Standard 1: Teaching and Learning	ASSESSMENTS							
Elements	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**
1.1 Knowledge of Learners and Learning	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
1.2 Effective and Knowledgeable Teacher	X	X		X		X		
1.3 Instructional Partner	X	X		X		X		
1.4 Integration of Twenty-first Century Skills and Learning Standards	X	X		X		X		

Standard 2: Literacy and Reading	ASSESSMENTS							
Elements	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**
2.1 Literature	X	X						X
2.2 Reading Promotion	X	X						X
2.3 Respect for Diversity	X	X						X
2.4 Literacy Strategies	X	X				X		X

Standard 3: Information and Knowledge	ASSESSMENTS							
Elements	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**
3.1 Efficient and Ethical Information-seeking Behaviour	X	X	X					
3.2 Access to Information	X	X		X			X	X
3.3 Information Technology	X	X					X	
3.4 Reseach and Knowledge Creation	X	X	X	X	X		X	X

Standard 4: Advocacy and Leadership	ASSESSMENTS							
Elements	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**
4.1 Networking with the Library Community	X	X		X				X
4.2 Professional Development	X	X		X	X			
4.3 Leadership	X	X		X	X			
4.4 Advocacy	X	X		X				X

Standard 5: Program Management and Administraton	ASSESSMENTS							
Elements	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**
5.1 Collections	X	X	X		X			X
5.2 Professional Ethics	X	X	X					
5.3 Personnel, Funding, and Facilities	X	X	X		X			X
5.4 Strategic Planning and Assessments	X	X	X	X	X			X

I.3 Program of Study

MLS Program Requirements for School Pathway

Tier 1 Courses

⇩

LlBS 6010 Foundations of Library and Information Studies (3 s.h.)

LlBS 6012 Analyzing and Synthesizing Professional Library Information (3 s.h.)

LlBS 6042 Technology for Library Services (3 s.h.)

Tier 2 Courses

⇩

LlBS 6014 Introduction to Reference (3 s.h.)

LlBS 6026 Organization of Information in Libraries (3 s.h.)

LlBS 6031 Library Administration and Management (3 s.h.)

18-Hour Portfolio Review

Tier 3 Courses

⇩

LlBS6018 Collection Development (3 s.h.)

LIBS 6135 Materials for Children (3 s.h.)

LlBS 6137 Materials for Young Adults (3 s.h.)

LlBS 6142 Instructional Foundations of the School
Library Media Program (3 s.h.)

LIBS 6144 Instructional Strategies and Leadership for School
Library Media Specialists (3 s.h.)

Elective (3 s.h.)

LlBS6991 Internship: Seminar (3 s.h.)

Final Portfolio Review

I.4: Candidate Information
MLS Program: School Pathway

Academic Session *(Academic Year defined by College of Education as Summer thru Spring)*	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program*	# of Program Completers**
Summer 2008	223	31
Fall 2008	280	32
Spring 2009	293	36
Summer 2009	261	23
Fall 2009	259	30
Spring 2010	207	49
Summer 2010	226	19
Fall 2010	264	52
Spring 2011	231	40

* Admitted candidates who were currently taking courses/course in the program. This is a duplicated head count, providing a general picture of the number of candidates actively involved in the program during each time period.

** Candidates who completed the MLS degree requirements for the school pathway.

1.1 MLS OBJECTIVES	AASL Standards
1. Obtain and apply an understanding of the foundations of library science from contemporary professional standards used to resolve ethical and legal issues.	Standard 3
2. Investigate library problems through analysis and synthesis of professional library literature.	Standard 3
3. Use reference and information resources in a variety of formats to promote information literacy.	Standards 2, 3
4. Select, acquire, develop and manage collections to meet the lifelong learning needs of diverse groups in various library settings.	Standards 2, 5
5. Apply appropriate standards and guidelines for the organization of library materials and resources.	Standard 5
6. Plan, organize, staff, direct, and budget library programs to meet informational, instructional, and recreational needs.	Standard 5
7. Apply appropriate technologies to support or enhance library functions and processes.	Standard 3
8. Instruct individually, and in collaboration with other information professionals/educators, diverse user groups to access effectively and efficiently the resources and services available to them in a variety of library settings.	Standard 1
9. Obtain practical experience in professional roles for which students are preparing.	Standards 1, 4

I.1: Praxis II

  a. Description of the Assessment

The Praxis II Subject Assessments measure subject-specific content knowledge. To become licensed as a media specialist in North Carolina, a candidate must pass the Praxis II Library Media Specialist test. Candidates typically take the Praxis toward the end of their MLS program; however, this can vary. The Praxis II has been offered in two versions: 0310 and 0311. The 0310 test was discontinued September 11, 2009 and is no longer available. As of September 12, 2009 all students take the test 0311, which is an updated version of 0310. Both tests cover the same content areas as indicated in I.b.

  b. Description of how the assessment specifically aligns with the standards

The Library Media Specialist test is designed to measure the knowledge and abilities of examinees who have had preparation in a program for school library media specialists. The assessment is comprised of 120 multiple choice questions covering 5 content categories: Program Administration; Collection Development; Information Access and Delivery; Learning and Teaching; and Professional Development, Leadership, and Advocacy. Alignment with standards is evident in the table below.

AASL STANDARD	PRAXIS CONTENT AREA
Standard 1: Teaching for Learning	Learning and Teaching
Standard 2: Literacy and Reading	Learning and Teaching (includes knowledge of trends, issues, & research related to reading and information literacy)
Standard 3: Information and Knowledge	Information Access and Delivery
Standard 4: Advocacy and Leadership	Professional Development, Leadership, and Advocacy
Standard 5: Program Management and Administration	Program Administration Collection Development

  c. Brief analysis of the data findings

The Praxis II scores in the data chart are those that program completers reported to ECU during the academic years summer 2009 – spring 2010; summer 2010 – spring 2011; and the most recent time period of summer 2011 – fall 2011. The College of Education defines an academic year as beginning with the summer session. The pass rate of program completers remained consistent (over 90%) for all three data periods. This high pass rate is evidence of proficiency in the overall content areas covered by the assessment.

d. Interpretation of how the data provides evidence for meeting standards

The Praxis II Media Specialist test was chosen to provide evidence of a licensure assessment required for the report. As such, it provides a consistent measurement of content-based proficiency of program completers.

Seventy-seven program completers from the academic year summer 2009 through spring 2010 took the Praxis II and reported those scores to ECU. Of these, one did not pass, resulting in a pass rate of 98.70%. Ninety-four program completers from the academic year summer 2010 through spring 2011 took the Praxis II and reported those scores to ECU. Of these, two did not pass, giving in an overall pass rate of 97.87%. Thirty-one program completers from the time period of summer 2011 through fall 2011 completed the test and reported those scores to ECU. Of these, only one did not pass, resulting in an overall pass rate of 96.77%. A full academic year could not be completed for 2011-2012 at the time of this report.

Pass rates of 98.70%, 97.87% and 96.77% respectively indicate that a large majority of candidates are at an acceptable level of proficiency in their knowledge of content areas in general. As shown in the chart in I.b, the Praxis content areas align well with overall standards. However, scores on the individual content areas are not available; therefore, any interpretation of the data is limited to the total score.

Based on this interpretation, we could expect candidates to be able to apply their knowledge of learning and teaching; information access and delivery; professional development and advocacy; program administration; and collection development in a school media center.

e. Assessment tools

The Library Media Specialist Praxis II (0311) assessment consists of 120 multiple choice questions covering five content areas with the following percentages:

Program Administration - approximately 18%
Collection Development - approximately 21%
Information Access and Delivery – approximately 21%
Learning and Teaching – approximately 28%
Professional Development, Leadership, and Advocacy – approximately 12%

The Library Media Specialist Praxis II (0310) assessment contains the same number of multiple choice questions covering the five content areas with very similar percentages as shown below:

Program Administration – approximately 21%
Collection Development – approximately 21%
Information Access and Delivery – approximately 23%
Learning and Teaching – approximately 25%
Professional Development, Leadership, and Advocacy – approximately 10%

Candidates are given two hours in which to complete the test. Representative descriptions of topics covered in each category, as well as sample test questions, are provided at http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/PRAXIS/pdf/0311.pdf and http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/PRAXIS/pdf/0310.pdf

    f.   Scoring guide

Since this is a national assessment with variations in the questions asked, a scoring guide is not available. The test is comprised of 120 questions, some which may not count toward a candidate's score. For the Praxis II (0310), a passing score in North Carolina is 610. For the Praxis II (0311), a passing score in North Carolina is 148.

    g.   Charts that provide candidate data for this assessment

Assessment 1: Praxis II

Academic Year or Time Period*	N**	# Passed	# Not Passed	Pass Rate
Summer 2009 thru Spring 2010	77	76	1	98.70%
Summer 2010 thru Spring 2011	94	92	2	97.87%
Summer 2011 thru Fall 2011	31	30	1	96.77%

College of Education defines an academic year as Summer through Fall.
*** Program completers who reported Praxis II scores to ECU.*

Assessment #2: Portfolio

a. Brief description of the assessment

The MLS online portfolio is comprised of nine artifacts (capstone assignments) aligned with MLS program objectives, ALA/AASL Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians (2010), N.C. Standards for the Master of Library Science Degree/School Library Media Coordinator License, and ALA's Core Competences of Librarianship. The portfolio is first reviewed at a candidate's midpoint in the program, typically 18-hours. It is known as the 18-hour portfolio review. The second review occurs before a candidate's graduation and is titled the final portfolio review. The successful completion of the final portfolio review serves as the exit requirement for the MLS program for all pathways. A detailed description of the portfolio process is provided in section (2)e of this report. In both the 18-hour and final reviews, candidates must score at a proficiency level on all components of the rubric in to pass the overall review.

b. How assessment aligns with standards

Each of the nine artifact assignments is scored by the instructor, following a rubric that is aligned to the appropriate standards. These alignments are indicated in the following table with courses numbers arranged by program tiers:

Course	AASL Standards (2010)																			
Artifact	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.4
6010	X		X								X									
6012									X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
6042	X								X	X		X								
6014									X	X	X	X								
6026										X								X		
6031												X			X	X		X	X	X
6018	X								X	X								X		X
6135	X				X	X	X		X	X						X	X	X		X
6137	X	X			X	X		X		X		X								
6142	X	X														X				
6144	X	X	X	X				X												
6991	X	X	X	X						X		X	X	X	X	X				X

Following is a brief description of each artifact from required courses in the school pathway:

> *LIBS 6010 – Foundations of Library and Information Studies*
> Candidates analyze a library legal or ethical issue such as copyright and libraries, filtering, censorship, confidentiality, etc.
> *LIBS 6012 – Analyzing and Synthesizing Professional Library Information*
> Candidates prepare a research proposal using specified components to address a research question related to the topic of their choice.
> *LIBS 6042 – Technology for Library Services*
> Candidates develop a program or service that integrates at least one type of technology covered in the course.

