

2017 Graduate Reading Program Assessment Plan

Degree Program: Reading Education

Degree Types: MEd, GC, EdS, PhD

Authors: Dr. Linda Dorn and Dr. Kent Layton

Section 1. Program or Departmental Mission Statement.

The graduate reading programs are based on the 2017 International Literacy Association (ILA) Standards (Updated) for preparing candidates as literacy educators according to the roles and responsibilities of their profession. The ILA Standards reflect current research and literature about literacy, professional learning, and the important roles of professionals involved with literacy instruction (e.g., classroom teachers, literacy coaches, reading specialists, teacher educators). A significant change in the 2017 standards relates to the distinction of roles and responsibilities as follows:

- *Reading/literacy specialist:* A primary focus on planning, teaching, and evaluating instruction for students experiencing difficulties with reading and writing.
- *Literacy coach:* A primary focus on improving classroom instruction by supporting teacher learning and facilitating school literacy program efforts.
- *Literacy coordinator/supervisor:* A primary focus on developing, leading, coordinating, and evaluating the school or district literacy program.

The distinctions in these roles are important in designing key courses and assessments for the 7 graduate reading programs in our school. Our assessment plan is organized to reflect the type of reading degree according to ILA's unique roles under three major specializations.

1) *Specialized Literacy Professionals*

- Masters in Reading- Reading Teacher
- Masters in Reading - Reading Specialist
- Dyslexia Therapist Graduate Certificate
- Post Master's Literacy Coach Graduate Certificate
- Educational Specialist in Reading as Literacy Coordinator/Supervisor

2) *Classroom Teachers*

- Masters in Reading

3) *Teacher Educators*

- PhD in Reading

Section 2: Student Learning Goals for Academic Program.

Each standard includes elements that increase in knowledge and complexity according to the roles and responsibilities for preparing reading professionals.

Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge.

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical, conceptual, historical, and evidence-based foundations of literacy and language, in ways in which they interrelate, and the role of the reading/literacy specialist in schools.

Standard 2: Curriculum and Instruction.

Candidates use foundational knowledge to design literacy curricula to meet needs of learners, especially those who experience difficulty with literacy, design, implement, and evaluate small-group and individual evidence-based literacy instruction for learners.

Standard 3: Assessment and Evaluation.

Candidates understand, select, and use valid, reliable, fair, and appropriate assessment tools to screen, diagnose, and measure student literacy achievement; inform instruction and evaluate interventions; assist teachers in their understanding and use of assessment results; advocate for appropriate literacy practices to relevant stakeholders.

Standard 4: Diversity and Equity.

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of research, relevant theories, pedagogies, and essential concepts of diversity and equity; demonstrate an understanding of themselves and others as cultural beings; create classrooms and schools that are inclusive and affirming; advocate for equity at school, district, and community levels.

Standard 5: Learners and Literacy Environment. Candidates meet the developmental needs of all learners and collaborate with school personnel to use a variety of print and digital materials to engage and motivate all learners; integrate digital technologies in appropriate, safe, and effective ways; foster a positive climate that supports a literacy-rich learning environment.

Standard 6. Professional Learning and Leadership. Candidates demonstrate the ability to be reflective literacy professionals, who apply their knowledge of adult learning to work collaboratively with colleagues; demonstrate their leadership and facilitation skills; advocate on behalf of teachers, students, families, and communities.

Standard 7: Practicum/Clinical Experiences. Candidates complete supervised, integrated, extended practica/clinical experiences that include intervention work with students and working with peers and experienced colleagues; practica include ongoing experiences in school-based setting(s); supervision includes observation and ongoing feedback by qualified supervisors.

Section 3: Curriculum Map

Attach a map of your program’s curriculum (elective and required courses) that shows where each outcome is taught.

ILA Role	Classroom Teacher	Specialized Literacy Professionals				Teacher Educator
Degree	MEd in Reading	MEd in Reading	DTON - GC	RDG / GC	EdS in Reading	PhD in Reading
Role	Reading Teacher	Reading / Literacy Specialist	Dyslexia Therapist	Literacy Coach	Literacy Coordinator/ Supervisor	Teacher Educator
Key Courses	READ 7351 READ 7352 READ 7354 READ 7327 READ 7306	READ 7357 READ 7370 READ 7393 READ 7352 READ 7353 READ 7385	READ 7393 READ 7353 READ 7385 READ 7387	READ 7398 READ 8301 READ 8302 READ 8304 READ 8305	READ 7398 READ 8304 READ 8340 READ 8348 READ 8349	READ 8320 READ 8330 READ 8342 READ 8345 READ 8399 READ 9399

Section 4: Assessment Methods

This section aligns the key assessments for all the required courses to the ILA standards for preparing reading educators for their specialized roles under the six READING programs in our school.

Specialized Literacy Professionals						
ILA Standards	Reading Teacher	Reading/Literacy Specialist	Dyslexia Therapist	Literacy Coach	Literacy Coordinator/Supervisor	Teacher Educator
	Courses with Key Evidences that Demonstrate Competency Within Courses					
Standard 1 Foundational Knowledge	READ 7351 Creating a Literate Environment Project READ 7393 Scholarly Paper on Dyslexia	READ 7393 Scholarly Paper on Dyslexia READ 7357 Research Paper & Presentation	READ 7393 Scholarly Paper on Dyslexia	READ 7398 Literacy Intervention Portfolio	READ 8340 Literacy Action Research Study	READ 8345 Theoretical Models and Reading Processes Literature Review READ 8320 Review of Literature on Phonological, Orthographic, and Linguistics
Standard 2 Curriculum & Instruction	READ 7327 Curriculum Project READ 7354 Multi-Genre Content Literacy Project	READ 7327 Curriculum Project READ 7354 Multi-Genre Content Literacy Project	READ 7385 Writing a Case Study of a Reader with Dyslexia	READ 8304 Literacy Curriculum Unit Portfolio	READ 8304 Literacy Curriculum Unit Portfolio	READ 8342 Teaching Portfolio for Preparing Reading Teachers
Standard 3 Assessment/Evaluation	READ 7352 Learner Assessment/ Intervention Plan	READ 7352 Learner Assessment/ Intervention Plan READ 7353 Criteria & Standards for Administration of Assessments	READ 7387 Intervention Project with Dyslexia Report	READ 7398 Literacy Intervention Portfolio READ 8301 Coordinating and Assessing a Literacy Program	READ 8340 Literacy Action Research Study READ 7398 Literacy Intervention Portfolio READ 8301 Portfolio of Supervising and Coordinating a School's Literacy Program	READ 8330 Research Proposal in Social and Cultural Learning READ 8342 Teaching Portfolio for Preparing Reading Teachers
Standard 4 Diversity & Equity	READ 7354 Multi-Genre Content Literacy Project	READ 7354 Multi-Genre Content Literacy Project READ 7370 Advanced Practicum	READ 7385 Writing a Case Study of a Reader with Dyslexia	READ 7398 Literacy Intervention Portfolio	READ 8340 Literacy Action Research Study READ 7398 Literacy Intervention Portfolio	READ 8330 Research Proposal in Social and Cultural Learning READ 8342 Teaching Portfolio for Preparing Reading Teachers

Standard 5 Learners & the Literate Environment	READ 7351 Creating a Literate Environment Project READ 7354 Multi-Genre Content Literacy Project	READ 7352 Emergent Literacy Assessment/ Learner Assessment	READ 7385 Writing a Case Study of a Reader with Dyslexia	READ 8304 Literacy Curriculum Unit Portfolio	READ 8304 UbD Literacy Curriculum Unit Portfolio	READ 8342 Teaching Portfolio for Preparing Reading Teachers
ILA Standard 6 Professional Learning & Leadership		READ 7370 Structured Observations of Teaching Students with Reading Difficulties READ 7393 Scholarly Paper on Dyslexia	READ 7393 Scholarly Paper on Dyslexia	READ 8301 Coordinating and Assessing a Literacy Program READ 8302 Portfolio of Reflective Practices in Literacy Education	READ 8348 Research Proposal in Literacy READ 8349 Research Project in Literacy	READ 8342 Teaching Portfolio for Preparing Reading Teachers
ILA Standard 7 Practicum / Clinical Experiences	READ 7352	READ 7370 Structured Observations of Teaching Students with Reading Difficulties READ 7385 Structured Observations of Teaching Students with Dyslexia	READ 7385 & READ 7387 Structured Observations of Teaching Students with Dyslexia	READ 7398 Literacy Intervention Project READ 8302 Portfolio of Reflective Practices in Literacy Education	READ 8340 Literacy Action Research Study READ 8305 Literacy Coaches as Agents of Change	NA

This section includes at least one key assessment with learning outcomes for each program with links to ILA standards. Assessment rubrics with asterisks are included at end of report. Additionally, we added a column for Standard 7 to identify specific courses in the six programs that include practicum/clinical experiences. These clinical assessments will be discussed in more detail in Section 6 as an area of program improvement.

