

**Graduate Program Assessment  
Annual Report  
(2010-2011)**

**Submitted by: Dr. Barbara O'Byrne**

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

**I. Descriptive Characteristics**

**I PROGRAM OVERVIEW**

**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 2010-2011 for each program. The growth in admissions to the MA program in 2006-09 reflected 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. In the last year, many candidates have elected to register and complete just the 18-hour Certificate Program.

**II PROGRAM ADMISSIONS**

**A. Applicants/Admits**

Tables 1 and 2 summarize admission date for the literacy education program for the MA and certificate programs.

**Table 1 LEP Admission & Graduation Data**

Categories	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
Applicants	96	69	23 <sup>1</sup>	101	85	87	43	61
Admits	95	53	33	94	99	85	43	61

**Table 2 Program Breakdown of Admission Data 10-11**

Category	Applicants	Admits
36-hr Master of Arts	25	25
18-hr Certificate Program	36	36
Total	61	61

**B. Admission scores**

Candidate performance on admissions tests meets or exceeds program, unit, and institutional criteria. UGPA mean is 3.41. Means of GRE Quantitative (427), Verbal (445), and Writing 3.9 and MAT (387) demonstrate the strength of applicants to the graduate program.

**III PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY****A. Enrollment/sections/credit hours**

Table 3 describes enrollment activity for fall 2010 through summer 2011 for program and professional development courses.

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

Semester	Enrollment	Sections	Credit Hours
Fall 2010	239	21	717
Spring 2011	283	20	849
Summer 2011	155	15	465

**B. Professional Development Courses (Third Party Contracts)**


---

Table 4 provides information on professional development courses developed to serve the needs of counties and agencies in West Virginia.

**Table 4 Professional Development Courses**

Semester	Agencies	Enrollment	Credit Hours
Fall 2010	1	75	225
Spring 2011	1	80	240
Summer 2011	1	44	132

**C. Collaborative Programs**

Between the Fall 2010 and Summer 2011, five county school districts have hosted cohorts to address needs for highly qualified literacy teachers and literacy specialists: The host counties were: Mercer, Clay, Putnam, Mingo and Logan. In addition, the LEP continued to work out collaborative arrangements with WVU to accommodate candidates in meeting their practicum requirement.

**D. Graduates**

Table 5 provides information on the number of graduates and the PRAXIS Passing rates for the past seven years.

**Table 5 Graduation and PRAXIS Passing Rates**

Categories	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
Graduates	70	42	48	70	21	15	24	34
Praxis Passing Rates	96%	91%	90.7%	91.8%	90.2%	89%	90%	92.6

**E. 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 6 describes the sites, number of candidates, and number of students served through the LEP practicum.

**Table 6 2010-11 Practicum Experiences**

Site	Course	Semester	Candidates
Huntington	623	Fall	12
South Charleston	643	Fall	11
South Charleston	623	Spring	8
Mercer County	623	Spring	18

Logan County	623	Spring	15
South Charleston (Andrew Jackson Middle School)	623	Summer	7
Mingo County	643	Summer	8
South Charleston (Dunbar Intermediate)	643	Summer	7
Huntington	643	Summer	12

#### IV 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. E- Delivery is available for CIRG 601, 636, 644, and 621. All foundation courses are delivered as 'T' or hybrid courses that are 8-0% electronic and 20 % live. All program courses are technology enhanced. Clinical courses such as CIRG 623 and 643 are now supported by Blackboard, WIMBA, and IPAD face-time tools. In addition, the program has a Blackboard site that houses and maintains all candidate data essential to the multi-focal assessment plan. Table 7 summarizes the LEP's electronic delivery of courses.

**Table 7 Electronically Delivered Courses**

Semester	Courses	Sections
Fall 2010	7	12
Spring 2011	8	14
Summer 2011	6	7

#### V FACULTY

##### A. Status

The LEP has four full-time faculty positions on the South Charleston campus and two partially assigned positions on the Huntington campus. LEP South Charleston is searching for a candidate to fill a vacancy. 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.

##### B. Part-Time Utilization

The LEP uses from six-ten adjuncts each semester to assist with the delivery of program courses.

**C. Advising**

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. Huntington faculty members serve fewer graduate candidates but this is offset by considerable undergraduate advising responsibilities.

**D. Research and Scholarly Activity**

Each full-time faculty member is activity involved in research and presentation of findings. More complete information can be found in each faculty member's annual report.