LIBS 6014 – Introduction to Reference
Candidates compile a pathfinder of reference sources on a topic of their choosing.
LIBS 6026 – Organization of Information in Libraries
Candidates research and evaluate an online public access catalog and its functionality as well as discuss the history and future of library catalogs.
LIBS 6031 – Library Administration and Management
Candidates prepare an organizational overview of their current library or subject library (real or imaginary library in the desired setting).
LIBS 6018 – Collection Development
Candidates produce a collection development policy for a real-life (partner) school library that addresses how the student would evaluate and select print, non-print and digital materials and resources.
LIBS 6135 – Materials for Children
Candidates develop a pamphlet consisting of a wide range of items from the Notable Children's list that are appropriate for a K—5 population.
LIBS 6137 – Materials for Young Adults
Candidates prepare and present a thematic booktalk to teens that provides evidence of candidates' understanding of literary genres.
LIBS 6142 – Instructional Foundations of the School Library Media Program
Candidates research and evaluate dispositions of a school librarian who impacts K-12 student learning.
LIBS 6144 – Instructional Strategies and Leadership for School Media
Candidates collaborate to prepare an inquiry project that nurtures the creativity of K-12 students.
LIBS 6991 – Internship
Candidates develop an in-service workshop to be presented to members of the site school's faculty to strengthen the skills of the faculty and the faculty's knowledge of the skills of the librarian.

In addition to scoring the artifact, the instructor also approves the posting of the artifact to the portfolio. At two points during a candidate's program, the Portfolio Assessment Team (PAT) conducts reviews of the portfolio, using a portfolio rubric. Therefore, the content of each artifact is scored based on the instructor rubric aligned with standards. The PAT completes a follow-up check on the artifact posting and on the reflection in particular to insure that standards are recorded correctly and that candidates provide a thoughtful reflection of the experience, with an indication of how the artifact meets the specified standards. The portfolio review serves as a confirmation of alignment to standards and reflective writing regarding the development of the artifact.

c. Brief analysis of data findings

Of the 23 candidates who underwent 18-hour reviews in the spring 2011, 91% were proficient and 9% were below proficient in the overall review. Of the 40 candidates who underwent final reviews in spring 2011, 100% were proficient. Of the 28 candidates who underwent 18-hour reviews in the fall of 2011, 97% were proficient and 3% were below proficient in the overall

review.   Of the 27 candidates who underwent final reviews in the fall of 2011, 100% were proficient.

The disaggregated data provides evidence that almost all candidates meet the level of proficiency for all rubric elements, which are interpreted more completely below.

  d.   Interpretation of how data provides evidence for meeting standards

During the 18-hour review, candidates are mentored by a member of the PAT. During this process, candidates must have posted at least six instructor-approved artifacts, adequate reflections, and an initial impressions essay by a specified deadline. During the fall of 2011, a majority (97%) of candidates were proficient in meeting these requirements. The candidates who did not pass either had difficulty in meeting the deadline or did not follow the reflective writing guide with correct alignment to standards. As explained in the rich description of the assessment, individual artifacts are aligned with standards and scored by the instructor. At that point, the candidate has reached a level of proficiency with content knowledge as specified in the artifact rubric. Given this interpretation of the data, we could expect most candidates to have the skills and knowledge required to meet the specified standards aligned with each course artifact. At the 18-hour review, candidates have completed approximately one half of the program. The data provides evidence that candidates have met some standards, specifically those aligned with artifacts to that date. However, a few candidates are not proficient in the reflective writing component.

By the time a candidate has reached the final review phase, he or she has undergone the 18-hour review, which serves as excellent preparation. As detailed in the description of the assessment, the final portfolio review process involves extensive mentoring with individual candidates. In addition, successful completion of the final review is required for graduation. All of these factors contribute to the 100% proficiency rate of candidates. All courses in a candidate's program are posted by the time of the final review. Given this interpretation of the data, we could expect candidates to have the skills and knowledge required to meet all of the standards aligned with each course artifact. We would expect that all candidates could provide a critical reflection regarding the development and creation of each artifact and how it aligns to specific standards.

(2) Assessment Documentation

  e. Rich description of the assessment

Prior to 2008, the MLS program had developed an online web portfolio format in which each candidate created a web page to post applicable artifacts and reflections.   Since 2008, the program has used an electronic portfolio system called SETS (Student Evidence Tracking System) which provided consistency among portfolios. In SETS, an artifact (capstone assignment) and reflection on the artifact are required for each course.   The artifacts are created during coursework and are aligned with applicable standards. Students receive instructions on the specific artifacts required through course syllabi. All artifacts are scored on an Above Proficient, Proficient, and Below Proficient scale determined by the instructor. After the

instructor assesses an artifact, the candidate posts the artifact in SETS where it is approved by the instructor.

Accompanying reflections are used to help students assess their own learning and consider how what they have learned in relationship to MLS program objectives will contribute to their professional careers and how the artifact meets specific standards. Reflections are intended to help students analyze their own performance and to identify ways to improve. Reflections follow reflective writing guidelines that are provided to students in every course.

Assessment is done by the Portfolio Assessment Team (PAT), comprised of three to four full-time MLS faculty members, one of whom is designated as Chair. The portfolio process involves extensive mentoring and communication with each candidate during both review periods. During a typical year, a member of PAT spends approximately 80 hours on this service and the PAT chair spends approximately 130 hours. The PAT completes a round of both 18-hour and final assessments each semester and summer session.

Portfolios are assessed twice during a candidate's program. The first assessment occurs after the completion of 18 hours, which is approximately the midpoint of the MLS coursework of 39 hours. At this point, the portfolio should contain at least 6 artifacts with adequate accompanying reflections and an Initial Impressions Essay. The Initial Impressions Essay is written in LIBS 6010 (the foundations course), where candidates record their present understanding of the profession. Candidates must complete the review process by the deadline specified by the PAT. The process involves a preliminary review and consistent communication between PAT members and candidates.

The PAT completes the final portfolio assessment for candidates who are expecting to graduate that semester. The final portfolio must contain the artifacts for all courses taken during the MLS program with accompanying reflections, the initial impressions essay, final impressions essay, and a philosophy statement. In the Final Impressions Essay, candidates revisit their initial impressions essay. They reflect on what, if anything, they would change about the Initial Impressions Essay and to record how their understanding of the profession has changed, deepened, or remains the same. The philosophy statement allows candidates to state their personal views about what libraries and librarians do, why they are important, and the core values they will bring to the profession.

During the 2010-11 academic year, the College of Education began transitioning into an online portfolio system, Task Stream, for every department in the college. The Department of Library Science faculty underwent training on Task Stream and critically analyzed existing rubrics and alignments of all artifacts. The department has been in the process of inputting rubrics, coding, and alignments; at the present time, there is no data in Task Stream. Candidates who entered the MLS program in the fall of 2011 will be the first group to post their artifacts and reflections in Task Stream. Data input will begin this spring.

Task Stream alignment occurs at a more granular level than in SETS and allows clear alignment of artifacts and standards at the rubric component level (Attachment 2A). The AASL standards and elements are highlighted in red on the attachment. In addition to the AASL standards, N.C. Standards for the Master of Library Science Degree/School Library Media Coordinator License,

ALA's Core Competences of Librarianship, and the department's MLS objectives are aligned with each rubric component.

As well as the standard alignments, Task Stream provides clear evidence of levels of proficiency within the rubrics and among the standards that was lacking in SETS. A revised rubric for the portfolio reflection to be used in Task Stream provides a more precise measure of proficiency in analyzing the experience of creating the artifact (Attachment 2B).

f. <u>Scoring guide for the assessment</u>

18-Hour Portfolio Review Rubric

Proficiency = 5 points	Proficient – 1 pt.	Below Proficient – 0 pts.
Artifacts	At least 6 artifacts are posted.	Fewer than 6 artifacts are posted.
Reflections	Each artifact is accompanied by a reflection.	Some reflections are not posted.
Reflective Writing	Each reflection adequately follows reflective writing guidelines.	Some reflections are limited and do not fully follow reflective writing guidelines.
Alignment with Standards	Each reflection provides correct alignment with applicable national and state standards or competences.	Some reflections are missing correct alignment with applicable national and state standards or competences.
Initial Impressions Essay	Initial Impressions Essay is posted and follows assignment criteria.	Initial Impressions Essay is not posted or does not follow assignment criteria.