Student Learning Outcomes for Specific Role in Reading Program	Degree	Assessment Method or Learning Activity/Artifact (see rubrics)	Course in Which Learning Activity or Assessment Takes Place	Alignment with ILA Standard	Addresses Standard 7 (Practicum/ Clinical)
Use multiple sources of information to guide instructional planning to improve reading achievement of all students. (1.3)	MED -RT	Creating a Literate Environment Project	READ 7351 Foundations of Teaching Reading	ILA 1.3 ILA 4.1 ILA 4.2	NA

Demonstrate understanding of the ways in which the various forms of diversity interact with reading and writing development. (4.1, 4.2)					
<p>Select, adapt, teach, and evaluate evidence-based supplemental, and intervention approaches; such instruction is explicit, intense, and provides adequate scaffolding to meet the literacy needs of individual and small groups of students, especially those who experience difficulty with reading and writing. (2.3)</p> <p>Administer and interpret appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. (3.2)</p> <p>Use both written and oral communication to explain assessment results and advocate for appropriate literacy and language. (3.4)</p>	MED - RS	Observation Protocol and Rubric*	<p>READ 7370 Advanced Practicum</p> <p>READ 7385 Formative Assessment & Intervention for Children with Dyslexia*</p> <p>READ 7398 Intervention Portfolio for Teaching Struggling Reader</p>	<p>ILA 2.3 ILA 3.3 ILA 3.4 ILA 7.1 ILA 7.4</p>	<p>Structured observations and ongoing feedback using video analysis and/or video conferencing.</p> <p>Intervention project for teaching a struggling reader</p>
<p>Select, adapt, teach, and evaluate evidence-based supplemental, and intervention approaches; such instruction is explicit, intense, and provides adequate scaffolding to meet the literacy needs of individual and small groups of students, especially those who experience difficulty with reading and writing. (2.3)</p> <p>Administer and interpret appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. (3.2)</p> <p>Use both written and oral communication to explain assessment results and advocate for appropriate literacy and language. (3.4)</p>	DTON-GC	Observation Protocol and Rubric*	<p>READ 7385 Formative Assessment & Intervention for Children with Dyslexia</p>	<p>ILA 2.3 ILA 3.2 ILA 3.4 ILA 7.3</p>	<p>Structured observations and ongoing feedback using video analysis and/or video teleconferencing.</p>

<p>Collaborate as a means of improving teaching practices and enhancing teachers' knowledge and skills of evidence-based classroom, supplemental, and intervention approaches to improve student learning. (2.3)</p> <p>Facilitate and coach teachers in their efforts to integrate digital technologies in appropriate, safe, and effective ways. (5.3)</p> <p>Design, facilitate, and lead professional learning experiences for groups (e.g. data team meetings, professional learning communities, workshops, book studies), using collaborative data, analysis, and decision-making processes. (6.2)</p> <p>Engage in ongoing opportunities for authentic, school-based practicum experiences that include opportunities to network with and be mentored by other coaches. (7.3)</p>	<p>RDG-GC (LC)</p>	<p>Rubric - Portfolio of Reflective Practices in Literacy Education*</p>	<p>READ 8302 Professional Experiences in Reading</p> <p>READ 8305 Literacy Coaches as Agents of Change</p>	<p>ILA 2.3 ILA 5.3 ILA 6.2 ILA 7.3</p>	<p>Field-based activities provide evidence of coaching skills in a variety of areas, including leading team meetings, facilitating book studies, and coaching teachers. Candidates upload videos of field-based experiences for feedback.</p>
<p>Lead and support school and/or district-wide literacy instructional efforts to develop, implement, and evaluate evidence-based literacy practices across classroom and in academic disciplines. (2.2)</p> <p>Engage with school or district personnel in self-reflection about the effect of culture, beliefs, and potential bias on literacy instruction and how to create school environments and instructional experiences that are culturally and linguistically relevant and socially just. (4.2)</p>	<p>EdS</p>	<p>Action Research Project in Literacy Area*</p> <p>Portfolio of Leadership Experiences*</p>	<p>READ 8340 Research in Language and Literacy Development</p> <p>READ 8301 Supervision and Organization of Reading Programs</p>	<p>ILA 2.2 ILA 4.2 ILA 7.2 ILA 7.4</p>	<p>Develop, in collaboration with school personnel, an action research project to improve instruction in a specific literacy area. Write up the action research project and share with stakeholders.</p> <p>Field-based experiences in supervising, coordinating, and assessing literacy aspects of a school's literacy program.</p>

<p>Create environments in the university classroom that focus individual motivation to read and write and teach teachers how to create such environments (1.1).</p> <p>Convey knowledge and understanding of curriculum to candidates and reading professionals. (2.2).</p>	PhD	Teaching Portfolio for Preparing Reading Teachers*	READ 8342 Theory and Research in Reading Comprehension	ILA 1.1 ILA 2.2	NA
---	-----	--	--	--------------------	----

Assessment Results

One key assessment with summary of results from each program is presented. Each assessment is aligned with specific ILA standards for preparing reading educators.

Degree Program & ILA Standard	Assessment Artifact	Semester of Data Analysis	Summary of Results
MED-RS	Creating a Literate Environment	Fall	For the past three years, we have used the rubric based on the 2010 standards. Beginning in fall 2018, the rubric will be revised to more closely align with new Reading licensure assessment with an emphasis on the essential elements of the reading process. Data collection using the new rubric will begin in fall 2018.
DT-GC	Observation Rubric	Fall, Spring	Data collection of clinical observations will begin next spring for candidates in READ 7385-7387 practicum courses.
LC-GC ILA 2.3, 2.4	Portfolio for Coordinating & Supervising Literacy Programs	Spring 2014-2017	Three years of data from READ 8301 Supervision and Organization of Reading Programs indicate that 100% of candidates scored at proficient or advanced levels in their understandings for organizing, coordinating, and assessing a school's literacy program. A key factor in the number of candidates at the advanced level related to whether they were employed as a literacy coach in a school. A smaller number of candidates in the LC-GC program were working as classroom teachers; therefore, several assignments were intentionally designed to scaffold candidates through collaborative experiences. The course was designed to allow candidates to use the rubric as a self-assessment of their performance on each activity based on ongoing feedback throughout the semester and to make revisions for continuous improvement before submitting the final portfolio at the end of the course. Furthermore, if a candidate needed additional scaffolding on any project, a zoom conference was scheduled with the instructor (during each semester, at least one or two students requested

			additional conferences). This formative process enabled all students to achieve proficiency or above on the final portfolio.
EdS	Curriculum Portfolio	Spring 2014-2017	Three years of data from READ 8304 Curriculum Design and Evaluation indicate that 100% of candidates scored at proficient or advanced levels in their understandings of curriculum design and evaluation. The course was designed to allow candidates to use the rubric as a self-assessment of their performance on each activity based on ongoing feedback throughout the semester and to make revisions for continuous improvement before submitting the final portfolio at the end of the course. Furthermore, if a candidate needed additional scaffolding on any project, a zoom conference was scheduled with the instructor (during each semester, at least one or two candidates requested additional conferences). This formative process enabled all candidates to achieve proficiency or above on the final portfolio.
PhD ILA 1.1, 2.2	Teaching Portfolio for Preparing Reading Professionals	Spring 2015 & 2017 (Next term will be spring 2019)	Two years of data for READ 8342 Theory and Research in Reading Comprehension indicate that 100% of candidates scored at proficient or advanced levels in their ability to use reading theory and comprehension research to design a standards-based graduate reading course with specific activities and assessments for preparing reading professionals. The clinical assessment also included video observations of teaching demonstrations with explicit feedback from the instructor. All candidates scored at proficiency or advanced in this area.