**VI PROGRAM APPROVAL INFORMATION**

During the academic year 2009-2010 the Sub-committee on assessment favorably reviewed the LEP in all review categories. The LEP MA in Reading received full national from NCATE in winter 2011 and state approval for the certificate program in summer 2011. Admission to the reading specialist program has been suspended, pending a review of new IRA/NCATE standards and a needs analysis.

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. Teacher retirements anticipated over the next five years will create an ongoing need for additional reading specialists. 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 2011, 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.

**VII 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).

Eight assessments measures comprehensively address the five professional standards expected of reading specialists by the International Reading Association (IRA). Descriptions and the results of data collected in the past year demonstrate a robust, comprehensive assessment plan. Data on an additional eighth assessment, a project on technology and literacy, is reported 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. On average, over 90% of our candidates have been successful on this test for the last four years. Table 8 summarizes candidate results on the PRAXIS II Test for the Reading Specialist.

**Table 8 PRAXIS Passing Rates 2007-2010**

<b>READING</b>	Marshall University 2007-08 N=51	Marshall University 2008-09 N=36	Marshall University 2009-2010 N= 20	Marshall University 2010-2011 N=27	Marshall University 4Year Average
Pass rate	90.2%	89%	90%	92.6	90.5%

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 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 9 shows the analysis of candidates' scores from 2009-10 and 2010-2011. The scores from 2010-2011 demonstrate that the mean scores of candidates increased 5.8 points on the Post-Foundation Test while the median score increased 6 points, indicating significant gains in content knowledge. Additionally, the smaller standard deviation demonstrates a tighter range of scores. A recent change in procedures ensures that candidates take the Pre-Foundation Test at the point of admission to the program and accounts for the larger number of test-takers. It is expected that this change will yield more accurate results on the Pre-Foundation Test.

**Table 9 Pre-Post Foundation Scores**

2009-2010				2010-2011			
Pre-Foundation (N=72)	Mean	Median	SD	Pre-Foundation (N=89)	Mean	Median	SD
	25	24	6.01		23.09	24	6.23
Post-Foundation (N=30)	29.1	30	5.6	Post-Foundation (N=45)	28.9	30	4.86

### 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. Table 10 summarizes data from this assessment from 2010-2011; robust means (2.62, 2.84) across both applications of data demonstrate candidate competence in planning effective, assessment-based reading instruction.

**Table 10 Assessment 3 Planning Instruction  
Developing Effective Reading Interventions**

FA 10 (N=7) Pass Rate: 100% Weighed Mean: 2.61

SP 11 (N=10) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean: 2.84

Section 1 Assessment	Outstanding (3) F10	Satisfactory (2) F10	Unsuccessful (1) F10	Outstanding (3) SP11	Satisfactory (2) SP11	Unsuccessful (1) SP11	F10 Mean 2.62	SP11 Mean 2.80
3.1	5	2	0	7	3	0	2.71	2.70
1.0	4	3	0	8	2	0	2.57	2.80
1.3	4	3	0	9	1	0	2.57	2.90

<b>Section 2 Behavior Analysis</b>							<b>Mean 2.50</b>	<b>Mean 2.85</b>
1.4	3	4	0	8	2	0	2.43	2.80
3.2	4	3	0	9	1	0	2.57	2.90
<b>Section 3 Intervention</b>							<b>Mean 2.71</b>	<b>Mean 2.87</b>
3.3	4	3	0	8	2	0	2.57	2.80
2.2	6	1	0	9	1	0	2.86	2.90
2.3	5	2	0	9	1	0	2.71	2.90

#### **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 format 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 11 summarizes results from this assessment. The means across three applications of data (2.78, 2.61, 2.39) demonstrate that candidates are able to develop, deliver, monitor, and modify reading and writing instruction to address the needs of diverse learners.

