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Deans, please indicate your recommendation and submit the rationale.

Recommendation:
Continuation of the program at the current level of activity

Rationale:

The Reading Education program is designed to focus on theoretical and pedagogical bases for literacy development. The Curriculum is directed at extending the capabilities of the professional educator to serve general classroom populations as well as students that find literacy learning difficulty.

The Program is nationally recognized and in full compliance with the International Reading Association (IRA) standards. The program has a strong clinical focus and is very active in working with RESAs and school districts throughout the state.

The program has been an institutional leader in using the cohort model of program delivery and has a substantial commitment to electronic course delivery.

The program continues to be extremely responsive to state needs, with cohorts located in various parts of the state. Their commitment to outreach is strong.

The MA in Reading Education is a healthy and viable program and indications are that it will remain so.
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Marshall University
Program Review

For purposes of program review, the academic year will begin in summer and end in spring.

Program: MA in Reading (Literacy Education)

College: Graduate School of Education and Professional Development

Date of Last Review: Academic Year 2005 - 2006

I. Accreditation Information

1. Name of Accrediting Organization
   Literacy Education is part of Marshall University’s Professional Education Unit (PEU). The PEU is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

2. Date of Most Recent Self-Study and Accreditation Visit
   October 2004

3. Accreditation Status: (regular, probationary, etc.)
   The 2004 review resulted in the PEU receiving ‘regular’ continuing accreditation. The next accreditation visit will occur fall 2012.

4. Accrediting Organization’s Report:
   No major deficiencies were noted.

II. CONSISTENCY WITH UNIVERSITY MISSION (Not required for accredited programs)

III. Adequacy of the program (#5-#8 Not required for accredited programs)

9. Assessment Information

   a. Appendix I summarizes this information from all elements of 9A on the Reynolds template

   b. Other Learning Activities and Services: All learning activities are explained in Appendix I

   c. Plans for Program Improvement

   The program established three short term goals. The first, to fill the vacant faculty position, was achieved in summer 2012. Secondly, the program needs to align program assessments with new International Reading Association Standards and
recommend changes to existing assessments to address the new diversity standard. Thirdly, the tools and data of each assessment must be scrutinized to evaluate utility to candidate learning and value as a tool in gauging program effectiveness.

**Long term goals**
Recent graduates have contacted Literacy Education faculty about the need for professional training beyond that provided by the MA in Reading (Literacy). The program is responding by developing a plan to meet the needs of literacy specialists for continuing education. Our first step is to develop and administer a survey for graduates of the program to determine post-MA courses, certificates and degrees that best meet the needs of experienced literacy educators. Survey results will inform the development of a sequence of post-MA classes to meet these needs. The LEP collaborates with other programs to determine how best to utilize existing instructional resources to maximize professional development opportunities for literacy professionals. The second objective is to encourage faculty to engage in research with local schools. Several Literacy Education faculty members participate in professional development projects that meet the needs of k-12 educational professionals. Our goal is to extend this relationship through the development of school-based research projects that meet the needs and interests of teachers, schools and literacy professionals. The final objective of the MA in Reading (Literacy) Program is to engage in collaborative projects with other programs and entities that extend learning opportunities for our candidates.

d. **Graduate Satisfaction** Consistent with its commitment to continuous improvement, in Spring 2010 the Professional Education Unit conducted a follow-up study of program graduates. The purpose of the study was to determine the perspective of program graduates, overall and by program, regarding the importance and their level of preparation for each of the 10 candidate outcomes for advanced students. All graduates of advanced programs for 2008-2010 were mailed a paper and pencil survey. One hundred and seventy-one graduates responded to the survey. Respondents were first asked to rate the level of importance of each of the candidate outcomes and, secondly, to indicate the level of preparation they had received for the outcome. Data were analyzed for the total group and disaggregated for each program. A four point Likert scale was used for separate questions of importance and preparation. For level of importance, 1=Unimportant and 4=Very Important. For preparation, 1=Poor Preparation and 4=Excellent Preparation. Two open-ended questions concerning strengths and challenges were asked while a third open-ended question asked for additional comments. The strongest area in terms of importance for the overall group was understanding and applying the current knowledge base for their specializations (m= 3.90). The strongest area for the overall group in terms of preparation was demonstrating a commitment to continued professional growth and development and life-long learning (m=3.69). The weakest area in terms of importance for the overall group was cultural pluralism and its effect on the curriculum (m=3.40). This was also one of the two weakest areas in terms of preparation (m=3.14). The preparation for the basic understanding of children with special needs also had a mean of 3.14 for the overall group. Special Education students were the most prepared (m=3.75) while Reading graduates felt the least prepared when working with special needs students (m=2.85). MAT students felt least prepared working
with special needs students (m=3.15) and understanding diversity (m=3.15). Six graduates (out of 21) from the Elementary Education commented that integrating technology into the curriculum was a positive experience. Elementary Education graduates also wanted more practical knowledge to use in his/her classroom. Four Counseling graduates mentioned that the role-playing and practicum aspects of the program were beneficial while three Counseling graduates also wanted more practical experience. Five (of 16) Secondary Education graduates felt the practical ideas were the most helpful aspect of the program. Eight (of 38) Leadership Studies graduates felt the field experiences were the most helpful aspect of the program. Three (of 19) Reading graduates wanted more technology integration. Eight (of 11) School Psychology graduates mentioned the practicum was the most helpful aspect of the program. The overriding theme of the open-ended comments was the importance of the field experience/practicum in each program. Twenty-five graduates either mentioned how helpful the field experiences/practicum was or wanted to see more field experiences during his/her program. Overall, survey data indicate that graduates perceive candidate expectations to be more than moderately important and that their preparation is better than good. These data also indicate that program faculty may want to review their programs to determine if there is a need to strengthen special needs and cultural diversity components of their program. Based on the open-ended question answers, more opportunities should be offered for field experiences in each program.

