

April 2013



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

**READING
MASTER OF EDUCATION IN READING**

**ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
SUBMITTED APRIL, 2012**

**FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD
JUNE 2010 – JULY 2011**

**FOR QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS REPORT, PLEASE EMAIL THE
COE ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR,
DR. BRUCE SMITH, COE ASSOCIATE DEAN
BDSMITH@UALR.EDU**

April 2013

**Program Report for the
Preparation of Reading Education Professionals
International Reading Association (IRA)**

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

C O V E R S H E E T

Institution University of Arkansas – Little Rock **State** Arkansas

Date submitted 3/14/08

Name of Preparer Sheri Tucker and Kent Layton

Phone # 501-569-8933 **Email** sjtucker@ualr.edu

Program documented in this report:

Name of institution's program (s) Master of Education in Reading

Grade levels for which candidates are being prepared P-8 and/or 7-12

Degree or award level Master's Degree

Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes X No

If yes, list the sites at which the program is offered?

Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared

Reading Specialist P-8 and/or 7-12

Program report status:

- Initial Review**
- Response to a Not Recognized Decision**
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions**
- Response to a Deferred Decision**

State licensure requirement for national recognition:

NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section III. Does your state require such a test?

Yes **No**

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

To complete a program report, institutions must provide evidence of meeting IRA standards based on data from 6-8 assessments. In their entirety, the assessments and data required for submission in this report will answer the following questions:

- Have candidates mastered the necessary knowledge for the subjects they will teach or the jobs they will perform?
- Do candidates meet state licensure requirements?
- Do candidates understand teaching and learning and can they plan their teaching or fulfill other professional education responsibilities?
- Can candidates apply their knowledge in classrooms and schools?
- Do candidates focus on student learning?

To that end, the program report form includes the following sections:

Section I. Context (*6-page maximum narrative, plus three attachments not to exceed 5 pages each*)
Provide general information on the program as specified by the directions for this section.

Section II. List of Assessments (*completion of chart*)

Using the chart included in this report form, indicate the name, type, and administration point for each of the 6-8 assessments documented in this report. (Note that Section IV of the report form lists examples of assessments that may be appropriate for each type of assessment that must be documented in the program report.)

Section III. Relationship of Assessments to Standards (*completion of chart*)

Using the chart included in this report form, indicate which of the assessments listed in Section II provide evidence of meeting specific program standards.

Section IV. Evidence for Meeting Standards (*attachments of the assessment, scoring guide/criteria, and data tables plus a 2-page maximum narrative for each of the 6-8 assessments*)

Attach assessment documentation plus a narrative statement for each assessment as specified by the directions for this section.

Section V. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance (*3-page maximum narrative*)

Describe how faculty are using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and student learning.

Section VI. For Revised Reports Only

Describe what changes or additions have been made in the report to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4>.

Format and page limits for narrative sections and attachments:

Narrative: Sections I, IV, and V include narrative sections based on specific directions and page limits. Page limits are based on single-spaced text using 12-point type.

Attachments: Sections I and IV include attachments. In general, attachments should be no longer than the equivalent of five text pages.

April 2013

→ NCATE staff may require institutions to revise reports that do not follow directions on format and page limits. In addition, hyperlinks imbedded in report documentation will not be read by reviewers and cannot be used as a means of providing additional information.

Program report information on the web: <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=10>.

To download report forms: <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/programStandards.asp?ch=4>.

Specific Instructions for IRA

Who Should Submit Program Reports:

- Graduate reading and/or literacy programs that lead to a Master's degree. Programs must have a minimum of 24 credit hours in reading and/or literacy and include an additional minimum of six credit hours of supervised clinical practica experiences. Thus, Master's programs in reading and/or literacy must have a minimum of 30 credit hours.
- Graduate programs that lead to a reading endorsement. Programs must have a minimum of 24 credits in reading and/or literacy and include and an additional minimum of six credits of supervised clinical practica experiences. Thus, graduate programs that lead to a reading endorsement must have a minimum of 30 credit hours.

IRA National Recognition Decision Rules:

In order to gain national recognition, programs must meet all five standards and at least 15 of the 19 elements with not more than one element in any standard being unmet. Not all components within an element need to be addressed to meet the element.

Additional Assessment Types (beyond the first 5 required types) required by IRA:

None. It is up to the institution to decide if it wants to submit 1-2 optional assessments to demonstrate how standards and elements are being met.

Other specific information required by IRA only:

In Section 1, Attachment A (Course of Study) institutions must provide documentation that the program includes:

- A minimum of 24 graduate level credit hours in reading/literacy education
- An additional six credit hours of supervised clinical practica experiences.

Will IRA accept grades as one of the assessments?

Grades should not be used as an assessment unless it can be clearly demonstrated how the grades are directly based on the IRA Standards.

Programs must address the 2003 standards and elements at the reading specialist/literacy coach level. These standards and elements are delineated in the IRA publication *Standards for Reading Professionals: Revised 2003* that is available for purchase at www.reading.org.

Other resources, including models of assessments and scoring guides, are available on the IRA web site at <http://www.reading.org/resources/community/ncate.html>

SECTION I—CONTEXT
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Master of Education in Reading
Reading Specialist Program Report

Provide the following contextual information:

- 1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of IRA standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)**

The Master of Education in Reading at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock is designed for candidates who possess a teaching license and wish to obtain specialized expertise in literacy instruction and literacy coaching. The Arkansas Department of Education specifies the following when adding reading specialist licensure to an existing teaching license:

4.00 REQUIREMENTS FOR ADDING AN AREA OF LICENSURE OR ENDORSEMENT

- 4.01 Teachers/administrators shall have a valid Arkansas initial or standard content area license or provisional licensure through reciprocity in order to add an area of licensure or endorsement.**
- 4.02 Teachers adding an additional licensure/endorsement area(s) to their Arkansas teaching license by meeting the program of study requirements of an Arkansas college/university or when adding a licensure/endorsement area by reciprocity, shall meet the following requirements regarding degrees and coursework.**
- 4.02.1 The coursework/degree required for the area(s) that are being added shall have been completed through a college/university that holds regional/national accreditation that is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education or Council for Higher Education Accreditation.**
- AND**
- 4.02.2 All teacher education coursework shall have been completed through a college/university teacher education program that holds national accreditation that is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education or Council for Higher Education Accreditation.**
- 4.06 The Office of Professional Licensure shall add a licensure/endorsement area(s) to a valid Arkansas initial or standard teaching license upon receiving the following:**
- 4.06.1 An application requesting the licensure/endorsement area(s);**
- 4.06.2 Documentation that all program of study requirements (including Arkansas History when required); and**

4.06.3 Evidence that all State Board required assessments have been successfully completed. (Reading Specialist Praxis Test #0300 – minimum score of 560)

(http://www.arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade_254_add_licensure_061107_currenrent.pdf, retrieved July 29, 2007)

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)

The Master of Education in Reading Candidates have numerous opportunities for field and clinical experience throughout their program of study. These experiences take place in the candidates' own classrooms, colleagues' classrooms, and in an established summer literacy camp sponsored by the Teacher Education Department at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) and held in local elementary schools. Candidates are given opportunities to assess and teach P-12 students and assist paraprofessionals and teachers/colleagues. UALR faculty supervise the candidates who participate in the summer literacy camp. Candidates document field-based work through logs, video-tapes of teaching and of coaching colleagues, reflections of teaching and coaching sessions, completed observation rubrics, and live demonstration teaching.

Field experiences occur throughout the program of study. Candidates are required to complete two practicum courses / supervised clinical experiences as well as field components in other courses. The following table outlines and describes these experiences.

Evidence of Field Experiences

Required Courses Containing Field Experience	Description of the Field Experience
*READ 7351 Foundations of Teaching Reading	Candidates assess, teach, and document the reading and writing progress of 3 students in classrooms over a period of 8 weeks. A final paper charting the students' change over time in literacy achievement and the teacher's shift in instructional philosophy and methodology is prepared and submitted along with all assessment protocol and anecdotal notes.
*READ 7352 Diagnosis of Reading Difficulties I	Candidates select appropriate assessments to administer, and then score and analyze the results in order to develop a program of study for a struggling reader classroom in an after-school reading program at a local elementary school. This report of testing along with all assessment protocols and anecdotal notes are submitted.

Required Courses Containing Field Experience	Description of the Field Experience
*READ 7356 Practicum in Reading	Candidates work with a colleague to assess a small group of struggling readers using a survey of reading strategies and attitudes, running records and writing samples. Data are used to plan reading and writing lessons to meet the developmental needs of these students. The lessons are taught and videotaped. A discussion, collaborative summary, and personal reflection over the collaborative experience are prepared and submitted. Candidates present their videotapes, lesson rationale, and reflection during class sessions using a Power Point presentation.
*READ 7370 Advanced Practicum in Reading	Candidates assume the role of a literacy coach in order to assist a colleague with professional development in reading and/or writing assessment and instruction. Candidates complete 3 coaching cycles consisting of a pre-conference, teaching modeling/observation, and post-conference. Reflections, lesson plans, and observation rubrics are submitted.
Reading Recovery Field Experiences	
**READ 7342 Principles of Literacy and Cognition I	Candidates in training to become Reading Recovery Teachers assess and teach identified struggling readers on a daily basis according to the Reading Recovery intervention model. Candidates use specified assessments and anecdotal records to record progress and plan individualized instruction. Candidates work with individual students in a “behind the glass” setting while being observed by colleagues and a university supervisor. These teaching sessions are discussed and analyzed for effectiveness and to guide future instruction. Candidates submit assessments and lesson records weekly and are observed at their site twice per semester by a university supervisor.
**READ 7343 Principles of Literacy and Cognition II	Candidates in training to become Reading Recovery Teachers assess and teach identified struggling readers on a daily basis according to the Reading Recovery intervention model. Candidates use specified assessments and anecdotal records to record progress and plan individualized instruction. Candidates work with individual students in a “behind the glass” setting while being observed by colleagues and a university supervisor. These teaching sessions are discussed and analyzed for effectiveness and to guide future instruction. Candidates submit assessments and lesson records weekly and are observed at their site twice per semester by a university supervisor.

Required Courses Containing Field Experience	Description of the Field Experience
**READ 7345 Advanced Practicum in Intervention Models	Candidates study the Comprehensive Intervention Model (CIM) and implement the model in their respective schools. Candidates conduct team meetings to discuss and select appropriate services for students, conduct small group intervention lessons, use assessments to monitor students' progress, and collaborate with classroom teachers and teachers across intervention programs. Candidates submit reflections, logs of intervention team meetings, and assessment records outlining student progress. Candidates are supervised by Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders..
** READ 7365 Specialized Assessment in Early Literacy Instruction	Candidates teach two groups of struggling readers (K-3) for a minimum of 8 weeks in order to develop an Assessment Portfolio, including assessment protocols, anecdotal notes, an analysis of the students' performance, and recommendations for instruction to meet the needs of each student. In addition, candidates discuss the link between assessment and literacy instruction. Videotaped observations of reading groups, an in-depth analysis of writing samples, and a description of the link between the reading and writing processes are submitted.

* Required for Master of Education Degree in Reading

** Required for Reading Recovery Teachers in training – courses can be used toward electives in a Master of Education Degree in Reading

3. Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

Admission Requirements for Master's Degree in Reading:

- A valid initial or standard teaching license (Arkansas or other state)
- Favorable recommendation as the result of an interview with Reading Program Faculty
- Minimum of one year classroom teaching experience
- Current employment in a school setting
- **For Regular Admission:** Baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution, with a cumulative undergraduate GPA of at least 2.75 on a 4.0 scale – OR – A GPA of at least 3.0 for the last 60 hours of undergraduate

coursework – **OR** – A master’s degree from a regionally accredited institution with a cumulative GPA of at least 3.0.

- **For Conditional Admission:** Baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution, accredited institution, a cumulative GPA of no lower than a 2.5, and a GRE score of at least 370 on the Verbal Scale, 440 on the Quantitative Scale, and 4.5 on the Analytical Writing Scale – **OR** – Completion of at least 12 semester hours of graduate coursework in another UALR program or graduate program from another regionally accredited college or university with a cumulative GPA of 3.0 and no lower than a B.
- Upon admission to the Master of Reading Program and prior to the start of coursework, the student is required to meet with a member of the Reading Program Faculty in order to complete a program of study.

Retention Requirements for Master’s Degree in Reading:

Once admitted, students are required to maintain an overall GPA of 3.0, with at least a grade of B in all Reading Education (READ) courses. The student must have a 3.0 GPA in the initial 12 hours of READ courses in order to continue in the Master of Education in Reading Program. The student’s adviser will conduct a transcript evaluation after the completion of 12 hours of READ courses. Students will be notified of their status.

In addition, students’ professional behavior, content knowledge, classroom performance, and dispositions will be monitored throughout the program. Professional development conferences with Reading Department Faculty will be held if concerns in these areas are identified. Successful advancement in the program is not based solely on the number of course credits earned, but requires demonstration of specified professional knowledge, skills, behaviors, and dispositions.

Exit Requirements for Master’s Degree in Reading:

- Complete a minimum of 36 hours of program coursework with at least 21 hours in reading, including required classes.
- Earn a minimum GPA of 3.0 in coursework.
- Pass a comprehensive examination that covers program areas.
- Pass the Praxis II examination for Reading Specialist #0300 with a score of 560 or better.

4. Description of the relationship¹ of the program to the unit’s conceptual framework. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

The mission of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock College of Education is to promote and strengthen the professional development of individuals concerned with education and human resource development in a variety of settings such as schools, colleges and universities, private and corporate organizations, and government agencies. The college strives to develop professionals who use state- of-the-art methodologies and technologies.

The Conceptual Framework of the College of Education promotes Leadership in Learning through specialized expertise (SE), communication (C), diversity (D), and professional development (PD) in competency, disposition and behavior. This Conceptual Framework aligns with the Arkansas Department of Education’s Competencies for Reading Professionals.

The Master of Education in Reading Program outcomes reflect the alignment of the Standards for Reading Professionals as set forth by the International Reading Association as well as the College of Education’s Conceptual Framework and the Arkansas Department of Education’s Competencies for Reading Professionals. The following table demonstrates this alignment.

**Alignment of College Conceptual Framework,
Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) State Competencies,
and IRA Standards for Reading Professionals**

College Conceptual Framework	State Competencies	IRA Standards for Reading Professionals
<p style="text-align: center;">Specialized Expertise</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches, can create learning experiences that make aspects of the subject matter meaningful, and can link the discipline to other subjects. (ADE Standard 1) • The teacher plans curriculum to meet student needs, the content, and the course objectives. (ADE Standard 2) • The teacher plans instruction based on human growth, development, theory, and student needs. (ADE Standard 3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. (IRA Standard 1) • Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.. (IRA Standard 2) and Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society (IRA Standard 4) • Candidates use a variety of

¹ The response should describe the program’s conceptual framework and indicate how it reflects the unit’s conceptual framework

		<p>assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.. (IRA Standard 3) Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society (IRA standard 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments. (IRA Standard 5)
<p>Communication</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher exhibits human relations skills that support the development of human potential. (ADE Standard 4) • The teacher works collaboratively with colleagues, parents, and community to support students' learning and well being. (ADE Standard 5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society (IRA standard 4) • Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility. (IRA Standard 6)
<p>Diversity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher plans curriculum to meet student needs, the content, and the course objectives. (ADE Standard 2) • The teacher plans instruction based on human growth, development, theory, and student needs. (ADE Standard 3) • Teacher exhibits human relations skills that support the development of human potential. (ADE Standard 4) • The teacher works collaboratively with colleagues, parents, and community to support students' learning. (ADE Standard 5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. (IRA Standard 1) • Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.. (IRA Standard 2) and Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society (IRA Standard 4) • Candidates create and engage

		<p>their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society (IRA Standard 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility. (IRA Standard 6)
Professional Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher works collaboratively with colleagues, parents, and community to support students' learning. (ADE Standard 5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility. (IRA Standard 6)

5. Indication of whether the program has a unique set of program assessments and their relationship of the program’s assessments to the unit’s assessment system¹.(Response limited to 4,000 characters)

The College of Education requires all programs to have assessments in each of the four Transition Gates. This requirement aligns with NCATE standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation. The Transition Gates are as follows: 1) Entry Requirements, 2) After 12 Hours: Approval to Remain in the Program, 3) Specialized Coursework, and 4) Exit Requirements. The following table outlines the alignment of required unit assessments and specific program assessments.

UNIT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS	PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS
<p>Gate 1: Entry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA • Teaching License • Interview 	<p>Gate I: Entry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA • Teaching License • Interview
UNIT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS	PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS
<p>Gate 2: After 12 Hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA 	<p>Gate 2: After 12 Hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA of 3.0 or higher in reading coursework
<p>Gate 3: Specialized Coursework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theory Paper 	<p>Gate 3: Specialized Coursework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • READ 7351: Change Over Time Paper

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study • Research Theory Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • READ 7352: Report of Testing • READ 7357: Historical Perspectives Paper/Professional Development Presentation and Handout
<p>Gate 4: Exit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA Transcript • Portfolio/Comprehensive Exam/Thesis • Clinical Practice/Field Experience • State Exam 	<p>Gate 4: Exit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Transcript reflecting cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher • Comprehensive Exam • READ 7356 Case Study • READ 7370 Lit Coaching Case Study • PRAXIS II

Master of Education in Reading Candidates upload required Gate assessments and data into Chalk and Wire, an electronic data management and student portfolio system, for faculty review and evaluation. Reports are generated through Chalk and Wire in order to inform program decision-making.

In addition, all graduates of the College of Education are asked to evaluate their educational experience through an online survey upon graduation. Master of Education in Reading candidates and graduates are also invited and encouraged to attend the annual stakeholders' meeting. Data collected via the survey and stakeholders' meeting are used to inform program decision-making.

**6. Please attach files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles.
(This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)**

Master of Education in Reading Program of Study: 36 Hours

Required Core Courses (15 credit hours)

***Optional Course for Reading Recovery Candidates**

****Requirements for Reading Recovery Candidates**

Course Offered	Course Selection	Semester Taken
Spring	Curriculum: READ 7327 Contemporary Curriculum Design 3 hours _____	
Fall, Spring	Instructional Technology: LSTE 7305 Micro Applications 3 hours _____	
Summer	OR TCED 5300 Computers and the Internet in the Classroom 3 hours _____	
Spring	Assessment: READ 7352 Diagnosis of Reading Difficulties I 3 hours _____	
Fall, Spring, Summer	Research: EDFN 7303 Introduction to Research 3 hours _____	
Fall, Spring	Learning Theory: READ 7351 Foundation of Teaching Reading 3 hours _____	

Required Courses: Reading Emphasis (12 hours)

Course Offered	Course Selection	Semester Taken
Summer	Practicum: READ 7356 Practicum in Reading 3 hours _____	
Fall	AND READ 7370 Advanced Practicum in Reading 3 hours _____	
Summer	Reading Research and Practice READ 7397 Creating Literate Environments 3 hours _____	
Spring	AND READ 7357 Seminar in Reading 3 hours _____	

April 2013

Elective Courses: Reading Emphasis (9 hours)

Course Offered	Course Selection		Semester Taken
Spring	READ 7307 Reading Workshop	3 hours _____	
Fall	READ 7321 Processes and Strategies in Reading Comprehension	3 hours _____	
Summer	READ 7326 Creating a Literate Environment for Older Students	3 hours _____	
Fall	READ 7330 Children's Literature Across the Curriculum	3 hours _____	
Spring	READ 7340 Best Practices in Literacy Instruction	3 hours _____	
Fall	**READ 7342 Principles of Literacy and Cognition I	3 hours _____	
Spring	**READ 7343 Principles of Literacy and Cognition II	3 hours _____	
Fall	**READ 7344 Intervention Designs for Struggling Learners	3 hours _____	
Spring	READ 7345 Advanced Practicum in Intervention Models	3 hours _____	
Spring	READ 7352 Diagnosis of Reading Difficulties I (if not taken for core)	3 hours _____	
Fall	READ 7354 Content Area Reading	3 hours _____	
Summer	READ 7361 Language and Reading Instruction	3 hours _____	
Summer	READ 7365 Specialized Assessment in Early Literacy (if not taken for core)	3 hours _____	
Spring	READ 7393 Special Topics in Reading (ELLA)	3 hours _____	
Fall, Spring, Summer	READ 7107 Workshop in Reading	1 hour _____	
Fall, Spring, Summer	READ 7207 Workshop in Reading Topics	2 hours _____	
Fall, Spring, Summer	TCED 5300 Workshop in Reading Topics	3 hours _____	

8. Candidate Information. Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary

The table below gives the number of Candidates enrolled in the Master of Education in Reading and the number of Program Completers.

