

**Graduate Program Assessment
Annual Report
(2009-2010)**

Submitted by: Dr. 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 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 two major areas: 1) classroom literacy instruction (k-12) and 2) reading specialist/ 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 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 10 years. Table 2 provides information on admission data for 09-10 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.

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	09-10
Applicants	81	131	109	96	69	23 ¹	101	85	87	43
Admits	66	87	23	95	53	33	94	99	85	43
Graduates	26	89	51	70	42	48	70	21	15	24
Praxis Passing Rates (%)	85	97	93	96	91	90.7	91.8	90.2	89	90

Table 2. Program Breakdown of Admission Data 09-10

Category	Applicants	Admits
36-hr Master of Arts	43	43
18-hr Certificate Program	26	26
Total	69	69

E. Admission scores: Candidate performance on admissions tests meets or exceeds program, unit, and institutional criteria. UGPA mean is 3.32, GRE Analytical (465), Quantitative (429), Verbal (400), 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 2009	286	20	856
Spring 2010	283	26	849
Summer 2010	151	18	453

Professional Development Courses

Semester	Agencies	Enrollment	Credit Hours
Fall 2009	5	67	111
Spring 2010	3	33	99
Summer 2010	1	14	42

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 2009 to summer 2010. 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. 2009-10 Practicum Experiences

Site	Course	Semester	Candidates
Huntington	623	Fall	18
South Charleston	623	Spring	12
Raleigh County Mabscott Elementary	643	Spring	8
South Charleston (Andrew Jackson Middle School)	623	Summer	10
South Charleston (Andrew Jackson Middle School)	643	Summer	8
Logan	643	Summer	9
Mercer	643	Summer	17
Huntington	643	Summer	12

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 2009	7	12
Spring 2010	8	14
Summer 2010	6	7

J. Faculty: The LEP has four full-time faculty positions on the South Charleston campus and three partially assigned positions on the Huntington campus. LEP South Charleston is searching for a candidate to fill a vacancy. 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 Huntington site 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 2008-2009 the Subcommittee on assessment favorably reviewed the LEP in all review categories. The LEP submitted a SPA report to NCATE in fall 2010 for its MA in Reading Education Program and plans to submit a CAR report for the 18-hour Certificate Program in spring 2011. Admission to the reading specialist program has been suspended, pending a review of new IRA/NCATE standards and a needs analysis.

L. Summary: The above information supports continuing of the LEP. The number of program graduates exceed the number of employment slots for reading specialists 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 2010, 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 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 comprehensively address the five standards of the International Reading Association (IRA). Descriptions and the results of data collected in the past year demonstrate a robust, comprehensive assessment plan. An eighth assessment, a project on technology and literacy, is being piloted this year.

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. The PRAXIS is required by the WVDE and is administered and evaluated by Educational Testing Service (ETS). Program Admissions and Graduation Data in Table 1 reflect results on PRAXIS tests. Data are distributed to the Program areas through the Dean's office.

Table 6. PRAXIS Passing Rates 2007-2010

READING	Marshall University 2007-08 N=51	Marshall University 2008-09 N=36	Marshall University 2009-2010 N= 20	Marshall University 3 Year Average N=107
Pass rate	90.2%	89%	90%	90%

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 Pre- 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 45 items and, as the test is diagnostic, there are no unacceptable scores. The Post-Foundation Test, a different version of the Pre-Foundation Test, was developed to ascertain the preparedness of candidates for advanced program work and the impact of foundation courses on candidate knowledge. Table 7 shows the analysis of candidates' scores from 2009-10. The scores demonstrate that the mean scores of candidates increased 4.1 points on the Post-Foundation Test while the median score increased 6 points, indicating significant gains in content knowledge. A recent change in procedures ensures that candidates take the Pre-Foundation Test at the point of admission to the program. It is expected that this change will yield more accurate results on the Pre-Foundation Test.

Table 7. Pre-Post Foundation Scores 2009-2010

Pre-Foundation (N=72)	Mean 25	Median 24	SD 6.01
Post-Foundation (N=30)	29.1	30	5.6

Assessment 3: Planning Instruction

The program has designed a learning experience in CIRG 654 Aligning Assessment and Instruction to show 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. Table 8 shows data from spring and fall 2009.