Final Portfolio Review Rubric

Proficiency = 5 points	Proficient – 1 pt.	Below Proficient – 0 pts.
Artifacts	13 artifacts from the program are posted.	Less than 13 artifacts are posted.
Reflections	Each artifact is accompanied by a reflection.	Some reflections are not posted.
Reflective Writing	Each reflection adequately follows reflective writing guidelines.	Some reflections are limited and do not fully follow reflective writing guidelines.
Alignment with Standards	Each reflection provides correct alignment with applicable national and state standards or competences.	Some reflections are missing correct alignment with applicable national and state standards or competences.
Initial Impressions Essay	Initial Impressions essay is posted and follows	Initial Impressions essay is not posted or does not

	assignment criteria.	follow assignment criteria.
Final Impressions Essay	Initial Impressions essay is posted and follows assignment criteria.	Initial Impressions essay is not posted or does not follow assignment criteria.
Philosophy Statement	Philosophy Statement is posted and follows assignment criteria.	Philosophy Statement is not posted or does not follow assignment criteria.

g. Candidate data derived from the assessment

Assessment 2: 18-Hour Portfolio Review

	Proficient		Below Proficient	
	Fall 2011 n=28	Spring 2011 n=23	Fall 2011 n=28	Spring 2011 n=23
Artifacts	26 (93%)	23 (100%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)
Reflections	26 (93%)	22 (96%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)
Reflective Writing	26 (93%)	23 (100%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)
Alignment with Standards	26 (93%)	22 (96%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)
Initial Impressions Essay	28 (100%)	23 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Overall Proficiency	26 (93%)	22 (96%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)

Assessment 2: Final Portfolio Review

	Proficient		Below Proficient	
	Fall 2011 n=27	Spring 2011 n=39	Fall 2011 n=27	Spring 2011 n=39
Artifacts	27 (100%)	39 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Reflections	27 (100%)	39 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Reflective Writing	27 (100%)	39 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Alignment with Standards	27 (100%)	39 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Initial Impressions Essay	27 (100%)	39 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Overall Proficiency	27 (100%)	39 (100%)	0(0%)	0 (0%)

LIBS 6031 Presentation

Levels/Criteria	Below Proficient Value: 1	Proficient Value: 2	Above Proficient Value: 3	Score/Level
Introduction	Presentation opens with little or no information beyond the title slide about the library setting, or is disorganized, incoherent or poorly written.	Presentation opens with information about the library setting, but may be vague as to what might follow. Includes primarily the characteristics of the subject library.	Presentation opens with enough information to identify the library setting and gives the audience a sense of what will follow. The introduction is concise, engaging and interesting.	
Role and purpose of the library, and threats, challenges, possible futures	Reflects little content delivered in Assignment 1, lacks position statement, weak supporting argument, does not mention threats or challenges. Relies entirely on the thought of others.	Reflects some content delivered in Assignment 1, includes a position and argument based on boilerplate material from sources or many quotes from the literature or professional organization statements. Relies on the thoughts of others.	Reflects content delivered in Assignment 1, includes a position and reasonable argument, along with discussion of threats and challenges in the contemporary library environment. Reflects independent thought.	

Standards
NC- ECU MLS Program Objectives (2011)
Objective:
2. Investigate library problems through analysis and synthesis of professional library literature.
Objective:
6. Plan, organize, staff, direct and budget library programs to meet informational, instructional and recreational needs.
USA- ALA Core Competencies of Librarianship
Area 1. :
Foundations of the Profession
Detail:
1E. Current types of library (school, public, academic, special, etc.) and closely related information agencies.
Detail:
1F. National and international social, public, information, economic, and cultural policies and trends of significance to the library and information profession.
Area 5. :
Reference and User Services
Detail 5G.:
The principles and methods used to assess the impact of current and emerging situations or circumstances on the design and implementation of appropriate services or resource development.
USA- ALA/AASL Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians (2010)
Standard:
Standard 1: Teaching for Learning Candidates are effective teachers who demonstrate knowledge of learners and learning and who model and promote collaborative planning, instruction in multiple literacies, and inquiry-based learning, enabling members of the learning community to become effective users and creators of ideas and information. Candidates design and implement instruction that engages students' interests and develops their ability to inquire, think critically, gain and share knowledge.
Element:
1.3 Instructional partner Candidates model, share, and promote effective principles of teaching and learning as collaborative partners with other educators. Candidates acknowledge the importance of participating in curriculum development, of engaging in school improvement processes, and of offering professional development to other educators as it relates to library and information use.

Levels/Criteria	Below Proficient Value: 1	Proficient Value: 2	Above Proficient Value: 3	Score/Level
Leadership	Little connection drawn between leadership and libraries in the current environment, no apparent leadership philosophy, relies on	Provides basic rationale for the importance of strong leadership, but leadership philosophy is somewhat vague, hesitant, or implied rather	Provides a compelling reason for the importance of strong leadership, a distinct leadership philosophy statement, and	

Levels/Criteria	Below Proficient Value: 1	Proficient Value: 2	Above Proficient Value: 3	Score/Level
	quotes from the literature or professional organization statements.	than stated. Draws some parallel between leadership and libraries in the current environment.	characteristics of and priorities for leaders of libraries in the current environment.	

Standards
NC- ECU MLS Program Objectives (2011)
Objective:
6. Plan, organize, staff, direct and budget library programs to meet informational, instructional and recreational needs.
NC- North Carolina Standards for Master of Library Science Degree/School Library Media Coordinator (2011)
Standard:
Standard 2: Collaboration and Leadership Functioning in a leadership and change agent role, the school library media coordinator demonstrates self-directed, reflective professional behavior to foster and advocate for a collaborative culture, with colleagues and the greater community, that supports life-long learning and that honors diversity.
Indicator:
2.2 Acts as a catalyst for change through visioning and planning;
USA- ALA Core Competencies of Librarianship
Area 8. :
Administration and Management
Detail 8E. :
The concepts behind, issues relating to, and methods for, principled, transformational leadership.
USA- ALA/AASL Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians (2010)
Standard:
Standard 4: Advocacy and Leadership Candidates advocate for dynamic school library programs and positive learning environments that focus on student learning and achievement by collaborating and connecting with teachers, administrators, librarians, and the community. Candidates are committed to continuous learning and professional growth and lead professional development activities for other educators. Candidates provide leadership by articulating ways in which school libraries contribute to student achievement.
Element:
4.3 Leadership Candidates are able to articulate the role and relationship of the school library program's impact on student academic achievement within the context of current educational initiatives. Utilizing evidence-based practice and information from education and library research, candidates communicate ways in which the library program can enhance school improvement efforts.

Levels/Criteria	Below Proficient Value: 1	Proficient Value: 2	Above Proficient Value: 3	Score/Level
Budget in Context	Presents some content delivered in Assignment 4, but with little or incorrect analysis of the subject library's current position. Little or no interpretation for the audience. Section is two slides or less.	Presents some content delivered in Assignment 4, but short on analysis of the subject library's current position and interpretation for audience. Section is brief.	Presents all content delivered in Assignment 4 to fully describe and analyze the subject library's current position. Fully and correctly interprets data for the audience.	

Standards
NC- ECU MLS Program Objectives (2011)
Objective:
6. Plan, organize, staff, direct and budget library programs to meet informational, instructional and recreational needs.
NC- North Carolina Standards for Master of Library Science Degree/School Library Media Coordinator (2011)
Standard:
Standard 4: Program Administration The school library media coordinator understands and demonstrates effective techniques for managing the school library media program and aligning program goals with the educational mission of the school. Functioning in a stewardship role, the school library media coordinator manages resources and makes them readily available to students, teachers, administrators, and support staff both within and beyond the walls of the school. Working with the Media and Technology Advisory Committee (MTAC) and through other partnerships, the school library media coordinator acts as a change agent to plan and implement policies and procedures that enhance access to resources and

Levels/Criteria	Below Proficient Value: 1	Proficient Value: 2	Above Proficient Value: 3	Score/Level
	services and to solve problems as they arise. **Indicator:** 4.7 Plays a leading role in the school's budgetary processes to ensure funding for the school library media program to support school-wide goals; **USA- ALA Core Competencies of Librarianship** **Area 8. :** Administration and Management **Detail 8A.:** The principles of planning and budgeting in libraries and other information agencies. **USA- ALA/AASL Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians (2010)** **Standard:** Standard 5: Program Management and Administration Candidates plan, develop, implement, and evaluate school library programs, resources, and services in support of the mission of the library program within the school according to the ethics and principles of library science, education, management, and administration. **Element:** 5.2 Professional Ethics Candidates practice the ethical principles of their profession, advocate for intellectual freedom and privacy, and promote and model digital citizenship and responsibility. Candidates educate the school community on the ethical use of information and ideas.			
Evaluation for quality improvement	Identifies illogical or marginal stakeholders and provides little or no explanation of influence. Measures are included that do not bear relationship to desired outcomes. Evaluation framework would not be likely to results in evidence to guide future quality improvement actions.	Identifies logical stakeholders, influence, and desired outcomes. Measures are somewhat associated with stakeholders' desired outcomes and may be convincing. Evaluation framework would result in modest evidence to guide future quality improvement actions.	Identifies stakeholders of great influence, explains their influence, desired outcomes are estimated reasonably, measures are strongly associated with stakeholders' desired outcomes, and expected results for the library follow logically. Evaluation framework is highly likely to result in evidence that would guide future quality improvement actions.	
	Standards **NC- ECU MLS Program Objectives (2011)** **Objective:** 6. Plan, organize, staff, direct and budget library programs to meet informational, instructional and recreational needs. **NC- North Carolina Standards for Master of Library Science Degree/School Library Media Coordinator (2011)** **Standard:** Standard 2: Collaboration and Leadership Functioning in a leadership and change agent role, the school library media coordinator demonstrates self-directed, reflective professional behavior to foster and advocate for a collaborative culture, with colleagues and the greater community, that supports life-long learning and that honors diversity. **Indicator:** 2.5 Collaborates with system-level and building-level technology personnel to provide leadership in the school's use of instructional technology resources to enhance learning; **Indicator:** 2.8 Seeks, evaluates, and applies input for improvement provided by educators, parents, students, and community leaders. **Standard:** Standard 4: Program Administration The school library media coordinator understands and demonstrates effective techniques for managing the school library media program and aligning program goals with the educational mission of the school. Functioning in a stewardship role, the school library media coordinator manages resources and makes them readily available to students, teachers, administrators, and support staff both within and beyond the walls of the school. Working with the Media and Technology Advisory Committee (MTAC) and through other partnerships, the school library media coordinator acts as a change agent to plan and implement policies and procedures that enhance access to resources and services and to solve problems as they arise. **Indicator:**			