Program: Master of Education in Reading		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers²
7/09 – 6/10	40	11
7/10 – 6/11	10	10
7/11 – 6/12	8	5

² NCATE uses the Title II definition for *program completers*. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

Information. Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for instruction, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

FACULTY EXPERTISE AND EXPERIENCE

Highest Degree, Field, & University	Assignment- Indicate the role of the faculty member	Faculty Rank	Tenure Track (Yes/No)	Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service: List up to 3 major contributions in the last 3 years	Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools
<p>Ph.D. Curriculum and Instruction Graduate: Literacy Missouri State University Ph.D. Doctorate-Law University of Kansas-Lawrence Lawrenceville</p>	<p>Coordinator of Master of Education in Reading Program</p>	<p>Assistant Professor</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>IRA NE Children’s Choice Committee Team Member 2009-2010; Co-Chair Children’s Choice Committee 2010-2013;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IRA SPA Reviewer 2009-present LRA ASCD 	<p>High School Language Arts Teacher Grades 9, 10,12 St. Louis, MO Middle School Reading Specialist – St. Louis, MO Literacy Coach – St. Louis MO Licenses: MO Language Arts 6-12; Reading K-12</p>
<p>Ph.D. Reading Education University of Georgia</p>	<p>Graduate Faculty</p>	<p>Associate Professor</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Layton, K. & Cooper, L. (2009). University System of Georgia African-American Male Initiative Program. A \$29,262 matching grant awarded by the University System of Georgia Board of Regents to the College of Coastal Georgia to support the Boys of Summer Minority Outreach Program.</p> <p>O’Sullivan, S., Boggs, M., Bedwell,</p>	<p>Summer Enrichment ESOL Instructor Grades K-3 Springfield, MO</p> <p>Remedial Reading and Math Teacher Grades 7-8 Willard, MO</p>

				<p><i>Starting from scratch: Telling stories of the founding of brand new teacher education units.</i> Symposium presented at the 63rd American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Annual Conference, San Diego, CA.</p> <p>Grant Reviewer, Georgia's Improving Teacher Quality Grants Program, University of Georgia/University System of Georgia, 2011</p>	<p>Classroom Teacher Grade 5 Springfield, MO</p> <p>Professional Development School Faculty Liaison Fox Meadow Elementary School, Jonesboro AR</p> <p>Member, First District RESA Brooklet, GA [as Dean of School of Education and Teacher Preparation at the College of Coastal Georgia]</p> <p>Licenses: MO Lifetime K-6, Reading K-12, Math 7-8</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

SECTION II— LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the IRA standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

	Name of Assessment³	Type or Form of Assessment⁴	When the Assessment Is Administered⁵
1	[Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment] Praxis II Reading Specialist Exam	Standardized test required for state reading licensure	End of program prior to graduation
2	[Assessment of content knowledge in reading education] Comprehensive Exam – Take Home Question: Philosophy of Instruction	Paper	End of program prior to graduation
3	[Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction] Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection	Clinical Case Study	READ 7356 (Required Course) Middle of program
4	[Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience] Coaching Case Study	Clinical Case Study	READ 7370 (Required Course) Middle of program
5	[Assessment of candidate effect on student learning] Change Over Time Paper	Case Study	READ 7351 (Required Course) Beginning of program

³ Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

⁴ Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

⁵ Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

	Name of Assessment³	Type or Form of Assessment⁴	When the Assessment Is Administered⁵
6	Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (<i>required</i>)] Professional Development in Literacy Instruction	Research Paper and Professional Development Seminar Presentation	READ 7397 (Required Course) Middle of program
7	Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (<i>optional</i>)] Report of Testing	Comprehensive Report of Testing	READ 7352 (Required Course) Beginning of program
8	Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (<i>optional</i>)] Historical Perspectives Paper	Research Paper and Professional Development Seminar Presentation	READ 7357 (Required Course) End of program

SECTION III—RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

For each IRA standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple IRA standards.

IRA STANDARDS 2010	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
1. Foundational Knowledge. Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.	
1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections.	X 1 X 2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 X 8
1.2 : Understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components.	X 1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 X 8
1.3 : Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students’ reading development and achievement.	X 1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 X 6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 X 8
Standard 2: Curriculum and Instruction Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.	
2.1 2.1: Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum. ¹	X 1 X 2 X #3 X 4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 X 6 <input type="checkbox"/> #7 <input type="checkbox"/> #8
2.2 2.2: Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections. ²	X 1 X 2 X #3 X 4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 X 6 X 7 <input type="checkbox"/> #8

IRA STANDARDS 2010	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
2.3: Use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.	X 1 X 2 X #3 X 4 □#5 X 6 □#7 □#8
Standard 3: Assessment and Evaluation Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.	
3.1 Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.	X 1 □#2 X 3 X 4 X 5 □#6 X 7 □#8
3.2: Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes. ¹	X 1 □#2 X 3 X 4 X 5 □#6 X 7 □#8
3.3: Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.	□ 1 □#2 X 3 X 4 X 5 □#6 X 7 □#8
3.4: Communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences.	X 1 □#2 X 3 X 4 X 5 □#6 X 7 □#8
Standard 4: Diversity Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.	
4.1 Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. ¹	X#1 X2 X#3 □#4 □#5 □#6 □#7 □#8
4.2: Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.	X#1 X#2 □#3 □#4 □#5 □#6 □#7 □#8
4.3: Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity.	X#1 X#2 □#3 □#4 □#5 □#6 □#7 □#8

<p>Standard 5: Literate Environment Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.</p>	
<p>5.1: Articulate the theories related to the connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>#1 <input type="checkbox"/>#2 <input type="checkbox"/>#3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6 <input type="checkbox"/>#7 <input type="checkbox"/>#8</p>
<p>5.2: Design a social environment that is low-risk, includes choice, motivation, and scaffold support to optimize students’ opportunities for learning to read and write.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>#1 <input type="checkbox"/>#2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6 <input type="checkbox"/>#7 <input type="checkbox"/>#8</p>
<p>5.3: Use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another; discussion, and peer feedback).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>#1 <input type="checkbox"/>#2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6 <input type="checkbox"/>#7 <input type="checkbox"/>#8</p>
<p>5.4 Use a variety of classroom configurations (i.e. whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>#1 <input type="checkbox"/>#2 <input type="checkbox"/>#3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6 <input type="checkbox"/>#7 <input type="checkbox"/>#8</p>
<p>Standard 6: Professional Learning and Leadership Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility.</p>	
<p>6.1: Demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning theories and related research about organizational change, professional development, and school culture.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>#1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#2 <input type="checkbox"/>#3 <input type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6 <input type="checkbox"/>#7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#8</p>
<p>6.2: Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. ³</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>#1 <input type="checkbox"/>#2 <input type="checkbox"/>#3 <input type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6 <input type="checkbox"/>#7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#8</p>
<p>6.3: Participate in, design, facilitate, lead, and evaluate effective and differentiated professional development programs.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>#1 <input type="checkbox"/>#2 <input type="checkbox"/>#3 <input type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6 <input type="checkbox"/>#7 <input type="checkbox"/>#8</p>
<p>6.4: Understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>#1 <input type="checkbox"/>#2 <input type="checkbox"/>#3 <input type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6 <input type="checkbox"/>#7 <input type="checkbox"/>#8</p>

SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

#1 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Data from licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge. IRA standards addressed in this entry could include all of the standards. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 1. Praxis II Reading Specialist Exam #0300

Description. The Praxis II Reading Specialist Test consists of 120 multiple-choice questions that assess a Candidate’s knowledge of relevant facts and the ability to analyze problems and apply principles to reading literacy instruction. The test content covers the theoretical and knowledge bases of reading, the application of theoretical and knowledge bases of reading, the application of theoretical and knowledge bases of reading in instruction, the application of theoretical and knowledge bases of reading in diagnosis and assessment, and reading leadership. As much as possible, the test questions involve the evaluation and application of ideas and practices to reading literacy instruction, as opposed to the recall of factual material. The Arkansas Department of Education requires Candidates to take this test and pass with a minimum score of 560 in order to receive reading licensure. This is a graduation requirement for the Master of Education in Reading as well.

Alignment. The Praxis II Reading Specialist Exam addresses the following standards and accompanying elements:

Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge

- Candidates will...
 - demonstrate knowledge of major theories and empirical research in the foundational areas as they relate to reading. **(1.1)**
 - recount the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time demonstrate an understanding of the theories of **(1.2)**
 - explain professional judgment and knowledge in the teaching reading. **(1.3)**

Standard 2: Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials

- Candidates will...
 - demonstrate foundational knowledge to implement a balanced literacy curriculum**(2.1)**
 - demonstrate knowledge of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches and methods, including technology-based practices. **(2.2)**
 - demonstrate knowledge of a wide range of texts in order to meet the needs of all students. **(2.3)**

Standard 3: Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation

- Candidates will...
 - demonstrate knowledge of a wide range of assessment tools used for a specific purpose in assessing reading difficulties **(3.1)**
 - demonstrate knowledge of how to select assessments for a specific purpose. **(3.2)**
 - demonstrate knowledge of how to use assessment information to plan instruction **(3.3)**
 - explain how to inform a variety of audiences of assessment results **(3.4).**

Standard 4 Diversity

- Candidates will...
 - explain how to value the forms of diversity and their importance in learning how to read and write **(4.1)**
 - explain how to develop a literacy curriculum that positively impacts students knowledge of diversity **(4.2)**
 - demonstrate a knowledge of developing and implementing strategies to advocate for equity **(4.3)**

Standard 5 Creating a Literate Environment

- Candidates will...
 - demonstrate knowledge of designing the physical environment to optimize student literacy learning **(5.1)**
 - demonstrate knowledge of how to develop routines to support reading and writing instruction **(5.2)**
 - demonstrate knowledge of grouping to differentiate instruction **(5.3)**

Standard 6: Professional Development

- Candidates will...
 - demonstrate knowledge of adult learning theories to design professional development **(6.1)**
 - demonstrate knowledge of positive dispositions in regards to their own professional development **(6.2)**
 - demonstrate the knowledge to design effective and differentiated professional development **(6.3)**

Data Findings. Master of Education in Reading Candidates have successfully passed the Praxis II Exam for Reading Specialists with a score of 560 or higher (as required by the state of Arkansas) 100% of the time. Candidates may not graduate from the Master of Education in Reading Program without successfully passing the Praxis II Exam for Reading Specialists. This surpasses the NCATE required passing rate of 80%. Candidates' mean scores are well above the passing score. In addition, there is a significant decrease in the range of scores. Analysis of individual scores demonstrates that the majority of Candidates scored 600 or higher during the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 academic years. Tables 1.1 and 1.2 share these findings.

Table 1.1

Program: Master of Education in Reading Praxis II Exam – Reading Specialist		
Academic Year	# of M.Ed. in Reading Candidates Taking the Praxis Exam	# of M. Ed. In Reading Candidates with Passing Score
7/08 – 6/09	25	100%
7/09 – 6/10	11	100%
7/10- 6/11	25	100%

Table 1.2

Academic Year	N	Mean Score	Range
7/08 – 6/09	25	634.8	130
7/09 – 6/10	11	627	380
7/10 – 6/11		629.09	170
7/11 – 6/12	5		

Interpretation of Data. The 100% passing rate, mean scores, and decrease in the score range on the Praxis II Exam for Reading Specialists demonstrate that Candidates in the Master of Education in Reading Program are well prepared for the exam. Coursework is appropriately aligned with the IRA Standards for Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach in order to prepare Candidates who are knowledgeable professionals in the field of literacy.

#2 (Required)-CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge in reading education. IRA standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to 1 and 5. Examples of appropriate assessments include comprehensive examinations, research reports, child studies, action research, portfolio projects,⁶ and essays. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 2. Comprehensive Exam: Take-Home Component
Philosophy of Literacy Development

Description. The Master of Education in Reading comprehensive examination is taken by candidates in the final 6 hours of their program of study. The examination was designed by reading faculty members and reviewed by other teacher education faculty for clarity and content

⁶ For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included are discrete items. In this case, some of the artifacts included in the portfolio may be considered individual assessments.

validity. One portion of this comprehensive examination requires the successful completion of The Philosophy of Literacy Development Paper. This paper focuses on the candidate's personal philosophy regarding literacy instruction. The candidate is required to identify and justify the components of a comprehensive literacy program in a classroom and in a school. Candidates must clearly discuss their beliefs regarding literacy instruction and support in detail these beliefs with research and theory. In addition, candidates must elaborate upon the connections between teaching beliefs and classroom practice.

Alignment. The Take-Home component of the Comprehensive Exam, the Philosophy of Literacy Development Paper, addresses the following standards and accompanying elements:

Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge

- Candidates will...
 - refer to major theories in the foundational areas as they relate to reading instruction. Candidates will explain, compare, contrast, and critique the theories. **(1.1)**

Standard 2: Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials

- Candidates will:
 - discuss grouping options in order to meet students' needs as a part of their school and classroom plans. **(2.1)**
 - discuss a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods in order to best meet the needs of all students. **(2.2)**
 - discuss a wide range of curriculum materials and the rationale behind their use in order to best meet the needs of all students. **(2.3)**

Data Findings. This assessment was substantially revised in the summer of 2007 to more accurately align with the Arkansas Department of Education's State Competencies for Reading Professionals and the IRA Standards for Reading Professionals at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level. For this reason, data are provided for one academic year. Eleven Candidates completed a Philosophy of Literacy Development paper as a part of their Comprehensive Exam. Table 2 and Table 2.1 outline the Candidates' scores in each criterion evaluated on the rubric. The paper is read and scored holistically by the candidate's self-selected, three member faculty examination committee. Candidates have the opportunity to score a total of 16 points on the paper. In order to pass the assessment, a score of 12 (75%) or greater must be obtained. This is an overall ranking of "3.0 – Proficient" or higher according to the assessment rubric. Findings reveal that all Candidates scored at the target level of "Proficient" or higher on each criterion assessed.

**TABLE 2: Assessment 2: Comprehensive Exam: Take-Home Component
*Philosophy of Literacy Development***

September 1, 2008 – December, 2009

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Overall Format	-	-	33%	67%	9	3.7	0.5
Philosophy of Teaching (IRA 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	33%	67%	9	3.7	0.5
Philosophy as it Relates to Literacy Development (IRA 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	56%	44%	9	3.4	0.5
Theoretical Support (IRA 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	56%	44%	9	3.4	0.5

Interpretation of Data. Candidates have developed a solid understanding of the literacy components to be implemented in a comprehensive literacy model classroom and school. Candidates were able to support their thinking with theory and refer to specific theorists and seminal studies (Elements 1.1, 2.1,2.2, 2.3). Candidates appear to have a more difficult time articulating their understanding of the reading processing systems and how these systems are integral to a student’s literacy development (Elements 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3). While all of the Candidates achieved the target score of “Proficient” on each criteria of this assessment, the data demonstrate that further attention needs to be given to ensuring that students can support, to a greater extent, their thinking with appropriate theory and research. Additionally, data reveal that more attention needs to be given to the instruction of language development and literacy processing systems during the Candidate’s coursework. Section V addresses recent programmatic changes to address these needs.

**TABLE 2.1:
January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2010**

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Overall Format		10%	10%	80%	20	3.7	0.6
Philosophy of Teaching (IRA 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)		10%	20%	70%	20	3.6	0.7

Philosophy as it Relates to Literacy Development (IRA 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)		10%	25%	65%	20	3.6	0.7
Theoretical Support (IRA 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)		10%	30%	60%	20	3.5	0.7

Interpretation of Data. Candidates have developed a solid understanding of the literacy components to be implemented in a comprehensive literacy model classroom and school. Candidates were able to explain their philosophy of teaching as it relates to literacy development. The majority of candidates achieved the target score of “Proficient” on each criteria of this assessment, the data demonstrate that further attention needs to be given to the understanding specific theorists and seminal studies (Elements 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3). Candidates appear to have improved in articulating their understanding of the reading processing systems and how these systems are integral to a student’s literacy development. However, data reveal that more attention needs to be given to the instruction of language development. In addition data reveal that we need to continue to emphasize understanding the literacy processing system and the theoretical underpinnings during the Candidate’s coursework

THE NEW IRA STANDARDS 2010 ARE BEING APPLIED.

Alignment. The Take-Home component of the Comprehensive Exam, the Philosophy of Literacy Development Paper, addresses the following standards and accompanying elements:

Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge

Candidates will...

- Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections **(1.1)**
- Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students’ reading development and achievement **(1.3)**
-

Standard 2: Curriculum and Instruction

Candidates will:

- Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum. ¹**(2.1)**
- : Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections. ²**(2.2)**

April 2013

- Use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources. **(2.3)**

Standard 3 Assessment and Evaluation

Candidates will:

- Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction. **(3.3)**

Standard 4 Diversity

Candidates will:

- Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. ¹ (4.1)
- Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity (4.2)
- Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity (4.3)

Table 2.2: Assessment 2 – Comprehensive Exam: Take-Home Component *Philosophy of Literacy Development*

July 2010-June 2011

There was a change in the fiscal year by the College of Education. Although the year shows a gap in time, there is not a gap in the data collection. Spring 2011 is listed in the following report.

April 2013

Comprehensive Exam

OLD Take Home Exam Question Philosophy of Literacy Development IRA Standards: 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3,

As a part of the Master's Degree in Reading comprehensive exam, you will be required to complete a take-home exam question. This question is to be submitted to the attendant in the East Lab on the day you are scheduled to take your sit-down exam prior to the start of the exam. The paper you submit must be 6-10, double-spaced pages. Please use 12 pt, Times New Roman font and printed with black ink. The paper's header must include your name and the page number out of the total number of pages (eg. Page 1 of 4). The completed paper and accompanying reference page must be formatted according to APA 5th Edition guidelines. The completed paper must be placed in a sealed envelope with your name printed on the front. Please do not fold your paper.

We expect you to complete this paper independently and adhere to the university's policy regarding plagiarism. Your submission of this paper is confirmation of this expectation.

Exam Question:

Identify and justify the literacy components that you believe to be the most important when implementing a comprehensive literacy program in your classroom/school. What theories support your philosophy of literacy instruction? How does what you believe about literacy teaching relate to your beliefs about literacy development? Discuss in detail the theories and research that support your response and write with the vocabulary of the field.

**Comprehensive Exam: Philosophy of Literacy Development
Paper Rubric**

Exceptional (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Unacceptable (0-1)	Comments:
All parts of the paper are included and complete. The paper is organized effectively and written with clarity. There are no errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.	All parts of the paper are included and complete. The paper is organized effectively and written with clarity. There are five or fewer errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.	All parts of the paper are included. The paper is organized somewhat effectively. For the most part, the writing is clear. There are six to ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.	One or more parts of the paper are missing. The paper is not organized effectively and lacks clarity. There are more than ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.	
The candidate does an exceptional job of identifying, accurately describing, and effectively justifying the literacy components to be implemented in a comprehensive literacy model classroom / school.	The candidate does a proficient job of identifying, accurately describing, and effectively justifying the literacy components to be implemented in a comprehensive literacy model classroom / school.	The candidate satisfactorily identifies, describes, and justifies the literacy components to be implemented in a comprehensive literacy model classroom / school.	The candidate does not satisfactorily identify, describe, and/or justify the literacy components to be implemented in a comprehensive literacy model classroom / school.	

	Exceptional (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Unacceptable (0-1)	Comments:
<p>Philosophy of Literacy Teaching as it relates to Literacy Development: Discuss how your beliefs regarding literacy teaching relate to your beliefs regarding literacy development. (IRA 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates an exceptional ability to develop a cogent philosophy of literacy development and how it relates to literacy instruction.</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates a proficient ability to develop a cogent philosophy of literacy development and how it relates to literacy instruction.</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates a satisfactory ability to develop a cogent philosophy of literacy development and how it relates to literacy instruction.</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates a lack of ability to develop a cogent philosophy of literacy development. The relationship between instruction and development is missing and/or lacks adequate detail.</p>	
<p>Theoretical Support: Discuss in detail the theories and research that support your response. Refer to specific theorists, theories, and seminal studies. Write using the vocabulary of the field. (IRA 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates exceptional insight into how theory and research support their philosophy of literacy instruction. Specific theorists, theories, and studies are referenced and discussed effectively. Facility with the language of the field is evident.</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates proficient insight into how theory and research support their philosophy of literacy instruction. Specific theorists, theories, and studies are referenced and adequately discussed. Facility with the language of the field is evident.</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates satisfactory insight into how theory and research support their philosophy of literacy instruction. Specific theorists, theories, and studies are referenced, but the discussion lacks depth. Facility with the language of the field is not always evident.</p>	<p>The candidate lacks insight into how theory and research support their philosophy of literacy instruction. Specific theorists, theories, and studies are not referenced or discussed at any length. Facility with the language of the field is not evident.</p>	

April 2012

**NEW Comprehensive Exam
Philosophy of Literacy Development
IRA STANDARDS 2010
1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3**

Question

Identify and justify the literacy components that you believe to be the most important when implementing a comprehensive and balanced literacy program in your classroom/school. Ensure the literacy program is responsive to all types of diversity and why this is important to consider (please refer to IRA Standard 4). Explain how your philosophy of literacy instruction is related to literacy development. Provide in detail the theory, theorists, **and research** supporting your philosophy of literacy instruction. Use the professional vocabulary of the field.