**Table 11 Assessment of Practicum  
Folio of Practicum Experiences**

FA 10 (N=12) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean: 2.71

SP 11 (N=29) Pass Rate: 100% Weighed Mean: 2.68

SU11 (N=9) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean: 2.39

Section 1 Assessment-driven instruction IRA Standard	Outs. (3) F10	Sat. (2) F10	U (1) F10	Out. (3) SP11	Sat. (2) SP11	U (1) SP11	Out. (3) SU11	Sat. (2) SU11	U (1) SU11	Mean <b>2.78</b> F10	Mean <b>2.61</b> SP11	Mean <b>2.41</b> SU11
3.1	11	1	0	22	6	1	3	6	0	2.92	2.72	2.33
3.2	10	2	0	20	8	1	5	4	0	2.83	2.66	2.56
3.3	7	5	0	14	14	1	3	6	0	2.58	2.45	2.33
Section 2 Instructional Lessons/Materials IRA Standard										Mean <b>2.69</b>	Mean <b>2.53</b>	<b>2.38</b>
2.1	8	4	0	12	15	2	1	8	0	2.67	2.34	2.11
2.2	9	3	0	13	16	0	3	5	1	2.75	2.45	2.22
2.3	8	4	0	16	13	0	3	6	0	2.67	2.55	2.33
4.1	8	4	0	15	14	0	3	6	0	2.67	2.52	2.33
4.2	7	5	0	15	14	0	5	4	0	2.58	2.52	2.56
4.3	9	3	0	22	7	0	6	3	0	2.75	2.76	2.67
4.4	9	3	0	18	10	1	4	5	0	2.75	2.59	2.44
Section 3 Literacy Coaching IRA Standard										Mean <b>2.55</b>	Mean <b>2.69</b>	<b>2.48</b>
2.1	3	9	0	20	9	0	4	5	0	2.25	2.69	2.44
2.2	7	5	0	14	15	0	3	6	0	2.58	2.48	2.33
5.3	10	2	0	26	3	0	6	3	0	2.83	2.90	2.67
Section 4 Commitment to Professional Development										Mean <b>2.86</b>	Mean <b>2.77</b>	<b>2.41</b>
5.2	10	2	0	21	8	0	2	7	0	2.83	2.72	2.22
5.3	10	2	0	23	6	0	4	5	0	2.83	2.79	2.44
5.4	11	1	0	23	6	0	3	6	0	2.92	2.79	2.33
Section 5 Communications IRA Standard										Mean <b>2.67</b>	Mean <b>2.78</b>	Mean <b>2.27</b>
1.4	8	4	0	25	3	1	3	6	0	2.67	2.79	2.33
3.4	8	4	0	24	4	1	2	7	0	2.67	2.76	2.22

**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. Table 12 summarizes results from this assessment for 2010-2011. The strong means on this assessment (2.69-2.89) demonstrate that candidates can effectively gauge the impact of interventions on student learning and make appropriate changes to instructional methods and materials to better meet the needs of learners. Incomplete data, indicated with asterisks, from one set of submissions is being corrected.

**Table 12 Assessment on Impact on Student Learning**  
 FA 10 (N=11) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean:  
 SU 11 (N=26) Pass Rate 100 % Weighed Mean:

<b>IRA standards</b>	Outstanding (3) F10	Satisfactory (2) F10	Unsuccessful (1) F10	Outstanding (3) SU11	Satisfactory (2) SU11	Unsuccessful (1) SU11	Mean F10	Mean SU11
<b>Section 1 Knowledge of assessment</b>							<b>Mean 2.69</b>	<b>Mean 2.89</b>
3.1	7	4	0	24	2	0	2.64	2.92
3.2	8	3	0	22	4	0	2.73	2.85
<b>Section 2 Knowledge of reading behaviors and assessment</b>							Mean N/A	Mean N/A
1.4	5	6	0	19	7	0	2.45	2.73
3.2.	N/A	N/A	N/A	9*	3*	0*	N/A	N/A
<b>Section 3 Knowledge of writing behaviors and related instructional practices</b>							Mean N/A	Mean N/A
4.1	6	5	0	21	5	0	2.55	2.81
3.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	8*	4*	0*	N/A	N/A
<b>Section 4 Word Study</b>							Mean N/A	Mean N/A
1.4	5	6	0	17	9	0	2.45	2.65
3.2.	N/A	N/A	N/A	12*	0*	0*	N/A	N/A
<b>Section 5 Engagement</b>							Mean 2.69	Mean 2.91
4.1	9	2	0	22	4	0	2.82	2.85
4.4	6	5	0	25	1	0	2.55	2.96
<b>Section VI Applying the SPR to the Interventions</b>							Mean 2.45	Mean 2.77

3.3	5	6	0	19	7	0	2.45	2.73
2.2	5	6	0	21	5	0	2.45	2.81
2.3	5	6	0	20	6	0	2.45	2.77

**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 three 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 13 describes candidates’ performance on the three sections of the portfolio that comprise the reflective practitioner.