Levels/Criteria	Below Proficient Value: 1	Proficient Value: 2	Above Proficient Value: 3	Score/Level
	4.6 Evaluates the school library media program on a continual basis according to accepted standards of quality; **USA- ALA Core Competencies of Librarianship** **Area 5. :** Reference and User Services **Detail 5E.:** The principles and methods of advocacy used to reach specific audiences to promote and explain concepts and services. **Area 8. :** Administration and Management **Detail 8C.:** The concepts behind, and methods for, assessment and evaluation of library services and their outcomes. **USA- ALA/AASL Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians (2010)** **Standard:** Standard 4: Advocacy and Leadership Candidates advocate for dynamic school library programs and positive learning environments that focus on student learning and achievement by collaborating and connecting with teachers, administrators, librarians, and the community. Candidates are committed to continuous learning and professional growth and lead professional development activities for other educators. Candidates provide leadership by articulating ways in which school libraries contribute to student achievement. **Element:** 4.4 Advocacy Candidates identify stakeholders within and outside the school community who impact the school library program. Candidates develop a plan to advocate for school library and information programs, resources, and services. **Standard:** Standard 5: Program Management and Administration Candidates plan, develop, implement, and evaluate school library programs, resources, and services in support of the mission of the library program within the school according to the ethics and principles of library science, education, management, and administration. **Element:** 5.4 Strategic Planning and Assessment Candidates communicate and collaborate with students, teachers, administrators, and community members to develop a library program that aligns resources, services, and standards with the school's mission. Candidates make effective use of data and information to assess how the library program addresses the needs of their diverse communities.			
Conclusion	Ends haphazardly or abruptly.	Summarizes or restates previous material without drawing conclusions or meaning for the audience.	Without repeating previous content, leaves the audience with a strong final impression and a sense of completeness. Poses questions, or challenges the audience to rethink their ideas, or looks to the future. Inspires the audience.	
Design, composition, construction, and appearance of the presentation	Content seems disorganized. Design, slide composition or style is inconsistent across the entire presentation. There are errors in grammar or spelling.	Content is well-organized, presented logically, and some attempt at transition has been employed. One or two slides may contain too much text, but overall the text is well-proportioned. Some attention has been paid to design elements and overall attractiveness. There are no errors in grammar or spelling.	Content is well-organized and flows seamlessly. Slides are attractive, well composed and easy to read. Visual or graphic elements are appropriate to text. Content is presented in proportion to weights for each section. There are no errors in grammar or spelling.	
	Standards **USA- ALA Core Competencies of Librarianship** **Area 1. :** Foundations of the Profession **Detail:** 1J. Effective communication techniques (verbal and written).			

Artifact Reflection Scoring Rubric

Levels/Criteria	Below Proficient Value = 1.00	Proficient Value = 2.00	Above Proficient Value = 3.00	Score/Level
Content of responses to all four questions	Responses fail to address the questions and convey little understanding of the course artifact as a learning experience. Responses consist of personal complaints about the experience or attack the requirements of the artifact rather than focus on the learning experience. Word count of responses is less than approximately 400 words.	Responses deal with some questions in depth, but not others, or are too short and/or shallow. Presents the viewpoint of a student, rather than an objective professional. Word count of responses is approximately 400 or more words.	Responses deal with all of the reflection questions in an exceptionally clear and effective manner. Student maintains a professional viewpoint while being honest and candid about the experience of creating the artifact and related learning experiences. Word count of responses is approximately 500 or more words.	
Writing Style	Responses are poorly written, unclear, or unrelated to the questions. Contains spelling, grammar or sentence structure errors.	Responses are clear, focused, and easy to read. Reflects attention to editing for spelling, grammar and sentence structure.	Responses are clear, focused, easy to read, and are enjoyable to read. Contains no spelling, grammar or sentence structure errors.	

Assessment #3 Collection Development Plan
  a. Description of the Assessment

      The assessment for *LIBS 6018 Collection Development* is the required Collection
      Development Plan. Candidates evaluate and select print, non-print, and digital resources
      using professional selection tools and evaluation criteria to develop and manage a quality
      collection designed to meet the diverse curricular, personal, and professional needs of
      students, teachers, and administrators. This assessment teaches the principles and
      methods of selecting print and non-print materials, intellectual freedom, and formulation
      of selection policies. *LIBS 6018* is a course required for all students.

  b. Description of how the assessment specifically aligns with the standards

      Students evaluate and select print, non-print, and digital resources using professional
      selection tools and evaluation criteria to develop and manage a quality collection
      designed to meet the diverse curricular, personal, and professional needs of students,
      teachers, and administrators. This assignment aligns with ALA/AASL Standards for
      Initial Preparation of School Librarians: Standard 1 *Teaching for Learning* (1.1);
      Standard 3 *Information and Knowledge* (3.1); Standard 5 *Program Management and
      Administration*, (5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4).

      Specifically, the final assignment allows candidates to show evidence of meeting the
      standards by producing a Collection Development Policy for a real-life (partner) school
      library that addresses how the student would evaluate and select print, non-print and
      digital materials and resources (5.1). Candidates collect and make effective use of data
      and information to assess how the library program addresses the needs of their diverse
      communities (1.1, 5.4). Candidates identify multiple collaborative strategies to efficiently
      and ethically access, interpret, and communicate information (3.1). Candidates must
      explain use of all available media, especially technologically new ones (1.1) in creating
      the collection development plan. Candidates must also determine professional selection
      tools and criteria that would be used to select materials and resources (5.3). Candidates
      must document how the curricular, personal and professional needs of all stakeholders
      including students, teachers, and administrators in the state they are residing, are
      addressed by accessing the state curricular plan (5.1). Candidates explain and advocate
      acceptable levels of the ethical principles of librarianship, advocate for intellectual
      freedom and privacy, and uphold fair interpretations of the copyright laws (5.2).

LIBS 6018 Collection Development

	6018 Artifact Components	**AASL Standard**
Component 1	**Community Analysis**	1.1 5.4

Component 2	Library Patrons	1.1 5.4
Component 3	Collection Guidelines	3.1 5.1
Component 4	Selection Policy	5.1 5.4
Component 5	Acquisition Policy	5.1
Component 6	Collection Evaluation	5.1 5.3
Component 7	Copyright	3.1 5.2
Component 8	Evaluate Computer/ Internet Access	5.3
Component 9	Challenges	3.1 5.2
Component 10	Gift Policy	5.2 5.4

   c.   Brief analysis of the data findings

An analysis of data findings for the two most current semesters, (Spring and Fall 2011), indicates 27 out of 28 who finished the course in spring 2011, achieved Proficient or Above Proficient; and 34 out of 34 who completed the course in fall 2011, achieved Proficient or Above Proficient on the course artifact.

The disaggregated data provides evidence that all candidates met or exceeded the level of proficiency for most rubric elements, which are interpreted more completely below. Cumulative data shows that 93% of all candidates in the two semesters under review performed at proficient or above proficient levels.

Data includes all 6018 students

   d.   Interpretation of how the data provides evidence for meeting standards

The required Collection Development Plan serves as the course artifact for LIBS 6018 and the assessment for this report. In developing the collection plan, students must first analyze the community they serve. According to the analysis of the data from the spring and fall of 2011, candidates can be expected to directly address learner needs of all students including those with diverse learning styles, physical and intellectual abilities and needs and student interests and learning needs and link it to the assessment of student achievement (1.1; 5.4). In the spring semester of 2011, over 93% of students scored at or above overall proficiency ratings. In fall of

2011, over 94% of scores measured at or above overall proficiency levels indicating that candidates show clear evidence of meeting skills (1.1, 3.1, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4).

While the majority continue at or above proficiency, identified areas with higher below proficiency ratings may call for examination. These areas include: library patrons, collection guidelines, selection policy, acquisition policy, collection evaluation and challenges. Specifically, the Selection Policy (5.1) element needs further examination because of the higher below proficiency ratings in both spring and fall 20ll. 11% and 12% respectively fell at below proficient in the area for evaluating and selecting print, non-print, and digital resources using professional selection tools (5.1). In the area Collection Evaluation (5.1, 5.4), 11% of candidates also scored at below proficiency. For library patrons/stakeholders (1.1, 5.4) and collection guidelines (3.1, 5.1) scores for spring 2011 were 14% below proficiency. The rubric element Challenges (3.1) proved to be the weakest area overall with 7% and 18% respectively scoring below proficiency in spring and fall, 2011. This provides evidence of a weakness of candidates to acknowledge and understand the ethical principles of the profession.

Interestingly, in analyzing the rubric element Copyright, it bears noting that in the area of efficient and ethical information seeking, results indicated only 4% and 3% were below proficient. Yet, in the rubric element regarding Challenge Policies, looking at the same elements (3.1, 5.2), 18% and 7% from spring and fall scored below proficient. This large difference indicates a need to closely examine the rubric, as ethical use is the focus of both these areas, yet student understanding seems to vary widely within those areas.

The variation in scores indicates a need for further evaluation of the rubric. Clearly, however this assessment shows that a large majority, 93%, of candidates completing this course have the skills to focus on supporting a flexible learning environment through their collection development planning.

This assessment was selected because it provides evidence that candidates, overall, are prepared to evaluate and select print, non-print, and digital resources using professional selection tools and evaluation criteria to develop and manage quality collection development plans designed to meet the diverse learner needs.

e. Assessment tools

 The Collection Development Policy is the culminating activity in LIBS 6018. This assignment is the course artifact.

The summary instructions to the candidates are:

Candidates will write a Collection Development Policy (CDP) for the library or media center he/she has been working with. Candidates should develop a CDP that they think the Partner Library should have as policy, not necessarily the practices which are actually in place. This is to be an original document. Candidates may not copy and paste from the Collection Development Policy of an existing library, except where allowed for in the Challenge procedure below. Even then, it should be the candidate's ideal policy, and each candidate is responsible for every element in it, even if there are parts borrowed from an existing library or from a library or school organization such as ALA and DPI.

The candidate's selected institution may have a different policy, and candidates are not required to be in conformity with that policy for this assignment. This is a Policy, not a description of the library, not a plan. Candidates are required to use APA Reference List at end for sources used.

Policy should be written so that a patron, board member or parent is able to read it, i.e., there should be no jargon, no unexplained acronyms or initials, etc.

Candidates must remember this is a policy statement, <u>not</u> a description or analysis of the library. It is <u>not</u> a policy manual for all library operations. It is a Collection Policy that is reviewed every few years.