IRA Standards	Standard Elements	Exam Elements	Exemplary	Proficient	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Standard 1 Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.	1.1 Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections.	Provide in detail the theory and research that supports your philosophy of literacy instruction.	Candidate provided theories and empirical research that fully verifies and supports a sophisticated philosophy of literacy instruction.	Candidate provided theories and empirical research that makes subtle connections that supports a systematic philosophy of literacy instruction	Candidate provided theories and empirical research that gives an in-depth evidence of a philosophy of literacy instruction; the evidence given reveals insufficient theoretical knowledge.	Candidate provided theories and empirical research that gives a developed or naïve evidence of a philosophy of literacy instruction; the evidence given is over generalized or is a superficial theoretical base.
Standard 1 Standard 4 Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices	1.1 Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and	Explain how your philosophy of literacy instruction is related to literacy development.	Candidate provided an explanation to the question that demonstrates a sophisticated and comprehensive	Candidate provided an explanation to the question that demonstrates a systematic understanding of the	Candidate provided an explanation to the question that demonstrates a somewhat in-depth understanding of the	Candidate provided an explanation to the question that demonstrates a developing or naïve understanding of the

<p>that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.</p>	<p>sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections.</p> <p>4.1 Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students.</p>		<p>understanding of the theories and empirical research in support of his or her theory of literacy development, the connection to literacy instruction as well as the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students.</p>	<p>theories and empirical research in support of his or her theory of literacy development, the connection to literacy instruction as well as the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students.</p>	<p>theories and empirical research in support of his or her theory of literacy development, the connection to literacy instruction as well as the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students.</p>	<p>theories and empirical research in support of his or her theory of literacy development, the connection to literacy instruction as well as the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students.</p>
<p>Standard 1 Standard 4</p>	<p>1.3 Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.</p> <p>4.3 Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity.</p>	<p>Explain how your philosophy of literacy instruction is related to literacy development.</p>	<p>Candidate's response communicates a sophisticated and mature understanding of the importance of professional judgment and professional behavior in literacy instruction as well as the importance of advocating for social justice in a literacy curriculum.</p>	<p>Candidate's response communicates a systematic and sensitive understanding of the importance of professional judgment and professional behavior in literacy instruction as well as the importance of advocating for social justice in a literacy curriculum.</p>	<p>Candidate's response communicates a somewhat in-depth and a somewhat empathetic understanding of the importance of professional judgment and professional behavior in literacy instruction as well as the importance of advocating for social justice in a literacy curriculum.</p>	<p>Candidate's response communicates a developing, limited and/or naïve understanding of the importance of professional judgment and professional behavior in literacy instruction as well as the importance of advocating for social justice in a literacy curriculum.</p>

<p>Standard 2 Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.</p> <p>Standard 3 Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate</p>	<p>2.1 Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.</p> <p>3.1 Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.</p>	<p>Identify and justify the literacy components that you believe to be the most important when implementing a comprehensive literacy program in your classroom/school.</p>	<p>Candidate uses foundational knowledge that demonstrates a sophisticated and insightful ability to identify and justify the literacy components to implement an effective integrated, comprehensive and balanced literacy program in a classroom/school.</p>	<p>Candidate uses foundational knowledge that demonstrates a systematic and revealing ability to identify and justify the literacy components to implement an effective integrated, comprehensive and balanced literacy program in a classroom/school.</p>	<p>Candidate uses foundational knowledge that demonstrates a somewhat in-depth and perceptive ability to identify and justify the literacy components to implement an effective integrated, comprehensive and balanced literacy program in a classroom/school.</p>	<p>Candidate uses foundational knowledge that demonstrates a naïve and/or literal ability to identify and justify the literacy components to implement an effective integrated, comprehensive and balanced literacy program in a classroom/school.</p>
<p>Standard 2 Standard 4</p>	<p>2.2 Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge and reading-writing connections.</p> <p>2.3 Use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.</p> <p>4.2 Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices</p>	<p>Identify and justify the literacy components that you believe to be the most important when implementing a comprehensive literacy program in your classroom/school.</p>	<p>Candidate’s response demonstrates a masterful ability to design and implement a comprehensive literacy program that uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches and a wide range of texts that also capitalizes on diversity and provides differentiated instruction.</p>	<p>Candidate’s response demonstrates a skilled ability to design and implement a comprehensive literacy program that uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches and a wide range of texts that also capitalizes on diversity and provides differentiated instruction.</p>	<p>Candidate’s response demonstrates a limited ability to design and implement a comprehensive literacy program that uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches and a wide range of texts that also provides differentiated instruction also capitalizes on diversity and provides differentiated instruction.</p>	<p>Candidate’s response demonstrates a very limited or novice ability to design and implement a comprehensive literacy program that uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches, a wide range of texts and also capitalizes on diversity and provides differentiated instruction.</p>

	that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

April 2012

NEW IRA Standards 2010 are being applied

Comprehensive Exams
IRA STANDARDS 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3

Comprehensive Exam

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00-1.99	Basic 2.00-2.99	Proficient 3.00-3.99	Exceptional 4.00-4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
1.1	-	50%	37%	13%	8	2.6	.7
1.3	-	50%	37%	13%	8	2.6	.7
2.1	-	50%	13%	37%	8	2.8	.9
2.2	-	50%	13%	37%	8	2.8	.9
2.3	-	50%	13%	37%	8	2.8	.9
3.1	-	50%	13%	37%	8	2.8	.9
4.1	-	50%	37%	13%	8	2.6	.7
4.2	-	50%	13%	37%	8	2.8	.9
4.3	-	50%	37%	13%	8	2.6	.7

Interpretation of Data. It is difficult for us to determine whether with Candidates struggled more with the new standards or with the overturn of faculty throughout the completion of their program.

#3 (Required)-PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan reading and literacy instruction, or fulfill other professional responsibilities in reading education. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 2, 3, 4, and 5. Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates' abilities to develop lesson or unit plans or individualized educational plans. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Sections III and IV.

Assessment 3. Practicum in Reading: READ 7356
Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection

Description. This assessment focuses on the collaboration between colleagues to assess a small group of students using a reading strategies and attitudes survey, running records and writing samples. Colleague partnerships use these data to plan reading and writing lessons to meet the developmental needs of these students. The lessons are taught and videotaped. After each lesson, the candidates view the videotape and discuss the lesson. A collaborative summary of the experience is written. Each candidate also writes a personal reflection about the collaborative process. The candidates present their videotape, lesson rationale, and reflection to the practicum instructor and colleagues in the form of a professional development seminar.

Alignment. The Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection Assessment addresses the following standards and accompanying elements:

Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge

- Candidates will...
 - use assessment data in order to determine if students are integrating the components of phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation in fluent reading. **(1.4)**

Standard 2: Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials

- Candidates will...
 - support one another in the selection and use of grouping options in order to meet the needs of all students. Assessment data will be used to inform the selection and use of grouping options. **(2.1)**
 - support one another in the selection and use of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices. Assessment data will be used to select appropriate instructional practices, approaches, and methods. Candidates demonstrate the instructional options in their teaching. **(2.2)**
 - support one another in the selection and use of a wide range of curriculum materials. Assessment data will be used to select appropriate curriculum materials. Candidates demonstrate the use of a wide range of curriculum materials in their teaching. **(2.3)**
 -

Standard 3: Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation

- Candidates will...
- work collaboratively to assess, score, and interpret data. **(3.1, 3.2)**
- work collaboratively to plan developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate literacy instruction for a small group of students. **(3.3)**
- present their assessment data, instructional plans, and results of instruction (videotapes and anecdotal notes) to the practicum instructor and colleagues. **(3.4)**

Standard 4: Creating a Literate Environment

- Candidates will...
- work collaboratively to select materials (books and non-print) that match the reading levels, interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds of students. **(4.1, 4.2)**
- develop reading writing lessons that model authentic literacy experiences. **(4.3)**
- collaboratively reflect upon each lesson in order to determine instructional effectiveness, lesson strengths and needs, and student engagement/motivation. Reflection data will be used to develop subsequent lessons. **(4.4)**

Standard 5: Professional Development

- Candidates will...
- collaboratively present all components of the project to the practicum instructor and colleagues. **(5.2)**
- collaboratively evaluate their own and their partner's teaching practices and dispositions in a positive, constructive manner in order to improve their practice. **(5.1, 5.3)**

Data Findings. This assessment was substantially revised in the summer of 2007 to more accurately align with the Arkansas Department of Education's State Competencies for Reading Professionals and the IRA Standards for Reading Professionals at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level. For this reason, data are provided for one academic year. Twenty Candidates completed the Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection assessment as a requirement for READ 7356: Practicum in Reading. This course fulfills three of the six required clinical hours. Table 3 and Table 3.1 outline the Candidates' scores in each criterion evaluated on the rubric.

On the criterion measuring Candidate's impact on student achievement in reading and writing, each Candidate scored at the "Exceptional" level. Findings reveal that 95% of the Candidates scored at the target level of "Proficient" or higher on the remaining 5 of the 7 criterion assessed. In Table 3.1 data reveal that 93% of the Candidates scored at the target level of "Proficient" or higher on the remaining 5 of the 7 criterion assessed.

TABLE 3: Assessment 3: Practicum in Reading: READ 7356
Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection

September 1, 2008 – August 31, 2009

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Project Components	-	-	33%	67%	15	3.7	0.5
Lesson Plan (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)	-	-	27%	73%	15	3.7	0.4
Student Achievement in Reading (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	-	100%	15	4.0	-
Student Achievement in Writing (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	-	100%	14	4.0	-
Lesson Summary (IRA 5.1, 5.2, 5.3)	-	-	40%	60%	15	3.6	0.5
Project Reflection (IRA 5.3)	-	7%	33%	60%	15	3.5	0.6
Project Presentation (IRA 3.4, 5.2)	-	7%	20%	73%	15	3.7	0.6

Interpretation of Data. The majority of Candidates have developed a solid understanding of how to select, administer, and interpret assessment data to inform instruction. Candidates demonstrate their ability to collaborate with colleagues to plan, teach, and reflect upon their practice in order to meet the instructional needs of individual students (Elements 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). It is apparent that one Candidate scored at the “Basic” level in three of the criterion assessed during the ’07-’08 year while one Candidate scored at the “Basic” level in two of the criterion assessed during the ’08 – ’09 year. The “Basic” level Candidate in Table 3 lacked experience working with emergent and early readers at the onset of the practicum. While the rubric scored her work as “Basic”, it is evident to the supervising professor that her knowledge level increased over the course of the practicum experience. The “Basic” level Candidate in Table 3.1 required additional support from the supervisor as she reflected upon her learning and presented her thinking to her peers. Growth was seen over the course of the practicum.

TABLE 3.1: Assessment 3: Practicum in Reading: READ 7356
Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection

January 1, 2010 – August 31, 2010

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Project Components	-	7%	14%	79%	14	3.7	0.6
Lesson Plan (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)	-	7%	21%	71%	14	3.6	0.6
Student Achievement in Reading (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	25%	-	75%	12	3.5	0.9
Student Achievement in Writing (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	-	100%	9	4.0	-
Lesson Summary (IRA 5.1, 5.2, 5.3)	-	7%	29%	64%	14	3.6	0.6
Project Reflection (IRA 5.3)	-	7%	21%	71%	14	3.6	0.6
Project Presentation (IRA 3.4, 5.2)	-	7%	21%	71%	14	3.6	0.6

Interpretation of Data. The majority of Candidates have developed a solid understanding of how to administer and interpret assessment data to inform instruction. Candidates demonstrated the ability to collaborate with colleagues to plan, teach, and reflect upon their practice in order to meet the instructional needs of individual students (Elements 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). However, it is noted that overall this year, Candidates’ ability to reflect upon their own teaching practices and others has decreased with more candidates meeting “Proficient” expectations than “Exceptional.” There is a lack of consistency over a period of time on this assessment. Although not statistically significant, the data indicate a need to increase active reflection about teaching practices. Two Candidates scored in Basic and required additional support in reflective practices and collaboration.

TABLE 3.2: Assessment 3: Practicum in Reading: READ 7356
Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection

There was a change in the fiscal year in the College of Education. However all data is being reported.

January 1, 2010 – August 31, 2010

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Project Components	-			100 %	3	4.0	0
Lesson Plan (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)	-			100 %	3	4.0	0
Student Achievement in Reading (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-			100 %	3	4.0	0
Student Achievement in Writing (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-			100 %	3	4.0	0
Lesson Summary (IRA 5.1, 5.2, 5.3)	-			100 %	3	4.0	0
Project Reflection (IRA 5.3)	-			100 %	3	4.0	0
Project Presentation (IRA 3.4, 5.2)	-			100 %	3	4.0	0

Interpretation of Data. Candidates have developed a solid understanding of how to administer and interpret assessment data to inform instruction. Candidates demonstrated the ability to collaborate with colleagues to plan, teach, and reflect upon their practice in order to meet the instructional needs of individual students (Elements 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). The practicum had small numbers this summer as well as losing the normal practicum sight. A new sight was selected; however date availability did not match Candidates' teaching dates. Therefore only a small number were able to take practicum. In addition, a new rubric addressing the new IRA 2010 standards was not written but will be in place for the summer 2012.

Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection

READ 7356

IRA Standards: 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3

Collaborate with a colleague in READ 7356 to assess a small group of students using a reading strategies and attitudes survey, running records and writing samples. Use these data to plan a reading and writing lesson to meet the developmental needs of these students. The lessons will be taught and videotaped. Afterward, the candidates will discuss the lesson and write a collaborative summary of the experience. Each candidate will write a personal reflection over the collaborative process. The candidates will then present their videotapes, lesson rationale, and reflection to the whole group.

Assessing The Students: (IRA 1.4, 3.1, 3.2)

Each partnership will collaborate to assess their small group of students in three ways at the beginning of the course in order to determine the students' strengths and needs.

- Reading Strategies and Attitudes Survey
- Running Records
- Writing Samples

Lesson Planning: (IRA 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

Using the data collected, the candidates will collaboratively plan a relevant and authentic reading and writing lesson to meet the needs of their small group. The lesson will focus on 6 of the Principles of Cognitive Apprenticeship (Dorn, French, & Jones, 1998, p. 17).

- **Observation and Responsive Teaching:**
 - The reading and writing lessons will be based upon the assessment data collected and anecdotal notes taken during the observation of student performance on the assessments. The lesson context must be relevant and meaningful.
 - Students will be grouped appropriately according to their reading and writing instructional needs.
- **Modeling and Coaching:**
 - During the lessons, the candidates will use modeling and coaching techniques with clear demonstrations and explicit language.
 - Practices, approaches and methods used will support individual students in their reading and writing endeavors.
- **Clear and Relevant Language for Problem Solving:**
 - During the lessons the candidates will use language prompts that encourage cognitive action.
- **Adjustable and Self-Destructing Scaffolds:**
 - During the lessons the candidates provide support depending upon the needs of the students. These scaffolds are removed as they are no longer needed.
- **Structured Routines:**
 - Routine interactions that enable independence are used during the lessons.
- **Assisted and Independent Work:**
 - A balance of opportunities to practice with assistance and independently is included in the lessons.

- Materials for assisted and independent practice will be selected according to students' instructional needs and reading interests. Attention will be paid to the students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Teaching and Observing the Lesson: (IRA 5.3)

Each candidate will teach one of the planned lessons while the other candidate observes the lesson and uses an observation rubric to record data. Each lesson will be videotaped.

Lesson Summary: (IRA 5.2, 5.3)

Following each lesson, the candidates will view the lesson videotape together and discuss the notes taken by the observer. A summary of the lesson will be written collaboratively and the following points will be included.

- A detailed account of the “model, guide, and apply section of the lesson
- The teacher's directions and prompts
- The students' interactions during the lesson
- The students' reactions and responses to the lesson

Project Reflection: (IRA 5.3)

Each candidate will write a personal reflection over the collaborative process. The reflection will discuss the following:

- The success of the lesson taught – why were those things successful?
- The things that would be changed about the lesson – why are those changes necessary?
- The things you learned about yourself as a teacher/collaborator and what it means to work collaboratively with a partner

Project Presentation: (IRA 3.4, 5.2)

Working collaboratively, the candidates will present their project the rest of the class using a Power Point presentation to guide the discussion. This 30 minute presentation will include the following elements:

- Assessment data that informed the lessons
- A description of each lesson
- Teacher's directions and prompts
- Students' interactions, reactions, and responses
- Successes of the lessons
- Any necessary changes to the lessons and the rationale behind those changes
- How this experience has influenced each candidate's development as a literacy professional

Each candidate will upload the lesson plan he/she taught, the summary of the lesson he/she taught, the reflection of the lesson he/she taught, and the Power Point presentation done collaboratively with a partner to Chalk and Wire for assessment.

READ 7356: Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection

100 POINTS	EXCEPTIONAL:	PROFICIENT:	BASIC:	UNACCEPTABLE:	COMMENTS:
<p>Project Components: The candidate includes all of the project components: Lesson Plan, Lesson Summary, Lesson Reflection, and Power Point Presentation. The project was completed and turned in on time to the professor.</p>	<p>All of the components are included and complete. The project is organized according to the specified format. Writing is clear and concise. There are no errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. The project was completed and turned in on time to the professor.</p> <p>18-20 pts.</p>	<p>All of the components are included and complete. The project is organized according to the specified format. For the most part, writing is clear and concise. There are five or fewer errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. The project was completed and turned in on time to the professor.</p> <p>16-17.5 pts.</p>	<p>All of the components are included but one is incomplete. The project is partially organized according to the specified format. For the most part, writing is clear and concise. There are six to ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. The project was not completed and turned in on time to the professor.</p> <p>14-17 pts.</p>	<p>One or more of the components are missing. Of those included, more than two of them are incomplete. The project is not organized according to the specified format. The writing lacks clarity and there are more than ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. The project was not completed and turned in on time to the professor.</p> <p>13.5 or fewer pts.</p>	
<p>Lesson Plan: Each partnership used assessment data to plan a reading and writing lesson (one lesson was taught by each person) that met the needs of their small group. The lesson focused on 6 of the Principles of Cognitive</p>	<p>Lesson Plan: The lesson is planned according to the required format. Each part of the lesson plan is written with clarity and detail. The first 6 of the Principles of the Cognitive Apprenticeship Model are clearly</p>	<p>Lesson Plan: The lesson has been planned according to the required format. Each part of the lesson plan is written with clarity and some detail. The first 6 of the Principles of the Cognitive Apprenticeship Model are evident in</p>	<p>Lesson Plan: The lesson has been planned according to the required format. Parts of the lesson plan lack clarity and/or detail. Not all of the first 6 Principles of the Cognitive Apprenticeship Model are evident in</p>	<p>Lesson Plan: The lesson has not been planned according to the required format. Parts of the lesson plan are incomplete or lack clarity and/or detail. Not all of the first 6 Principles of the Cognitive Apprenticeship Model are evident in</p>	

Apprenticeship* (IRA 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)	evident in the plan. 18-20 pts.	the plan. 16-17.5 pts.	the plan. 14-17 pts.	the plan. 13.5 or fewer pts.	
--	---	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

	EXCEPTIONAL:	PROFICIENT:	BASIC:	UNACCEPTABLE:	COMMENTS:
Student Achievement –Reading: The candidate’s instruction positively impacted the students’ achievement in reading. (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	The candidate adjusted his/her instruction to meet the needs of students. The candidate documented students’ growth in reading achievement.			It is not clear that the candidate adjusted his/her instruction to meet the needs of students. Student growth in reading achievement is not documented.	
Student Achievement –Writing: The candidate’s instruction positively impacted the students’ achievement in writing. (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	The candidate adjusted his/her instruction to meet the needs of students. The candidate documented students’ growth in writing achievement.			It is not clear that the candidate adjusted his/her instruction to meet the needs of students. Student growth in writing achievement is not documented.	
Lesson Summary: The summary of the lesson was written collaboratively and includes a detailed account of the lesson - the teacher’s directions, prompts, and dispositions as well as the students’ interactions, reactions and responses. (IRA 5.1, 5.2, 5.3)	Lesson Summary: The lesson summary provides a clearly worded, detailed account of the teacher’s directions, prompts, and dispositions. Student interactions, reactions and responses as recorded as well. The summary is 2-3 double-spaced pages and is written collaboratively by the teacher and the observer.	Lesson Summary: The lesson summary provides a clearly worded, somewhat detailed account of the teacher’s directions, prompts, and dispositions. Student interactions, reactions and responses are recorded as well. The summary is 2-3 double-spaced pages and is written collaboratively by the teacher and the observer.	Lesson Summary: The lesson summary provides an account of the lesson, however, detail is lacking. Teacher directions, prompts, and dispositions as well as student interactions, reactions and responses may or may not be included or are vague. The summary is less than 2 or more than 3 double-spaced pages. Collaboration between the teacher and observer is not	Lesson Summary: The lesson summary provides an incomplete account of the lesson. Little attention has been paid to detail. Teacher directions, prompts, and/or dispositions as well as student interactions, reactions and/or responses are not included. The summary is less than 2 or more than 3 double-spaced pages. Collaboration between the teacher	

	18-20 pts.	16-17.5 pts.	clearly evident. 14-17 pts.	and observer is not evident. 13.5 or fewer pts.	
--	-------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--

	EXCEPTIONAL:	PROFICIENT:	BASIC:	UNACCEPTABLE:	COMMENTS:
<p>Project Reflection: The project reflection was written individually and discusses successes of the lesson taught, what needs to be changed about the lesson, the things you learned about yourself as a teacher/collaborator, and what it means to work collaboratively with a partner. (IRA 5.3)</p>	<p>Project Reflection: The project reflection discusses the following points with clarity and in detail: *the successes of the lesson – why were these things successful? *things that you would do differently if you were to do the lesson again – why? *things you learned about yourself as a teacher/collaborator and what you learned about working collaboratively with a colleague.</p> <p>The reflection is 1-2 double –spaced pages and is done independently.</p> <p>18-20 pts.</p>	<p>Project Reflection: The project reflection discusses the following points with clarity and in some detail: *the successes of the lesson – why were these things successful? *things that you would do differently if you were to do the lesson again – why? *things you learned about yourself as a teacher/collaborator and what you learned about working collaboratively with a colleague.</p> <p>The reflection is 1-2 double-spaced pages and is done independently.</p> <p>16-17.5 pts.</p>	<p>Project Reflection: The project reflection discusses the following points but may lack clarity and/or detail: *the successes of the lesson – why were these things successful? *things that you would do differently if you were to do the lesson again – why? *things you learned about yourself as a teacher/collaborator and what you learned about working collaboratively with a colleague.</p> <p>The reflection is less than 1 or more than 2 double-spaced pages and has not been done independently.</p> <p>14-17 pts.</p>	<p>Project Reflection: The project reflection does not discuss the following points with clarity and/or detail: *the successes of the lesson – why were these things successful? *things that you would do differently if you were to do the lesson again – why? *things you learned about yourself as a teacher/collaborator and what you learned about working collaboratively with a colleague.</p> <p>The reflection is less than 1 or more than 2 double-spaced pages and has not been done independently.</p> <p>13.5 or fewer pts.</p>	

	EXCEPTIONAL:	PROFICIENT:	BASIC:	UNACCEPTABLE:	COMMENTS
<p>Project Presentation: The Power Point communicates the following: data that informed the lessons; lesson descriptions; teacher’s directions and prompts; students’ interactions, reactions, and responses; successes of the lessons; necessary changes to the lessons; the rationale behind those changes; and how this experience influenced each candidate’s development as a literacy professional. The presentation is 30 minutes long. (IRA 3.4, 5.2)</p>	<p>The Power Point Presentation is well organized, includes all of the necessary information in detail, and is shared in a conversational format. The presentation stayed within the 30 minute limit and is a collaborative effort. Rehearsal is clearly evident. Any questions or comments from the audience are responded to thoughtfully and accurately.</p> <p>18-20 pts.</p>	<p>The Power Point Presentation is well organized, includes all of the necessary information in detail, and is shared in a mostly conversational format. The presentation stayed within the 30 minute limit and is a collaborative effort. Rehearsal is evident. Any questions or comments from the audience are responded to thoughtfully and accurately.</p> <p>16-17.5 pts.</p>	<p>The Power Point Presentation is somewhat organized and includes most of the necessary information, although detail is lacking. The candidates read most of the information from the slides and do not have equal responsibility in the presentation. The presentation did not adhere to the time limit. Any questions or comments from the audience were not responded to thoughtfully and/or accurately.</p> <p>14-17 pts.</p>	<p>The Power Point Presentation is missing several of the necessary components and lacks organization and detail. The candidates read the information from the slides and do not have equal responsibility in the presentation. The presentation did not adhere to the time limit. Any questions or comments from the audience were not responded to thoughtfully or accurately.</p> <p>13.5 or fewer pts.</p>	

➤ *Dorn, L.J., French, C., & Jones, T. (1998). *Apprenticeships in literacy: Transitions across reading and writing*

#4 (Required)-PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 2, 3, 4, and 5. The assessment instrument used to evaluate internships, practicum, or other clinical experiences should be submitted. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 4: Advanced Practicum in Reading: READ 7370
Coaching Case Study

Description. For this assessment, Candidates will fulfill the role of a literacy coach by assisting a mentee/classroom teacher with professional development during READ 7370. In order to successfully complete this assessment, Candidates will complete three coaching cycles consisting of a pre-conference and planning session, observation, and post-conference discussion and reflection. During the pre-conference, Candidates will talk with the mentee in order to determine a professional development focus. The discussion will revolve around the mentee's completed self-assessment form. The candidate will work with the mentee to collaboratively plan a lesson in the focus area in order to meet students' needs as demonstrated by the assessment data. Candidates will use a specified lesson plan format. Candidates will observe the lesson and complete a rubric/observation checklist. This rubric/checklist will be discussed in a post-conference. Upon completion of the coaching cycles, the candidate will write a reflection about the coaching experience.