MED and DT Assessment Results on State Assessments

MED candidates who are seeking to add K-12 reading specialist endorsement to their teaching license are required to pass the Praxis II Reading Specialist exam. Therefore, our overall pass rate has been 100%. Dyslexia Therapist candidates who are seeking to add Dyslexia Therapist endorsement to their teaching license are required to pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching exam; therefore, the overall pass rate has been 100%.

Five- Year Trend of Graduation Rates

This section looks at graduation rates for the six graduate Reading programs. Historically, the MEd, EdS, and PhD programs were built as progressive degrees that would entice teachers to seek additional licensure, greater expertise, and different career aspirations as literacy professionals. Graduate Certificates were designed to complement the three graduate programs, as well as federal and state literacy initiatives, and to entice students to move from a completing a Graduate Certificate to completing one or more of the degree programs. Over the past decade, state and federal initiatives have changed along with the literacy profession. As a result, Reading Program faculty have made various changes to adjust the curriculum to meet school districts and teachers' needs. More recently, due to lack of consistent interest and enrollment, the Literacy and Culture Graduate Certificate and Literacy

Interventionist Graduate Certificate were discontinued. In addition, the Dyslexia Therapist Graduate Certificate was added to meet Arkansas Department of Education and legislative expectations.

Table 1 reveals number of graduates across five years for each of our current programs. Since the 2012-13 academic year, the Reading Program has matriculated 130 graduates with a mean of 26. Considering the minimal average recognized for academic program viability, a mean of 26, overall program production exceeds the expectation of 18 graduates by 44%. The main reason the EdS lags behind the expected mean average is due largely to the fact that the EdS program is used to gauge students’ potential for the PhD program. Through professional development programs offered in the Center for Literacy and within the graduate certificates and MEd/EdS, students are ‘cultivated’ and ‘mentored’ to reach their potential for doctoral level coursework. Thus, our program completion rates for the EdS are impacted by those students who decide to transition to the PhD before completing the EdS degree. At the same time, it is noteworthy that from 2012-2017, of the 17 total EdS graduates, over 50 percent (9 students) moved into the PhD program, and are on track for graduation with their doctoral degree within the next year to two. It is questionable as to whether these doctoral students would have pursued their higher degree without their EdS courses. Not only is the EdS in Reading an important program for PhD candidates, but is also impacts student enrollment in the MEd and Graduate Certificate programs, as EdS students take these reading courses as part of their elective track in literacy education.

Table 1

Graduation Rates Program/Year	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	Total	5 yr. Mean	Difference
PhD	0	4	3	4	2	13	2.6	+.6
EdS	8	1	1	3	4	17	3.4	-.6
LitCoach GC	4	2	3	5	5	19	3.8	-.2
MEd	7	6	1	8	14	37	7.4	+3.4
DT GC	-	-	-	34	10	44	8.8	+4.8
Total	19	13	9	54	35	130	26	
Min. Expect. Average	14	14	14	18	18	18		
Difference	+5	-1	-5	+36	+17	+51		

Table 2 reveals enrollment trends for the Reading Programs from Spring 17 to Spring 2018. An increase of 40% has occurred since Spring 17 in the enrollment of EdS students, noting that we currently have 16 active students with degree plans and 5 students are on track to graduate in spring 2018. Likewise, significant increases in the MEd and DT programs are likely to increase the EdS enrollment over the next few years, similar to the impact the new dyslexia laws in Arkansas have affected enrollments in the DT and MEd programs.

Table 2

Enrollment Program/Semester	Spring 17 Primary	Spring 17 Secondary	Spring 18 Primary	Spring 18 Secondary	% Increase Primary
PhD	19	-	26	-	36%
EdS	15	2	21	4	40%
LitCoach GC	2	5	-	-	-
MEd	21	-	36	-	71%
DT GC	5	11	14	4	180%
Total	62	21	97	8	56%

Section 6. Continuous Improvement Process. Document the process your program will use for implementing changes to improve curriculum, student support and assessment practices based on assessment findings.

1. Changes in Response to State Reading Assessment.

In response to the state’s new Reading Assessment, and in accordance with Act 416, candidates applying for an Elementary Education K-6 or a Special Education K-12 license (beginning with Spring 2018 graduates) will be required to successfully pass a stand-alone reading test on the essential elements of reading. Additionally, practicing teachers will be expected to demonstrate competencies in these areas for the recertification of their teaching license. Furthermore, teacher education programs will be judged on the pass rates of candidates on the new Reading Assessment. These laws have created the need for revisions to the reading curriculum, specifically revamping the READ 7351 Foundations of Teaching Reading course to more explicitly address the areas of phonology, morphology, and linguistics in reading acquisition.

2. Changes in Response to Roles in Preparing Reading Professionals in the 2017 ILA Standards.

In January 2018, the International Literacy Standards for the Preparation of Literacy Professionals were approved by the ILA Board of Directions. The new standards include two areas that will impact our reading curriculum. First, the professional roles for preparing educators are more clearly defined in relation to specific responsibilities of the candidate within a school (see Figure 1). For example, the old category of Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach has been revised to recognize the diverse and highly specialized roles of literacy professionals. Under this broader category, the 2017 standards include the role of Literacy Coordinator, which has typically been associated with the EdS program. This revision indicates that some MED and LC-GC candidates would benefit from particular courses in the EdS program that focus on literacy leadership within the school. These courses include READ 8301 Supervision and Organization of Reading Programs and READ 8302 Professional Experiences in Reading.

ROLES	
Standards for Reading Professionals Revised 2010	Standards for the Preparation of Literacy Professionals 2017
Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach	Specialized Literacy Professionals Reading/Literacy Specialist Literacy Coach Literacy Coordinator/Supervisor
Pre-K and Elementary Classroom Teachers Middle and High School Content Middle and High School Reading Teachers	Classroom Teachers Pre-K/Primary Elementary/Intermediate Middle/High School
Administrator	Principals
Teacher Educator	Teacher Educators
Educational Support Personnel	Literacy Partners

In response to ILA revisions for Standard 4 (Diversity and Equity) and Standard 5 (Learners and the Literacy Environment), we are revising assessments for READ 7351 and READ 7354 to more closely align with student learning goals. Also, the 2017 ILA revisions include a new standard: Standard 7: Practicum/Clinical Experiences (only for Specialized Literacy Professionals). The addition of this stand-alone standard places an emphasis on the need for highly effective clinical experiences in the preparation of reading specialists. As a result of Standard 7, we have begun the process of incorporating more clinical experiences into courses, including more supervised experiences that utilize video conferencing tools in practicum courses.

STANDARDS	
Standards for Reading Professionals Revised 2010	Standards for the Preparation of Literacy Professionals 2017
Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge	Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge
Standard 2: Curriculum and Instruction	Standard 2: Curriculum and Instruction
Standard 3: Assessment and Evaluation	Standard 3: Assessment and Evaluation
Standard 4: Diversity	Standard 4: Diversity and Equity
Standard 5: Literate Environment	Standard 5: Learners and the Literacy Environment
Standard 6: Professional Learning and Leadership	Standard 6: Professional Learning and Leadership
	Standard 7: Practicum/Clinical Experiences (only for Specialized Literacy Professionals)

Section 7. Stakeholder Involvement/Communication Plan. Who are stakeholders in your program, and how will they be involved in your assessment process? How will they learn about your assessment results and continuous improvement?