(Detailed instructions for each element are then presented to candidates.)

f. <u>Scoring guide</u>

Scoring rubric for Assignment for Assessment 3

LIBS 6018 Collection Development Components		Above Proficient (30>28)	Proficient (27>23)	Below Proficient (22 and below)
Community Analysis 1.1 5.4		Provides clear, thorough analysis of community	Provides analysis of community	Provides poor analysis of community
Library Patrons / Stakeholders 1.1 5.4		Provides clear, complete description of all patrons / stakeholders	Provides description of patrons / stakeholders	Provides incomplete description of patrons / stakeholders
Collection Guidelines 3.1 5.1		Provides clear, complete guidelines	Provides guidelines	Provides inadequate guidelines
Selection Policy (criteria) 5.1 5.4		Provides clear, complete selection criteria	Provides selection criteria	Provides inadequate selection criteria
Acquisition Policy (criteria) 5.1		Provides clear, complete acquisition criteria	Provides selection criteria	Provides inadequate selection criteria
Collection Evaluation 5.1 5.3		Explains evaluation process clearly and completely	Explains evaluation process	Does not explain evaluation process
Copyright 3.1 **5.2**		Includes clear, complete copyright policy	Includes copyright policy	Does not include clear copyright policy
Computer & Internet Access		Includes clear, complete description	Includes description of computer &	Includes poor description of

5.3		of computer & internet access	internet access	computer & internet access
Challenges 3.1 5.2		Includes comprehensive policy on intellectual freedom	Includes policy on intellectual freedom	Does not include policy on intellectual freedom
Gift Policy 5.2 5.4		Includes clear, comprehensive gift policy	Includes gift policy	Does not include gift policy
Points may be deducted for late submittal (1/day)				
Above Proficient = 28-30 Proficient = 23-27 Below Proficient = 0-22				

g. <u>Charts that provide candidate data for this assessment</u>

Data for Assessment 3 Collection Development

Assessment 3: Collection Development Plan						
	Above Proficient		**Proficient**		**Below Proficient**	
LIBS 6018 Development	**Spring 2011 (N) 28**	**Fall 2011 (N) 34**	**Spring 2011 (N) 28**	**Fall 2011 (N) 34**	**Spring 2011 (N) 28**	**Fall 2011 (N) 34**
Community Analysis 1.1 5.4	25 (89%)	27 (79%)	2 (7%)	6 (18%)	1 (4%)	1 (3%)
Library Patrons / Stakeholders 1.1 5.4	15 (54%)	25 (74%)	9 (32%)	7 (20%)	4 (14%)	2 (6%)
Collection Guidelines 3.1 5.1	21 (75%)	25 (74%)	3 (11%)	7 (20%)	4 (14%)	2 (6%)
Selection Policy (criteria) 5.1 5.4	20 (71%)	21 (62%)	5 (18%)	9 (26%)	3 (11%)	4 (12%)
Acquisition Policy (criteria) 5.1	16 (57%)	20 (59%)	10 (36%)	11 (32%)	2 (7%)	3 (9%)
Collection Evaluation	15	24	10	9	3	1

5.1 5.4	(54%)	(71%)	(36%)	(26%)	(11%)	(3%)
Copyright **5.3** **5.1**	25 (89%)	30 (88%)	2 (7%)	3 (9%)	1 (4%)	1 (3%)
Computer & Internet Access 5.3	18 (64%)	27 (79%)	10 (36%)	7 (21%)	0	0
Challenges 3.1 5.2	22 (79%)	24 (71%)	4 (14%)	4 (12%)	2 (7%)	6 (18%)
Gift Policy 5.2 5.4	28 (100%)	33 (97%)	0	1 (3%)	0	0
Overall Proficiency Rate	20.5 73.2%	25.6 75.4%	5.5 19.6%	6.4 18.6%	2 7.2%	2 6%

*Numbers rounded to the nearest whole number

Assessment #4 Internship In-Service

Internship Evaluation and Reflection

    a.   Description of the Assessment

The development of an in-service for presentation to faculty is an assignment in the *LIBS 6991 Professional Internship*, a required course that is offered in Tier III of the program. *LIBS 6991* is offered upon completion of 30 semester hours of required courses in the Library Science Program. Working under the direction of the site librarian, candidates develop an in-service initiative to be presented to the faculty to strengthen the skills of the faculty and the faculty's knowledge of the skills of the librarian. This assessment requires candidates to conduct surveys, and analyze library programs and services to determine an area of need through which they, as library leaders, could develop or expand library programs or services to benefit the school. Candidates determine a specific need through consultation with the site supervisor, use of surveys, observations and a brief review the literature. Then candidates develop a presentation, based upon analysis of data collected and the review of literature, to offer a ways to meet the identified need. The presentation is shared with members of the school faculty. This assessment demonstrates that candidates are able to effectively apply their knowledge, skills, and strengths to support and improve library programs as librarian leaders.

    b. Description of how the assessment specifically aligns with the standards

Assessment #4 aligns with North Carolina DPI standards and specific elements in AASL's Standards. AASL Standards addressed include: Standard 1: *Teaching for Learning*; Standard 3: *Information and Knowledge*; Standard 4: *Advocacy and Leadership*; Standard 5: *Program Management and Administration*. For the in-service, candidates must determine ways and means to support and/or improve library programs for effective teaching and learning. Areas to address are determined by observation, surveys of faculty, and consultation with the site supervisor. Presentations designed to provide information to the faculty about the library program, or for program or service improvements, are based upon research of current literature.

In completing this assessment, candidates support the learning of members of the learning community through sharing skills and information (1.1, 1.4; 4.1; 4.2). The presentations specifically demonstrate a candidate's ability to develop solutions to promote access to resources and services (3.2) and to improve academic processes to support student achievement (1.1). For the in-service presentation, candidates interpret and use data to create, share and document (1.2) new knowledge or practices for the faculties and students they serve in their library settings (1.2; 3.4; 4.2). Candidates document use of a variety of strategies to address the diverse needs and interests of the specific faculty they serve, as well as a variety of research strategies to generate knowledge to improve practice (3.4).

Specifically through the in-service project, candidates provide models of leadership, articulating ways their findings can impact or contribute to student achievement (4.3). Additionally, this assignment provides an opportunity for candidates to articulate the role of the school librarian, and the relationship of the school library program's impact on student academic achievement within the context of other educational initiatives (4.3). Documentation demonstrates that candidates model, share, and promote effective principles of teaching and learning as

collaborative partners with faculty (1.3). Candidates are able to use this opportunity to advocate for their programs (4.4) through the presentations they develop and design.

Identifying needs and designing ways to address those needs, candidates are able to support a library program that aligns resources, services, and standards with the overall school mission (5.4).

> c. <u>Brief analysis of the data findings</u>

During the summer of 2011, 19 candidates enrolled in *LIBS 6991, Professional Internship*. 18 completed the in-service with required documentation. 17 scored at above proficiency and 2 candidates scored at below proficiency in connection to the in-service requirement specifically 1.1 *Knowledge of learners,* 1.2 *Effective teacher*, 1.3 *Instructional partner*, 1.4 *Integration of skills*, 3.2 *Access to information*, 3.4 *Research*, 4.1 *Networking*, 4.2 *Professional development*, 4.3 *Leadership*, 5.4 *Planning and assessment*. Of the two who scored below proficiency one candidate was counseled with mentoring in these areas and offered an opportunity to revise. One candidate required additional guidance in this and other areas, therefore, elected to repeat the internship with mentoring.

During the fall of 2011, 26 candidates enrolled in *LIBS 6991 Professional Internship*. 26 completed the in-service with required documentation. 25 candidates scored at above proficiency with 1 scoring at proficiency in connection to the in-service requirement.

In looking at the two semesters of data, it is evident that all candidates in fall performed at above proficiency levels while only 91.6% of candidates did so in the summer session with 8.4% of candidates performing at below proficiency during the summer session.

The disaggregated data provides evidence that a large majority of candidates meet or exceed the level of proficiency for all rubric elements, which are interpreted more completely below.

> d. <u>Interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards</u>

This assessment used in LIBS 6991, the *Professional Internship* was selected because it measures elements from AASL Standards 1, 3, 4, and 5 and allows candidates to demonstrate evidence of putting theory into practice as they develop and demonstrate knowledge skills and professional dispositions supporting student learning. Data for this assessment align with these standards as shown in the disaggregated data

During the internship, candidates receive extensive mentoring from site supervisors and university supervisors in developing and delivering the in-service initiative. Candidates present evidence that includes a reflective narrative and video documentation of presentation, to demonstrate their level of standard attainment.

Supervisors use the North Carolina Media Performance Appraisal instrument provided at http://info.dhhs.state.nc.us/olm/manuals/dei/eval/man/2002MCPAI-RForm12.pdf to rate candidates on key indicators. Faculty and supervisors also use a rubric to assess proficiency level of AASL standards for each component of the presentation. An interpretation of the data indicates that a large majority of candidates performed at above proficiency levels. Specifically, in fall 2011 for elements (1.1), (1.2), (1.3), (1.4), (3.2), (3.4), (4.1), (4.2), (4.3), and (5.4) 100%

of candidates scored at above proficient or proficient for this component. For summer 2011, 91.6% scored at above proficient or proficient levels for elements (1.1), (1.2), (1.3),(1.4), (3.2), (3.4), (4.1), (4.2), (4.3), and (5.4)   These scores provide evidence that candidates can demonstrate knowledge of learners (1.1); are effective and knowledgeable teachers (1.2); are instructional partners (1.3); integrate skills and learning standards (1.4); support access to library services (3.2); interpret and use date to create and share new knowledge (3.4); actively network with the library community (4.1); participate in professional growth and leadership (4.2); can demonstrate the role of the library on educational initiative (4.3), and are able to develop a program that aligns resources, services and standards with the mission of the school (5.4).

For element (4.4) in both summer and fall of 2011, 100% of candidates scored at above proficient or proficient for this component. These scores provide evidence that candidates can develop a plan to advocate for library programs, resources and services to support learning needs (4.4).

Questions are raised when considering the overall proficiency rates for fall 2011 at 100% and at 91.6% for summer 2011. Although a large majority of candidates performed at proficiency or above, in the summer session 8.4% of students performed at below proficiency and at this point in the program, we would expect all students to perform at levels of proficiency. The extensive mentoring of site supervisors may be a factor in the proficiency rates of candidates in the fall semester as candidates and mentors have longer to work closely together on this project. We see a need to examine the teaching background of these students to see if there is a correlation between teaching experience and proficiency in these areas. This may lead to further examination of LIBS 6989 *Early Internship* for those students who do not have a teaching background.