Table 8. Assessment 3 Planning Instruction - Developing Effective Reading Interventions

SP 09 (N=4) Pass Rate: 100% Weighed Mean: 2.21

FA 09 (N=20) Pass Rate: 87.8% Weighted Mean: 2.24

Section 1 Assessment	Outstanding (3) SP09	Satisfactory (2) SP09	Unsuccessful (1) SP09	Outstanding (3) F09	Satisfactory (2) F09	Unsuccessful (1) F09	SP09 Mean 2.08	F09 Mean 2.23
3.1	1	3	0	9	10	1	2.25	2.4
1.0	0	4	0	4	15	1	2	2.15
1.3	0	4	0	4	15	1	2	2.15
Section 2 Behavior Analysis							Mean 2.12	Mean 2.1
1.4	1	3	0	5	15	0	2.25	2.25
3.2	1	2	1	4	11	5	2	1.95
Section 3 Intervention							Mean 2.42	Mean 2.41
3.3	2	1	1	9	10	1	2.25	2.4
2.2	2	2	0	12	6	2	2.5	2.5
2.3	2	2	0	9	9	2	2.5	2.35

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. 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 site

**Table 9. Assessment of Practicum
Folio of Practicum Experiences**
SU 08 (N=10) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean: 2.8
FA 09 (N=10) Pass Rate: 100% Weighed Mean: 2.8

Section 1 Assessment- driven instruction IRA Standard	Outstanding (3) SU10	Satisfactory (2) SU10	Unsuccessful (1) SU10	Outstanding (3) SP10	Satisfactory (2) SP10	Unsuccessful (1) SP10	Outstanding (3) F09	Satisfactory (2) F09	Unsuccessful (1) F09	Mean 3.0 SU08	Mean 3.0 F09
3.1	10	0	0	6	2	0	10	0	0	3.0	3.0
3.2	10	0	0	6	2	0	10	0	0	3.0	3.0
3.3	10	0	0	5	3	0	10	0	0	3.0	3.0
Section 2 Instructional Lessons and Materials IRA Standard										Mean 2.87	Mean 2.8
2.1	10	0	0	6	2	0	6	4	0	3.0	2.6
2.2	10	0	0	5	3	0	9	1	0	2.8	2.9
2.3	10	0	0	7	1	0	8	2	0	2.9	2.8
4.1	10	0	0	3	5	0	9	1	0	2.8	2.8
4.2	10	0	0	6	2	0	10	0	0	2.9	3.0
4.3	10	0	0	4	4	0	7	3	0	2.9	2.7
4.4	10	0	0	4	3	1	8	2	0	2.8	2.8
Section 3 Literacy Coaching IRA Standard										Mean 2.7	Mean 2.6
2.1	10	0	0	1	7	0	7	3	0	2.7	2.7
2.2	10	0	0	4	4	0	7	3	0	2.7	2.7
5.3	10	0	0	2	6	0	6	3	1	2.7	2.5
Section 4 Commitment to Professional Development										Mean 2.67	Mean 2.7
5.2	9	1	0	8	0	0	8	2	0	2.7	2.8
5.3	9	1	0	3	5	0	7	2	0	2.6	2.7
5.4	10	0	0	7	1	0	6	4	0	2.7	2.6
Section 5 Communications IRA Standard										Mean 2.95	Mean 3.0
1.4	10	0	0	5	2	1	10	0	0	2.9	3.0
3.4	10	0	0	6	1	1	10	0	0	3.0	3.0

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. 5 sets of writing behaviors are also used. These sets were developed from candidates in earlier practicum sections.

Table 10. Assessment of Impact on Student Learning

SP 10 (N=10) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean: 3.0

SU 10 (N=18 Pass Rate 100% Weighed Mean: 3.0

IRA standards	Outstanding (3) SP09	Satisfactory (2) SP09	Unsuccessful (1) SP09	Outstanding (3) SU09	Satisfactory (2) SU09	Unsuccessful (1) SU09	Mean 3.0 SP09	Mean 3.0 SU09
Section 1 Knowledge of assessment							Mean 3	Mean 3
3.1	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
3.2	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
Section 2 Knowledge of reading behaviors and assessment							Mean 3	Mean 3
1.4	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
3.2.	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
Section 3 Knowledge of writing behaviors and related instructional practices							Mean 3	Mean 3
4.1	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
3.2	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
Section 4 Word Study							Mean 3	Mean 3
1.4	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
3.2.	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
Section 5							Mean	Mean

Engagement							3	3
4.1	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
4.4	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
Section VI Applying the SPR to the Interventions								
3.3	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
2.2	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0
2.3	10	0	0	18	0	0	3.0	3.0

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.