Alignment. The Coaching Case Study Assessment addresses the following standards and accompanying elements:

Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge

- Candidates will...
 - use assessment data in order to determine if students are integrating the components of phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation in fluent reading. **(1.4)**

Standard 2: Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials

- Candidates will...
 - support the mentee in the selection and use of grouping options in order to meet the needs of all students. Assessment data will be used to inform the selection and use of grouping options. **(2.1)**
 - support the mentee in the selection and use of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices. Assessment data will be used to select appropriate instructional practices, approaches, and methods. Candidates demonstrate the instructional options in their own teaching. **(2.2)**
 - support the mentee in the selection and use of a wide range of curriculum materials. Assessment data will be used to select appropriate curriculum

materials. Candidates demonstrate the use of a wide range of curriculum materials in their own teaching. **(2.3)**

Standard 3: Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation

- Candidates will...
 - work collaboratively to assess, score, and interpret data. **(3.1, 3.2)**
 - work collaboratively to plan developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate literacy instruction for a small group of students. **(3.3)**
 - discuss the assessment data, instructional plans, and results of instruction with the mentee. This information will be shared in the reflection paper. **(3.4)**

Standard 4: Creating a Literate Environment

- Candidates will...
 - work collaboratively to select materials (books and non-print) that match the reading levels, interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds of students. **(4.1, 4.2)**
 - develop reading / writing lessons that model authentic literacy experiences. **(4.3)**
 - collaboratively reflect upon each lesson in order to determine instructional effectiveness, lesson strengths and needs, and student engagement/motivation. Reflection data will be used to develop subsequent lessons. **(4.4)**

Standard 5: Professional Development

- Candidates will...
 - present all components of the project to the practicum instructor in the project reflection paper **(5.2)**
 - reflect upon their role as a literacy coach and contrast that with the role of a classroom teacher. The Candidate will provide feedback to the mentee in regard to his/her teaching practices and dispositions in a positive, constructive manner to improve his/her practice. **(5.1, 5.3)**

Data Findings. This assessment was substantially revised in the summer of 2007 to more accurately align with the Arkansas Department of Education’s State Competencies for Reading Professionals and the IRA Standards for Reading Professionals at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level. For this reason, data are provided for one academic year. Twenty-five Candidates completed the Coaching Case Study assessment as a requirement for READ 7370: Advanced Practicum in Reading. This course fulfills three of the six required clinical hours. Table 4 and Table 4.1 outline the Candidates’ scores in each criterion evaluated on the rubric.

On the criterion measuring Candidate’s impact on student achievement in reading and writing, each Candidate scored at the “Exceptional” level. Findings on Table 4 reveal that 100% of the Candidates scored at the target level of “Proficient” or higher on the remaining criterion assessed. On Table 4.1 one of the Candidates scored at the “Basic” level on criterion three.

**TABLE 4: Assessment 4: Advanced Practicum in Reading: READ 7370
Coaching Case Study**

September 1, 2008 – August 31, 2009

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Project Components	-	-	40%	60%	5	3.6	0.5
Pre-Conference Reflection (IRA 5.2)	-	-	40%	60%	5	3.6	0.5
Lesson Plan (IRA1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4)	-	20%	20%	60%	5	3.4	0.8
Post-Conference Reflection (IRA 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3)	-	-	40%	60%	5	3.6	0.5
Observation (IRA 4.3)	-	-	20%	80%	5	3.8	0.4
Student Achievement in Reading & Writing (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	-	100%	5	4.0	-
Project Reflection (IRA 5.3)	-	-	40%	60%	5	3.6	0.5

Interpretation of Data. This practicum provides the first opportunity for Candidates to work with a teacher/colleague in a coaching role. The assessment requires each Candidate to complete three coaching cycles consisting of a pre-conference, lesson plan, observation, and a post-conference in order to assist a teacher as he/she instructs a specific group of struggling readers. In addition, Candidates teach this group of struggling readers while the teacher/colleague observes. The Candidate reflects upon his/her role as a coach and discusses the shifts in student learning as a result of the coaching experience (Elements 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). The rubric for this assessment measures the Candidate's proficiency in each of the components listed above. Overall, in Table 4, Candidates demonstrate strengths in each of the criterion assessed. Data reveal that Candidates positively impact student achievement in reading and writing as a result of the coaching experience. While all of the Candidates achieved the target level of "Proficient" or higher for each criterion, the supervising professors realize that Candidates need more experience leading the teacher/colleague through the reflection process in order to create shifts in instructional practice. One Candidate, as revealed in Table 4.1, needs continued assistance in writing lesson plans that are detailed, clear, and adhere to the principles of an apprenticeship model. Guidance will continue to be given in future courses.

TABLE 4.2: Assessment 4: Advanced Practicum in Reading: READ 7370
Coaching Case Study

January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2010

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Project Components	-	11%	11%	78%	18	3.7	0.7
Pre-Conference Reflection (IRA 5.2)	-	17%	28%	56%	18	3.4	0.8
Lesson Plan (IRA1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4)	-	28%	22%	50%	18	3.2	0.9
Post-Conference Reflection (IRA 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3)	-	28%	28%	44%	18	3.2	0.8
Observation (IRA 4.3)	-	28%	28%	44%	18	3.2	0.8
Student Achievement in Reading & Writing (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	-	100%	10	4.0	-
Project Reflection (IRA 5.3)	-	11%	11%	78%	18	3.7	0.7

Interpretation of Data. This practicum provides the first opportunity for Candidates to work with a teacher/colleague in a coaching role. Each candidate must complete three coaching cycles consisting of a pre-conference, lesson plan, observation, and a post conference in order to assist a teacher as he/she instructs a specific group of struggling readers. In addition, Candidates teach this group of struggling readers while the teacher/colleague observes. The Coach/Candidate observes the teacher/colleague work with the same group of struggling readers. The Candidate reflects upon her/his role as a teacher and as a coach and discusses the shifts in student learning as a result of the teaching/coaching experience. (Elements 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). The rubric for this assessment measures the Candidate’s proficiency in each of the components listed above. The majority of Candidates have developed the ability to collaborate with other professionals in a coaching role. However, there is a marked decrease from last year in the ability to enter into reflective practices about one’s own teaching and the teaching of others. There is an increase in the score of “Proficient,” and “Basic,” indicating that coursework may need to include further scaffolding in active reflective practices.

TABLE 4.3: Assessment 4: Advanced Practicum in Reading: READ 7370
Coaching Case Study

July 2010-June 2011

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Project Components	-			100 %	4	4.0	0
Pre-Conference Reflection (IRA 5.2)	-			100 %	4	4.0	0
Lesson Plan (IRA1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4)	-			100 %	4	4.0	0
Post-Conference Reflection (IRA 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3)	-			100 %	4	4.0	0
Observation (IRA 4.3)	-			100 %	4	4.0	0
Student Achievement in Reading & Writing (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-			100 %	4	4.0	0
Project Reflection (IRA 5.3)	-			100 %	4	4.0	0

Interpretation of Data. This practicum provides the first opportunity for Candidates to work with a teacher/colleague in a coaching role. Each candidate must complete three coaching cycles consisting of a pre-conference, lesson plan, observation, and a post conference in order to assist a teacher as he/she instructs a specific group of struggling readers. In addition, Candidates teach this group of struggling readers while the teacher/colleague observes. The oach/Candidate observes the teacher/colleague work with the same group of struggling readers. The Candidate reflects upon her/his role as a teacher and as a coach and discusses the shifts in student learning as a result of the teaching/coaching experience. (Elements 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). The rubric for this assessment measures the Candidate’s proficiency in each of the components listed above. All of the Candidates have developed the ability to collaborate with other professionals in a coaching role.

This course was taught by adjunct faculty, a previous employed professor in the MED Reading program. A new rubric was not written to address the new IRA 2010 standards.

Coaching Case Study: READ 7370

IRA Standards: 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3

For this project, you will fill the role of a literacy coach by assisting a colleague with professional development during READ 7370. In order to successfully complete this project you will need to fulfill the following requirements:

Hold a Pre-Conference (Lyons & Pinnell, 2001, ch. 10 and 11):

1. Talk with your colleague in order to find out his/her personal perceptions regarding literacy instruction. In what area does the colleague wish to focus upon for his/her professional development experience (shared reading, guided reading, or writers' workshop)? This discussion should revolve around the colleague's completed Self Assessment Form. **(IRA 5.2)**
2. Work with the colleague to plan a lesson in the targeted area that will meet the needs of the students as revealed through their assessment data (interest surveys, running records, writing samples, and observations). Use the specified lesson plan format. **(IRA 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4)**

Observation:

3. Observe the colleague while he/she teaches the lesson. Record observations and comments on the appropriate checklist / rubric. **(IRA 4.3)**

Hold a Post-Conference (Lyons & Pinnell, 2001, ch. 12):

4. Talk with your colleague about the lesson and the comments recorded on the rubric in order to do the following: **(IRA 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3)**
 - a. Help the teacher observe and analyze students' behavior.
 - b. Help the teacher become aware of the impact their decisions and dispositions have had on students.
 - c. Help the teacher deepen his/her understanding of the selected literacy component (shared reading, guided reading, or writers' workshop).
 - d. Help the teacher reflect upon his/her own learning. (Lyons & Pinnell, 2001, p. 164)

You will complete this coaching cycle three times with the same colleague.

Paperwork to be submitted for a grade and uploaded into Chalk and Wire:

- **Pre-conference Reflection** (one per coaching cycle): Write a 2-3 page Pre-conference reflection:
 - Discuss the colleague's chosen area of focus and the rationale behind this choice
 - Discuss the assessment data – what did it reveal?
Share the rationale behind the plan you created – why did you decide upon this particular lesson goal?

- **Lesson Plan** (one per coaching cycle)
 - Submit the specified form, fully completed
- **Observation Rubric** (one per coaching cycle)
 - Submit the chosen checklist / rubric, fully completed
- **Post-conference Reflection** (one per coaching cycle): Write a 2-3 Post-conference reflection.
 - Summarize what was discussed during the post-conference – make reference to points a-d above
- **Project Reflection** (1 at the end of the project): Write a 3-5 page project reflection.
 - Discuss your role as a literacy coach. How was this role different from that of the classroom teacher?
 - What did you do/say to assist the classroom teacher? How did your assistance impact the students in the classroom?
 - What did you learn about being a literacy coach? What are the challenges and rewards of this position?
 - How will this coaching experience shape your future experiences?

READ 7370 Coaching Case Study

100 Points Total	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory/Basic	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
<p>Project Components: The candidate includes all of the project components: 3 Pre-conference Reflections, 3 Lesson Plans, 3 Post-conference Reflections, and 1 Project Reflection. The project was completed and turned in on time to the professor.</p>	<p>All of the components are included and complete. The document is organized according to the specified format. Writing is clear and concise. There are no errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. The project was completed and turned in on time to the professor.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">18-20 pts.</p>	<p>All of the components are included and complete. The document is organized according to the specified format. For the most part, writing is clear and concise. There are five or fewer errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. The project was completed and turned in on time to the professor.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">16-17.5 pts.</p>	<p>All of the components are included but one is incomplete. The document is partially organized according to the specified format. For the most part, writing is clear and concise. There are six to ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. The project was not completed and turned in on time to the professor.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">14-17 pts.</p>	<p>One or more of the components are missing. Of those included, more than two of them are incomplete. The document is not organized according to the specified format. The writing lacks clarity and there are more than ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. The project was not completed and turned in on time to the professor.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">13.5 or fewer pts.</p>	
<p>Pre-conference Reflection: The candidate includes a discussion of the colleague's chosen area of focus; the rationale behind this choice; a summary of the assessment data; and the rationale behind the goal as stated in the lesson. (IRA 5.2)</p>	<p>The Pre-conference Reflection is well organized, written clearly, and includes all of the necessary information in detail.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4.5-5 pts. each 13.5-15 pts. total</p>	<p>The Pre-conference Reflection is well organized, written clearly, and includes all of the necessary information. Detail is lacking in one or two components.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4 pts. each 12-13 pts. total</p>	<p>The Pre-conference Reflection includes most of the necessary information but lacks organization and clarity. Detail is lacking in one three to five components.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3-3.5 pts. each 3-11.5 pts. total</p>	<p>The Pre-conference Reflection is missing several of the necessary components. Organization, clarity, and detail are lacking overall.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2.5 or fewer each 11 or fewer total</p>	

	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory/Basic	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
<p>Lesson Plan: The candidate includes a complete lesson plan utilizing the specified format. The plan is a collaborative effort between the candidate and the colleague as a result of the Pre-conference meeting. (IRA: 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4)</p>	<p>The lesson has been collaboratively planned according to the required format. Each part of the lesson plan is written with clarity and detail. The first 6 of the Principles of the Cognitive Apprenticeship Model* are clearly evident in the plan.</p> <p>9-10 pts. each 27-30 pts. total</p>	<p>The lesson has been collaboratively planned according to the required format. Each part of the lesson plan is written with clarity and some detail. The first 6 of the Principles of the Cognitive Apprenticeship Model* are evident in the plan.</p> <p>8-8.5 pts. each 24-26.5 pts. total</p>	<p>The lesson has been collaboratively planned according to the required format. Parts of the lesson plan lack clarity and/or detail. Not all of the first 6 Principles of the Cognitive Apprenticeship Model* are evident in the plan.</p> <p>7-7.5 pts. each 21-23.5 pts. total</p>	<p>The lesson has not been collaboratively planned according to the required format. Parts of the lesson plan are incomplete or lack clarity and/or detail. Not all of the first 6 Principles of the Cognitive Apprenticeship Model* are evident in the plan.</p> <p>6.5 or fewer each 20.5 or fewer total</p>	
<p>Post-conference Reflection: The candidate shares details regarding the conversation held with the colleague. The following points are discussed: how observation helped the colleague analyze student behavior, how the teacher's decisions and dispositions impacted the students' learning, and how the colleague's understanding of literacy instruction shifted as a result of the experience.</p>	<p>The Post-conference Reflection is well organized, written clearly, and includes all of the necessary information in detail.</p> <p>4.5-5 pts. each</p>	<p>The Post-conference Reflection is well organized, written clearly, and includes all of the necessary information. Detail is lacking in one or two components.</p> <p>4 pts. each</p>	<p>The Post-conference Reflection includes most of the necessary information but lacks organization and clarity. Detail is lacking in one three to five components.</p> <p>3-3.5 pts. each</p>	<p>The Post-conference Reflection is missing several of the necessary components. Organization, clarity, and detail are lacking overall.</p> <p>2.5 or fewer each</p>	

(IRA 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3)	13.5-15 pts. total	12-13 pts. total	3-11.5 pts. total	11 or fewer total	
	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory/Basic	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
Observation: The candidate fully completes the chosen observation checklist / rubric. Each area on the form is addressed, written with clarity, and good detail. (IRA 4.3)	The observation checklist / rubric provides a clearly worded, detailed account of the lesson. Teacher directions and prompts as well as student interactions, reactions and responses are recorded.	The observation checklist / rubric provides a clearly worded, somewhat detailed account of the lesson. Teacher directions and prompts as well as student interactions, reactions and responses are recorded.	The observation checklist / rubric provides an account of the lesson, however, detail is lacking. Teacher directions and prompts as well as student interactions, reactions and responses may or may not be included or are vague.	The observation checklist / rubric provides an incomplete account of the lesson. Little attention has been paid to detail. Teacher directions and/or prompts as well as student interactions, reactions and/or responses are not included.	
Student Achievement – Reading/Writing: The candidate’s instruction positively impacted the students’ achievement in reading/writing. (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	The candidate adjusted his/her instruction to meet the needs of students. The candidate documented students’ growth in reading/writing achievement.			It is not clear that the candidate adjusted his/her instruction to meet the needs of students. Student growth in reading/writing achievement is not documented.	
Project Reflection: The candidate discusses their role as a literacy coach and how it compares to that of the classroom teacher. In addition, the candidate discusses how their assistance impacted the progress of the students and what he/she learned about the	The Project Reflection is well organized, written clearly, and includes all of the necessary information in detail.	The Project Reflection is well organized, written clearly, and includes all of the necessary information. Detail is lacking in one or two components.	The Project Reflection includes most of the necessary information but lacks organization and clarity. Detail is lacking in one three to five components.	The Project Reflection is missing several of the necessary components. Organization, clarity, and detail are lacking overall.	

challenges and rewards of being a literacy coach. (IRA 5.3)	4.5-5 pts. each 13.5-15 pts. total	4 pts. each 12-13 pts. total	3-3.5 pts. each 3-11.5 pts. total	2.5 or fewer each 11 or fewer total	
---	---	---	--	--	--

- These principles are found on page 17 of *Apprenticeship in Literacy* (Dorn, French, and Jones, 1998).

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates and evaluates candidate effects on student learning and provision of supportive learning environments for student learning. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 2, 3, 4, and 5. Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 5: Teaching Reading: Read 7351
Change Over Time Paper

Description. This assessment focuses on the reading and writing development of literacy learners over time and the shifts in teacher instruction based on assessment and observation of student performance. Candidates will also discuss the relationship between teacher dispositions and student achievement in literacy. In order to complete this assessment, Candidates will identify three students of varying reading ability in their classroom and collect and analyze data regarding reading and writing performance (based on reading interest and motivation surveys, running records/metalinguistic interviews, writing samples, and anecdotal notes) over the course of eight weeks. The data will be used to design instruction to meet the individual needs of students. Data will be presented in a paper and shared with classmates.

Alignment. The Change Over Time Paper Assessment addresses the following standards and accompanying elements:

Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge

- Candidates will...
 - use assessment data in order to determine if students are integrating the components of phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation in fluent reading. **(1.4)**

Standard 3: Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation

- Candidates will...
 - assess, score, and interpret data. **(3.1, 3.2)**
 - plan developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate literacy instruction for a small group of students. **(3.3)**
 - analyze and present the assessment data, instructional plans, and results of instruction. This information will be shared in the paper. **(3.4)**

Standard 4: Creating a Literate Environment

- Candidates will...
 - select materials (books and non-print) that match the reading levels, interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds of students. **(4.1, 4.2)**
 - develop reading / writing lessons that model authentic literacy experiences. **(4.3)**
 - reflect upon each lesson in order to determine instructional effectiveness, lesson strengths and needs, and student engagement/motivation. Reflection data will be used to develop subsequent lessons. **(4.4)**

Standard 5: Professional Development

- Candidates will...
 - discuss the relationship(s) between teacher dispositions and student achievement. **(5.1)**
 - reflect upon his/her teaching practices in a positive, constructive manner to improve his/her teaching. **(5.3)**

Data Findings. This case study was added to the list of key assessments for the Master of Education in Reading Program in the summer of 2007 to more accurately align with the Arkansas Department of Education's State Competencies for Reading Professionals and the IRA Standards for Reading Professionals at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level. For this reason, data are provided for one academic year. Thirty-six Candidates completed the Change Over Time assessment as a requirement for READ 7351: Teaching Reading. Table 5 outline the Candidates' scores in each criterion evaluated on the rubric. On 2 of the 8 criterion assessed, 100% of the Candidates scored at the target level of "Proficient" or higher. On the remaining criteria, 1, 2, or 3 Candidates scored at the "Basic" level.

Table 5.1 reveals that all Candidates scored at the "Proficient" level or higher on all criteria assessed.

**TABLE 5: Assessment 5: Teaching Reading: READ 7351
Change Over Time Paper**

September 1, 2008 – August 31, 2009

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Project Components	-	-	33%	67%	9	3.7	0.5
Introduction (IRA 3.3)	-	-	11%	89%	9	3.9	0.3
Summary and Analysis of Student Progress in Reading (IRA 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 4.4)	-	-	33%	67%	9	3.7	0.5
Summary and Analysis of Student Progress in Writing (IRA 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 4.4)	-	-	33%	67%	9	3.7	0.5
Student Achievement in Reading (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	-	100%	9	4.0	-
Student Achievement in Writing (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	-	100%	9	4.0	-
Weekly Data and Summaries / Analysis (IRA 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)	-	-	11%	89%	9	3.9	0.3
Reflection and Synthesis (IRA 4.4, 5.1, 5.3)	-	-	22%	78%	9	3.8	0.4

Interpretation of Data. The majority of Candidates have developed a solid understanding of how to administer, score, and interpret data from weekly running records and writing samples. In addition, the majority of the Candidates were able to manage, organize, and analyze multiple sources of data over time to make instructional decisions (Elements 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3). Closer analysis of individual Candidate data in Table 5 revealed that a small percentage of Candidates need further support with data management and organization. One Candidate in particular had a difficult time analyzing data in order to inform instructional practice. Candidates have further opportunities to refine these skills in subsequent classes. Subsequent data, as revealed in Table 5.1, demonstrate an increase in Candidate proficiency in the areas listed above.

