professionals.	interactions are limited and/or not evident with students and other professionals.	
4.4 Motivates learners to become enthusiastic readers.	Reflects on and evaluates the impact of instruction on student motivation.	Describes the impact of instruction on student motivation.	Comments on student motivation are absent and/or are disconnected from instruction.	/3
Part III Literacy Coaching	Outstanding (3)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (1)	
2.1 Uses instructional groupings as appropriate for accomplishing given purposes.	Consistently implements, models, and supports the formation of instructional groups to accomplish given purposes.	Implements, models, and supports the formation of instructional groups to accomplish given purposes.	Implements instructional groups but shows little evidence of modeling and supporting the formation of instructional groups to accomplish given purposes.	/3
2.2 Uses appropriate instructional materials to meet the diverse needs of learners at different stages of development.	Consistently implements, models and supports the use appropriate instructional materials.	Implements, models and supports the use of appropriate instructional materials.	Implements appropriate instructional materials but does not model and/or support the use of appropriate instructional materials.	/3
5.3 Works with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on instructional practices.	Reflectively self-evaluates literacy practices and in the role of literacy coach provides thoughtful feedback to school personnel.	Routinely self-evaluates literacy practices and in the role of literacy coach provides feedback to school personnel.	Presents limited self-evaluation and/or limited or inaccurate feedback to school personnel.	/3
Part 4	Outstanding (3)	Successful (2)	Unsuccessful (1)	

Commitment to Professional Development				
5.2 Continues to pursue the development of professional development dispositions	Consistently and thoughtfully uses self-reflection in planning for future professional growth	Self-reflects and has plans for future professional growth.	Self-reflections are limited and/or absent. There are no plans for future professional growth.	/3
5.3 Works with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on instructional practices.	Consistently and effectively uses self-evaluation to improve instructional and coaching practices.	Uses self-evaluation to improve instructional and coaching practices.	Presents insufficient or no self-evaluation of instructional and/or coaching practices.	/3
5.4 Participates in, initiates, implements, and evaluates professional development programs	Confidently plans, implements, and evaluates professional development programs defining and using evidence-based criteria	Plans, implements and selects professional development programs using some evidence-based criteria.	Plan and/or implementation of professional development is not effective. Scant or inaccurate use of evidence-based criteria.	/3
Part 6 Final Reporting to professionals and parents	Outstanding (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	
1.4 Demonstrates knowledge of the components of reading and how they are integrated into fluent reading.	Communications with professionals and parents demonstrate clear understanding of the components of reading and their relationship to fluent reading.	Communications with professionals and parents demonstrate understanding of the components of reading and their relationship to fluent reading.	Communications with professionals and parents demonstrate limited understanding of the components of reading and their relationship to fluent reading.	/3
3.4 Communicates	Effectively uses written	Uses written communication	Written communications are	/3

assessment results for intended audiences.	communication to explain students' strengths and weaknesses and to suggest a plan for continued progress.	to explain students' strengths and weaknesses and suggest a plan for continued progress.	unclear or incomplete.	
--	---	--	------------------------	--

**Appendix D**  
**Module 2 - Giving Feedback to Students**  
**Assignment Options**  
**15 % of final grade**  
**(See calendar for due date)**  
**Submit to dropbox as a word attachment**

**Option 1**

Consider the insights of the readings in evaluating your own conferencing skills and practices with students. Tape a conference with at least one student or the whole class and use the module readings as a guide to critique the tape. Make a plan for what you will do to change in your conferencing style. Present your findings in a report of 750-1000 words that covers each topic in this option.

**Option 2**

Some teachers want to find a way to open up a dialogue with students that is more natural. There are students and teachers who are more comfortable in a text medium rather than a face-to-face conference. Initiate a response-type journal with students in the class in which you participate. If you would like to see an example of this tool, consult Nancie Atwell *In the middle*. Generate a report of 750-1000 words that anchors the response journal in the module ideas on conferencing and explains how the response-journal worked for you and for your students. Make sure the report has several examples/exemplars from the response-journals of several students to illustrate your points. Conclude by evaluating the effectiveness of the response journal as a tool in writing workshop.

**Option 3**

Creating a structure for conferencing can be daunting in a class where there are already many requirements. Consider the ideas in the readings, create and initiate a conferencing schedule that works for you and for your students. Generate a report of 750-1000 words that explains the structure you developed, how it fits with ideas from the module readings, and how it fits with your beliefs and both your personal and school scheduling constraints. Be sure to include a copy (if possible) of any classroom charts or organizational features associated with your conferencing structure.