Given the interpretation of Assessment 4 data (see the disaggregated and cumulative data charts for a complete breakdown) one could expect ECU's Department of Library Science candidates to be able to meet the identified standards and to be able to recognize and respond to school needs by designing ways to address those needs. Candidates are able to support a library program that aligns resources, services, and standards with the overall school mission

(2) Assessment Documentation: Assessment Tool, Scoring Guide, Candidate Data

e. Assessment Tool/ Description of Assignment: LIBS 6991 Professional Internship

This assessment requires each candidate to determine an area of need through which he/she as a library leader may develop or expand library programs or services to benefit the students and faculty in the school. Candidates will base plans for program improvement on consultations with site supervisors, surveys of faculty and observations of faculty and students. Candidates will read current literature in the area or concept identified as needing improvement. Each candidate, concentrating upon the area/concept to be addressed, will research plans and ideas for program improvement using surveys, observations, and information from the related literature. Working under the direction of the site librarian, candidates should develop an in-service workshop to be presented to the faculty, effectively applying their knowledge, skills, and strengths to support and improve their library program. Site supervising librarians will video the presentations. Video analysis will enhance the interaction for this component allowing university supervisors to

observe and critique each presentation. A reflective summary will be written and submitted by candidates upon completion of the presentation.

Assignment:

In-Service Learning Initiative

Your integrative data driven in-service learning initiative is designed to have you:

- Consult with a local school librarian to identify and address a defined need
- Survey faculty to determine strengths or needs
- Select a topic impacting targeted faculty
- Review the literature on selected topic
- Develop an initiative (the service learning component) to address the topic
- Present findings to faculty
- Reflect upon strengths and weaknesses of the in-service

Candidates must submit 2 components for this project:

1. A (3-5) page reflection of the in-service learning faculty engagement initiative

    a. This project should begin with a brief description of why the topic you chose was important. This explanation should be based in your surveys, consultations, research and the professional literature. Please remember that your explanation should be brief (it is not expected to be a lengthy literature review)

    b. After your explanation of why your topic is important professionally, please briefly explain why it is important at your school (if you don't work at the school, please just share the information that was shared with you when you were making your decision about what to focus on for the project) or public library.

    c. Then, share what you did—explain your service-learning initiative.

    d. Share what meaningful contribution you intended for the service-learning initiative to make and if and/or how it might continue to be used or have an impact at your site.

2. A 30-45 minute video of your presentation

AASL Standards Addressed: Standard 1: *Teaching for Learning*, Standard 3: *Information and Knowledge*, Standard 4: *Advocacy and Leadership*, and Standard 5: *Program Management and Administration*

f: Scoring guide for the assessment

Each in-service assessment is evaluated according to the scoring rubric.

Rubric for In-Service Learning Initiative Assignment

	Above Proficient 100 to >93	Proficient 92 to >85	Below Proficient 84 > and Below
Assess Faculty and Identify Target Audience Needs (AASL Standard 1.1)	Multiple evidence is provided demonstrating that candidates design and deliver instruction based on needs of the learning community	Some evidence is provided demonstrating that candidates design and deliver instruction based on needs of the learning community	Little or no evidence is provided demonstrating that candidates design and deliver instruction based on needs of the learning community
Survey, Consultation, and Observation (AASL Standard 3.4, 4.1)	Multiple evidence is provided to demonstrate use of networking with colleagues using research strategies to create new knowledge and improve services in school libraries	Some evidence is provided to demonstrate use of networking with colleagues using research strategies to create new knowledge and improve services in school libraries	Little or no evidence is provided to demonstrate use of networking with colleagues using research strategies to create new knowledge and improve services in school libraries
Literature Review (AASL Standard 3.4)	Multiple evidence is provided to demonstrate use of evidence based research	Some evidence is provided to demonstrate use of evidence based research	Little or no evidence is provided to demonstrate use of evidence based research
Promotion of library Program Resources and Services (AASL Standard 4.4)	Multiple evidence is provided that candidate articulates the role of the school library program in contributing to student achievement initiatives or professional development initiatives	Some evidence is provided that candidate articulates the role of the school library program in contributing to student achievement initiatives or professional development initiatives	Little or no evidence is provided that candidate articulates the role of the school library program in contributing to student achievement initiatives or professional development initiatives
In-Service Topic and Significance to School (AASL Standard 1.2, 1.3, 1.4,)	Multiple evidence is provided demonstrating that candidates can document and communicate the impact of in-service	Some evidence is provided demonstrating that candidates can document and communicate the impact of in-	Little or no evidence is provided demonstrating that candidates can document and communicate the impact of in-service initiative on

	initiative on supporting learning and student achievement	service initiative on supporting learning and student achievement	supporting learning and student achievement
Presentation Designed to Promote Teaching, Learning and Access to Information (AASL Standard 1.3, 3.2,)	Multiple evidence is provided demonstrating that candidates collaborate with educators in professional development activities providing solutions supporting access to information	Some evidence is provided demonstrating that candidates collaborate with educators in professional development activities providing solutions supporting access to information	Little or no evidence is provided demonstrating that candidates collaborate with educators in professional development activities providing solutions supporting access to information
Skills Instruction (AASL Standard 1.4)	Multiple evidence is provided to indicate candidate advocates for skills to support the learning needs of the school community	Some evidence is provided to indicate candidate advocates for skills to support the learning needs of the school community	Little or no evidence is provided to indicate candidate advocates for skills to support the learning needs of the school community
Delivery/Video of In-Service Presentation (AASL Standard 1.3, 4.2, 4.3)	Multiple evidence is provided evidence of candidate's use of research and other evidence-based data to contribute to and lead school improvement and professional development initiatives, modeling and sharing teaching and learning	At least one evidence is provided of candidate's use of research and other evidence-based data to contribute to and lead school improvement and professional development initiatives, modeling and sharing teaching and learning	Little or no evidence is provided of candidate's use of research and other evidence-based data to contribute to and lead school improvement and professional development
Mission and School Goals (AASL Standard 5.4)	Multiple evidence is provided to demonstrate candidate designs, directs, and promotes strong school library programs with services aligned with the school's mission	Some evidence is provided to demonstrate candidate designs, directs, and promotes strong school library programs with services aligned with the school's	Little or no evidence provided to demonstrate candidate designs, directs, and promotes strong school library programs with services aligned with the school's mission

		mission	
Reflective Summary	Multiple evidence is provided to demonstrate candidate has reflected on practice and can identify meaningful adjustments to improve teaching	Some evidence is provided to demonstrate candidate has reflected on practice and can identify meaningful adjustments to improve teaching	Little to no evidence is provided to demonstrate candidate has reflected on practice and can identify meaningful adjustments to improve teaching

Rating Scale:

Score	Grade
93-100	Above Proficient
85-92	Proficient
84-Below	Below Proficient

g. Charts that provide candidate data for this assessment

Assessment 4: In-Service Learning Initiative						
	Above Proficient		**Proficient**		**Below Proficient**	
	Summer 2011 (N) 19	**Fall 2011 (N) 26**	**Summer 2011 (N) 19**	**Fall 2011 (N) 26**	**Summer 2011 (N) 19**	**Fall 2011 (N) 26**
Assess Faculty and Identify Target Audience Needs (AASL Standard 1.1)	16 (84%)	25(96 %)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	2 (11%)	0
Survey, Consultation, Observation (AASL Standard 3.4, 4.1)	17 (89%)	24 (92%)	2 (11%)	2 (8%)	0	0
Literature Review	17 (89%)	25 (96 %)	0	1 (4%)	2 (11%)	0

(AASL Standard 3.4)						
Library Program Resources and Services (AASL Standard 4.4)	16 (84%)	25 (96 %)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	2 (11%)	0
In-Service Topic and Significance to School (AASL Standard 1.2, 1.3, 1.4,)	17 (89%)	25 (96%)	0	1 (4%)	2 (11%)	0
Presentation Designed to Promote Teaching, Learning and Access to Information (AASL Standard 1.3, 3.2,)	17 (89%)	24 (92%)	0	2 (8%)	2 (11%)	0
Skills Instruction (AASL Standard 1.4)	16 (84%)	25 (96%)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	2 (11%)	0
Delivery/Video of In-Service Presentation (AASL Standard 1.3, 4.2, 4.3)	17 (89%)	24 (92%)	0	2 (8%)	2 (11%)	0
Mission and School Goals (AASL Standard 5.4)	16 (84%)	24 (92%)	1 (5%)	2 (8%)	2 (11%)	0
Reflective Summary	16 (84%)	25 (96%)	3 (16%)	1 (4%)	0	0
Overall Proficiency Rate	16.5 (87%)	24.6 (94.6%)	0.9 (4.6%)	1.4 (5.4%)	1.6 (8.4%)	0 (0%)

*Students are closely guided through this project by site supervisors. Students who score below proficiency are mentored by both the site supervisor and program supervisor.

Assessment #5: Candidate effect on student learning

Narrative

    a. <u>Description of the Assessment</u>

The Analysis, Synthesis, and Application of Impact Studies is a required assignment in LIBS 6142 *Instructional Foundations of the School Library Program*, which is a tier III course available only to school pathway students. LIBS 6142 is taken near the end of this program after candidates have completed required courses such as administration, collection development, reference, and cataloging. This assessment requires candidates to (1) analyze and synthesize 10 impact studies and to chart the elements of school library programs that impact student learning, (2) evaluate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions based on their analysis of impact study findings, (3) evaluate a school library based on the analysis of impact study findings, (4) develop short- and long-range plans to increase student learning, (5) implement one short-range plan, and (6) advocate by communicating to stakeholders the school library's impact on student learning.

    b. <u>Description of how the assessment specifically aligns with the standards</u>

Assessment #5 aligns with Standards 1: Teaching for Learning; 3: Information and Knowledge; 4: Advocacy and Leadership; and 5: Program Management and Administration. Candidates analyze and synthesize research to understand elements of exemplary school library programs that support diverse learning needs through equitable and open access and the removal of barriers to service (Standard 3). Candidates are leaders who create positive learning environments and advocate for the school library (Standard 4) based on their study of these impact studies (Standard 3) and their implementation of plans (Standard 5). Candidates utilize findings of this body of research to assess their strengths and weaknesses as well as the resources, facilities, services and their professional ethics to provide opportunities for learning, inquiry, and reading for all students regardless of their gender, ethnicity, nationality, socioeconomic status, special need, or academic competence (Standard 5).