**TABLE 5.1: Assessment 5: Teaching Reading: READ 7351
Change Over Time Paper**

January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2010

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Project Components	-	4%	42%	54%	9	3.5	0.6
Introduction (IRA 3.3)	-	4%	13%	83%	9	3.8	0.5
Summary and Analysis of Student Progress in Reading (IRA 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 4.4)	-	8%	46%	46%	9	3.4	0.6
Summary and Analysis of Student Progress in Writing (IRA 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 4.4)	-	13%	42%	46%	9	3.3	0.7
Student Achievement in Reading (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	8%	17%	4%	71%	9	3.4	1.0
Student Achievement in Writing (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	8%	17%	8%	67%	9	3.3	1.0
Weekly Data and Summaries / Analysis (IRA 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)	8%	13%	25%	54%	9	3.3	1.0
Reflection and Synthesis (IRA 4.4, 5.1, 5.3)	-	8%	42%	50%	9	3.4	0.6

Interpretation of Data. The majority of Candidates have developed a solid understanding of how to administer, score, and interpret data from weekly running records and writing samples in this introductory Master’s level course. In addition the majority of the Candidates were able to manage, organize, and analyze multiple sources of data over time to make instructional decisions (Elements 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3). Three Candidates in particular had a difficult time analyzing data to inform instructional practice. Candidates have further opportunities to refine these skills in subsequent classes.

Change Over Time Paper
READ 7351

IRA Standards: 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3

This project focuses on the reading and writing development of a learner over time and the shifts in teacher instruction based on assessment and observation of student performance. You will also discuss the relationship between teacher dispositions and student achievement in literacy. In order to complete this project, you will need to identify three students of varying reading ability in your classroom and collect and analyze data regarding their reading and writing performance (reading interest and attitude surveys, running records/metalinguistic interviews, writing samples, and anecdotal notes) over the course of eight weeks. The data will be presented in a paper and shared with classmates. The following steps should be taken:

The first week of the project give each child the Garfield Reading Motivation Survey and the Gambrell Motivation to Read Survey in order to find out how they feel about reading at school and at home.

1. During the second through seventh weeks of the project, take a weekly running record of each study child's oral reading performance and collect a sample of his/her writing. Score these adhering to the guidelines discussed in class, summarize the results, and analyze your findings for each assessment. As you build knowledge about literacy teaching and learning, focus on implementing the strategies learned in class with these students, making sure to use assessment to guide instruction. Document these strategies/instructional methods for future reference in your final paper. The running record score sheets, a copy of the writing samples (students' names removed), and a one page summary/analysis of the students' scores will be compiled and submitted to the professor each week. Each week in class, candidates will share and discuss data in an effort to mentor one another through the change over time process. **(IRA 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)**
2. During the eighth week of the project, administer the Garfield Survey and Motivation to Read Survey again.
3. Finally, revisit the running records, writing samples, and score summary sheets in order to see the students' change over time. Consider the relationship between your literacy instruction and the students' reading/writing growth. Write a paper referencing class readings and utilizing the vocabulary of the field in order to discuss the changes over time observed in the students' reading and writing, as well as in your teaching of reading and writing in order to meet the needs of the students. Use the following headings to construct the paper:

Introduction (IRA 3.3)

Student:

- A. Name
- B. Date of birth
- C. Gender, ethnicity, primary language, socioeconomic status
- D. Grade placement in school – retentions?

- E. Special services received
- F. Home literacy practice – parental attitudes
- G. Reason for selecting the children to participate in the project
- H. Environment in which data samples were collected and instruction occurred
- I. Child’s attitude / behavior during project
- J. Rapport with children

Change Over Time (1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3)

- A. **Change over time – Reading:** What behaviors/strategies were observed at the beginning of data collection? Provide specific assessment and observational data to document the student’s reading development at the beginning of the study. What did you notice about the student’s progress over time? What behaviors/strategies were observed at the end of data collection? Provide specific assessment and observational data to document the student’s literacy development at the end of the study. What reading growth was demonstrated in your data? Situate your student’s development on a literacy processing continuum.
- B. **Change over time – Writing:** What behaviors/strategies were observed at the beginning of data collection? Provide specific assessment and observational data to document the student’s writing development at the beginning of the study. What did you notice about the student’s progress over time? What behaviors/strategies were observed at the end of data collection? Provide specific assessment and observational data to document the student’s literacy development at the end of the study. What writing growth was demonstrated in your data? Situate your student’s development on a literacy processing continuum.
- C. **Recommendations for future instruction:** Using your data, write specific, detailed recommendations for future instruction. Include the following:
 - Discuss the strategies and skills that need to be further developed.
 - Provide specific instructional methods and materials required to accomplish these goals.
 Cite specific examples from the data to inform your recommendations and support these recommendations with research and theory.
- D. **Reflection and Synthesis: Instructional changes made based upon student performance** – How did you adjust your instruction in order to meet student needs? What instructional shifts did you make and how did those shifts impact student learning? Reflect upon your teaching and discuss how your knowledge of the reading/writing processing system influenced students’ progress in literacy learning. In addition, discuss how your dispositions toward reading and writing influenced students’ literacy achievement and attitude toward literacy learning.

Change Over Time Paper Organization:

1. Introduction of student #1

- 2.** Change over time – reading for student #1
- 3.** Change over time – writing for student #1
- 4.** Recommendations for future instruction student #1
- 5.** Instructional changes made for student #1
- 6.** Weekly data for student #1
- 7.** Introduction, change over time in reading/writing, recommendations, and instructional changes for student #2
- 8.** Weekly data for student #2
- 9.** Introduction, change over time in reading/writing, recommendations, and instructional changes for student #3
- 10.** Weekly data for student #3
- 11.** Reference page in APA format – 5th edition

**READ 7351: Change Over Time
Final Project Rubric**

100 points total	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory (Basic)	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
<p>Project Components: The candidate includes all of the project components: introduction, summary and analysis of student progress in reading and writing, recommendations for future instruction, weekly assessment data, teacher’s instructional shifts, and a reference page.</p>	<p>All of the components and subparts of the Change Over Time Project are included and complete. The document is organized according to the specified format. Writing is clear and in the objective case. There are no errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9-10 pts.</p>	<p>All of the components and subparts of the Change Over Time Project are included and complete. The document is organized according to the specified format. For the most part, writing is clear and in the objective case. There are five or fewer errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8-8.5 pts.</p>	<p>All of the components of the Change Over Time Project are included and two or fewer may be incomplete. Some of the subparts may be missing. The document is partially organized according to the specified format. For the most part, writing is clear and in the objective case. There are six to ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-7.5 pts.</p>	<p>One or more of the components of the Change Over Time Project are missing. Of those present, more than two are incomplete. Some of the subparts are missing. The document is not organized according to the specified format. The writing lacks clarity and is not written in the objective case. There are more than ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6.5 or fewer pts.</p>	
<p>Introduction: The candidate followed the standard format for organizing and developing a Change Over Time Project introduction. The heading data, student information, and community / school information are all included and organized according to specified format. (IRA 3.3)</p>	<p>The Change Over Time Project introduction is well organized, written clearly, and includes all of the necessary information in detail.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9 -10 pts.</p>	<p>The Change Over Time Project introduction is well organized, written clearly, and includes all of the necessary information. Detail is lacking in one or two areas.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8-8.5 pts.</p>	<p>The Change Over Time Project introduction lacks some organization and clarity. At least 9 of the required pieces of information are present but may lack detail.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-7.5 pts.</p>	<p>The Change Over Time Project introduction lacks organization and clarity. More than 6 of the required pieces of information are missing. Areas included lack detail.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6.5 or fewer pts.</p>	

	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory (Basic)	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
<p>Summary and Analysis of Student Progress - Reading: The reading progress of the case study students is summarized and analyzed. Links between student progress and classroom instruction are outlined. (IRA 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 4.4)</p>	<p>The reading progress of the case study students is summarized and analyzed clearly and in detail. Change over time is discussed as it relates to the students' abilities and attitudes toward reading. Links between students' progress and classroom instruction are clearly defined. Thoughts are well supported with references.</p> <p>4.5-5 pts. per student 13.5-15 pts. total</p>	<p>The reading progress of the case study students is summarized and analyzed clearly and with some detail. Change over time is discussed as it relates to the students' abilities and attitudes toward reading. Links between students' progress and classroom instruction are defined. Thoughts are supported with references.</p> <p>4 pts. per student 12 pts. total</p>	<p>The reading progress of the case study students is summarized and analyzed. Change over time is discussed as it relates to the students' abilities and attitudes toward reading. Links between students' progress and classroom instruction are present, but not made obvious. Thoughts are partially supported with references.</p> <p>3.5 pts. per student 10.5 pts. total</p>	<p>The reading progress of the case study students is not effectively summarized and analyzed. Change over time is not clearly discussed as it relates to the students' abilities and attitudes toward reading. Links between students' progress and classroom instruction are missing or not outlined. Thoughts are not supported with references.</p> <p>less than 3.5 pts. per student: less than 10.5 total</p>	
<p>Summary and Analysis of Student Progress - Writing: The writing progress of the case study students is summarized and analyzed. Links between student progress and classroom instruction are outlined. (IRA 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 4.4)</p>	<p>The writing progress of the case study students is summarized and analyzed clearly and in detail. Change over time is discussed as it relates to the students' abilities and attitudes toward writing. Links between students' progress and classroom instruction are clearly defined. Thoughts are well supported</p>	<p>The writing progress of the case study students is summarized and analyzed clearly and with some detail. Change over time is discussed as it relates to the students' abilities and attitudes toward writing. Links between students' progress and classroom instruction are defined. Thoughts are</p>	<p>The writing progress of the case study students is summarized and analyzed. Change over time is discussed as it relates to the students' abilities and attitudes toward writing. Links between students' progress and classroom instruction are present, but not made obvious. Thoughts are partially</p>	<p>The writing progress of the case study students is not effectively summarized and analyzed. Change over time is not clearly discussed as it relates to the students' abilities and attitudes toward writing. Links between students' progress and classroom instruction are missing or not outlined. Thoughts are not supported with references.</p> <p>less than 3.5 pts.</p>	

	with references. 4.5-5 pts. per student 13.5-15 pts. total	supported with references. 4 pts. per student 12 pts. total	supported with references. 3.5 pts. per student 10.5 pts. total	per student: less than 10.5 total	
--	--	---	---	--	--

	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory (Basic)	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
Student Achievement –Reading: The candidate’s instruction positively impacted the students’ achievement in reading. (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	The candidate adjusted his/her instruction to meet the needs of students. The candidate documented students’ growth in reading achievement.			It is not clear that the candidate adjusted his/her instruction to meet the needs of students. Student growth in reading achievement is not documented.	
Student Achievement –Writing: The candidate’s instruction positively impacted the students’ achievement in writing. (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	The candidate adjusted his/her instruction to meet the needs of students. The candidate documented students’ growth in writing achievement.			It is not clear that the candidate adjusted his/her instruction to meet the needs of students. Student growth in writing achievement is not documented.	
Weekly Running Records, Writing Samples, and Summaries/Analysis (IRA 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)	4.5-5 pts. per week 36-40 pts. total	4 pts. per week 32 pts. total	3.5 pts. per week 28 pts. total	less than 3.5 points per week less than 28 pts. total	
Reflection and Synthesis: The final portion of the paper provides closure by discussing what was learned regarding modifying instruction to meet students’ needs. Professional dispositions toward reading and writing and their influence over student performance are discussed. (IRA 4.4, 5.1, 5.3)	Candidate demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the need to use student performance to guide instruction. Professional dispositions and their relation to student learning are recognized and clearly discussed. 9 - 10 pts.	Candidate demonstrates a proficient understanding of the need to use student performance to guide instruction. Professional dispositions and their relation to student learning are recognized and discussed. 8 – 8.5 pts.	Candidate demonstrates a basic understanding of the need to use student performance to guide instruction. Professional dispositions and their relation to student learning are not fully discussed. The relationship between dispositions and student learning is not fully recognized. 7 – 7.5 pts.	Candidate demonstrates a lack of understanding of the need to use student performance to guide instruction. Professional dispositions and their relation to student learning are not discussed. 6.5 or fewer pts.	

THE NEW IRA STANDARDS 2010 ARE BEING APPLIED.

**READ 7351 Change Over Time
(2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 4.2)**

Change Over Time Paper (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 4.2) For this paper, you will need to identify three students in your classroom and collect and analyze data regarding their reading and writing performance over the course of eight weeks. Detailed instructions for this assignment accompany the syllabus. This is a key assessment for the Master of Education in Reading degree. This paper will be turned into Blackboard and is a Chalk and Wire Assessment.

Paper Outline

- I. Introduction of Children – A paragraph per child
 - A. Name of the children (pseudonyms please)
 - B. Children’s date of birth
 - C. Children’s gender, ethnicity, primary language, socioeconomic status
 - D. Children’s grade placement / school
 - E. Special services the children receive
 - F. Home literacy practice – parental attitudes
 - G. Reason for selecting the children to participate in the project
 - H. Environment in which data samples were collected and instruction occurred
 - I. Child’s attitude / behavior during project - any specific comments / behaviors
 - J. Rapport with children

- II. First Case Child
 - A. Reading change over time – What did you notice about the student’s progress over time? What behaviors/strategies were observed at the beginning of data collection versus the end? What growth was demonstrated in your data?
 - B. Writing change over time – (same prompts as for reading)
 - C. Explain your comprehensive and balanced reading and writing curriculum for this child.
 - D. Instructional changes made based upon student performance – How did you adjust and differentiate your instruction in order to meet student needs? What shifts did you make and did these shifts make a difference? How?
 - E. How did your instruction capitalize on diversity? Explain.
 - E. Anecdotal notes / additional observations
 - F. Analyze and give a reflective summary of student’s progress and how the progress is linked to classroom instruction.
 - G. Recommendations for future instruction
 - H. Provide references for instructional strategies used.

- III. Second Case Child – (same basic structure as for first child)
 - A. Reading change over time – What did you notice about the student’s progress over time? What behaviors/strategies were observed at the beginning of data collection versus the end? What growth was demonstrated in your data?

- B. Writing change over time – (same prompts as for reading)
- C. Explain your comprehensive and balanced reading and writing curriculum for this child.
- D. Instructional changes made based upon student performance – How did you adjust and differentiate your instruction in order to meet student needs? What shifts did you make and did these shifts make a difference? How?
- E. How did your instruction capitalize on diversity? Explain.
- E. Anecdotal notes / additional observations
- F. Analyze and give a reflective summary of student’s progress and how the progress is linked to classroom instruction.
- G. Recommendations for future instruction
- H. Provide references for instructional strategies used.

IV. Third Case Child – (same basic structure as for first and second child)

- A. Reading change over time – What did you notice about the student’s progress over time? What behaviors/strategies were observed at the beginning of data collection versus the end? What growth was demonstrated in your data?
- B. Writing change over time – (same prompts as for reading)
- C. Explain your comprehensive and balanced reading and writing curriculum for this child.
- D. Instructional changes made based upon student performance – How did you adjust and differentiate your instruction in order to meet student needs? What shifts did you make and did these shifts make a difference? How?
- E. How did your instruction capitalize on diversity? Explain.
- E. Anecdotal notes / additional observations
- F. Analyze and give a reflective summary of student’s progress and how the progress is linked to classroom instruction.
- G. Recommendations for future instruction
- H. Provide references for instructional strategies used.

V. Summary / Conclusions

Rationale for using student performance to guide instruction with references supporting your rationale. Paper must be in APA 6th Edition format or most recent format edition.

IRA Standard /Element	Descriptors	Exemplary 18-20 Points	Proficient 16-17.5 Points	Satisfactory 14-15.5 Points	Unsatisfactory 13.5 and Less Points
2.1 Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.	2.1 Develop and implement the curriculum to meet the specific needs of students who struggle with reading;	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate develops and implements an efficient MASTERFUL comprehensive and balanced reading and writing curriculum that exemplifies the use of Candidate's use of foundational knowledge to meet students' specific needs and gives the research underpinning the Candidates' plan.	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate develops and implements a THOROUGH comprehensive and balanced reading and writing curriculum which exemplifies Candidate's competent use of foundational knowledge to meet students' specific needs.	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate develops a broad but limited balanced reading and writing curriculum that exemplifies a growing and ABLE ability to use some foundational knowledge to meet students' general needs.	In the Change over Time Paper it is not evident Candidate develops a balanced reading or writing curriculum but relies on a limited repertoire of routines, or NOVICE singular approaches to meet the students' general or specific needs.
2.2 Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop all areas in a <i>cognitive model of reading (McKenna & Stahl, 2009) and</i> 4.2 Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.	Use instructional approaches supported by literature and research in literacy; Provide differentiated instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online resources that capitalize on diversity.	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate demonstrates the MASTERFUL ability to use varied instructional approaches and materials that capitalizes on diversity to meet the needs of those who struggle with reading and writing and gives the research to support instructional choices.	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate demonstrates the SKILLED ability to use instructional approaches and instructional materials that capitalizes on diversity to meet the needs of those who struggle with reading and writing.	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate demonstrates the ABLE ability to use instructional approaches and instructional materials to meet the needs of those who struggle with reading and writing.	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate did not demonstrate the ability to use instructional approaches to meet the needs of those who struggle with reading and writing and did not use instructional materials to capitalize on diversity.
2.2 Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop all areas in a <i>cognitive model of reading (McKenna & Stahl, 2009).</i> 4.2 Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.	Provides appropriate in-depth instruction for all readers and writers especially those who struggle with reading and writing; and Provide differentiated instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online resources that capitalize on diversity.	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate demonstrates the masterful ability to adjust and differentiate appropriate in-depth instruction to meet the needs of those who struggle with reading and writing and gives the research to support instruction	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate demonstrates the skilled ability to adjust and differentiate appropriate in-depth instruction to meet the needs of those who struggle with reading and writing and gives the research to support instruction	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate demonstrates the ABLE ability to adjust or differentiate appropriate in-depth instruction to meet the needs of those who struggle with reading and writing and gives the research to support instruction	In the Change over Time Paper Candidate did not demonstrate the ability to adjust or differentiate appropriate in-depth instruction but relies on a limited or NOVICE singular approach to meet the needs of those who struggle with reading and writing.

3.1 Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.	Demonstrate an understanding of established purposes for assessing the performance of all readers, including tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and measuring outcomes.	In Change over Time Paper, Candidates gives a SOPHISTICATED and COMPREHENSIVE reflective summary and analysis of students' reading and writing abilities and provides a clear, detailed interpretation of students' progress and the link to assessments and to classroom instruction which is supported by research-based references.	In Change over Time Paper, Candidates gives a SYSTEMATIC summary and analysis of students' reading and writing abilities and provides a clear, detailed interpretation of students' progress and the link to assessments and to classroom instruction that is supported by references.	In Change over Time Paper, Candidates gives a somewhat IN-DEPTH summary and analysis of students' reading and writing abilities and provides an interpretation of students' progress with some link to classroom instruction or assessments.	In Change over Time Paper, Candidates gives an incomplete somewhat DEVELOPED or NAIVE summary and analysis of students' reading and writing abilities and provides some basic interpretation of students' progress or is not clear in how progress is linked to assessments and to classroom instruction.
FORMAT	APA Format, Spelling, Grammar, and Paper Requirements: Introduction, Student Information, Reflective Summary and Analysis, References, Lesson Plans.	All requirements met, there are no spelling or grammar errors, APA format 6 th edition is correct.	1 required element missing, 1-2 spelling or grammar errors, or 1 -2 APA errors.	2 required elements missing, 3-4 spelling or grammar errors, or 3-4 APA errors.	3 or more required elements missing, more than 4 spelling or grammar errors, or more than 4 APA errors.

Wording for Rubric such as masterful, skilled, and systematic is adapted from Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (p. 178). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

TABLE 5.3: Assessment 5: Teaching Reading: READ 7351
Change Over Time Paper

July 2010 – July 2011

The fiscal reporting year changed for the College of Education. READ 7351 was offered in the fall 2010 and was not offered again until the fall 2011. A new rubric meeting the IRA 2010 Standards was created. Only 1 new reading candidate was in the fall 2011 course. In addition the program lost a tenure track faculty and the course was taught by a PhD Reading Candidate.

Criterion/ Standard	Unsatisfactory 1-1.9	Satisfactory 2-2.9	Proficient 3-3.9	Exemplary 4-4.9	N	Mean	S.D.
2.1	-	-		100%	1	4.0	0
2.2	-	-	100%		1	3.0	0
2.2	-	-	100%		1	3.0	0
4.2	-	-		100%	1	4.0	0
3.1	-	-	100%		1	3.0	0

Interpretation of Data. The Candidate developed a solid understanding of how to administer, score, and interpret data from weekly running records and writing samples in this introductory Master's level course. The Candidate will have further opportunities to refine these skills in subsequent classes.

#6 (Required)-Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 2, 3, 4, and 5. Examples of appropriate assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, research reports, child studies, action research, portfolio tasks, and follow-up studies. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 6. Creating a Literate Environment: READ 7397
Professional Development in Literacy Instruction

Description. This assessment focuses on the theories and research in the areas of language development and literacy instruction and how these theories inform literacy instruction in classrooms and schools. Candidates must research and compare theories of language development, determine how they inform literacy instruction, and use this information to develop a school-wide comprehensive literacy plan. In addition, candidates organize and present findings through a professional development seminar.

Alignment. The Professional Development in Literacy Instruction Assessment addresses the following standards and accompanying elements:

Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge

- Candidates will:
 - research and discuss a major theory in the area of language development and learning to read. **(1.3)**

Standard 2: Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials

- Candidates will:
 - discuss grouping options in order to meet students' needs as a part of their school and classroom plans. **(2.1)**
 - discuss a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods in order to best meet the needs of all students. **(2.2)**
 - discuss a wide range of curriculum materials and the rationale behind their use in order to best meet the needs of all students. **(2.3)**

Standard 5: Professional Development

- Candidates will:
 - discuss the relationship(s) between teacher dispositions and student achievement. **(5.1)**
 - organize and present a professional development seminar discussing language acquisition theories and their influence on literacy development. **(5.2)**
 - demonstrate their understanding of the characteristics of effective professional development. **(5.4)**

Data Findings. This assessment was substantially revised in the summer of 2007 to better align with the Arkansas Department of Education's State Competencies for Reading Professionals and the IRA Standards for Reading Professionals at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level. For this reason, data are provided for one academic year. As shown in Table 6, twenty-one Candidates completed the Professional Development in Literacy Instruction Paper and Professional Development Seminar Presentation as a requirement for READ 7397, Creating a Literate Environment between September 1, 2007 and August 31, 2008. Data demonstrate that 100% of the Candidates scored at the target level of "Proficient" or higher on each of the criterion assessed.