Our stakeholders include former and current students, school administrators, state department leaders, and faculty colleagues in the teacher education programs. In 2017, the reading faculty met several times with special education and elementary education faculty to go over curriculum and assessment processes to prepare candidates for the new reading assessment. Also, reading faculty have communicated frequently with school administrators about our reading programs. For example, we've corresponded with our teachers and administrators about the Dyslexia Graduate Certificate program, and we are currently engaged in a three-year research project with the Nixa Public School District in Missouri to study the effectiveness of the Dyslexia GC program on teachers' knowledge for teaching children with dyslexia and the subsequent effect on students' reading achievement over a three-year period. We have also sent surveys to Literacy Coaches and Intervention Specialists to provide feedback on how our reading programs have prepared them for their specific roles and responsibilities.

Rubric for Writing a Scholarly Paper on Understanding Dyslexia
READ 7393 Special Topics in Reading Education: Teaching Children with Dyslexia

Component and Standards	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Introduction and Purpose of the Paper	Introduction includes a well-crafted thesis statement and a description of how the paper is organized.	Introduction includes a good thesis statement and a description of how the paper is organized.	Introduction is written poorly with no thesis statement and no description of how the paper is organized.
Understanding dyslexia; myths about dyslexia; definitions of dyslexia; characteristics of dyslexia; language processing requirements; genetics and the environment	Comprehensive and accurate discussion of critical topics from professional readings and resources, indicating a solid understanding of dyslexia.	Adequate and accurate description of critical topics from professional readings and resources, indicating a good understanding of dyslexia.	Sketchy description that indicates inadequate understanding of dyslexia.
History of dyslexia; dyslexia and the brain; federal and state laws that pertain to learning disabilities and dyslexia	Comprehensive and accurate discussion of critical topics from professional readings and resources, indicating a solid understanding of the history of dyslexia and laws that pertain to learning disabilities and dyslexia.	Adequate and accurate discussion of critical topics from professional readings and resources, indicating a solid understanding of the history of dyslexia and laws that pertain to learning disabilities and dyslexia.	Sketchy description that indicates inadequate understanding of dyslexia.
Differences between good and poor readers; continuum of severity; development of language, reading, orthography, and writing.	Comprehensive and accurate description of good and poor readers, continuum of severity and developmental processes in language and literacy.	Adequate and accurate description of good and poor readers, continuum of severity and developmental processes in language and literacy.	Sketchy description that indicates inadequate understanding of dyslexia.
Assessment of cognitive and linguistic correlates of dyslexia; development of phonological awareness; rapid automatized naming; processing speed; orthographic coding; memory span; decoding, encoding, and reading fluency	Expert and comprehensive descriptions of essential assessments of cognitive and linguistic correlates of dyslexia.	Adequate descriptions with accurate details of essential assessments of cognitive and linguistic correlates of dyslexia.	Sketchy and/or inaccurate descriptions of assessments for assessing children with dyslexia.
Instructional methods for teaching children with dyslexia; early reading and spelling skills; reading fluency; multi-sensory techniques; assistive technology; teaching ELL students	Expert and comprehensive descriptions of specific instructional methods for teaching children with dyslexia.	Adequate and accurate descriptions of specific instructional methods for teaching children with dyslexia.	Sketchy and/or inaccurate description of specific instructional methods for teaching children with dyslexia.
Description of dyslexia programs for phonics, structural analysis, fluency, and spelling instruction.	Comprehensive and objective review of dyslexia programs, including a discussion of effectiveness studies for at least three of the most commonly used programs.	Adequate review of programs of dyslexia programs, including discussion of effectiveness for at least one commonly used program.	Inadequate or biased discussion of dyslexia programs.

Format of Scholarly Paper	Well-written paper that follows the rubric guidelines and APA formatting, including excellent headings and subheadings for clarifying and organizing big ideas. There are no spelling or grammatical errors.	Well-written paper that follows the rubric guidelines and APA formatting, including appropriate headings for clarifying organizing big ideas. There are no more than 2 typing errors.	Poorly written paper that does not follow rubric guidelines and has several spelling and/or grammatical errors.
---------------------------	--	---	---

**Rubric for Structured Observations of Teaching Students with Dyslexia
READ 7385 and READ 7387**

Component and Standards	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Teaching Methods and Impact on Student Learning Goals	Demonstrates expertise in setting a purpose aligned with learning objectives, standards, and assessments for implementing specific methods and appropriate assistive technologies (as needed) that support learning goals for students with dyslexia. Solid evidence that methods and instructional decisions resulted in a positive impact on student learning.	Demonstrates knowledge in setting a purpose aligned with learning objectives, standards, and assessments for implementing specific methods and assistive technologies (as needed) that support learning goals for students with dyslexia. Adequate evidence that methods and instructional decisions resulted in a positive impact on student learning.	Lesson is disorganized and unclear with evidence of a negative impact on the progress of dyslexic students in achieving learning goals. Teaching methods are inappropriate and technologies do not address specified learning goals or facilitate positive student learning.
Overall Organization, Delivery of Content to Facilitate Learning	Demonstrates expertise of a variety of research-based instructional strategies for teaching students with dyslexia. Shows expertise in planning and delivering intervention lesson with excellent pacing, explicit teaching, and adjustable scaffolding techniques (along a scale of assistance) that enable dyslexic students to practice effective problem solving activity with successful learning outcomes.	Demonstrates knowledge of a variety of research-based instructional strategies for teaching students with dyslexia. Shows knowledge in planning and delivering intervention lesson with good pacing, explicit teaching, and some evidence of ability to adjust scaffolding techniques (along a scale of assistance) that enable dyslexic students to practice effective problem solving activity with successful outcomes.	Does not demonstrate the use of research-based instructional strategies; lesson is poorly paced and does not include opportunities (with appropriate scaffolding) for students to develop skills addressing the lesson goals/outcomes.
Facilitates Student Engagement to Promote Learning and Motivation to Learn	Demonstrates expertise in motivating dyslexic students to develop planning actions, monitor their performance, and accomplish literacy tasks with and without assistance. Engages	Demonstrates knowledge of methods for motivating dyslexic students to acquire planning actions, monitor their performance, and accomplish literacy tasks with and without assistance. Engages	Does not provide opportunities for students to actively learn content with understanding. Little or no incorporation of problem-solving or higher order thinking skills.

	students to actively participate in text discussions through the use of discussion protocols, language frames, and discourse chains. Creates meaningful opportunities for students to develop metacognition and self-correcting behaviors through organizational tools that incorporate problem-solving and higher order thinking skills into learning tasks.	students to participate in text discussions through the use of discussion protocols, language frames, and discourse chains. Creates meaningful opportunities for students to acquire metacognition and self-correcting behaviors through organizational tools that incorporate problem-solving and higher order thinking skills into learning tasks.	
Teaching Comprehension Strategies for Understanding and Expanding Content Knowledge	Demonstrates expertise in teaching dyslexic students how to use comprehension strategies for learning and expanding content information, including activating background knowledge, applying close reading strategies (e.g., annotating, rereading, etc.), using vocabulary maps, and accessing technological tools. Demonstrates challenging, yet reasonable expectations, for student learning, and applies expert scaffolding to promote deeper comprehension of text meanings.	Demonstrates knowledge in teaching dyslexic students how to use comprehension strategies for learning and expanding content information, including activating background knowledge, applying close reading strategies (e.g., annotating, rereading, etc.), using vocabulary maps, and accessing technological tools. Demonstrates reasonable expectations, for student learning and applies good scaffolding to promote good comprehension of text meanings.	Does not provide opportunities for dyslexic students to develop comprehension strategies for understanding the content. Demonstrates low or inconsistent expectations for student learning.