Table11. Scores from Sections 1-3 of Portfolio Reflective Practitioner Assignment

PORTFOLIO SECTION ONE

A Literacy Biography

SP 09 (N=31) Pass Rate: 94% Weighted Mean: 2.47

FA 09 (N=23) Pass Rate: 96% Weighted Mean: 2.31

Element/IRA Standards	Outstanding SP09	Successful SP09	Unsuccessful SP09	Outstanding F09	Successful F09	Unsuccessful F09	Mean SP09	Mean F09
Philosophical Orientation <i>IRA Std 1.4</i>	16	14	1	10	13	0	2.48	2.43
Training in literacy <i>IRA Std. 1.2, 2.2</i>	17	12	2	8	15	0	2.48	2.35
Professional Literacy Practice <i>IRA Std. 1.1, 1.4</i>	13	16	2	8	15	0	2.35	2.35
Role of Literacy Specialist <i>IRA Std. 1.1, 5.1</i>	18	11	2	6	16	1	2.51	2.22
Form and structure <i>IRA. Std. 4.3</i>	17	14	0	5	18	0	2.55	2.21

PORTFOLIO SECTION TWO

Reflective Analysis of Foundation Learning Experiences

SP 09 (N=16) Pass Rate: 94% Weighted Mean: 2.46

FA 09 (N=31) Pass Rate: 97 % Weighted Mean: 2.54

Element/IRA Standards	Outstanding SP09	Successful SP09	Unsuccessful SP09	Outstanding F09	Successful F09	Unsuccessful F09	Mean SP09	Mean F09
Description of Program Learning Experiences <i>IRA Std 1.2</i>	11	5	0	18	13	0	2.69	2.58
Literacy Theories That Inform Practice <i>IRA Std. 2.2, 2.3</i>	8	7	1	16	14	1	2.44	2.48
Analysis <i>IRA Std. 1.3</i>	5	11	0	16	14	1	2.31	2.48
Evaluation <i>IRS Std. 5.2</i>	6	9	1	19	12	0	2.31	2.61
Form and Structure <i>IRA. Std. 4.3</i>	9	7	0	19	11	0	2.36	2.54

PORTFOLIO SECTION THREE

Uses of Data in Assessment and Research

SP 09 (N=9) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean: 2.33

FA 09 (N=14) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean: 2.23

Element/IRA Standards	Outstanding SP09	Successful SP09	Unsuccessful SP09	Outstanding F09	Successful F09	Unsuccessful F09	Mean SP09	Mean F09
Description of Data Instruments <i>IRA Std 3.1, 3.4</i>	4	5	0	3	11	0	2.44	2.21
Literacy Theories That Inform Practice <i>IRA Std. 1.1, 3.2</i>	5	4	0	3	11	0	2.56	2.21
Comparison and Contrast <i>IRA Std. 3.1, 3.3</i>	1	8	0	3	11	0	2.11	2.21
Evaluation <i>IRA Std. 1.2</i>	2	7	0	4	10	0	2.22	2.29
Form and Structure <i>IRA. Std. 4.3</i>	3	6	0	3	11	0	2.33	2.21

Assessment 7: Writing Workshop

The LEP decided last 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. 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 in fall 2009 and spring 2010 are shown in table. 12.

Table 12. Writing Workshop Data
 SP10 (N=8) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean:
 FA 09 (N=61) Pass Rate: 100% Weighed Mean: 2.89

Section1 Bio	Outstanding (3) SP10	Satisfactory (2) SP10	Unsuccessful (1) SP10	Outstanding (3) F09	Satisfactory (2) F09	Unsuccessful (1) F09	Mean 3.0 SP10	Mean 3.0 FA09
1.1	8	0	0	61	0	0		3
Section 2 Goals							Mean 2	Mean 2.9
3.1	7	1	0	57	2	2		2.9
5.2	7	1	0	57	2	2	2	2.9
Section 3 On Being a writer							Mean 3	Mean 2.8
1.1	6	2		51	10	0		2.8
4.3	5	3		51	10	0	3	2.8
Section 4 Teaching writing							Mean	Mean 2.75
2.2, 2.3	8	0	0	51	10	0		2.8
3.2, 3.3	8	0	0	51	10	0		2.8
4.1; 4.3	8	0	0	51	10	0		2.8
5.2	8	0	0	48	10	3		2.7
Section 5 Oral Presentation							Mean	Mean 2.9
5.4	6	2	0	56	5	0	3	2.9

Assessment 8: The Literacy and Technology Project

This year the program piloted an eighth assessment. It is the final assignment in CIRG 622 Literacy and Technology. The assessment enables candidates to synthesize what they have learned about technology and apply this knowledge to support literacy learning in pk-12 classrooms. Candidates are expected to plan and implement a technology-enhanced unit of study consisting of at least five lessons, each of which is not less than thirty-minutes in length. The project demonstrates candidates' mastery in selecting from a wide range of technology instructional materials and tools and in using these materials and tools to plan a sequence of lessons that extends student learning. Candidates present projects for peer-review at a live class session and reflect on how the project has

expanded their understanding of literacy and the role of the literacy teacher/specialist/coach. The program uses this assessment to verify that candidates possess the necessary technology knowledge to be effective literacy teachers and leaders who can wisely select technology tools and applications appropriate to diverse learning needs, interests, and abilities. The assessment is embedded in a technology and literacy course that supports the evolving role of the /specialist/coach. It enables candidates to broaden their pedagogy to include electronic tools and resources while extending their understanding of literacy to include multimodal learning projects. This assessment is evaluated with an analytic rubric whose elements are linked to specific IRA standards. This assessment was piloted in the past year in two sections of CIRG 622 Literacy and Technology. The program is considering making this assessment mandatory for all candidates.