Due to the nature of the course and the timing of assessment through Chalk and Wire, data for one Candidate was collected from September 1, 2008 – August 31, 2009. This Candidate rated "Exceptional" level on all criteria assessed.

TABLE 6: Assessment 6: Creating a Literate Environment: READ 7397
Professional Development in Literacy Instruction

September 1, 2007 – August 31, 2008

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00-1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00-3.99	Exceptional 4.00-4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Presentation Content (IRA 1.5, 3.1)	-	-	5%	95%	21	4.0	0.2
Presentation Delivery and Materials (IRA 1.5, 3.1)	-	-	10%	90%	21	3.9	0.3
School Plan (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	5%	95%	21	4.0	0.2
Classroom Plan (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	29%	71%	21	3.7	0.5

TABLE 6.1: Assessment 6: Creating a Literate Environment: READ 7397
Professional Development in Literacy Instruction

September 1, 2008 – August 31, 2009

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Presentation Content (IRA 1.5, 3.1)	-	-	-	100%	1	4.0	-
Presentation Delivery and Materials (IRA 1.5, 3.1)	-	-	-	100%	1	4.0	-
School Plan (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	-	100%	1	4.0	-
Classroom Plan (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	-	100%	1	4.0	-

Interpretation of Data. Overall, Candidates demonstrated a solid understanding of the different theories of language development. Their Power Point presentations were informative, organized, and presented in a manner that engaged participants. Candidates used these theories to support classroom and school plans for literacy instruction (Elements 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). While the scores were at the target level, analysis of data from the first cohort reveal that Candidates had a difficult time using theory to support classroom practice. Adjustments in instruction resulted in higher scores on this criterion for the second cohort as shown in Table 6.1.

TABLE 6.2: Assessment 6: Creating a Literate Environment: READ 7397
Professional Development in Literacy Instruction

January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2010

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Presentation Content (IRA 1.5, 3.1)	-	-	13%	88%	24	3.9	0.3
Presentation Delivery and Materials (IRA 1.5, 3.1)	-	-	13%	88%	24	3.9	0.3
School Plan (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	13%	88%	24	3.9	0.3
Classroom Plan (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)	-	-	8%	92%	24	3.9	0.3

Interpretation of Data. Overall, Candidates demonstrated a solid understanding of the different theories of language development. Their Power Point presentations were informative, organized, and presented in a manner that engaged participants. Candidates used these theories to support classroom and school plans for literacy instruction (Elements 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). While the scores were at the target level, candidates scoring at the “Proficient” and “Exceptional,” level, analysis of data reveal the we need to continue to stress becoming proficient in understanding and using theory to support classroom practice.

Professional Development in Literacy Instruction

READ 7397

IRA Standards: 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4

This project focuses on the theories and research in the areas of language development and literacy instruction and how these theories inform literacy instruction in your classroom and school. In order to complete this project, you will need to research and compare theories of language development and determine how they inform literacy instruction. Your findings will be presented to the rest of the class as a professional development seminar. This information will then be used to develop a comprehensive plan for literacy instruction across all grade levels and content areas in your school. You will also provide a detailed plan for creating a literate environment in your own classroom.

Professional Development Seminar (IRA 1.3, 5.2, 5.4)

Working with a partner, you will read research in the area of language development and literacy instruction. Some of the researchers whose work you will read may include: Brian Cambourne, Don Holdaway, Lev Vygotsky, Noam Chomsky, John Piaget, and Marie Clay. Prepare a professional study group session over your findings. In this session, you will describe the theories you read and discuss how they inform literacy instruction in individual classrooms and across the school. Use a Power Point presentation to guide your discussion. The presentation should include the following:

- Provide a detailed description of the theory. What are its essential components and how does it compare and contrast to the theories discussed in class?
- What are the strengths/weaknesses or pros/cons of the theory?
- What would a typical classroom look like that espouses this theory?
- Engage the audience in an activity to promote further discussion and build understanding.

Begin by providing an overview of the intended goal and format of the presentation. Provide appropriate materials for the audience that support interaction and understanding of the theory and its relation to classroom practice.

Comprehensive School-wide Literacy Plan (2.1, 2.2, 2.3)

Using school assessment data (standardized test results, school surveys, and demographic data), analyze your school's current literacy program in relation to the 10 features of the Comprehensive Literacy Model (use the specified framework):

- Framework for Literacy
- High Standards
- Model Classrooms
- Coaching and Mentoring
- Interventions
- Professional Development
- School Plan
- Technology
- Spotlighting

Next, based on the 10 features, determine where your school is currently and where it needs to be in order to achieve full implementation. Finally, develop an action plan with specific steps for implementing the comprehensive literacy model in your school.

Creating A Literate Classroom Environment (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1)

Using the school-wide plan you developed above, create a plan for establishing a literate classroom environment. You will address the following in your plan:

- Demonstrate an Understanding of the Components of a Balanced Literacy Curriculum
 - Read-aloud
 - Shared Reading
 - Guided Reading
 - Independent Reading
 - Assisted Writing
 - Writer's Workshop
 - Independent Writing
 - Word Study
 - Content Workshop
 - Mini-lessons
- Outline a Daily Schedule – Integration and Differentiation of Instruction
- Design a Room Arrangement to Support Whole Group, Small Group, and Independent Literacy Learning
- Assess Curriculum Materials
- Assess Classroom Library
- Plan How Assessment will be used to Guide Instruction
- Design a Data Collection System for Tracking Students' Performance
- Discuss the relationship between a literate environment, teacher dispositions, and student achievement.

All three parts of this project will be uploaded into Chalk and Wire

READ 7397
Professional Development in Literacy Instruction

100 POINTS	EXCEPTIONAL	PROFICIENT	BASIC (SATISFACTORY)	UNACCEPTABLE
<p>Presentation Content: The content of the Power Point presentation clearly and accurately presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a detailed description of the theory. • What are its essential components and how does it compare and contrast to the theories discussed in class? • What are the strengths/weaknesses or pros/cons of the theory? • What would a typical classroom look like that espouses this theory? <p>(IRA 1.5, 3.2)</p>	<p>Presentation Content: The content of the Power Point presentation accurately and clearly presents all of the required information. The content demonstrates a deep understanding of the theory, and its application to classroom practice. The intended goal(s) of the presentation were clearly met.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">22.5-25 pts.</p>	<p>Presentation Content: The content of the Power Point presentation accurately and clearly presents all of the required information. The content demonstrates a firm understanding of the theory, and its application to classroom practice. The intended goal(s) of the presentation were met.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">20-22 pts.</p>	<p>Presentation Content: The content of the Power Point presentation shares all of the required information, however, it may lack clarity and/or accuracy. The content demonstrates a partial understanding of the theory, and its application to classroom practice. The intended goal(s) of the presentation were partially met.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">17.5-19.5 pts.</p>	<p>Presentation Content: The content of the Power Point presentation does not include all of the required information. What is included lacks clarity and/or accuracy. The content demonstrates little understanding of the theory, and/or its application to classroom practice. The intended goal(s) of the presentation were not met.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">17 or fewer points</p>
<p>Presentation Delivery and Materials: The presentation adhered to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended goal(s) and presentation format were clearly stated. • Power Point slides were well organized and easy to read. • Presentation and discussion stayed within the 30 minute time limit. • Handouts and materials provided were appropriate and met the intended presentation goal(s) • Presentation was a team 	<p>Presentation Delivery and Materials: The intended goal(s) and format of the presentation were clearly stated. The presentation was well organized and conducted as a conversation rather than a “read-aloud”. It was clearly evident that the presentation was a team effort. The class was actively engaged in the presented activity. The presentation stayed within the specified time limits. The discussion/interactions and support materials provided were appropriate for the goal(s) intended.</p>	<p>Presentation Delivery and Materials: The intended goal(s) and format of the presentation were stated. The presentation was well organized and conducted as a conversation rather than a “read-aloud”. It was evident that the presentation was a team effort. Most of the class was actively engaged in the presented activity. The presentation stayed within the specified time limits. The discussion/interactions and support materials provided were appropriate for the goal(s) intended.</p>	<p>Presentation Delivery and Materials: The intended goal(s) and/or format of the presentation were stated. The presentation was somewhat organized and conducted more as a “read-aloud” rather than a conversation. Understanding appeared to be at the surface level. It was unclear as to whether the presentation was a team effort. Most of the class was actively engaged in the presented activity. The presentation did not stay within the specified time limits. The discussion/interactions and</p>	<p>Presentation Delivery and Materials: The intended goal(s) and/or format of the presentation were not stated. The presentation was not organized. It was conducted as a “read-aloud” rather than a conversation. Understanding of the theory was not evident. The presentation showed little evidence of teamwork. The class was not actively engaged in the presented activity or unclear as to what was expected. The presentation did not stay within the specified time limits. The</p>

<p>effort and rehearsal was evident. (IRA 1.5, 3.2)</p>	<p>22.5-25 pts.</p>	<p>20-22 pts.</p>	<p>support materials provided were not related to the intended goal(s). 1.5-19.5 pts.</p>	<p>discussion/interactions and support materials provided were not related to the intended goal(s). 17 or fewer points</p>
<p>School Plan: The candidate uses assessment data to discuss his/her school's current status regarding the 10 components of a Comprehensive Literacy Model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework for Literacy • High Standards • Model Classrooms • Coaching and Mentoring • Interventions • Professional Development • School Plan • Technology • Spotlighting <p>The candidate then states the intended outcome and the actions necessary for achieving full implementation of the model in the school, i.e, "Where do we want to be? "What are the steps to get there?" (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)</p>	<p>School Plan: The analysis, plan, and action steps on the school plan matrix are complete, written with clarity, and in detail. The goals and action plan clearly reflect the theories and processes presented in class and are aligned with the 10 components of a Comprehensive Literacy Model. 22.5-25 pts.</p>	<p>School Plan: The analysis, plan, and action steps on the school plan matrix are complete, written with clarity, and in some detail. The goals and action plan reflect the theories and processes presented in class and are aligned with the 10 components of a Comprehensive Literacy Model. 20-22 pts.</p>	<p>School Plan: The analysis, plan, and action steps on the school plan matrix are somewhat complete but may lack clarity and/or detail. The goals and action plan do not clearly reflect the theories and processes presented in class and are not clearly aligned with the 10 components of a Comprehensive Literacy Model. 17.5-19.5 pts.</p>	<p>School Plan: The analysis, plan, and action steps on the school plan matrix are not complete and lack clarity and/or detail. The goals and action plan do not reflect the theories and processes presented in class and are not aligned with the 10 components of a Comprehensive Literacy Model. 17 or fewer points</p>

<p>Classroom Plan: The candidate uses assessment data to determine his/her classroom's instructional status relative to the Framework for Literacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate an Understanding of the Components of a Balanced Literacy Curriculum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Read-aloud ○ Shared Reading ○ Guided Reading ○ Independent Reading ○ Assisted Writing ○ Writer's Workshop ○ Independent Writing ○ Word Study ○ Content Workshop ○ Mini-lessons • Outline a Daily Schedule • Design a Room Arrangement • Assess Curriculum Materials and Library • Plan How Assessment will be used to Guide Instruction • Design a Data Collection System for Tracking Students' Performance <p>The candidate then states the intended outcome and the actions necessary for achieving full implementation of the above components, i.e.,</p>	<p>Classroom Plan: The analysis, plan, and action steps on the classroom plan matrix are complete, written with clarity, and in detail. The goals and action plan clearly reflect the theories and processes presented in class and are aligned with the Framework for Literacy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">22.5-25 pts.</p>	<p>Classroom Plan: The analysis, plan, and action steps on the classroom plan matrix are complete, written with clarity, and in some detail. The goals and action plan reflect the theories and processes presented in class and are aligned with the Framework for Literacy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">20-22 pts.</p>	<p>Classroom Plan: The analysis, plan, and action steps on the classroom plan matrix are somewhat complete but may lack clarity and/or detail. The goals and action plan do not clearly reflect the theories and processes presented in class and are not clearly aligned with the Framework for Literacy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">17.5-19.5 pts.</p>	<p>Classroom Plan: The analysis, plan, and action steps on the classroom plan matrix are not complete and lack clarity and/or detail. The goals and action plan do not reflect the theories and processes presented in class and are not aligned with the Framework for Literacy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">17 or fewer points</p>
--	--	---	--	---

#7 (Optional)-Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 7: Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties: READ 7352

Report of Testing

Description. This assessment focuses on developing a report of testing for a struggling reader. In order to complete this project, Candidates will administer a number of tests related to reading, writing, and/or language development; score, interpret, and synthesize the data collected; and report the findings in written and oral form. In addition, Candidates will create a set of appendices that include the individual test protocols, a rationale behind the selection of the given tests, and a detailed discussion of the theories and rationale supporting the list of instructional recommendations.

Alignment. The Report of Testing Assessment addresses the following standards and accompanying elements:

Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge

- Candidates will...
 - use assessment data in order to determine if the student is integrating the components of phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation in fluent reading. **(1.4)**

Standard 2: Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials

- Candidates will...
 - use assessment data to select a wide range of appropriate instructional practices, approaches, and methods to meet the individual needs of the student. **(2.2)**

Standard 3: Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation

- Candidates will...
 - assess, score, and interpret data collected by a number of assessments. **(3.1, 3.2)**
 - plan developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate literacy instruction for a struggling reader. Theory and research will be used to support the recommendations. **(3.3)**
 - discuss the assessment data, instructional plans, and results of instruction with the instructor orally and in the written report. **(3.4)**

Standard 4: Creating a Literate Environment

- Candidates will...
 - use assessment data to select materials (books and non-print) that match the reading levels, interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds of students. **(4.1, 4.2)**
 - recommend instructional plans to intrinsically and extrinsically motivate the struggling reader. **(4.4)**

Data Findings. The rubric for the Report of Testing was revised substantially in the summer of 2007 to more accurately align with the Arkansas Department of Education's State Competencies for Reading Professionals and the IRA Standards for Reading Professionals at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level. For this reason, data are provided for one academic year in Table 7. Twenty-three Candidates

completed the Report of Testing assessment as a requirement for READ 7352: Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties. Table 7 outlines the Candidates' scores in each criterion evaluated on the rubric. Overall, 91% of the Candidates scored at the target level of "Proficient" or higher on each of the criterion assessed. On 4 of the criteria, 1 Candidate scored at the "Basic" level, while 1 Candidate scored at the "Unacceptable" level on one criterion.

Table 7.1 reveals all but one Candidate scored at the "Proficient" level or higher on each of the criterion assessed. This Candidate scored at the "Basic" level on three criterions. No Candidate scored at the "Unacceptable" level.

**TABLE 7: Assessment 7: Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties: READ 7352
Report of Testing**

September 1, 2008 – August 31, 2009

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Overall Format	-	6%	29%	65%	17	3.6	0.6
Introduction (IRA 3.3)	-	-	12%	88%	17	3.9	0.3
Administration and Scoring (IRA 3.1)	-	-	53%	47%	17	3.5	0.5
Data Summary and Observations (IRA 1.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)	-	-	41%	59%	17	3.6	0.5
Data Analysis and Synthesis (IRA 1.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)	-	6%	29%	65%	17	3.6	0.6
Recommendations (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)	-	-	47%	53%	17	3.5	0.5
Presentation of Report (IRA 3.4)	-	-	6%	94%	17	3.9	0.2
Rationale for Test Use (IRA 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)	-	6%	35%	59%	17	3.5	0.6

Interpretation of Data. The majority of Candidates have developed a solid understanding of how to administer, score, and interpret data from a variety of literacy assessments. In addition, the majority of the Candidates were able to analyze data collected in order to make instructional recommendations for their focus student (Elements 1.4, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4). Closer analysis of individual Candidate data in Table 7 revealed that one Candidate needs further support with data management and organization. One Candidate in Table 7 had a particularly difficult time analyzing data in order to inform instructional practice. Further, it needs to be noted that while 96% of Candidates met the target level for criterion 6 – "Recommendations", professors for this course recommend that Candidates need to strengthen their skills in using data analysis to write specific, detailed recommendations and to support their recommendations with theory and research. These Candidates have further opportunities to refine these skills in subsequent classes.

All but one Candidate in Table 7.1 scored at the “Proficient” level or higher in 5 of the 8 criteria assessed. This Candidate needs additional support analyzing and synthesizing data and recognizing the rationale for selecting and using specific assessments. Further opportunities to develop these skills will be provided in subsequent classes.

**TABLE 7.1: Assessment 7: Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties: READ 7352
Report of Testing**

January 1, 2010 – August 31, 2010

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Overall Format	-	7%	29%	64%	14	3.6	0.6
Introduction (IRA 3.3)	-	7%	14%	79%	14	3.7	0.6
Administration and Scoring (IRA 3.1)	7%	7%	21%	64%	14	3.4	0.9
Data Summary and Observations (IRA 1.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)	-	7%	36%	57%	14	3.5	0.6
Data Analysis and Synthesis (IRA 1.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)	7%	7%	21%	64%	14	3.4	0.9
Recommendations (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)	-	14%	29%	57%	14	3.4	0.7
Presentation of Report (IRA 3.4)	-	7%	14%	79%	14	3.7	0.6
Rationale for Test Use (IRA 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)	-	14%	29%	57%	14	3.4	0.7

Interpretation of Data. The majority of Candidates demonstrate an overall “Proficient” ability to administer and score assessments. Two Candidates had more difficulty administering and analyzing data; however, there is another opportunity to work with the administering and scoring of assessments in another course to help remediate. Further analysis of the data indicate that Candidates may need further help in connecting the analysis of data to recommendations in literacy instruction.

READ 7352
IRA Standards: 1.4, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4

This project focuses on developing a report of testing for a struggling reader. In order to complete this project you will be expected to administer a number of tests related to reading, writing, and/or language development; score, interpret, and synthesize the data collected; and report the findings in written and oral form. In addition, you will create a set of appendices that include the individual test protocols, a rationale behind the selection of the given tests, and a detailed discussion of the theories and rationale supporting your list of instructional recommendations.

Introduction (IRA 3.3)

Through conversations with teachers, parents, and information found in cumulative school records (if you have access) gather information about the student.

Include the following:

Student:

- A. Age
- B. Gender
- C. Race/ethnicity
- D. Current grade level placement in school - retentions?
- E. Special services the child receives in/out of school
- F. Uses physical aids – glasses, hearing aids, etc...
- G. Other factors that may include: number of years in the school, number of schools attended, and family status
- H. Child's attitude toward / behavior during the testing
- I. Rapport with classroom teacher and classmates
- J. Rapport with test administrator

Community / School:

- A. Geographic location
- B. School population
- C. Testing environment

Include the information gathered above in introduction section of the Report of Testing.

Student Assessment (3.1)

Administer the assessments listed below to collect data regarding student literacy performance.

Administration must follow each test's guidelines and protocols must be complete, accurate, and neat.

- Garfield Reading Attitude Inventory (McKenna and Kear)
- Motivation to Read Profile (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, and Mazzoni)
- Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test
- Betts Ready to Read Test – selected parts
- Gates McGinitie Reading Test
- Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
- Informal Reading Inventory

- Developmental Spelling Analysis (Ganske) or Monster Spelling Test (Gentry)
- Additional tests of your choice that were discussed in class

Each of the completed and scored test protocols must be included in appendix A of the Report of Testing.

Data Summary and Observations (1.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)

First, provide a brief statement regarding the intended purpose and administration of each test. Next, summarize student performance data and observational data from each test.

Data Analysis and Synthesis (1.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)

Analyze the data from each test. Discuss the patterns/trends in processes, skills, and strategies revealed across the tests. State the child's current placement on the developmental continuum - emergent, early, transitional, or fluent. Discuss the processes / skills the child has under control.

Synthesize these findings.

Recommendations for Instruction (2.2, 3.2,3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4)

Using the findings from data analysis and synthesis, write specific, detailed recommendations for future instruction. Include:

- Discuss the strategies and skills that need to be further developed.
- Provide specific instructional methods and materials required to accomplish these goals.

Cite specific examples from the testing and observation data to inform your recommendations and support these recommendations with theory.

Oral Presentation of Report of Testing (3.4)

Students will present findings and recommendations to the professor who will be acting as a stakeholder in the situation (parent, teacher, principal, paraprofessional).