**Rubric for Intervention Portfolio with Intervention Report
READ 7387: Advanced Practicum in Dyslexia Therapy**

Component and Standards	Target	Proficient	Unacceptable
Portfolio Format: Intervention Portfolio with sections and supporting evidence for assessing and teaching children with dyslexia.	Portfolio includes a well-organized Table of Contents with defined sections and supporting evidences that document candidate's deep knowledge and expertise for assessing and teaching children with dyslexia.	Portfolio includes a Table of Contents with defined sections and supporting evidences that document candidate's adequate knowledge and abilities for assessing and teaching children with dyslexia.	Portfolio is poorly organized and lacks supporting evidence that documents candidate's knowledge and ability for assessing and teaching children with dyslexia.
Section 1: Definitions of all assessment used	All assessments are accurately defined, including purpose, type, reliability, validity, and other relevant information, and	All assessments are accurately defined, including purpose, type, reliability, validity, and other relevant information,	Assessments are inaccurately defined and/or lack descriptions of how assessments are used for

during intervention period	provide clear evidence of the teacher's expertise in using appropriate assessments for planning instruction and monitoring student's progress over time.	and provide some evidence of the teacher's ability to use appropriate assessments for planning instruction and monitoring student's progress over time.	planning instruction and monitoring student's progress over time.
Section 2: Analysis of formative assessment data collected on student during intervention period	All formative assessments are analyzed accurately for behavioral patterns that indicate changes over time in student's cognitive processing (executive control) functions and provide clear evidence of teacher's expertise in triangulating multiple sources for a comprehensive and in-depth interpretation of student's responsiveness to intervention.	All formative assessments are analyzed accurately for behavioral patterns that indicate changes over time in student's cognitive processing (executive control) functions and provide some evidence of teacher's ability to triangulate multiple sources for a good interpretation of student's responsiveness to intervention.	Formative assessments are analyzed incorrectly and/or show little or no evidence of interpreting patterns of behavior that indicate changes in student's cognitive processing (executive control) functions; therefore, assessment results are unreliable for determining how well the student is responding to intervention.
Section 3: Instructional Records and Teaching Decisions on student during intervention	Detailed and comprehensive records provide strong evidence of effective teaching decisions based on research-based techniques, including systematic and explicit instruction using multisensory procedures, for teaching children with dyslexia. The link between assessment and teaching is clearly visible in all lesson records, instructional activities, and progress monitoring assessments.	Accurate records provide good evidence of appropriate teaching decisions based on research-based techniques, including systematic and explicit instruction using multisensory procedures, for teaching children with dyslexia. The link between assessment and teaching is notable in most lesson records, instructional activities, and progress monitoring assessments.	Records are sketchy and limited in detail with little or no evidence of linking assessment to teaching; therefore, candidate is unable to make effective decisions for planning instruction and monitoring student progress.
Section 4: Intervention Report with Specific Recommendation for continued improvement in specific areas.	Comprehensive report is based on aggregated data over the intervention period with specific recommendations for continuous improvement in the intervention and includes concrete activities and accommodations for motivating and scaffolding student's learning in the classroom and other settings. Report demonstrates solid evidence of collaboration and congruency across classroom and intervention settings for promoting student's transfer and application of knowledge across multiple settings.	Adequate report is based on aggregated data over the intervention period with specific recommendations for continuous improvement in the intervention and includes concrete activities and accommodations for motivating and scaffolding student's learning in the classroom and other settings. Report demonstrates some evidence of collaboration and congruency across classroom and intervention settings for promoting student's transfer and application of knowledge across multiple settings.	Report is poorly written and lacks specificity and data-based recommendations.

**Portfolio Rubric for Coordinating and Assessing a School's Literacy Program
READ 8301 Supervision and Organization of Literacy Programs**

Component and Standards	Advanced	Proficient	Satisfactory/Basic	Unsatisfactory
Portfolio Format: Table of Contents with Eight Sections for Coordinating and Assessing a School's Literacy Program. Opening section includes a short reflective paragraph that summarizes the overall contents in a reflective analysis (IRA 2.2, 3.3, 4.1, 5.4).	Portfolio includes a cover page, self-reflection, and Table of Contents with supporting evidence in all sections that indicates deep understanding of the concepts. The self-reflection is a comprehensive and critical analysis of the portfolio contents. There are no grammatical or spelling errors.	Portfolio includes a cover page, self-reflection, and Table of Contents with supporting documents in all sections that indicates partial or good understanding of most concepts. The self-reflection is a summary of the portfolio contents, but lacks detail and depth. There are no more than 3 grammatical or spelling errors.	Portfolio includes a cover page, self-reflection, and Table of Contents with supporting documents in all sections that indicates partial or good understanding of most concepts. The self-reflection is a summary of the portfolio contents, but lacks detail and depth. There are no more than 4 grammatical or spelling errors.	Portfolio is limited in content and depth. There are more than 5 grammatical or spelling errors
Section 1: Effective Reading Programs: Conduct a review of reading programs and use this information to assess the reading programs in a school, including evidence (or lack of) their effectiveness (IRA 2.2, 5.3).	A review of at least 15 reading programs and a thoughtful analysis of a school's reading program based on research-based criteria with a convincing argument for implementing research-based programs in your school.	A review of at least 10 beginning reading programs and a thoughtful analysis of a school's reading programs based on research-based criteria with a convincing argument for implementing research-based programs in your school.	A review of at least 8 beginning reading programs and an analysis of a school's reading program based on research-based criteria with a good argument for implementing research-based programs in your school.	A review of less than 8 beginning reading programs and a limited analysis of a school's reading program based on research-based criteria. A weak argument is presented.
Section 2: Effective Reading Climate: Use the ESAIL instrument to assess the quality of a school's literacy environment, and summarize these findings into a well-written paper. (IRA 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)	A comprehensive assessment of a school's literacy environment using the ESAIL, including a diagnostic analysis of the school's strengths and needs and excellent recommendations for professional development.	A comprehensive assessment of a school's literacy environment using the ESAIL, including a summary of the school's strengths and needs and good recommendations for professional development.	An assessment of the school's literacy environment using the ESAIL, including a list of the school's strengths and needs and some recommendations for professional development.	An assessment of the school's literacy environment using the ESAIL, but no interpretation of the school's strengths and needs or recommendations for professional development.
Section 3: Coaching Teachers: Plan a coaching conference with a teacher, including a pre-and	A thoughtful and comprehensive critique of the conference, including a	A thoughtful critique of the conference, including a reflective analysis of the coach's language for	A good critique of the conference with a well-written paper that discusses types of coaching language	A weak critique that lacks knowledge of coaching principles. Paper is sketchy and poorly written.

<p>post-conference. Audiotape the conference and critique it according to effective coaching techniques. Write a paper (minimum of 5 pages) that captures your analysis of the coaching interaction (IRA 3.3, 5.3).</p>	<p>reflective analysis of the coach's language for empowering the teacher's decision-making. Paper exceeds 5 pages, includes theoretical references, and reflects knowledge of coaching principles.</p>	<p>empowering the teacher's decision-making. Paper is a minimum of 5 pages, and reflects knowledge of coaching language.</p>	<p>used with the teacher. Paper is a minimum of 4 pages.</p>	
<p>Section 4: Assessment Analysis: Compile a listing of all major assessments used in a school and the purposes of each assessment, including the following categories: screening, placement, diagnostic, informal, and summative. Create a grid or write a paper (minimum of 2 pages) evaluating the assessments, including an analysis of how they align with a seamless assessment system. (IRA 3.3, 3.4).</p>	<p>A comprehensive compilation of major assessments in the school, including a written evaluation with a grid that illustrates how the assessments align (or do not align) in a seamless system.</p>	<p>A comprehensive compilation of major assessments in the school, including a written evaluation (at least 2 pages) of how the assessments align (or do not align) in a seamless system.</p>	<p>A comprehensive compilation of major assessments, including a 1-2 page written evaluation of the assessments.</p>	<p>A list of major assessments, but paper lacks an evaluation of the assessments.</p>
<p>Section 5: Using technology for collaborative learning; locate online videos that can be used for teacher development and upload to PBWorks or YouTube; create a teacher wiki for supporting teachers in implementing reading and writing workshops; write a reflective analysis for how technology can be used to mentor teachers in best practices (IRA 5.3).</p>	<p>Excellent use of online tools for collaborative learning among classmates and for teacher development, including excellent examples of teaching videos, Internet sites, and teacher blogs; a well-designed wiki that can be used to support teachers in best practices. Reflective paper (4 or more pages) that illustrates knowledge of how technology can be used to support teacher development.</p>	<p>Good use of online tools for collaborative learning among classmates and for teacher development, including good examples of teaching videos, Internet sites, and teacher blogs. A good wiki that can be used to support teachers in best practices. Reflective paper (2-3 pages) that illustrates knowledge of how technology can be used to support teacher development.</p>	<p>Some use of online tools for collaborative learning among classmates and for teacher development, including a few examples of teaching videos or Internet sites. A basic wiki that can be used to support teachers in best practices. Reflective paper (at least 1 page) lists some benefits to using technology for teacher development.</p>	<p>Limited or no evidence of using online tools for collaborative learning or teacher development. No attempt to create a wiki.</p>