Table13. Technology and Literacy Project Data

SP10 (N=5) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean: 2.78

SU10 (N=1) Pass Rate: 100% Weighed Mean: 2.25

Part I Design of Project	Outstanding (3) SP10	Satisfactory (2) SP10	Unsuccessful (1) SP10	Outstanding (3) SU10	Satisfactory (2) SU10	Unsuccessful (1) SU10	Mean SP10 2.8	Mean SU10 2.0
Standard 1: Foundation Knowledge								
1.1	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.8	2.0
Standard 2: Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials								
2.2	5	0	0	0	1	0	3.0	2.0
2.3	3	2	0	0	1	0	2.6	2.0
Standard 4: Creating a Literate Environment								
4.1	5	0	0	0	1	0	3.0	2.0
4.2	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.8	2.0
4.4	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.8	2.0
Standard 5: Professional Development							Mean 2.6	Mean 3.0
Part II Presentation 5.2	3	2	0	1	0	0	2.6	3.0
Part III Reflection 5.1	3	2	0	1	0	0	2.6	3.0

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 for success.

III. Summary Statement of Program Changes

Extensive efforts have resulted in the design of a program assessment system and its components. This project, initiated as part of the 2002 NCATE program review submitted to IRA, is now complete. The program has a set of eight, multifocal assessments that enable the program to take stock of the effectiveness of learning and instruction. At least three applications of data are available for the initial seven assessments; limited data from the eighth assessment, project on literacy and technology, have been collected with a view of determining the value of this assessment to the program. The program has re-vamped the entry process to ensure that candidates have detailed knowledge about the nature and sequence of program assessments and complete the Pre-Foundation Test before starting program courses. The outcome chart demonstrates program action based on annual assessment data (Appendix B).

IV. Plans for Next Year and Beyond

The program has established three goals for the upcoming year. The first is to complete the development of a central data bank that houses all program data. A working model is in place but refinements will be needed to ensure seamless data gathering every semester. The second is to ensure that all program faculty have appropriate information about how the data collection system operates. The third goal is to examine the data and determine which assessments. 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.

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
	Entrance tests (will not be used as an assessment for NCATE	Varied	Entry into program
1	PRAXIS II	Multiple choice test	Completion of program
2	Pre-Post foundation test	Multiple choice tests	Entry into program End of foundation courses
3	Planning Instruction	Analytic rubric keyed to essential components of the assignment	During CIRG 654 Aligning Assessment and Instruction
4	Assessment of Practicum	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	Student Progress record: effect on learning	Descriptive statistics to represent qualitative data	After completion of CIRG 643 Reading Clinic for Struggling Readers
6	The Reflective Practitioner	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	Writing workshop	Analytic rubric keyed to essential components of the assignment	During CIRG 615 Writing in the Literacy curriculum
8	Technology and Literacy Project	Analytic rubric keyed to components of the assignment	During CIRG 622 Literacy and Technology

Appendix B**Summary of Program Action**

Candidate Outcome	Responsibility	Assessment Tool or Approach	Standards/Benchmark	Results/Analysis	Action Taken
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 2)Post-Foundation Assessment	1)Scores in average range or above 2) Scores in average range or above	72 completed the assessment; no passing score 28/30 met criteria	No action required Two low-scoring candidates advised by faculty on appropriate learning experiences.
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	2 candidates did not meet the criteria	Repeated the course

4. Candidates will demonstrate performance competence related to practicum experiences	Program Faculty	Portfolio Section 4	Analytic rubric	100% of candidates successful on assessment	No action required
5. Candidates will demonstrate performance competence related to impact on student learning.	CIRG 643 Instructors	Rubric on using SPR to deliver instruction	Acceptable ratings on analytic rubric	100% of candidates successful on assessment	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 candidates had problems with section II of portfolio; 5 students had difficulty with section II of portfolio;	Re-emphasis of topics of assessment and research data in CIRG 654 and CIRG 621 to better prepare candidates for portfolio requirements. Two students were successful on the second attempt at section II of portfolio. All candidates passed on the second attempt of portfolio section III.

7. Candidates will demonstrate an array of conferencing strategies to support writing workshop in the classroom	Instructors of CIRG 615	Course assignment on Writing Portfolio	Satisfactory ratings on analytic rubric	All students received satisfactory scores (13/15 or higher on rubric-scored assignment)	No action needed
8. Candidate will develop and implement literacy instructional unit that engages learners with appropriate digital tools and resources	Instructors of CIRG 622	Project on Technology and Literacy	Satisfactory ratings on analytic rubric		Field-testing in process. No action needed.