Report of Testing Organization

The Report of Testing should be organized as follows:

1. Introduction of student and community / school
2. Data summary and observations
3. Data analysis and synthesis across tests
4. Recommendations for future instruction
5. Appendix A – completed and scored test protocols
6. Appendix B – rationale for including tests in Report of Testing
7. Reference page – APA 5th edition style

**READ 7352: Report of Testing
Final Project Rubric**

100 points total	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory (Basic)	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
<p>Overall Format: The candidate followed the standard format for organizing and writing a Diagnostic Report of Testing. The report includes the following components: introduction, summary of test results (numeric), synthesis of data across tests, recommendations for future instruction, appendices, and reference page following APA format.</p>	<p>All of the components and subparts of the Report of Testing are included and complete. The document is organized according to the specified format. Writing is clear and in the objective case. There are no errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9-10 pts.</p>	<p>All of the components and subparts of the Report of Testing are included and complete. The document is organized according to the specified format. For the most part, writing is clear and in the objective case. There are five or fewer errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8-8.5 pts.</p>	<p>All of the components of the Report of Testing are included and two or fewer may be incomplete. Some of the subparts may be missing. The document is partially organized according to the specified format. For the most part, writing is clear and in the objective case. There are six to ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-7.5 pts.</p>	<p>One or more of the components of the Report of Testing are missing. Of those present, more than two are incomplete. Some of the subparts are missing. The document is not organized according to the specified format. The writing lacks clarity and is not written in the objective case. There are more than ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6.5 or fewer pts.</p>	
<p>Introduction: The candidate followed the standard format for organizing and developing a Report of Testing introduction. The heading data, student information, and community / school information are all included and organized according to specified format. (IRA 3.3)</p>	<p>The Report of Testing introduction is well organized, written clearly, and includes all of the necessary information in detail.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9 -10 pts.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing introduction is well organized, written clearly, and includes all of the necessary information. Detail is lacking in one or two areas.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8-8.5 pts.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing introduction lacks some organization and clarity. At least 9 of the required pieces of information are present but may lack detail.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-7.5 pts.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing introduction lacks organization and clarity. More than 6 of the required pieces of information are missing. Areas included lack detail.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6.5 or fewer pts.</p>	

100 points total	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory (Basic)	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
Administration and Scoring: The candidate administers and scores all tests according to specified procedures. The scores are figured accurately and test protocols are clearly, fully, and neatly marked. (IRA 3.1)	Tests are administered according to specified standards, scored correctly, and all test protocols are clearly, fully, and neatly marked. 9-10 pts.	Tests are administered according to specified standards, scored correctly, and all but one test protocol is clearly, fully, and neatly marked. 8-8.5 pts.	Tests are administered according to specified standards but scoring may be incomplete or inaccurate in one case. Two or fewer test protocols are not clearly, fully, and/or neatly marked. 7-7.5 pts.	One or more tests are not administered according to specified standards. Scoring is incomplete or inaccurate in more than cases. Two or more test protocols are not clearly, fully, and/or neatly marked. 6.5 or fewer pts.	
Data Summary and Observations: The purpose of each test is briefly stated. The numerical data from each test is summarized according to the specified format. Observations recorded during testing are included. (IRA 1.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)	The purpose of each test is briefly stated. The numerical data are summarized accurately and clearly and organized according to the specified format. Observations are written objectively and with clarity and detail. 9-10 pts.	The purpose of each test is briefly stated. The numerical data are summarized accurately and clearly and organized according to the specified format. Observational data are provided for most tests and written with clarity and detail in most cases. 8-8.5 pts.	The purpose of most tests is briefly stated. Most numerical data are summarized accurately and clearly and organized according to the specified format. Observational data are provided for most tests but clarity and detail are lacking in some cases. 7-7.5 pts.	The purpose of most tests is not stated. Numerical data are not summarized accurately, clearly, and/or organized according to the specified format. Observational data are missing for most tests. 6.5 or fewer pts.	
Data Analysis and Synthesis: Analyze the data from each test. Discuss the patterns/trends in processes, skills, and strategies revealed across the tests. Synthesize these findings (IRA 1.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)	Data analysis and synthesis effectively discusses the relevant patterns/trends in processes, skills, and strategies revealed across the tests. Analysis and synthesis is clearly written, states key findings, and demonstrates understanding of the literacy processing continuum. 18-20 pts.	Data analysis and synthesis discusses most of the relevant patterns/trends in processes, skills, and strategies revealed across the tests. Analysis and synthesis is clearly written, states key findings, and demonstrates understanding of the literacy processing continuum. 16-17.5 pts.	Data analysis and synthesis discusses most of the relevant patterns/trends in processes, skills, and strategies revealed across the tests. Analysis and synthesis states key findings but lacks clarity. An understanding of the literacy processing continuum is not clear. 14-15.5 pts.	Data analysis and synthesis is incomplete or inaccurate. Key findings are not discussed or are inaccurate based upon data. 13.5 or fewer pts.	
100 points total	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments

			(Basic)		ts
<p>Recommendations: The candidate uses the findings from data analysis and synthesis to write specific, detailed recommendations for future instruction. References to tests data and theory are provided to support these recommendations. (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4)</p>	<p>The recommendations for future instruction are clearly linked to data analysis and synthesis. They demonstrate the candidate's understanding of current reading research and theory. 18-20 pts.</p>	<p>The recommendations for future instruction are linked to data analysis and synthesis. They demonstrate the candidate's understanding of current reading research and theory. 16-17.5 pts.</p>	<p>The recommendations for future instruction are somewhat linked to data analysis and synthesis. They demonstrate some understanding of current reading research and theory. 14-15.5 pts.</p>	<p>The recommendations for future instruction are not linked to data analysis and synthesis. They demonstrate little understanding of current reading research and theory. 13.5 or fewer pts.</p>	
<p>Presentation of Report: The candidate presents a clear, concise, objective verbal explanation of the Report of Testing to the instructor. (IRA 3.4)</p>	<p>The candidate presents a clear, concise, objective verbal explanation of the Report of Testing to the instructor. Candidate responds cogently to questions and concerns and supports responses with data. 9-10 pts.</p>	<p>The candidate presents a concise verbal explanation of the Report of Testing to the instructor. Clarity may be somewhat lacking. Candidate responds somewhat cogently to questions and concerns and supports responses with data. 8-8.5 pts.</p>	<p>The candidate presents a verbal explanation of the Report of Testing to the instructor; however, the presentation is not concise and / or lacks clarity. Comments are not always stated objectively. Candidate has difficulty responding cogently to questions and concerns and has difficulty supporting responses with data. 7-7.5 pts.</p>	<p>The candidate did not present a clear, concise, objective verbal explanation of the Report of Testing to the instructor. Candidate did not respond cogently to questions and concerns. Candidate does not support responses with data. 6.5 or fewer pts.</p>	
<p>Rationale for Test Use: The candidate discusses the rationale for including each test in the Report of Testing. This discussion includes answers to the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do I want to know? • Why do I want to know? • What test will help me best 	<p>The candidate provides a clear, detailed rationale for including each test in the Report of Testing. The rationale addresses each specified question. 9-10 pts.</p>	<p>The candidate provides a clear rationale for including each test in the Report of Testing. The rationale addresses each specified question. 8-8.5 pts.</p>	<p>The candidate provides a rationale for including each test in the Report of Testing; however clarity and/or accuracy may be lacking. The rationale addresses two of the specified question. 7-7.5 pts.</p>	<p>The candidate does not provide a rationale for including each test in the Report of Testing. Two or more of the specified questions are not addressed. Clarity and/or accuracy are lacking. 6.5 or fewer pts.</p>	

discover this informatio n? (IRA 3.1, 3.2, 3.4)					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Report of Testing READ 7352

	Standard Element	Exemplary (18-20 points)	Proficient (16-17 points)	Satisfactory (14-15 points)	Unsatisfactory 13.5 and below points)
Standard 3 Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.	Standard 3.1 Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to</p> <p>*Provide a SOPHISTICATED, COMPREHENSIVE and organized rationale for including each assessment in the Report of Testing The rationale addresses motivation, attitude, and all literacy components, and is based upon research.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to</p> <p>* Provide an IN-DEPTH and organized rationale for including each assessment in the Report of Testing and the rationale addresses most literacy components and is based upon research.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to</p> <p>Provide a somewhat DEVELOPED rationale for assessments that addresses some literacy components with some research cited. The research provided may be misinterpreted or not appropriate.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to</p> <p>Provide an incomplete or NAÏVE rationale for assessments that is an incomplete account or superficial generalization that addresses minimal literacy components. The research provided may be misinterpreted or not appropriate.</p>
Standard 3	Standard 3.2 Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate</p> <p>*In a MASTERFUL application is able to administer all appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. Tests are administered according to specified standards, scored correctly, and all test protocols are clearly, fully, and neatly marked. without any errors, and</p> <p>*Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate</p> <p>*In a SKILLED application is able to administer appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing with few errors; in administration, scoring, or protocols are not well marked, and</p> <p>*Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate</p> <p>*In a somewhat LIMITED application is able to administer appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing; however, there are many errors in administration, scoring, or protocols are not readable, and</p> <p>*Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate</p> <p>* In an APPRENTICE or NOVICE application is able to administer appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing There are too many errors in administration, scoring, or protocols are not readable, and</p>

					*There are some dispositions of a reading specialist that are incomplete or naive.
<p>Standard 2 Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.</p> <p>Standard 3</p>	<p>IRA 2.2 Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections.</p> <p>3.3 Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to</p> <p>*Use multiple data sources, to analyze individual readers' performance to develop an extensive and MASTERFUL plan for literacy instruction and intervention;</p> <p>*All weekly lesson places describe how to link assessment to instruction to develop specific implementation plans in a seamless assessment and instruction intervention cycle;</p> <p>* All weekly teaching plans provide examples of appropriate use of assessments in practice, reflective teaching, and</p> <p>* Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to</p> <p>*Use multiple data sources, to analyze individual readers' performance to develop a SKILLED plan for literacy instruction and intervention;</p> <p>*All weekly lesson places describe how to link assessment to instruction to develop specific implementation</p> <p>* Provide weekly teaching plans that provide examples of appropriate use of assessments in practice, reflective teaching, and</p> <p>* Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to</p> <p>*Use some data sources, to analyze individual readers' performance to develop a limited or ABLE plan for literacy instruction and intervention;</p> <p>* Provide weekly teaching plans that provide some examples of appropriate use of assessments in practice, some reflective teaching, and</p> <p>* Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to</p> <p>*Use some data sources, to analyze individual readers' performance to develop an APPRENTICE or NOVICE plan for literacy instruction and intervention;</p> <p>*Provide weekly teaching plans that provide very little examples of appropriate use of assessments in practice or reflective teaching, and</p> <p>* Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist</p>
<p>Standard 3</p>	<p>3.3 Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to in an INSIGHTFUL interpretation of assessment and instruction by the following:</p> <p>*Analyze and use multiple data sources to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices;</p> <p>*Provide weekly</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to in a REVEALING interpretation of assessment and instruction by the following:</p> <p>*Analyze and use multiple data sources to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices;</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to in a somewhat PERCEPTIVE interpretation of assessment and instruction by the following:</p> <p>*Analyze and use some data sources to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices; however, some analysis or data sources is incorrect;</p>	<p>The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to provide a limited OR LITERAL interpretation of assessment and instruction by the following:</p> <p>*Analyze and use a datum source to</p>

		teaching plans that demonstrated Candidate analyzed and used assessment data and student's responses to intervention to modify intervention in a seamless assessment and intervention cycle, and *Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.	*Provide weekly teaching plans that demonstrated Candidate analyzed and used assessment data to modify intervention, and *Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.	*Provide some weekly teaching plans that demonstrated Candidate used assessment datum to modify intervention; *Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.	examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices; or, the analysis and use of data sources is incorrect; *Provide weekly teaching plans that demonstrated Candidate used assessment datum to modify intervention; or *Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.
Standard 3	IRA 3.4 Communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences	The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to *Provide an INSIGHTFUL analysis of student's progress and appropriate recommendations for instruction to parents, teachers, or other audience for instructional purposes and accountability, and *Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.	The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to *Provide a REVEALING analysis of student's progress and recommendations to parents, teachers, or other audience for instructional purposes and accountability, however there may be 1-2 errors in the analysis interpretation, and *Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.	The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is able to *Provide a somewhat PERCEPTIVE analysis of student's progress with recommendations to parents, teachers, or other audience for instructional purposes and accountability, however there are a few errors or poor recommendations, and *Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.	The Report of Testing indicates that Candidate is not able to *Provide an analysis of student's progress and recommendations to parents, teachers, or other audience for instructional purposes and accountability because there are too many errors leading to a simplistic or LITERAL analysis or recommendations for instruction are not appropriate or does not *Meet the professional dispositions of a reading specialist.
FORMAT	1 point for each	All of the components	All of the components	All of the components	One or more

<p>The candidate followed the standard format for organizing and writing a Diagnostic Report of Testing without any missing information or errors.</p>	<p>grammar/spelling or APA error/ 2 points for area of missing information</p> <p>The report includes the following components: introduction, summary of test results, synthesis and analysis of data across tests, sample of literacy instruction, recommendations for future instruction, appendices, and reference</p>	<p>and subparts of the Report of Testing are included and complete. The document is organized according to the specified format. Writing is clear and in the objective case. There are no errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. All references are in correct APA Format</p>	<p>and subparts of the Report of Testing are included and complete. The document is organized according to the specified format. For the most part, writing is clear and in the objective case. There are five or fewer errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. There are some errors in references in APA format.</p>	<p>of the Report of Testing are included and two or fewer may be incomplete. Some of the subparts may be missing. The document is partially organized according to the specified format. For the most part, writing is clear and in the objective case. There are six to ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. There are too many references that are not in correct APA format.</p>	<p>of the components of the Report of Testing are missing. Of those present, more than two are incomplete. Some of the subparts are missing. The document is not organized according to the specified format. The writing lacks clarity and is not written in the objective case. There are more than ten errors in grammar, spelling, or conventions. APA format for references was not followed.</p>
--	---	---	---	---	--

Table 7.3 Assessment 7 Practicum in Reading: READ 7352
Report of Testing

July 2010-June 2011

Criterion/ Standard	Unsatisfactory 1-1.9	Satisfactory 2-2.9	Proficient 3-3.9	Exemplary 4-4.9	N	Mean	S.D.
2.2	-	-	29%	71%	7	3.71	.48
3.1	-	-	14%	86%	7	3.85	.37
3.2	-	-	14%	86%	7	3.85	.37
3.3	-	-	29%	71%	7	3.71	.48
3.4	-	-	29%	71%	7	3.71	.48
4.2	-	-	29%	71%	7	3.71	.48

Interpretation of the Data. All candidates revealed a solid understanding about how to administer, score, and interpret assessment data to inform instruction as evidenced by scores in the proficient to exemplary range (Standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3). In addition, all candidates demonstrated appropriate and varied use of instructional approaches that develop word recognition, language, comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections (Standard 2.2). Moreover, all candidates engaged students at the proficient level or higher in literacy practices that positively impacted their knowledge and beliefs with connections to diversity (Standard 4.2).

A new rubric was designed to meet IRA 2010 Standards

#8 (Optional)-Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 8: Seminar in Reading: READ 7357 *Historical Perspectives Paper*

Description. This assessment focuses on the history of reading and writing instruction in the United States. Using *American Reading Instruction* (Smith, 2002) as a guide, Candidates will read about an assigned time period in history and review some of the seminal studies conducted during that period. Candidates will write a paper that discusses the focus of reading instruction at that time, influential theorists and theories, and shares the findings of the seminal studies read. In addition, Candidates will discuss how political, social, and economic events / movements / trends influenced the field of literacy. Candidates will work with a small group to lead a professional study session about their assigned time period.

Alignment. The Historical Perspectives Assessment addresses the following standards and accompanying elements:

Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge

- Candidates will...
 - refer to major theories in the foundational areas as they relate to reading instruction in the time period researched. Candidates will explain, compare, contrast, and critique the theories. **(1.1)**
 - summarize seminal studies conducted during the time period researched. Candidates will discuss how these studies impacted reading instruction and historical developments in reading will be discussed. **(1.2)**
 - identify, explain, compare, and contrast the theories and research in the areas of language development and learning to read in the time period researched. **(1.3)**

Standard 5: Professional Development

- Candidates will...
 - work with a small group to present all components of the paper to the class in order to advance the professional research base of classmates and expand their knowledge-based practices. **(5.2)**

Data Findings. This assessment was substantially revised and a new rubric was created in the summer of 2007 to ensure alignment with the IRA Standards for Reading Professionals at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level. For this reason, data are provided for one academic year. Twenty-nine Candidates completed the Historical Perspectives Paper as a requirement for READ 7357, Seminar in Reading. Table 8 and Table 8.1 outline the Candidates' scores in each criterion evaluated on the rubric.

Data in Table 8 demonstrate that 93% of the Candidates scored at the target level of "Proficient" or higher on 5 of the seven criteria assessed. On 2 of the 7 criteria, 100% of the Candidates scored at the target level of "Proficient" or higher. Data in Table 8.1 reveal that two Candidates had difficulty synthesizing and communicating information with their peers in a conversational format. These Candidates conducted their presentation in a "read-aloud" format rather than one that promoted thinking and discussion among peers.

TABLE 8: Assessment 8: Seminar in Reading: READ 7357
Historical Perspectives Paper

September 1, 2007 – August 31, 2008

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00-1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00-3.99	Exceptional 4.00-4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Overall Format	-	7%	14%	79%	29	3.7	0.6
Desc. of Reading Inst. (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	7%	21%	72%	29	3.7	0.6
Disc. of Influential Theorists (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	7%	31%	62%	29	3.6	0.6
Disc. of Seminal Studies (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	7%	34%	59%	29	3.5	0.6
Disc. of Political, Social, and Economic Trends (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	7%	34%	59%	29	3.5	0.6
Presentation Content (IRA 5.2)	-	-	10%	90%	29	3.9	0.3
Presentation and Delivery of Materials (IRA 5.2)	-	-	3%	97%	29	4.0	0.2

**TABLE 8.1: Assessment 8: Seminar in Reading: READ 7357
Historical Perspectives Paper**

September 1, 2008 – August 31, 2009

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Overall Format	-	-	13%	88%	8	3.9	0.3
Desc. of Reading Inst. (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	-	50%	50%	8	3.5	0.5
Disc. of Influential Theorists (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	-	50%	50%	8	3.5	0.5
Disc. of Seminal Studies (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	-	25%	75%	8	3.8	0.4
Disc. of Political, Social, and Economic Trends (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	-	63%	38%	8	3.4	0.5
Presentation Content (IRA 5.2)	-	-	-	100%	8	4.0	-
Presentation and Delivery of Materials (IRA 5.2)	-	13%	25%	63%	8	3.5	0.7

Interpretation of Data. Overall, Candidates in Table 8 demonstrated a solid understanding of the history of reading instruction in the United States. Candidates' papers and Power Point presentations demonstrated their understanding of the relationship between the social, economic and political issues of the time and their influence on reading instruction from pre-school through adult learning. In addition, data revealed that Candidates were aware of and familiar with the seminal studies and theories of literacy acquisition and instruction (Elements 1.1, 1.2, 1.2, 5.2). While all Candidates demonstrated their understanding of the important time periods in American Reading Instruction through their Power Point presentations, 2 Candidates had difficulty expressing the information in a formal, written paper. Throughout the program, Candidates have many opportunities to write reflective pieces, case studies, and data analysis papers. This is the first time Candidates are required to write a formal research paper using APA format. Writing in this genre is unfamiliar to most Candidates.

Data in Table 8.1 demonstrate that 100% of the Candidates attained a score of "Proficient" or higher on 6 of the 7 criteria assessed. Only two Candidates had difficulty with the delivery of the Power Point presentation, which required them to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate their findings and present this information as well as engage their peers in a discussion. Candidates have multiple opportunities to lead presentations of their learning throughout their course of study. Professors will provide additional support

and guidance when students present in the beginning and middle stages of their program of study in order to increase success in this final stage of their program.

TABLE 8.2: Assessment 8: Seminar in Reading: READ 7357
Historical Perspectives Paper

January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2010

Criterion	Unacceptable 1.00- 1.99	Basic 2.00- 2.99	Proficient 3.00- 3.99	Exceptional 4.00- 4.99	N	Mean	S.D.
Overall Format	-	6%	22%	72%	18	3.7	0.6
Desc. of Reading Inst. (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	6%	50%	44%	18	3.4	0.6
Disc. of Influential Theorists (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	6%	39%	56%	18	3.5	0.6
Disc. of Seminal Studies (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	6%	33%	61%	18	3.6	0.6
Disc. of Political, Social, and Economic Trends (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	-	6%	39%	56%	18	3.5	0.6
Presentation Content (IRA 5.2)	-	-	6%	94%	18	3.9	0.2
Presentation and Delivery of Materials (IRA 5.2)	-	-	6%	94%	18	3.9	0.2

Interpretation of Data. . Candidates demonstrated a solid understanding of the history of reading instruction in the United States. Candidates also demonstrated a solid understanding of the relationship between the social, economic, and political issues of the time and the influence on reading instruction from pre-school through adult learning. In addition, data revealed that Candidates were aware of and familiar with the seminal studies and theories of literacy acquisition and instruction (Elements 1.1, 1.2, 5.2). Candidates were able to generate a formal research paper using APA format. Because this is a capstone course in the program, further analysis of the data indicate that there might be a need to create different opportunities prior to this course to write about theorist and seminal studies or create an opportunity for remediation

Historical Perspectives Paper

READ 7357

IRA Standards: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 5.2

This project focuses on the history of reading and writing instruction in the United States. Using *American Reading Instruction* (Smith, 2002) as a guide, you will read about an assigned time period in history and review some of the seminal studies conducted during that period. You will then write a paper that discusses the focus of reading instruction at that time, influential theorists and theories, and share the findings of the seminal studies you read. In addition, you will need to discuss how political, social, and economic events / movements / trends influenced the field of literacy. You will be responsible for working with a small group to lead a professional study session over your time period on the assigned night.

Historical Perspectives Paper: (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)

You will be assigned one of the following time periods:

The Period of Emphasis on Scientific Investigation in Reading 1910-1925

The Period of Intensive Research and Application 1925-1935

The Period of International Conflict 1935-1950

The Period of Expanding Knowledge and Technological Revolution 1950-1966

American Reading Instruction Since 1967: Research in the late 1960s and 1970s

American Reading Instruction Since 1967: Research in the 1980s and 1990s

In addition, you will locate and read two seminal studies from the time period you are assigned. Resources may include:

Robinson, R. D. (2000). *Historical sources in U.S. reading education 1900-1970: An annotated bibliography*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Robinson, R. D. (2005). *Readings in reading instruction: Its history, theory, and development*. Boston: Pearson.

Tracey, D. H., & Morrow, L. M. (2006). *Lenses on reading*. New York: Guilford Press.

The Handbook of Reading Research – there are 3 editions

Study Group Leader: (IRA 5.2)

Working with classmates who researched the same time period, prepare a professional study group over your material. Use a Power Point presentation to guide your discussion. The presentation should include the following:

- The focus of reading instruction at that time
- Influential theorists and theories and reading researchers
- The findings of the seminal studies you read
- How political, social, and economic events / movements / trends influenced the field of literacy
- Engage the audience in discussion to promote further understanding.

Provide a handout for the audience that summarizes your time period and lists your resources (APA 5th Edition format).