Specifically, candidates meet the NCATE/AASL elements by applying evidence-based research to improve school library programs and services (3.4) through the development of short- and long-range plans (3.4) that support the diverse learning needs of students (1.1; 5.1; 5.3; 5.4). Short-range plans are implemented (4.3; 5.3; 5.4) thus improving the school library's learning environment (1.1). Candidates understand impact study research as a model methodology to collect data leading to a planning process and improved access and services (3.4; 5.1; 5.3). In addition, candidates' analysis of inquiry research and their evaluations of self (4.2) and school libraries are essential steps of advocacy leading to consummate learning environments based on

principles of open access (4.4; 5.1) that support diverse learning communities. Candidates advocate for the school library by communicating findings and plans to stakeholders (4.4).

c. Brief analysis of the data findings

Candidates performed well on this assignment during spring 2011 and summer 2011. When necessary, candidates were offered the opportunity to revise their work to score at the proficient/above proficient level. Mean data for spring 2011 indicated that 57% of candidates scored at the above proficient level and 36% scored at proficient. One candidate, or 7%, scored below proficient. Data for summer 2011 indicated that 47% of candidates scored at the above proficient level and 47% scored at proficient. One candidate, or 5%, scored below proficient.

d. Interpretation of how that data provides evidence of meeting standards

An interpretation of this data provides clear evidence of meeting elements of Standards 1, 3, 4, and 5 as candidates master an understanding of the impact study research (3.4; 5.4) by developing a chart or graphic representation of the findings of this body of research (4,2; 4.3) and applying these findings. The majority of candidates performed at above proficiency on their blog posting in which they shared their understandings, and responded to the postings of three additional candidates, about the impact of school libraries. During spring 2011, 64% of candidates performed at the above proficiency level for the blog posting and 71% were able to graphically represent this information at this high level. During summer 2011, candidates were not required to post to blogs as this Blackboard feature was not available to ECU. During summer 2011, candidates' charts received an above proficiency rate of 74% and a proficiency rate of 26%.

Candidates developed two instruments (3.4; 4.2; 5.1; 5.3) to compare/assess/evaluate their ability to impact student learning as well as the school library's impact; they interpreted these findings (3.4; 5.4). Candidates felt more confident about the school library's position to impact student learning than they did their skills and dispositions to impact student learning. In LIBS 6144, a class that follows this one, each candidate participates in a blog about dispositions, assesses his or hers, and as a group identifies the five most important dispositions to the exemplary school librarian. These assignments help candidates to understand more completely the importance of their skills and dispositions to impact student learning. Candidates proved to be above proficient in identifying short- and long-range plans (5.2; 5.3; 5.4) to improve student learning. For the spring 2011 semester, scores for the development of plans were 71% above proficient 21% proficient, and 7% below proficient. For summer 2011, 58% scored at above proficient and 42% scored proficient. Candidates performed slightly worse on implementation of short range plans slightly less well, but still very proficiently. Candidates were able to communicate to stakeholders the findings of their impact studies research (4.4) using a variety of formats such as pamphlets, emails, and presentations.

For spring 2011, the chart, development of instrument II, and development of short- and long-range plans received the highest above proficiency scores (at 71% each). The rubric element, interpretation of data, was the weakest (at 50%). For summer 2011, the chart received the highest

above proficiency ratings (at 74%). The rubric items receiving the lowest above proficiency ratings were implementation of the short-range plan and communication to stakeholders (at 37% each) and the development of instrument I (at 47%). This indicates that interpretation of research is an item that needs more teaching at an earlier time in the program. The lower summer 2011 scores (which were lower for each rubric element) suggests that ECU DLS faculty should discuss whether some courses are more compatible with the shortened summer semester (14-weeks compared to 11-weeks), or counsel some candidates from taking as many courses during summer session.

An interpretation of Assessment 5 data (see the disaggregated and cumulative data charts for the complete breakdown) indicates that one could expect that ECU's Department of Library Science candidates to successfully analyze and synthesize the body of impact study research to evaluate their own abilities as well as the school library program's to improve student learning (1.1; 3.4; 5.1; 5.3; 5.4) and plan and implement changes to reach this high mark. Candidates can communicate appropriately these findings, plans, and changes to stakeholders (4.4) using a variety of methods such as pamphlets, emails, and presentations.

This assessment was selected because it provides evidence that the ECU's DLS program is preparing candidates to advocate for the school library program. This assessment begins with candidates developing a solid understanding of the import of the school library program to student achievement and culminates in communicating with stakeholders their assessment of the school library, short- and long-range plans, and the implementation of a short-range plan. Thinking deeply about this body of research provides candidates with the quantitative and qualitative evidence that school libraries are integral to student learning. This knowledge provides a foundation for advocacy as well as the development of a school library that boosts student achievement.

Assessment Documentation

    e. <u>The assessment tool that is given to students</u>

The goal of assessment #5 is analysis and synthesis of impact studies to identify effects of the school library program on K-12 student learning and to communicate these findings to stakeholders. Based on this analysis and synthesis, MLS students assess their skills, knowledge, and dispositions as well as a school library for the purpose of creating short- and long-range plans to improve student learning. One short-range plan is implemented. This assignment begins with the following readings:

- Read the articles in the "Impact Study" folder in the Course Docs area in Blackboard to understand the importance this line of research
- Read 9 impact studies available at http://lrs.org and the New Jersey study available at http://www.njasl.org/ Read both quantitative studies (e.g., Massachusetts, Colorado, North Carolina) and qualitative studies (e.g., Idaho, Indiana)

- Watch the short seven-part podcast series at http://www.lrs.org/impact.php in which Keith Curry Lance discusses impact study research.
- Read Chapters 1 and 2 of the Guided Inquiry text by Kuhlthau, Maniotes, and Caspari
- Read pages 87-91 of the Doll text

This assignment consists of the following parts:

1. After reading ten impact studies, respond to the blog prompt about the impact studies, research methodologies, and ways you could gather data and information about your school library program. Please read the prompt's directions on the course blog.
2. Create a chart (or other form of graphic representation) using appropriate software that clearly and concisely presents the relevant and holistic findings of these impact studies.
3. Based on your analysis and synthesis of ten impact studies, create an instrument such as a rubric to self- assess and -evaluate yourself to determine if you have the skills, knowledge, and dispositions of a school librarian who can impact student learning. Describe instances in which you have applied these skills, knowledge, and dispositions.

   If you are not a practicing school librarian, you will need to evaluate and assess a practicing school librarian. In this case you will need to observe and learn enough about this person so that you can evaluate their skills, knowledge, and dispositions.
4. Based on your analysis and synthesis of ten impact studies, create an instrument such as a rubric to assess and evaluate a school library program. Collect this information. Connect this assessment and evaluation with your understanding of the impact studies to indicate the likeliness that the school library impacts student learning. Be specific and provide examples.
5. Write a brief narrative of your interpretation of the evaluations and assessments conducted in steps three and four.
6. Based on collection and interpretation of data, develop short- and long-range plans to increase student learning. Provide detailed information about each element of these plans and a realistic timetable for implementing these changes. Estimate costs and additional resources such as scheduling, additional staffing, and professional development for moving the school library program forward. At least one-third of these plans must represent changes that require no additional resources. What can you do with what you have to improve student learning?
7. Implement one short-range plan.
8. Communicate findings of this assignment to stakeholders using an appropriate format.

Communicate steps 2-8 in one document that is uploaded to your instructor.

f. The scoring guide for the assessment

	Above proficient 35 to >32	Proficient 32 to >28	Below proficient 28 and below
Blog posting AASL Standards: 3.4; 5.4 1 point maximum	Meets proficiency. In addition, MLS student articulates ideas for conducting further action research to improve student learning.	Meets requirements for blog prompt. Comments are meaningful. MLS student provides evidence of understanding importance of this body of research. Communicates differences in quantitative and qualitative research methodologies.	No reflection on value of impact studies. Shows little evidence of having read the studies. Cannot make useful comments to move discussion forward.
Chart/graphic representation AASL Standards: 4.2; 4.3 5 points maximum	Meets proficiency. In addition, chart is developed with stakeholders in mind as a tool to advocate for the school library. Effective use of technology.	Effective chart representing elements from 10 impact studies (both quantitative and qualitative). that provides clear evidence of elements of impactful school library. Chart is effectively designed as a communication tool.	Chart is unattractive and not effective as a communication tool.
Instrument 1 (step 3) 3.4; 4.2; 5.3 5 points maximum	Meets proficiency. In addition, MLS student applies the AASL *Standards for the 21st-century Learner* to this evaluation that provides evidence of deeper understanding of impact study findings.	Instrument and questions are well-designed to collect information about skills and dispositions of school librarian based on inquiry research. Results in useful collection of information.	Instrument is not well-developed. Questions are ambiguous; or no instrument.
Instrument II (step 4)	Meets proficiency. In addition, MLS	Instrument and questions are well-	Instrument is not well-developed;

	students show evidence of deeper understanding of impact study findings resulting in deeper questions.	designed to collect data about the school library program based on findings in the inquiry research.	or not developed.
AASL Standards: 3.4; 5.1

5 points maximum | | | |
| Interpretation of data

AASL Standards: 3.4; 5.4

5 points maximum | Meets proficiency. In addition, MLS students connect multiple aspects of the educational environment to create a synergistic school library program. | Well-designed questions result in the collection and interpretation of data that provides realistic picture of school library's strengths and weaknesses. | Little interpretation of data. |
| Plans

AASL Standards: 1,1;3.4; 5.1; 5.3; 5.4

5 points maximum | Meets proficiency. In addition, short- and long-range plans provide increased evidence of thoughtfulness and knowledge of students. Plans provide evidence of leadership and advocacy to meet goals. | MLS student develops short- and long-range plans based on data collection and interpretation. Plans are appropriate and doable. One-third of the plans do not require money and additional resources. | Plans are minimal. MLS student provides little evidence applying data and its interpretation to create plans. |
| Implementation of short-range plan

AASL Standards: 5.3; 5.4

5 points maximum | Meets proficiency. In addition, short-range plan is creative and appropriate based on a holistic understanding of school librarianship and standards such as Common Core, NC Essential, and AASL Standards for the 21st-Century Learner. | MLS student implements short-range plans justified by data collection. | No (or little) thoughtful implementation of short-range plan. |
| Communicate to stakeholders | Meets proficiency. In addition, | Findings and plans appropriately | Findings and plans are not |