e. Five years of reports from Office of Assessment included in Appendix IV

10. Previous Reviews
At its meeting of April 13, 2006, the Marshall University Board of Governors recommended that the MA in Reading (Literacy) Education continue at its current level of activity.

11. Weaknesses and Deficiencies
In a review submitted in academic year 2005-2006, the MA in Reading (Literacy) Education reported that its major challenge was retention and recruitment of faculty within the Marshall University and West Virginia faculty salary structure. Salary restraints continue to impede the hiring and retention of excellent faculty.

12. Current Strengths and weaknesses

Program Weaknesses

Since the last review, the program has conducted five searches for candidates to fill vacant positions. Two of these searches took more than one academic year to identify a qualified candidate willing to accept the salary that Marshall University was able to offer. It must be concluded that faculty salaries continue to be a problem. The Literacy Education Program has four full-time faculty members on the South Charleston Campus and three faculty members with responsibilities for graduate and undergraduate education on the Huntington Campus. At least one faculty member anticipates retiring in the next five years. Filling vacancies with faculty qualified to deliver graduate education will be a significant challenge.
Program Strengths

Seamless integration of program on both campuses
- The program has one set of program meetings and one program director. This integration has generated a culture of co-operation and collaboration that assists with data gathering necessary for program improvement and the accreditation process.

Strong alignment of assessment and instruction
- Program courses and learning experiences provide candidates with exceptional tools through which to use assessment data to drive literacy instruction. A sequence of courses required of all candidates ensures that graduates are prepared to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Outreach to public school and related educational agencies
- Involvement in grants, third party contracts, site-based literacy clinics, and professional development initiatives such as The June Harless Center for Rural Educational Research and Development demonstrate the on-going commitment of the Literacy Education Program to meeting the professional development needs of teachers and providing a range of literacy services to local communities.

Hybrid delivery model
- The Literacy Education Program offers classes using a variety of delivery models, including online, hybrid, and live classes. Flexible offerings maximize teaching and learning opportunities.

IV Viability of the Program (#1-#5, #8 Not required for accredited programs)

6. Program enrollment (Appendix II –Appendix VII Reynolds template)
The program enrollment in the M.A. in Reading Education shows a decline in the last few years. This is primarily because many candidates elect to take our certificate program that leads to certification as highly qualified teachers of reading. The program anticipates that increases in new hires due to an aging teaching population will lead to a greater need for the M. A. in Reading Education.

7. Trend lines Figure 1
The trend lines accurately reflect only enrollment in the M.A. in Reading; they do not include enrollment in the certificate program.

IV Necessity of the Program (#1 Not required for accredited programs)
2. **Graduates (See appendix)**

3. **Job Placement**
   The typical Reading Education candidate is an employed professional who is a part-time student seeking to upgrade or acquire new skills. Although the traditional array of job placement services is available through the Huntington campus, reading education candidates tend to have little need for these services. Information regarding available employment opportunities is routinely made available through local school system job postings and statewide through the West Virginia Department of Education. Program graduates are routinely recommended by faculty for other/new employment opportunities and for admission to advanced graduate programs. Follow-up studies of graduates are conducted annually and program faculty members maintain contact with employers and graduates through the delivery of staff development, licensure courses, continuing education programs, and involvement in clinical/field-based experiences.