**READ 7357: Historical Perspectives on Reading
Project Rubric**

100 points total	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
<p>Overall Format: The student followed an appropriate format for organizing and writing the Historical Perspectives Paper. The paper includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of reading instruction during that period • Influential theorists and theories • Influential reading researchers and research • Summary of seminal studies • Political, social, and economic events / movements / trends that influenced the field of literacy • Reference page (APA 5th Edition) 	<p>Student demonstrates an exceptional understanding for planning and writing a thorough, well organized paper.</p> <p>9-10 pts.</p>	<p>Student demonstrates a proficient understanding for planning and writing a thorough, well organized paper.</p> <p>8-8.5 pts.</p>	<p>Student demonstrates a basic understanding for planning and writing a thorough, well organized paper.</p> <p>7-7.5 pts.</p>	<p>Student demonstrates a lack of understanding for planning and writing a thorough, well organized paper.</p> <p>6.5 or fewer pts.</p>	
<p>Description of reading instruction during that time period: The period is summarized clearly, thoroughly, and with an appropriate amount of detail. (IRA 1.1, 1.2,</p>	<p>The period is summarized clearly, thoroughly, and with an appropriate amount of detail. The author does an exceptional job of discussing the period with a critical eye.</p>	<p>The period is summarized clearly, thoroughly, and with an appropriate amount of detail. The author does a proficient job of discussing the period with a critical eye.</p>	<p>The period summary lacks some clarity, thoroughness, or detail. The author does an acceptable job of discussing the period with a critical eye.</p>	<p>The period summary lacks clarity, thoroughness, and/or detail. The author does not discuss the period with a critical eye.</p> <p>10 or fewer pts.</p>	

1.3)	13.5 – 15 pts.	12-13 pts.	10.5–11.5 pts.		
-------------	-----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	--	--

100 points total	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
<p>Discussion of influential theorists and researchers and their work: The influential theorists, researchers, and their work are summarized clearly, thoroughly, and with an appropriate amount of detail. (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)</p>	<p>The influential theorists, researchers, and their work are summarized clearly, thoroughly, and with an appropriate amount of detail. The author does an exceptional job of discussing the material with a critical eye.</p> <p>13.5-15 pts.</p>	<p>The influential theorists, researchers, and their work are summarized clearly, thoroughly, and with an appropriate amount of detail. The author does a proficient job of discussing the material with a critical eye.</p> <p>12-13 pts.</p>	<p>The summary of influential theorists, researchers, and their work lacks some clarity, thoroughness, or detail. The author does an acceptable job of discussing the material with a critical eye.</p> <p>10.5 -11.5 pts.</p>	<p>The summary of influential theorists, researchers, and their work lacks clarity, thoroughness, and/or detail. The author does not discuss the material with a critical eye.</p> <p>10 or fewer pts.</p>	
<p>Discussion of Seminal Studies (minimum of 2): The studies are summarized clearly and with an appropriate amount of detail. The author discusses each study and how it contributed to reading instruction during the time period. (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)</p>	<p>The studies are summarized clearly and with an appropriate amount of detail. The author does an exceptional job of discussing each study and how it contributed to reading instruction during the time period. References are used when necessary.</p> <p>13.5-15 pts.</p>	<p>The studies are summarized clearly and with an appropriate amount of detail. The author does a proficient job of discussing each study and how it contributed to reading instruction during the time period. Thoughts are supported with references when necessary.</p> <p>12-13 pts.</p>	<p>The study summaries lack some clarity or detail. The author does an acceptable job of discussing each study and how it contributed to reading instruction during the time period. At times support from references is needed, but not provided.</p> <p>10.5-11.5 pts.</p>	<p>The study summaries lack clarity and detail. The author does not discuss how the studies contributed to reading instruction during the time period. Support from references is needed, but not provided.</p> <p>10 or fewer pts.</p>	
<p>Discussion of political, social, and economic events / movements / trends that influenced the field of literacy: The material is summarized clearly and with an appropriate amount of detail. The author discusses how the events, movements, and trends in these</p>	<p>The material is summarized clearly and with an appropriate amount of detail. The author does an exceptional job of discussing how the events, movements, and trends in these areas contributed to reading instruction during the time period. References are used when necessary.</p>	<p>The material is summarized clearly and with an appropriate amount of detail. The author does a proficient job of discussing how the events, movements, and trends in these areas contributed to reading instruction during the time period. Thoughts are supported with references when</p>	<p>The summary of material lacks some clarity or detail. The author does an acceptable job of discussing how some of the events, movements, and trends in these areas contributed to reading instruction during the time period. At times support from references is needed, but not provided.</p>	<p>The summary of material lacks clarity and detail. The author does not discuss how the events, movements, and trends in these areas contributed to reading instruction during the time period. Support from references is needed, but not provided.</p>	

areas contributed to reading instruction during the time period. (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)	13.5-15 pts.	necessary. 12-13 pts.	10.5-11.5 pts.	10 or fewer pts.	
100 points total	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Points/Comments
<p>Presentation Content: The content of the Power Point presentation clearly and accurately presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading instruction during that period • Influential theorists and theories • Influential reading researchers and research • Seminal studies • Political, social, and economic events / movements / trends that influenced the field of literacy <p>(IRA 5.2)</p>	<p>The content of the Power Point presentation accurately and clearly presents all of the required information. The content demonstrates a deep understanding of the time period.</p> <p>13.5-15 pts.</p>	<p>The content of the Power Point presentation accurately and clearly presents all of the required information. The content demonstrates a firm understanding of the time period.</p> <p>12-13 pts.</p>	<p>The content of the Power Point presentation shares all of the required information, however, it may lack clarity and/or accuracy. The content demonstrates a partial understanding of the time period.</p> <p>10.5-11.5 pts.</p>	<p>The content of the Power Point presentation does not include all of the required information. What is included lacks clarity and/or accuracy. The content demonstrates little understanding of the time period.</p> <p>10 or fewer pts.</p>	
<p>Presentation Delivery and Materials: The presentation adhered to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power Point slides were well organized and easy to read. • Presentation and discussion stayed within the 30 minute time limit. • Handouts and 	<p>The presentation was well organized and conducted as a conversation rather than a “read-aloud”. It was clearly evident that the presentation was a team effort. The class was actively engaged in the discussion. The presentation stayed within the specified time</p>	<p>The presentation was well organized and conducted as a conversation rather than a “read-aloud”. It was evident that the presentation was a team effort. Most of the class was actively engaged in the discussion. The presentation stayed within the specified time</p>	<p>The presentation was somewhat organized and conducted more as a “read-aloud” rather than a conversation. Understanding appeared to be at the surface level. It was unclear as to whether the presentation was a team effort. Most of the class was actively engaged in the discussion.</p>	<p>The presentation was not organized. It was conducted as a “read-aloud” rather than a conversation. Understanding of the material was not evident. The presentation showed little evidence of teamwork. The class was not actively engaged in the discussion. The presentation did</p>	

<p>materials provided were appropriate and met the intended presentation goal(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation was a team effort and rehearsal was evident. <p>(IRA 5.2)</p>	<p>limits. The handout appropriately summarized the required content.</p> <p>13.5-15 pts.</p>	<p>limits. The handout appropriately summarized the required content.</p> <p>12-13 pts.</p>	<p>The presentation did not stay within the specified time limits. The handout did not include some of the required content.</p> <p>11.5-10.5 pts.</p>	<p>not stay within the specified time limits. The handout did not include all of the required content.</p> <p>10 or fewer pts.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

NEW IRA Standards are being applied:

Historical Perspectives Paper: (IRA 1.1, 1.2,1.3. 6.1 6.2 70 pts.) This project focuses on the history of reading and writing instruction in the United States. Using *An Essential History of Current Reading Instruction* (Fresch) as a guide, you will read about an assigned topic and review some of the seminal studies conducted about that topic. You will write a paper that discusses the research, theories, instructional trends, and influential researches/contributors to the field in relation to your topic. In addition, you will need to discuss how political, social, and economic events, movements, and trends influenced thinking about this topic. You will be responsible for working with a small group to lead a professional study session over your time period on the assigned night (see below).

Historical Perspectives Professional Study Group: (30 pts.)

Working with the classmate(s) who researched your same topic (see assignment above), prepare a professional study group over your material. Use a Power Point presentation (30 slides or less) to guide your discussion. The **40 minute** presentation should include the following:

- Research trends
- Influential researchers/theorists/contributors
- The findings of the seminal studies you read
- How political, social, and economic events / movements / trends influenced the topic
- Engage the audience in discussion to promote further understanding.
- Provide a handout for the audience that summarizes your topic and lists your resources (APA 6th Edition format).

Standard	Element	Exemplary 9-10 Points	Proficient 8.5-8	Satisfactory 7.5-7	Unsatisfactory <6.5
Standard 1 Foundational Knowledge Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.	1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections.	Candidate gives a sophisticated and comprehensive explanation of the major theories and empirical research that describes the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a systematic AND in-depth explanation of the major theories and empirical research that describes the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a somewhat in-depth or developed explanation of the major theories and empirical research that describes the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives an incomplete or naive explanation of the major theories and empirical research that describes the assigned historical literacy topic.
Standard 1	Element 1.1	Candidate gives a profound interpretation of the significance of the historical literacy topic in the profession of literacy teaching.	Candidate gives a revealing or insightful interpretation of the significance of the historical literacy topic in the profession of literacy teaching.	Candidate gives a somewhat perceptive interpretation of the significance of the historical literacy topic in the profession of literacy teaching.	Candidate gives a plausible or literal interpretation of the significance of the historical literacy topic in the profession of literacy teaching.
Standard 1	Element 1.1	Candidate gives a sophisticated and comprehensive explanation of the political, social, and economic events, movements, and trends that influenced thinking about the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a systematic AND in-depth explanation of the political, social, and economic events, movements, and trends that influenced thinking about the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a somewhat in-depth or developed explanation of the political, social, and economic events, movements, and trends that influenced thinking about the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives an incomplete or naive explanation of the political, social, and economic events, movements, and trends that influenced thinking about the assigned historical literacy topic.
Standard 1	1.2: Understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components.	Candidate gives a sophisticated and comprehensive explanation of the major theories and instructional trends that influenced the perceptions that changed over time of the historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a systematic AND in-depth explanation of the major theories and instructional trends that influenced the perceptions that changed over time of the historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a somewhat in-depth or developed explanation of the major theories and instructional trends that influenced the perceptions that changed over time of the historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives an incomplete or naive explanation of the major theories and instructional trends that influenced the perceptions that changed over time of the historical literacy topic.

Standard	Element	Exemplary 9-10 Points	Proficient 8.5-8	Satisfactory 7.5-7	Unsatisfactory <6.5
Standard 1	Element 1.2	Candidate gives a sophisticated and comprehensive explanation of the contributions of the major theorists/researchers that influenced perceptions of the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a systematic AND in-depth explanation of the contributions of the major theorists/researchers that influenced perceptions of the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a somewhat in-depth or developed explanation of the contributions of the major theorists/researchers that influenced perceptions of the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives an incomplete or naïve explanation of the contributions of the major theorists/researchers that influenced perceptions of the assigned historical literacy topic.
Standard 1	1.2	Candidate gives a profound interpretation of the seminal studies to the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a revealing or insightful interpretation of the seminal studies to the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a somewhat perceptive interpretation of the seminal studies to the assigned historical literacy topic.	Candidate gives a plausible or literal interpretation of the seminal studies to the assigned historical literacy topic.
Standard 1 Standard 6 Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility.	1.3: Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement 6.1: Demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning theories and related research about organizational change, professional development, and school culture.	Candidate gives a sophisticated and comprehensive explanation of the importance of professional development and understanding research to guide instruction with students' reading development.	Candidate gives a systematic AND in-depth explanation of the importance of professional development and understanding research to guide instruction with students' reading development.	Candidate gives a somewhat in-depth or developed explanation of the importance of professional development and understanding research to guide instruction with students' reading development.	Candidate gives an incomplete or naïve explanation of the importance of professional development and understanding research to guide instruction with students' reading development.
FORMAT 1 point is deducted for each grammar/spelling, or convention error; 1 point is deducted for each APA format/reference error.	Meets all requirements of the paper; Meets APA 6 th edition format; Professional and organized graduate level text.	All elements of the paper are presented; there are no grammar/spelling or convention errors; all in-text citations are referenced according to APA 6 th edition; there are no APA errors; the paper is well-written, organized, and cohesive.	All elements of the paper are presented; there are 1-2 grammar/spelling or convention errors; there are 1-2 APA errors in references or citations; the paper is well-written, organized, and cohesive.	1-2 elements of the paper are omitted; there are 3-4 grammar/spelling or convention errors; there are 3-4 APA errors; the paper is not well organized, and is not cohesive.	1-2 elements of the paper are omitted; there are more than 4 grammar/spelling or convention errors; there are more than 4 APA errors; the paper is not well organized, and is not cohesive.

READ 7357
Historical Perspective PowerPoint Presentation

Standard	Element	Requirements	Exemplary 19-20 Points	Proficient 18.5-18	Satisfactory 17.5-17	Unsatisfactory 16.5 and less
<p>1 Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.</p> <p>6 Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility.</p>	<p>1.3 Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.</p> <p>6.2: Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.</p>	Engage the audience in discussion to promote further understanding.	<p>Candidate leads a profound discussion that engages the audience in discussion to promote a deeper understanding of the literacy topic.</p> <p>Candidate's discussion was lead in a positive, courteous, and professional manner that engaged and respected the audience, and related to the audience a sophisticated and comprehensive Understanding of his/her role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.</p>	<p>Candidate leads a revealing discussion that engages the audience in discussion to promote some deeper understanding of the literacy topic.</p> <p>Candidate's discussion was lead in a professional manner that engaged and respected the audience, and Related to the audience an in-depth understanding of his/her role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.</p>	<p>Candidate leads a reasonable and perceptive discussion that engages the audience in discussion to promote some understanding of the literacy topic.</p> <p>Candidate's discussion was lead in a professional manner that engaged and respected the audience, and Related to the audience a developed and somewhat in-depth understanding of his/her role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.</p>	<p>Candidate leads a plausible and literal discussion that engages the audience in a surface level discussion about the literacy topic.</p> <p>Candidate's discussion was lead in a professional manner that engaged and respected the audience, and Related to the audience in a somewhat insightful and naive understanding of his/her role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.</p>
Handout and Format			4-5 points	3.5-3 points	2.5-2 points	1.5 and less

Handout		Provide a handout for the audience that summarizes your topic and lists your resources (APA 6 th Edition format)	Handout has no grammar/spelling or convention errors. Handout is clearly written, cohesive, and well organized. Handout has no errors in APA format/references.	Handout has 1-2 spelling/grammar or convention errors. Handout is organized. There are 1-2 APA errors in format/references.	Handout has 3 spelling/grammar or convention errors. There are organizational issues in the handout. There are 3 APA format/reference errors.	Handout has more than 3 spelling/grammar or convention errors. Handout lacks organization. There are more than 3 APA format/reference errors
FORMAT		Research trends Influential researchers/theorists/contributors The findings of the seminal studies you read How political, social, and economic events / movements / trends influenced the topic Engage the audience in discussion to promote further understanding.	All required elements for the PowerPoint presentation are given. The presentation is clearly organized, cohesive, and well-delivered	Missing 1 element in the PowerPoint. The presentation is organized and well-delivered.	Missing 2 elements in the PowerPoint or the presentation needed clearer organization and delivery of information.	More than 2 missing elements in the PowerPoint. The presentation was not cohesive or needed better delivery of information.

TABLE 8.3: Assessment 8: Seminar in Reading: READ 7357
Historical Perspectives Paper

July 2010-June 2011

Criterion/ Standard	Unsatisfactory 1-1.9	Satisfactory 2-2.9	Proficient 3-3.9	Exemplary 4-4.9	N	Mean	S.D.
1.1	-	11.1%	33.3%	55.5%	9	3.61	.59
1.2	-	22.2%	22.2%	55.5%	9	3.53	.71
1.3	-	11.1%	22.2%	66.6%	9	3.53	.72
6.1	-	-	11.1%	88.8%	9	3.66	.70
6.2	-		11.1%	88.8%	9	3.88	.33.

Interpretation of the Data. Consistently, 77.7% or more of the candidates scored at the proficient or exemplary level across Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 6.1, and 6.2. No candidates were rated as unsatisfactory. Thus, a majority of the candidates consistently revealed a solid understanding of the major theories and empirical research as well as knowledge of the historical, political, social, and economic perspectives impacting the field of literacy. A new rubric was developed to meet IRA 2010 Standards.

SECTION V—USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. **This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.**

(response limited to 3 pages)

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Prior to the summer 2007 semester, Candidates developed an electronic portfolio that contained a number of assessments including papers, projects, and artifacts that addressed content knowledge. Data analysis indicated that program assessments required revision in order to more accurately assess Candidate knowledge. Consequently, assessments underwent substantial revision during the summer 2007 semester. Some of the assessments were retained, and new assessments were created. Guidelines and evaluation rubrics for the retained assessments were reviewed and revised. The guidelines now provide more specificity and detail in order to increase Candidates' understanding regarding assessment expectations. The evaluation rubrics are more specific in order to determine Candidates' content knowledge more accurately. The new assessments were created to ensure alignment with the Arkansas Department of Education's Competencies for Reading Professionals and the IRA standards and elements for Reading Specialist / Literacy Coach.

Multiple assessments across the program specifically address content knowledge: Assessment 2: Comprehensive Exam – Take Home Question: Philosophy of Reading Instruction, Assessment 6: Professional Development in Literacy Instruction, and Assessment 8: Historical Perspectives Paper. Beginning with the summer 2007 semester, Candidates began completing and uploading these revised and new assessments into the revised electronic portfolio. At present, two cohorts of Candidates have completed each of these key assessments. Data have been collected and reported in this document.

Overall, Candidates have developed a solid understanding of the literacy components to be implemented in a comprehensive literacy model classroom and school. Candidates support their thinking with theory; refer to the work of specific theorists; and read, interpret, and apply theories to practice. While all of the Candidates achieved the target score of "Proficient" or higher on each criteria addressing these elements, mean scores reveal that further attention needs to be given to ensuring that students can support, to a greater extent, their thinking with appropriate theory and research. Based on these findings, reading faculty has discussed and implemented the use of specific discussion prompts in each course to better model the use of theory to support thinking and instructional decision-making. In addition, reading faculty has reviewed and revised course assignments beyond the key assessments to increase the number of opportunities Candidates have to articulate their knowledge of theory and how it supports classroom instruction.

PROFESSIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

Prior to the summer 2007 semester, Candidates developed an electronic portfolio. This portfolio contained two documents that addressed professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Data analysis indicated that two assessments (Change Over Time Paper and Report of Testing) needed to be revised in order to more accurately assess the targeted areas. Two new assessments (Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection and the Coaching Case Study) were created in order to ensure alignment with the Arkansas Department of Education's Competencies for Reading Professionals and the IRA standards and elements for Reading Specialist / Literacy Coach. The rubrics for these four assessments are detailed and target specific elements in order to better determine Candidates' pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Beginning with the summer 2007 semester, Candidates began uploading the revised and new assessments into a new electronic portfolio. At present, two cohorts of Candidates have completed each of these key assessments. Data have been collected and reported in this document.

The majority of Candidates have developed a solid understanding of how to select and administer appropriate assessment instruments, score, and interpret the data to plan instruction. Data reveal that some Candidates need further support with data management and organization as well as data synthesis in order to develop recommendations for student instruction. To address this need, reading faculty has adjusted required texts and assignments. Candidates are given more opportunities to reflect upon and discuss data with a colleague. Reading faculty realize that this is an important skill that Candidates must possess and will continue to monitor understanding in this area.

STUDENT LEARNING

Prior to the summer 2007 semester, Candidates developed an electronic portfolio. This portfolio contained two assessments that addressed student learning. Data analysis indicated that these assessments required revision in order to more accurately assess the targeted areas. One of the assessments was retained but substantially revised (Change Over Time Paper) and two new assessments were created (Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection Case Study and the Coaching Case Study). The assessment guidelines provide more specificity and detail in order to increase Candidates' understanding regarding assessment expectations. The assessment rubrics contain more explicit language in order to emphasize the impact of Candidates' instruction on student learning.

The Change Over Time Paper requires Candidates to assess, teach, and document the reading and writing progress of 3 students in their classrooms over a period of 8 weeks. A final paper charting the students' change over time in literacy achievement and the Candidate's shift in instructional philosophy and methodology is prepared and submitted along with all assessment protocol and anecdotal notes. Analysis of the assignment showed clearly that Candidates positively impacted students' achievement in reading and writing. Data provided by the Candidates reveal their ability to use assessments effectively to guide instruction.

The Professional Collaboration, Observation, and Reflection Case Study requires Candidates to work with a colleague to assess a small group of struggling readers using a survey of reading strategies and attitudes, running records and writing samples. The data are used to plan reading and writing lessons to meet the developmental needs of these students. The lessons are taught and videotaped. A discussion, collaborative summary, and personal reflection over the collaborative experience are prepared and submitted. Candidates present their videotapes, lesson rationale, and reflection during class sessions using a Power Point presentation. Analysis of each component of the the assignment showed clearly that Candidates positively impacted students' achievement in reading

and writing. Data provided by the Candidates reveal their ability to plan collaboratively effective reading and writing lessons to meet the needs of their focus students. However, videotape analysis revealed that some Candidates had confusions regarding literacy terminology and practice. Reading faculty realized the need to demonstrate components of the comprehensive literacy model to ensure consistency in understanding among Candidates. This practice will be continued as future cohorts complete the course and assessment.

In the Coaching Case Study, Candidates assume the role of literacy coach in order to assist a colleague with professional development in reading and/or writing assessment and instruction. Candidates complete 3 coaching cycles consisting of a pre-conference, teaching modeling/observation, and post-conference. Reflections, lesson plans, and observation rubrics are submitted. These data showed clearly that Candidates positively impacted students' achievement in reading and writing. Data provided by the Candidates reveal their ability to problem-solve with a colleague. Detailed videotape analysis revealed that Candidates need more experience leading the teacher/colleague through the reflection process in order to create shifts in instructional practice. Reading faculty has discussed this need and will use role-playing situations to increase Candidate's coaching skills. A focus will be placed on ensuring Candidates articulate student outcomes, their plan for achieving those outcomes, and delineating the behaviors that demonstrate student learning. This, in turn, will support Candidates as they work with teacher/colleagues to positively influence student achievement.

Two areas for improvement in the program, which will be addressed in assignments to meet new IRA 2010 Standards, are the knowledge and application of empirical research and a better understanding of working with and meeting diversity needs. As the assignments and rubrics change to meet the new IRA 2010 Standards, there is confidence that there will be an increase in scores on assessments. In addition to improvement in the program, it is noted that currently the program is not meeting the elements 6.3 and 6.4, in Standard 6. Alignment with the new standards will be needed for the upcoming reporting year.