**Table 13 Scores from Sections 1-3 of Portfolio Reflective Practitioner Assignment**

**Assessment 6 Reflective Practitioner  
PORTFOLIO SECTION ONE**

A Literacy Biography

FA 10 (N=22) Pass Rate: % Weighted Mean: 2.44

SP 11 (N=19) Pass Rate: % Weighted Mean: 2.29

Element/IRA Standards	Outst. F10	Succ F10	U F10	Outst. SP11	Succ. SP11	U SP11	Mean F10	Mean SP11
<b>Philosophical Orientation</b> <i>IRA Std 1.4</i>	14	8	0	7	10	2	2.64	2.26
<b>Training in literacy</b> <i>IRA Std. 1.2, 2.2</i>	14	6	2	7	9	3	2.55	2.21
<b>Professional Literacy Practice</b> <i>IRA Std. 1.1, 1.4</i>	11	9	2	10	7	2	2.41	2.42
<b>Role of Literacy Specialist</b> <i>IRA Std. 1.1, 5.1</i>	6	11	5	6	9	4	2.05	2.11
<b>Form and structure</b> <i>IRA. Std. 4.3</i>	14	6	2	9	9	1	2.55	2.42

**PORTFOLIO SECTION TWO**

Reflective Analysis of Foundation Learning Experiences

FA 10 (N=25) Pass Rate: 84 % Weighted Mean: 2.4

SP 11 (N=22) Pass Rate: 82% Weighted Mean: 2.10

Element/IRA Standards	Outst. F10	Succ F10	U F10	Outst. SP11	Succ. SP11	U SP11	Mean F10	Mean SP11
<b>Description of Program</b>	15	6	4	6	12	4	2.44	2.09

<b>Learning Experiences</b> <i>IRA Std. 1.2</i>								
<b>Literacy Theories That Inform Practice</b> <i>IRA Std. 2.2, 2.3</i>	12	11	2	6	15	1	2.40	2.23
<b>Analysis</b> <i>IRA Std. 1.3</i>	10	13	2	3	11	8	2.32	1.77
<b>Evaluation</b> <i>IRS Std. 5.2</i>	13	10	2	5	10	7	2.44	1.91
<b>Form and Structure</b> <i>IRA. Std. 4.3</i>	12	11	2	9	11	2	2.40	2.32

### PORTFOLIO SECTION THREE

FA 10 (N=26) Pass Rate: 85 % Weighted Mean: 2.29  
 SP 11 (N=30) Pass Rate: 90 % Weighted Mean: 2.37

<b>Element/IR A Standards</b>	Outst. F10	Succ. F10	U F10	Outst. SP11	Succ. SP11	U SP11	Mean F10	Mean SP11
<b>Description of Data Instruments</b> <i>IRA Std. 3.1, 3.4</i>	9	3	4	16	11	3	2.19	2.43
<b>Literacy Theories That Inform Practice</b> <i>IRA Std. 1.1, 3.2</i>	13	10	3	11	18	1	2.38	2.33
<b>Comparison and Contrast</b> <i>IRA Std. 3.1, 3.3</i>	11	11	4	13	15	2	2.27	2.37
<b>Evaluation</b> <i>IRA Std. 1.2</i>	9	15	2	12	15	3	2.27	2.30
<b>Form and Structure</b> <i>IRA. Std. 4.3</i>	11	13	2	13	17	0	2.35	2.43

### 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 2010 and spring 2011 are shown in Table 14. The means (3.00, 2.91) from both applications of data demonstrate that candidates can develop, deliver and evaluate writing for diverse populations.

**Table 14 Writing Workshop Data**  
 FA 10 (N=11) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean: 3.00  
 SP 11 (N=8) Pass Rate: 100% Weighed Mean: 2.91

<b>Section Bio</b>	Outst. (3) F10	Sat. (2) F10	U. (1) F10	Outst. (3) SP11	Sat. (2) SP11	U (1) SP11	<b>Mean</b> <b>3.00</b> FA10	<b>Mean</b> <b>2.86</b> SP11
1.1	11	0	0	7	1	0	3.00	2.88
<b>Section 2 Goals</b>							<b>Mean</b> <b>3.00</b>	<b>Mean</b> <b>2.82</b>
3.1	11	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	3.00
5.2	11	0	0	5	3	0	3.00	2.63
<b>Section 3 On Being a writer</b>							<b>Mean</b> <b>2.96</b>	<b>Mean</b> <b>2.94</b>
1.1	10	1	0	7	1	0	2.91	2.88
4.3	11	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	3.00
<b>Section 4 Teaching writing</b>							<b>Mean</b> <b>3.00</b>	<b>Mean</b> <b>2.91</b>
2.2, 2.3	11	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	3.00
3.2, 3.3	11	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	3.00
4.1; 4.3	11	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	3.00
5.2	11	0	0	6	1	1	3.00	2.63
<b>Section 5 Oral Presentation</b>							<b>Mean</b> <b>3.00</b>	<b>Mean</b> <b>3.00</b>
5.4	11	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	3.00

### **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. This assessment, embedded in CIRG 622 Technology and Literacy, 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. The program has made this assessment mandatory for all candidates. Table 15 summarizes results from this assessment.