V. **RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (If applicable) (Not required for accredited programs)**
# Assessment Summary

**Marshall University**

**Assessment of the Program’s Student Learning Outcomes**

5 year summary

**Component Area/Program/Discipline: MA in Reading (Literacy) Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program’s Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Measures (Tools)</th>
<th>Standards/Benchmark</th>
<th>Results/Analysis</th>
<th>Action Taken to improve the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Candidates will demonstrate mastery of knowledge of reading theories and processes, and applications of knowledge at levels expected of literacy specialists/coaches</td>
<td>PRAXIS II (multiple choice exam)</td>
<td>Cut Score: 520 90% or better passing rate</td>
<td>Over 90% of candidates have met this standards over the last five years, Most of the remaining candidates are successful on a second attempt at this test.</td>
<td>Program undertook an analysis of PRAXIS categories in relation to course content and activities in 2008. Since 2009, the program has held annual ‘Practice for PRAXIS’ sessions to better prepare candidates for this assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Candidates will demonstrate acquisition of foundation knowledge,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Foundation Test</th>
<th>This test was recalibrated in 2010 and the results reported are from this revised test. No cut score on pre-foundation test. Must have score of 25 or better on Post-foundation test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Foundation Test</td>
<td>213 candidates completed the pre-foundation test Mean: 23.6 SD: 5.7 100 candidates attempted the post-foundation test Mean: 28.3 SD: 4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program has cross-referenced all items on the test with program courses to ensure basic content is covered in foundation classes.

6 candidates did not make the cut score. Counseled and provided appropriate remedial instructional support.

3. Candidates will provide evidence of assessment-based instructional plans to meet the unique needs and interests of learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic Rubric completed as part of activities in CIRG 654 Aligning Assessment and Instruction</th>
<th>Benchmark: 16/24 And candidates must achieve successful or better on all elements of the rubric.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over past five years, five candidates did not achieve this standard. Three successfully repeated the course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No further action required at this time.

4..Candidates will demonstrate knowledge and performance competences related to clinical experiences and those related to literacy leadership expected by the literacy specialist/coach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic Rubric (Program Electronic Portfolio Section 4)</th>
<th>Benchmark on Portfolio 4: 34/54 And candidates must achieve successful or better on all elements of the rubric.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over the past five years, all candidates have been successful on this assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program continues to revise the rubric to better reflect the changing expectations for literacy specialists and recently revised International Reading Association standards.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Candidates will demonstrate positive ability to document and positively influence learner outcomes.</td>
<td>Analytic Rubric completed as part of CIRG 643 The Reading Clinic.</td>
<td>Candidates must achieve successful or better on all elements of the rubric.</td>
<td>Over the past five years, all candidates have been successful on this assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analytic rubrics associated with three learning activities. Benchmark on Portfolio 1: 11/15 Benchmark on Portfolio 2: 10/15 Benchmark on Portfolio 3: 8/12 And successful or higher on each element of the rubric</td>
<td>Portfolio Section 1 170 candidates successful on first attempt. 6 candidates successful on second attempt. Portfolio Section 2 190 candidates successful on first attempt. 22 candidates successful on second attempt. Portfolio Section 3 106 candidates successful on first attempt. 80 successful on second attempt 9 successful on third attempt.</td>
<td>Program faculty meet and collaboratively grade portfolio submissions. Changes to the language of the rubric and revisions portfolio activities are routinely discussed and implemented. A current focus of the program is implementation of revised International Reading Association standards into portfolio activities and rubrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Candidates will demonstrate reflective stance toward core program learning experiences relative to NCATE/IRA standards.</td>
<td>Electronic Portfolio submissions completed as candidates move through the program. Implemented 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Candidates will develop, implement and assess writing instruction for p-12 learners. <em>(Assessment added in 2010)</em></td>
<td>Course portfolio completed in CIRG 615 Writing in the Literacy Curriculum graded with analytic rubric</td>
<td>Benchmark: 20/30 on rubric</td>
<td>All candidates have successfully passed this assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Candidates will research, develop and implement a literacy project that effectively incorporated technology to extend learning. <em>(Assessment added in 2011)</em></td>
<td>Analytic rubric</td>
<td>Benchmark: 17/24 on rubric</td>
<td>All candidates have successfully passed this assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II
Program Enrollment: MA in Reading (Literacy) Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Year 1 2007-2008</th>
<th>Year 2 2008-2009</th>
<th>Year 3 2009-2010</th>
<th>Year 4 2010-2011</th>
<th>Year 5 2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Education No Area of Emphasis</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Education Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Majors Enrolled*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Majors Enrolled:**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total of Students Enrolled in the Program</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of the program</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If known. This information is not completely accurate at this time, as students often do not declare a second major until the junior evaluation or the student has her/his primary major in another college.