Section 6: Professional Development (Literacy Team or Intervention Team) meeting. Plan and conduct a LT meeting. Write a short reflection paper (2-3 pages) on the purpose of the meeting, specific activities, and a thoughtful reflection on how well the meeting went (IRA 4.1, 5.4).	Comprehensive documents include evidence of thoughtful planning, conducting, and assessing the team meeting, including a reflective (3 or more pages) analysis of how well the meeting went with references to effective principles for working with adult learners.	Comprehensive documents include evidence of good planning, conducting, and assessing the team meeting, including a reflective analysis (2-3 pages) of how the team meeting went.	Documents include evidence of good planning, conducting, and assessing the team meeting, including a summary paper (1-2 pages) of how well the team meeting went.	Documents are sketchy and lack evidence of good planning, conducting, and assessing the team meeting, including a poorly written paper that shows limited or no understanding of how to conduct a constructive team meeting.
Section 7: School Plan. Use the template for School Plan (or CIM) to examine a school's literacy program, including a plan of action for future goals (IRA 3.3, 3.4).	Comprehensive plan with all features thoughtfully analyzed over a three-year period, including a detailed plan of action with specific steps outlined for future goals.	Comprehensive plan with all components analyzed over a three-year period, including a good plan of action for future goals.	Good plan with all features discussed over a three-year period, including a limited plan of action.	Plan did not include all features and/or did not cover the three years; no evidence of a plan of action.

**Rubric for Designing a Standards-Based Language Arts Curriculum
READ 8304 Curriculum Design and Evaluation**

Component	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory/Basic	Unsatisfactory
Alignment to Common Core State Standards (CCSS)	Clear evidence of curriculum alignment to CCSS, including stated objectives for each learning goal.	Clear evidence of curriculum alignment to CCSS, including stated objectives for each learning goal.	Some evidence of curriculum alignment to CCSS, including stated objectives for some learning goals.	No evidence of alignment to CCSS.
Unit Cover Pages	Unit cover pages contain all of the following elements: Unit title, grade level(s), texts and materials, time frame, and brief summary of unit that includes curricular context, unit goals and performance tasks, and clear alignment to the CCSS.	Unit cover pages contain all of the following elements: Unit title, grade level(s), texts and materials, time frame, and brief summary of unit that includes curricular context, unit goals and performance tasks, and clear alignment to the CCSS. Most of	Unit Cover pages contain most of the following elements: Unit title, grade level(s), texts and materials, time frame, and brief summary of unit that includes curricular context, unit goals and performance tasks, and alignment to CCSS. Summary may lack some clarity or ramble somewhat.	No cover pages are included or cover pages lack many of the following elements: Unit title, grade level(s), texts and materials, time frame, and brief summary of unit that includes curricular context, unit goals and performance tasks, and CCSS

	Summary is concise and clearly written.	summary is concise and clearly written.		
Established Goals	Goals capture the essence of the learning experience. Goals promote understanding of the content, spark connections, and promote transfer of ideas. Goals provoke deep thought, lively discussion, sustained inquiry, and new understanding. Includes overarching, topical, open, and guiding goals.	Most goals capture the essence of the learning experience. Most goals promote understanding of the content, spark connections, and/or promote transfer of ideas. Most goals provoke deep thought, lively discussion, sustained inquiry, and/or new understanding. Includes overarching, topical, open, and guiding goals.	Some goals capture the essence of the learning experience. Some goals promote understanding of the content, spark connections, and/or promote transfer of ideas. Some goals provoke deep thought, lively discussion, sustained inquiry, and/or new understanding. Includes both overarching and topical goals and open and guiding goals.	Goals are vague and simplistic. Goals do not promote understanding of the content, spark connections, and/or promote transfer of ideas. Goals do not provoke deep thought, lively discussion, sustained inquiry, and/or new understanding. Does not include all of the following types of goals: topical, overarching, open, and guiding.
Enduring Understandings	Clearly written understandings are stated as specific and useful generalizations; are transferable, big ideas; and summarize important strategic principles in skill areas. Includes both topical and overarching understandings. Reflect goals, established content standards, and curriculum expectations.	Most understandings are clearly written and stated as specific and useful generalizations; are transferable, big ideas; and summarize important strategic principles in skill areas. Includes both topical and overarching understandings. Reflect goals, established content standards, and curriculum expectations.	Some understandings are clearly written and stated as specific and useful generalizations; are transferable, big ideas; and summarize important strategic principles in skill areas. Includes both topical and overarching understandings. Reflect goals, established content standards, and curriculum expectations.	Understandings lack clarity and are narrowly focused and non-transferable. Skill area understandings are not strategic. Does not include both topical and overarching understandings. Do not reflect goals, established content standards or curriculum expectations.
Student Learning (Key Knowledge and Skills)	Clear statements of knowledge and skills to be gained. Key enabling knowledge and skills are included. Knowledge and skills are linked to goals and understandings.	Clear statements of knowledge and skills to be gained. Key enabling knowledge and skills are included. Most are linked to goals and understandings.	Statements of knowledge and skills to be gained may lack clarity. Some enabling knowledge and skills are included. Some are linked to goals and understandings.	Statements of knowledge and/or skills are missing. Enabling knowledge and skills not included. Knowledge and skills not linked to goals and understandings.
Assessments (IRA 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)	Includes individual and group assessments with a range of assessment strategies, including technology-based assessment tools. Articulates rationale for inclusion of	Includes individual and group assessment with a range of assessment strategies, including technology-based assessment tools. Articulates rationale for inclusion of	Includes individual and group assessment with a range of assessment strategies. Articulates rationale for inclusion of assessments, including how the assessments link to the goals and understandings. plan.	No assessment plan. Assessment plan includes only one assessment strategy. Rational for inclusion is missing and no link to goals and understandings are evident. Assessments