**Table15 Technology and Literacy Project Data**  
 SP 11 (N=6) Pass Rate: 100% Weighted Mean: 2.94  
 SU 11 (N=24) Pass Rate: 100% Weighed Mean: 2.80

Part I Design of Project	Outstanding (3) SP11	Satisfactory (2) SP11	Unsuccessful (1) SP11	Outstanding (3) SU11	Satisfactory (2) SU11	Unsuccessful (1) SU11	Mean SP11	Mean SU11
<b>Standard 1: Foundation Knowledge</b>								
1.1	6	0	0	22	1	1	3.00	2.83
<b>Standard 2: Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials</b>								
2.2	6	0	0	18	6	0	3.00	2.75
2.3	5	1	0	21	3	0	2.83	2.88
<b>Standard 4: Creating a Literate Environment</b>								
4.1	6	0	0	17	7	0	3.00	2.71
4.2	6	0	0	21	3	0	3.00	2.88
4.4	5	1	0	18	6	0	2.83	2.75
<b>Standard 5: Professional Development</b>								
<b>Part II Presentation 5.2</b>	6	0	0	15	8	1	3.00	2.58
<b>Part III Reflection 5.1</b>	5	1	0	21	0	0	2.83	3.00

**VIII 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 B). Where needed, the program has initiated action to better prepare candidates for success.

**IX REVIEW AND GOALS FOR NEXT YEAR**

The program has eight, multifocal assessments that enable the program to take stock of the effectiveness of learning and instruction. In addition, the program now uses several of these assessments to gather data on certificate candidates. This change makes for a seamless transition for candidates who elect to continue with the full MA in Reading. The program has re-vamped the entry process to ensure that candidates have detailed knowledge about the nature and sequence of program assessments and now complete the

Pre-Foundation Test before starting program courses. Appendix A provides a summary of these assessments and the points of administration.

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 robust data gathering system that is carefully monitored each semester. Information about program assessments is communicated each semester to all faculty teaching a course in which data is gathered. The program is in process of carefully evaluating the data from each assessment. Already, changes have been made to the portfolio rubrics to ensure that assessment tools convey expectations to candidates and more accurately capture data useful in evaluating program effectiveness.

The program has established three goals for the upcoming year. The first is to fill the vacant faculty position. An active search is in progress. Secondly, the program needs to consider how existing assessments align with new IRA standards and recommend changes to existing assessments to address the new diversity standard as well as changes to existing professional standards. Thirdly, the tools and data of each assessment must be scrutinized to evaluate its utility to candidate learning and value as a tool in gauging program effectiveness. The program director is undertaking a review of portfolio submissions (Assessment 6) to determine the overall effectiveness of this assessment piece. Similar reviews will be conducted on each assessment to verify the utility of the assessment tool and data.

Fourthly, the program is surveying graduates of the program to determine what kinds of post-MA courses, certificates and degrees will best meet the needs of candidates. The goal is to develop a sequence of post-MA classes to meet these needs. The LEP is collaborating with other programs to determine how best to utilize existing instructional resources to maximize professional development opportunities for literacy professionals.

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.

## Appendix A

## Summary of Literacy Education Program Assessments

	<b>Name of Assessment</b>	<b>Type or Form of Assessment</b>	<b>When the Assessment Is Administered</b>
	<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>Writing workshop</b>	Analytic rubric keyed to essential components of the assignment	During CIRG 615 Writing in the Literacy curriculum
8	<b>Technology and Literacy Project</b>	Analytic rubric keyed to components of	During CIRG 622 Literacy and

<b>Name of Assessment</b>	<b>Type or Form of Assessment</b>	<b>When the Assessment Is Administered</b>
	the assignment	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	89 completed the assessment; no passing score  45 completed the assignment; low scoring candidates were counseled on options to improve content knowledge	No action required
3. Candidate will provide evidence of planning instruction	Program Faculty	Assignment in CIRG 654 Aligning	Analytic rubric	All candidates obtained satisfactory or better	Repeated the course

relative to NCATE/IRA Standards.		assessment and instruction		on this assessment.	
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	Across the year,	All candidates were successful on the second attempt 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 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	All candidates received satisfactory scores on rubric-scored assignment	No action needed