**Option 4 (Intended for novice participants who have not as yet taught writing in a classroom)**

Developing awareness of the features of effective conferencing is an important step in creating a unique conferencing format and style. Comb carefully through module readings and identify a preliminary set of criteria for effective conferencing. Visit and observe at least 2 writing conferences given by different

teachers. If feasible, audio-tape the conferencing sessions. Reflecting carefully on what you observed, both from the point of view of the teachers and the learners, develop a 750-1000 word report that captures the essentials of what you observed in the classes. Conclude by evaluating the conferences with a view to determining the elements you would emulate in conferences with your own students as well as things you are going to try to avoid. Refer to module readings and student-teacher interactions to back up your points.

## **Module 2 Giving Feedback to Students Assessment Tool**

### **A Papers Share All of These Characteristics**

- Make specific, considered references to readings connected to the module assignment
- Provide a clear, succinct description of the project undertaken for the module assignment
- Demonstrate in-depth reflection about the findings of the project for your own conferencing style
- Refer extensively to several examples or facsimiles of research data (e.g., conference tapes, conversations, materials, journal interactions)
- Are at least 750 words in length and generally fall between 800-1000 words, with each section of the report being given sufficient attention
- Organization and mechanics enhance reader understanding of the report

### **B Papers Share All or Some of These Characteristics**

- Make general and implicit references to readings connected to the module assignment
- Provide a description of the project undertaken for the module assignment that becomes the main focus of the report
- Demonstrate inconsistent or insufficient reflection on the findings of the project for your own conferencing style
- Refer broadly to limited data examples
- Are at least 600 words but some sections were underdeveloped
- Organization and mechanics generally contribute to understanding of the report and never create misunderstanding for the reader

### **C Papers Share All or Some of These Characteristics**

- Make general, insufficient, or erroneous references to readings connected to the module assignment
- Provide a confusing or incomplete description of the project undertaken for the module assignment
- Demonstrate little reflection on the findings of the report for your own conferencing style
- Describe data in general ways (e.g., most student teacher-conferences begin, most journal responses show.)
- Are fewer than 600 words in length
- Organization and mechanics at times interfere with reader's understanding of the report

**Appendix F**

### Summary of Assessment of Candidate Outcomes 2008-2009

Candidate Outcome	Responsibility	Assessment Tool or Approach	Standards/Benchmark	Results/Analysis	Action Taken
1. Candidates will demonstrate mastery of knowledge of reading theories, processes, and applications at levels expected by reading specialists/literacy coaches.	LEP Program director LEP faculty	PRAXIS II	90% or better passing rate	Achieved this year	No action required.
2. Candidates will demonstrate acquisition of foundation knowledge by improved scores on pre- and post-multiple choice, content tests designated as Pre-and Post- Foundation Assessment	Program Faculty Program Advisors Program Director	1) Pre-Foundation Assessment	1) Scores in average range or above	103 met criteria	No action required
		2) Post- Foundation Assessment	2) Scores in average range or above	8 met criteria	No action required
3. Candidate will provide evidence of planning instruction relative to NCATE/IRA Standards.	Program Faculty	Assignment in CIRG 654 Aligning assessment and instruction	Analytic rubric	Tool is in the developmental stage	No action required
4. Candidates will demonstrate performance competence related to practicum experiences	Program Faculty	Portfolio Section 4	Analytic rubric	Tool is being field-tested	No action required
5. Candidates will demonstrate performance competence related to impact on student learning.	CIRG 643 Instructors	Student Progress Record	Acceptable ratings by instructor	Instructor dependent	No action needed

6. Candidates will demonstrate adoption of a reflective stance towards core program leaning experiences relative to NCATE/IRA Standards	Program Faculty	Portfolio Sections 1-3	Satisfactory ratings on analytic rubric	3 students had difficulty with section 3 of portfolio	Re-emphasis of topics of assessment and research data in CIRG 654 and CIRG 621 to better prepare candidates for portfolio 3
7. Candidates will demonstrate an array of conferencing strategies to support writing workshop in the classroom	Instructors of CIRG 615	Course assignment on Conferencing	Holistic rubric	All students received satisfactory scores (13/15 or higher on rubric-scored assignment)	Anchor the rubric in NCATE/IRA standards