	<p>assessments, including how the assessments link to the goals and understandings, and how assessments make up an effective assessment plan. Includes detailed description of performance tasks and other evidence (e.g., tests, quizzes, prompts, work samples, observations), student self-assessment, and clear evaluation criteria. Assessments provide opportunity for students to explain, interpret, apply, see in perspective, demonstrate empathy, and reveal self-knowledge. Assessments are valid, reliable, and sufficient.</p>	<p>assessments, including how the assessments link to the goals and understandings, and how assessments make up an effective assessment plan. Includes most of the following: detailed description of performance tasks and other evidence (e.g., tests, quizzes, prompts, work samples, observations), student self-assessment, and clear evaluation criteria. Assessments provide opportunity for students to do most of the following: explain, interpret, apply, see in perspective, demonstrate empathy, and reveal self-knowledge. Assessments are valid, reliable, and sufficient.</p>	<p>Includes some of the following: detailed description of performance tasks and other evidence (e.g., tests, quizzes, prompts, work samples, observations), student self-assessment, and clear evaluation criteria. Assessments provide opportunity for students to do some of the following: explain, interpret, apply, see in perspective, demonstrate empathy, and reveal self-knowledge. Assessments are mostly valid, reliable, and sufficient.</p>	<p>provide no opportunity for students explain, interpret, apply, see in perspective, demonstrate empathy, and reveal self-knowledge. Assessments are invalid, unreliable, and/or insufficient.</p>
<p>Learning Experiences (IRA 2.1, 2.2)</p>	<p>Includes a range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices, for learners at differing stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Provides strong evidence-based rationales for selecting appropriate options. Learning experiences allow students to engage with, develop and demonstrate desired understanding.</p>	<p>Includes a range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices, for learners at differing stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Provides evidence-based rationales for selecting appropriate options. Most learning experiences allow students to engage with, develop and demonstrate desired understanding. Learning experiences</p>	<p>Includes some instructional practices, approaches, and methods for learners at differing stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Provides rationales for selecting options. Some learning experiences allow students to engage with, develop and demonstrate desired understanding. Learning experiences are included that provide for some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that students understand the goals and why • hook and hold the students' attention 	<p>Learning experiences are geared to only one level of reading and writing development and reflect no cultural or linguistic diversity. Rationales are not provided or are sketchy. Learning experiences are missing or do not allow students to engage with, develop or demonstrate understanding. Organization is ineffective. Timetables are missing or incomplete.</p>

	<p>Learning experiences are included that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that students understand the goals and why • hook and hold the students' attention • provide necessary tools and knowledge to meet performance goals • provide opportunities to rethink, reflect, and revise • provide opportunities for progress monitoring • provide diverse experiences <p>Learning experiences are organized for optimal effectiveness. A detailed timetable for completion of each unit is included.</p>	<p>are included that provide for most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that students understand the goals and why • hook and hold the students' attention • provide necessary tools and knowledge to meet performance goals • provide opportunities to rethink, reflect, and revise • provide opportunities for progress monitoring • provide diverse experiences <p>Learning experiences are organized for effectiveness. A detailed timetable for completion of each unit is included.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide necessary tools and knowledge to meet performance goals • provide opportunities to rethink, reflect, and revise • provide opportunities for progress monitoring • provide diverse experiences <p>Organization of learning experiences may not always be effective. A timetable for completion of each unit is included, but may lack detail.</p>	
<p>Instructional Materials (IRA 2.3, 4.2)</p>	<p>Includes a range of instructional materials for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Provides strong evidence-based rationales for selecting appropriate options. Includes materials that represent multiple levels, broad interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>Includes a range of instructional materials for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Provides evidence-based rationales for selecting appropriate options. Includes materials that represent multiple levels, broad interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>Includes some instructional materials for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural or linguistic backgrounds. Provides rationales for selecting options. Includes some materials that represent multiple levels, broad interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>Instructional materials are geared to only one level of reading and writing development and reflect no cultural or linguistic diversity. Rationales are not provided or are sketchy.</p>

**Rubric for Writing an Action Research Project in Literacy Area
READ 8340 Research in Language and Literacy**

Component	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory/Basic	Unsatisfactory
Introduction, (IRA 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1)	Well-written introduction that engages the reader’s mind, presents relevant background that indicates an excellent understanding of the research topic, sets the stage for the problem.	Well-written introduction that presents relevant background that indicates a solid understanding of the research topic and sets the stage for the problem.	Satisfactory introduction that presents adequate background that indicates a good understanding of the topic and sets the stage for the problem.	Poorly written introduction that presents limited background that indicates an unsatisfactory understanding of the research topic.
Statement of the Problem (IRA 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1)	Problem is clearly articulated and addresses a significant issue in literacy education. There is compelling evidence to support the significance of the problem.	Problem addresses a significant issue in literacy education. There is adequate evidence to support the significance of the problem. Problem is contemporary, relative, and relates to best practices in literacy.	Problem addresses an issue in literacy education, but lacks adequate evidence to support the significance of the problem. Problem is contemporary, relative, and relates to best practices in literacy.	Problem is not relevant or contemporary, and is not related to best practices in literacy. No evidence to support the significance of the problem.
Purpose of the Study (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 5.1)	The purpose of the study is clearly articulated and relevant to the research problem. The introduction, statement of the problem, and purpose of the study are expertly crafted in a seamless manner that leads directly into the Literature Review.	The purpose of the study is clearly articulated and relevant to the problem. The introduction, statement of the problem, and purpose of the study are well written and lead directly into the Literature Review.	The purpose is adequately stated and somewhat relevant to the problem. The introduction, statement of the problem, and purpose of the study are somewhat aligned and provide an adequate lead-in for the Literature Review.	The purpose is poorly stated and does not relate to the problem. There is no alignment between the introduction, statement of the problem, and the purpose of the study.
Literature Review (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)	Literature review is comprehensive and indicates deep understanding of complex theories in literacy education. Literature provides excellent background for answering the research questions.	Literature review is adequate, including articles and texts relevant to the problem. Provides adequate background for answering the research questions.	Literature review is satisfactory, including articles and texts relevant to the problem, although this is limited in scope. Provides satisfactory background for answering the research questions, but does not go beyond basic level.	Literature review is too limited to answer the research questions. Poorly written and totally inadequate.
Action Research Questions (IRA 1.1, 1.3, 1.4)	Research questions are clear and concise and address the literacy problem. Questions can be answered based on the available data.	Research questions are clear and address the literacy problem. Questions can be answered based on the available data.	Research questions address the literacy problem, but they are somewhat vague, needing some clarification as to how they can be answered with the available data.	Research questions are totally inappropriate for the study. They do not address a literacy program.

Method (IRA 1.1, 1.4, 2.1)	Elaborated description of action research, including excellent rationale for why this type of research is most appropriate for your research questions.	Adequate description of action research, including good rationale for why this type of research is most appropriate for research questions.	Basic description of action research, although explanation of rationale is limited or missing.	No description of method.
Subject and Setting (IRA 1.1, 1.3, 1.4)	A thorough description of the subject(s) and your relationship to the study; describes how the study is positioned within an educational context.	An adequate description of the subject(s) and your relationship in the study; describes how the study is positioned within an educational context.	A limited description of the subject(s) and your relationship in the study; provides little or no background on how the study is positioned within an educational context.	Does not provide information on the subject(s) and setting.
Data Collection and Analysis (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2)	A comprehensive, well sequenced, and logical data plan with a timeline for data collection and analysis is included. Analysis clearly relates to the research questions.	A sequenced and logical data plan with a timeline for data collection and analysis is included. Analysis is somewhat sketchy and lacking in specificity. Analysis is related to the research questions.	A data plan is included, although it is sketchy, lacking specificity for how the data were analyzed. Analysis is at basic level with simple interpretations of data. Analysis relates to the research questions,	No evidence of a data plan. Description of analysis is limited.
Results (IRA 3.1)	The findings are based on a comprehensive analysis of the data. They are stated in a clear and concise manner, and present big important ideas in literacy learning.	The findings are based on an accurate interpretation of the data. They are stated in a clear manner.	The findings are based on a basic interpretation of the data, and a satisfactory attempt is made to describe the findings.	The findings are not stated, or, if so, they are inaccurate or unsupported by the data.
Summary and Conclusions (IRA 5.3)	Summary is thorough and well written; conclusions are accurate and clearly linked to the problem and provide relevant and significant information for improving literacy instruction.	Summary is well written; conclusions are based on an adequate interpretation of the data and provide important information for improving literacy instruction.	Summary includes basic information; conclusions are based on a basic interpretation of the data with some implications for improving literacy instruction.	Conclusions are unrelated, inaccurate, or overstated. Implications are missing, inaccurate or insufficient.
Future Actions and Directions	An excellent explanation of future research opportunities and directions for carrying these out in action research	An adequate explanation on future research opportunities and directions for carrying these out in action research	A basic explanation on future research opportunities and directions for carrying these out in action research	Does not include this section.
Reflections (IRA 5.3)	A deep reflective analysis of the action research project and its implications for improving practice.	An adequate reflection of the action research project and its implications for improving practice.	A basic reflection of the action research project with limited attention on how you will use this information for improving practice.	Does not include this section.