**On occasion you may have a student enrolled in your program who is declaring your program as a 3rd major.

***If known. This information is not completely accurate at this time, as students often do not declare minors until the junior evaluation or senior application for graduation.
Figure 1. Trend Line for Total Enrollment and Program Graduates: MA in Reading (Literacy) Education
Appendix III
Job and Graduate School Placement Rates: MA in Reading (Literacy) Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of graduates employed in major field</th>
<th># of graduates employed in related fields</th>
<th># of graduates employed outside field</th>
<th># of graduates accepted to further graduate study</th>
<th># of graduates not accounted for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five –Year Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV
Assessment Letters

Dr. Barbara O'Byrne, Program Director
Literacy Education
Graduate School of Education and Professional Development

Dear Barbara:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the MA in Literacy Education's assessment of student learning. This letter will provide general comments and suggestions for improvement. I have included the scoring rubric we used to evaluate your assessment report in a separate document.

This is an excellent assessment report. Data were gathered at appropriate assessment points using valid and complementary tools. Results were carefully analyzed and used for program improvement as appropriate.

During the coming academic year, it will be important that you follow the plan you developed as part of the first two activities of the Open Pathways Demonstration Project. The project's steering committee will provide more feedback regarding next steps in that project at summer's end. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Teresa Eagle, Dean, GSEP
Office of Assessment & Program Review

June 8, 2011

Dr. Barbara O’Byrne, Program Director
Literacy Education
GSEP

Dear Barbara:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the MA in Literacy Education Program’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports was sent to you in April, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that the rubric is still relatively new and is continuing to be revised. At this time, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this rubric.

This is an excellent report that demonstrates a strong assessment program. You are doing a nice job of analyzing and using assessment data for program improvement, which should result in improvements in student learning and application of that learning. The only negative comment I have is that you are using an outdated template. In future, please use the template that is available at http://www.marshall.edu/assessment/assessment_forms.htm.

During the academic year 2011 – 2012, I plan to meet with all programs to assist with further development of assessment plans and look forward to meeting with you. I will be in touch at the end of the summer about scheduling. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Teresa Eagle, Dean, GSEP
Dear Barbara:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the MA in Literacy Education Program’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric is still relatively new and, as you will see, it raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this rubric.

I was impressed with the level of planning you have put into your assessment program. For example, disaggregation of data from the e-portfolios has the potential to give you valuable information on strengths and weaknesses, which should result in continuous improvement of student learning in your program. Regarding the assessment chart presented at the end of your report, I realize that you are field testing some rubrics. However, for the benchmark, I recommend that you specify the level at which you expect students to perform. Then, results will specify the percentages of students who performed at each level, or the mean performance across students. I also recommend reporting performance by each trait of the rubric, which I believe you are planning to do. When reporting results for pre- and post foundations assessments, give the percentage of students who met criterion, not just the number of students who did so. I realize the reader can get this information earlier in the report, but it would be helpful to specify it in the chart as well. For performance related to impact on student learning, results need to be more specific.

Graduate Council reviewers further said that, “Program meets level three criteria in all three categories; report should follow outline/guidelines for annual assessment report.”

Please see the attached rubric. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C. Dr. Teresa Eagle, Dean, GSEPD
Dr. Barbara O’Byrne, Program Director
Literacy Education
GSEP

Dear Barbara:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the MA in Literacy Education’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric for the first time this year and, as you will see, it has changed considerably from the ones used in previous years. It raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment considerably and, since it was not shared with programs before this assessment cycle, I’m not comfortable using it to give programs a formal rating this year. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this new rubric.

I could tell from reading your report that you have spent time and thought in developing your assessment plan. However, I also found it to be confusing in parts. For example, you refer to IRA and LEP standards, but never actually specify what these are. I assume, though, from Appendix B that they are foundational knowledge, instructional strategies and curriculum materials, assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation, creating a literate environment, and professional development. If this is the case, then the student learning outcomes on your chart would correspond to the following IRA standards (1 = IRA standard 1; 2 = all IRA standards; 3 = IRA standards 2 and 3; 4 = IRA standards 2 & # -- maybe others??). So, I guess what I’m saying is that I had difficulty switching to the chart from the narrative. I would recommend that learning outcomes be derived from IRA standards. For example, students will (design, use, create, evaluate) appropriate instructional strategies and materials. Then, you would need at least two direct measures to assess each outcome.

Having said this, though, your current report does list several assessment measures and I really like the use of a portfolio to assess student learning. Additionally, your chart gave portfolio results by IRA outcome, which allows a more detailed analysis of strengths and weaknesses than would be afforded by a more holistic portfolio review.

Regarding benchmarks, I encourage you to specify these more clearly. Simply saying they are “instructor determined” is too vague and, since this is program assessment, benchmarks and rubrics should be developed by the faculty in the program as a group, not by a single instructor.

Please see the attached rubric and letter to Deans, Chairs, and Faculty detailing general suggestions for an effective assessment program. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

One John Marshall Drive • Huntington, West Virginia 25755-2203 • Tel 304/696-2206 • Fax 304/696-2261
A State University of West Virginia • An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer
Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Rudy Pauley, Dean, GSEP D