References	A minimum of 20 references that support the problem.	A minimum of 15 references that support the problem.	A minimum of 10 references that support the problem.	Less than 10 references.
Graphics	At least three well-designed graphics (figures, charts, illustrations) are included.	At least two well-designed graphics are included.	At least one well-designed graphic is included.	No graphics are included, or poorly constructed graphics are included that do not relate to the study.
Abstract	The abstract is a well-written synthesis of the action research, including clear and concise descriptions of data analysis, significant findings, conclusions, and implications. Easy to read and well written.	Paragraph that includes a summary of the study, with most of the important information included. Writing is adequate and concise.	Paragraph that includes a description of the study. Writing is satisfactory, although it should be more concise in representing the study.	Abstract is not included.
Format of Study	Paper is exceptionally organized according to rubric guidelines and APA formatting. All research sections are included. Paper has appropriate headings and subheadings for clarifying and organizing big ideas. No errors of spelling, typing, grammar, format, or sequencing.	Paper is adequately organized according to rubric guidelines and APA formatting. All research sections are included. Paper has appropriate headings for clarifying major sections. Fewer than 3 errors of spelling, typing, grammar, format, sequencing.	Paper is organized according to the rubric guidelines with all sections included, although some sections may be limited in detail. Fewer than five errors of spelling, typing, grammar, format, or sequencing.	Paper does not follow rubric guidelines. It is poorly written and has too many errors.

**Portfolio Rubric for Preparing Reading Educators
READ 8342 Theory and Research in Reading Comprehension**

Component	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory/Basic	Unsatisfactory
Portfolio Format: Table of Contents with sections that align with the International Reading Association (IRA) Standards (Revised 2010) for Preparing Reading Educators. Opening section includes a self-assessment of the overall contents of the portfolio with recommendations for self-improvement in needed areas.	Portfolio includes a cover page, self-reflection, and Table of Contents with supporting evidence in all sections that indicates deep understanding of the concepts. The self-reflection is a comprehensive and critical analysis of the portfolio contents. There are no grammatical or spelling errors.	Portfolio includes a cover page, self-reflection, and Table of Contents with supporting evidence in all sections that indicates partial or good understanding of most concepts. The self-reflection is a summary of the portfolio contents, but lacks detail and depth. There are no more than 3 grammatical or spelling errors.	Portfolio includes a cover page, self-reflection, and Table of Contents with supporting evidence in all sections that indicates partial or good understanding of most concepts. The self-reflection is a summary of the portfolio contents, but lacks detail and depth. There are no more than 4 grammatical or spelling errors.	Portfolio is limited in content and depth. There are more than 5 grammatical or spelling errors

<p>Section 1: Analyze and interpret theories and research of reading and writing processes, explain the role in an evolving knowledge base, and align each theory/research with specific IRA standards for preparing reading professionals (1.1, 12, 6.2). Written reviews are used to guide the oral discussions around key issues from the readings.</p>	<p>A concise, scholarly set of reviews that indicate an exceptional understanding of key concepts and implications for preparing reading educators. All reviews are completed on time and are clearly used to support your contributions to the group discussion. There are no grammatical, spelling, or APA errors in the total set of reviews.</p>	<p>A well written set of reviews that indicate a proficient understanding of key concepts and implications for preparing reading educators. All reviews are completed on time and are often used to support your contributions to the group discussion. There are less than 2 errors (grammar, spelling, or APA) in the total set of reviews.</p>	<p>A complete set of reviews, although some reviews are not as well written as others. Most reviews are completed on time, and there is sufficient evidence to show that the reviews are frequently used to support your contributions to the group discussion. There are no more than 4 errors (grammar, spelling, or APA) in the total set of reviews.</p>	<p>Reviews are incomplete, late, or poorly written. There is little evidence that the reviews are used to support your contributions to the group discussion. The reviews have more than 5 errors (grammar, spelling, or APA) in the submitted set.</p>
<p>Section 2: Create a graduate level reading course for preparing reading teachers to teach struggling readers (IRA 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.3, 5.3, 5.4). The course should include description, IRA standards and elements, required readings, supplemental materials, specific activities, assessment methods, assignment grid, a PowerPoint presentation, and a demonstration lesson of your teaching a class of teachers. Include clear evidence of incorporating technology in the course (IRA 5.3)</p>	<p>A well-designed reading course that includes all required components and indicates an exceptional understanding of key principles for preparing reading educators, including the expert use of technology for sharing and enhancing knowledge. All readings, activities, assessments, and methods are clearly aligned with the IRA standards and elements. The PowerPoint activity shows evidence of expert planning, with opportunities for teacher engagement. Your teaching demonstration incorporates a variety of effective</p>	<p>A well-designed reading course that includes all required components and indicates a proficient understanding of key principles for preparing reading educators, including some use of technology for sharing and enhancing knowledge. Most activities, readings, assessments, and methods are aligned with the IRA standards. The PowerPoint activity shows evidence of good planning, including opportunities for teacher engagement. Your teaching demonstration shows your ability to apply at least two effective techniques to engage and scaffold teachers.</p>	<p>A reading course that includes all required components, although some components are not as well developed as others. The inconsistency among components indicates a basic understanding of key principles for preparing reading educators. The use of technology is missing or inadequate. Some of the activities, readings, and methods are aligned to the IRA standards, but others are not. The PowerPoint activity shows evidence of good planning, including opportunities for teacher engagement. Your teaching demonstration shows your ability to engage teachers in learning with at least one effective technique.</p>	<p>The course is incomplete or poorly development and indicates an overall lack of understanding for preparing reading educators.</p>

	techniques for engaging and scaffolding teachers in active learning.			
Section 3: A reflective analysis of your teaching demonstration to reading educators based on one activity from the course you prepared in Section 2. The demonstration should be uploaded to Vimeo, including supplemental materials, and classmates will engage in constructive dialogue about the lesson (IRA 5.3, 6.1)	A critical analysis of your teaching, including specific ways to improve (or expand upon) the lesson; lesson shows evidence of careful planning and alignment to IRA standards. Active and constructive participation in video analysis of lesson.	A proficient analysis of your teaching, including ways to improve (or expand upon) the lesson; lesson shows evidence of very good planning and alignment to IRA standards. Active participation in video analysis of lesson.	A good analysis of your teaching, including how to improve the lesson; lesson shows evidence of good planning and alignment to IRA standards. Some participation in video analysis of lesson.	Poor or limited analysis of your teaching; poor planning for lesson; limited or no participation in video analysis.
Section 4: Demonstrate knowledge of technology for online teaching; collaborate with other reading professionals through video analysis, and select good examples of video lessons from the Internet for utilizing in preparing reading educators (IRA 5.3, 6.1).	An excellent collection of video lessons (minimum of 20) from the Internet (e.g., Teaching Channel, Anneberg, YouTube, etc.) that align with the IRA standards for preparing reading educators. Active online participation in assessing the quality of the videos for reading preparation. (Videos should be uploaded to YouTube and/or PBWorks for group analysis).	A proficient collection of video lessons (minimum of 15) from the Internet (e.g., Teaching Channel, Anneberg, YouTube, etc.) that align with the IRA standards for preparing reading educators. Active online participation in assessing the quality of the videos for reading preparation. (Videos should be uploaded to YouTube or PBWorks for group analysis).	A good collection of video lessons (minimum of 10) from the Internet (e.g., Teaching Channel, Anneberg, YouTube, etc.) that align with IRA standards for preparing reading educators. Good online participation in reviewing the quality of the videos for reading preparation. (Videos should be uploaded to YouTube or PBWorks for group analysis).	A collection of less than 10 video lessons; some are not appropriate for aligning with the IRA standards; quality indicates limited time spent on searching for good teaching videos; poor or limited engagement with classmates on video analysis.