AASL Standards: 4.4 4 points maximum	findings and plans attractively designed and communicated to stakeholders using appropriate methods of communication. Useful advocacy tool.	communicated to stakeholders to advocate for school library program.	

g. Chart that provides overall proficiency and disaggregated data for this assessment

Assessment 5: Candidate effect on student learning						
	Above Proficient		Proficient		Below Proficient	
	Spring 2011 n=14	Summer 2011 n=19	Spring 2011 n=14	Summer 2011 n=19	Spring 2011 n=14	Summer 2011 n=19
Blog posting	9 (64%)	nd	5 (36%)	nd	0 (0%)	nd
Chart/graphic representation	10 (71%)	14 (74%)	4 (29%)	5 (26%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Instrument I	8 (57%)	9 (47%)	5 (36%)	8 (42%)	1 (7%)	2 (11%)
Instrument II	10 (71%)	10 (53%)	4 (29%)	8 (42%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
Interpretation of data	7 (50%)	10 (53%)	6 (43%)	8 (42%)	1 (7%)	1 (5%)
Plans	10 (71%)	11 (58%)	3 (21%)*	8 (42%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
Implementation of short-range plan	9 (64%)	7 (37%)	4 (29%)	11 (58%)	1 (7%)	1 (5%)
Communicate to stakeholders	8 (57%)	7 (37%)	5 (36%)	11 (58%)	1 (7%)	1 (5%)
Overall Proficiency	8 (57%)	9 (47%)	5 (33%)	9 (47%)	1 (7%)	1 (5%)

* Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Note: Blog posting rubric element instituted for spring 2011 to provide additional opportunities for candidates to communicate about impactful school libraries.

Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses ALA/AASL standards

a. Description of the assessment

The Collaborative Inquiry Plan is a required assignment in LIBS 6144 *Instructional Strategies and Leadership for School Librarians*, which is a required course for school pathway students. LIBS 6144 is the last course students take before LIBS 6991 *Internship*, and many candidates take both courses during the same semester. In this assessment, candidates collaborate to develop an inquiry project that meets Common Core State Standards, North Carolina Essential Skills, and P21 Skills (Partnership for 21st-Century Schools) by applying exemplary and differentiated teaching practices to engage students who have various cognitive abilities, interests, and needs. The collaborative group identifies a topic that meets the above standards, selects six student-generated higher-order questions, and creates activities in eight curricular areas to provide K-12 students multiple ways to engage in inquiry. Individually, candidates participate in a blog, model higher-order thinking question posing resulting in K-12 students' question posting, and reflect on the project.

Through an effective process of collaboration, candidates understand, learn, and model the skills, dispositions, responsibilities, and self-assessment strategies expressed in the AASL *Standards for the 21st-Century Learner* such as creativity (1.2.3), displaying emotional resilience by persisting in information searching despite challenges (1.2.6), demonstrating teamwork by working productively with others (3.2.3), and showing social responsibility by participating actively with others in learning situations and by contributing questions and ideas during group discussions (3.2.2). Additionally, data from an earlier assignment in this course indicates that candidates find that collaborating with teachers is their greatest challenge. This assessment provides candidates with the practice and confidence to initiate and lead school-wide collaborative efforts to meet various standards.

b. Description of how the assessment specifically aligns with the standards

Assessment #6 aligns with Standard 1: Teaching for Learning through collaborative planning to develop an intrinsically motivating inquiry plan based on student-generated questions (1.1; 1.2). Candidates develop differentiated activities in eight curricular areas for each of the six guiding questions that reflect students' varying intellectual abilities and learning styles (1.1). An inquiry focus enables candidates to become effective users and creators of ideas and information (and models for students) by understanding that the foundation of inquiry *is* the question (1.2). It is the development of good questions that provides opportunities for members of the learning community to consider intellectual possibilities that prescribed teacher-driven research efforts do not support. The activities developed by candidates provide students with opportunities to create, analyze, and evaluate—the higher-order thinking and cognition skills—that are most likely to be flexed when students' question posing that leads to inquiry is taught, modeled, and supported (1.2). These activities engage students with technology (1.1; 1.2) using Wikis, blogs, graphing

programs, and podcasting. Proficiency in this assessment requires that candidates share knowledge resulting in the creation of standards-based activities to drive curriculum development (1.3), and integrate twenty-first century skills (e.g., P21 skills), Common Core Standards, and NC Essential Standards (1.4). Furthermore, this assessment provides candidates the opportunity to hone the skills, dispositions, responsibilities, and self-assessment strategies identified in AASL *Standards for the 21*st*-Century Learner* by collaborating with others to broaden and deepen understanding (1.1.9), displaying *initiative* and *engagement* by posing questions (1.2.1), contributing to the exchange of ideas within the learning community (1.3.4), and assessing their own ability to work with others in a group setting by evaluating varied roles, leadership, and demonstrations of respect for other viewpoints (3.4.3). This assessment provided opportunities for candidates to "practice" the AASL student learning standards in a safe and supportive learning environment.

Assessment #6 aligns with Standard 2: Literacy and Reading when candidates create activities that reinforce reading using such strategies as thinking aloud, providing background knowledge, and developing Venn diagrams and similar graphics to understand text (2.4).

c. Brief analysis of the data findings

An analysis of candidates' scores on this assessment provides evidence of their continuing development as knowledgeable collaborators. During spring 2012 and fall 2011 only one candidate did not fulfill her responsibilities to the collaborative group. Reflections indicate that candidate's knowledge of the inquiry process grows even while grappling with the challenges of collaboration. For the spring 2012 scoring of this assessment, three groups, or 37%, scored above proficient; five groups, or 63% scored proficient, and no groups scored below proficient. In addition, candidates' individual scores in spring 2012 were added to the group's scores to provide the candidate's cumulative score for this assignment. Seventeen candidates, or 41%, scored above proficient, 24 candidates, or 57%, scored proficient, and one candidate, or 2%, scored below proficient.

For the fall 2011 scoring of this assessment, 4 groups, or 80%, scored above proficient; one group, or 20%, scored proficient. No group scored below proficient. In addition, candidates' individual scores in fall 2011 were added to the group's scores to provide the candidate's cumulative score for this assignment. Fifteen candidates, or 58%, scored above proficient; and 11 candidates, or 42%, scored proficient. No candidate scored below proficient.

d. Interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards

Disaggregated data of rubric elements for summer and fall 2011 provides clear evidence that candidates are becoming skilled in collaboration, inquiry, and developing engaging activities to meet numerous standards. The assignment for this assessment has been tweaked and developed over several semesters to prepare candidates to excel at meeting the challenges of collaboration and the inquiry-based focus of school librarianship. For the spring 2012 assessment an additional rubric element was added—engagement with K-12 students; candidates read and apply Wilhelm's question generating concepts that he presents in a newly required text for LIBS 6137. In previous semesters question generation was discussed but Wilhelm's text has helped candidates to understand the criticality of student-generated rather than teacher-generated questions. Although group scores for identifying essential questions were slightly higher in fall 2011, candidates in spring 2012 were held to a higher expectation since question posing has become a greater focus of this assignment. Candidates' reflections of K-12 students' ability to pose questions indicated that this was a difficult task for K-12 students that required considerable modeling by candidates.

The weakest individual score is the candidate's reflection (but still all are above proficient/proficient). Data from this assessment as well as anecdotal evidence supports a weakness of candidates to reflect.

The weakest group score (but still all above proficient/proficient) was the use of technology to present a visually engaging inquiry project that could be used as a tool to advocate for the school librarian's inquiry role.

Interpretation of individual data elements indicates that candidates meet NCATE/AASL Standards 1.1 by modeling for K-12 students the development of engaging questions to drive inquiry. Candidates receive first-hand experience to understand the interests of students, their learning styles, and cultural and developmental uniqueness. Candidates meet Standard 1.1 by developing a compelling inquiry plan that interests students. Candidates provided evidence of being an effective and knowledgeable teacher by identifying and implementing best practices in the development of activities for the inquiry plan. Candidates meet Standard 1.3, Instructional partner, by collaborating with fellow candidates—many who are practicing educators—as instructional partners. Candidates indicate in this assignment's reflection the importance to engage with teachers in curriculum development to support inquiry. Candidates meet Standard 1.4 by integrating P21 Skills into the inquiry activities. Candidates met Standard 2.4 by identifying best teaching practices for these activities—some of which reinforce reading strategies.

This assessment was selected because it provides evidence of faculty support of collaborative behaviors and the higher-order thinking required for inquiry.

(2) Assessment #6 Documentation

e. The assessment tool that is given to students

Collaborative Inquiry Plan (35 points)

The goal of this assignment in LIBS 6144 *Instructional Strategies and Leadership for School Librarians* is for MLS students to develop collaborative skills by participating with group members to create an inquiry plan and develop and model questioning and discourse skills integral to P-12 authentic generative inquiry. This assignment moves the MLS students from a teacher-driven "copy and paste" research model that unfortunately is still used in some schools today to a "messier" inquiry focus whereby K-12 students ask authentic questions that drive research and inquiry. To do this MLS students reframe standards (Common Core State and NC Essential), to support K-12 students' authentic questions that become the foundation of inquiry. At the conclusion of this assignment, MLS students will have created a collaborative inquiry standards-based plan that allows K-12 students to explore their questions. MLS students will demonstrate successful transfer of the leadership principles of engagement and influence as identified by John Maxwell in his book *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership* that was studied for assignment 2.

Frontloading:

MLS students read Wilhelm's book *Engaging Readers & Writers with Inquiry*. Discuss with your collaborative group members the important ideas presented by Wilhelm. Collaborative groups can use Blackboard , Skype, Centra, or a similar technological tool of choice that supports sharing, learning, and planning. Examples of important ideas to explore are:

- Why does it matter that we consider K-12 students' interests and authentic questions? How would this change our teaching and students' learning?
- What are guiding questions? How do guiding questions promote student engagement and learning? Consider why this is so. Based on all readings from LIBS 6144 as well as understandings gleaned from Assignment 2 *Leadership Application to a Group Scenario,* how can school librarians promote inquiry using student generated guiding questions?
- How do teachers/school librarians apply Wilhelm's five-step transformation model? (pps. 25-29) These steps are: Teach so it matters: review and renew your memberships; shift your stance to show-how; recast yourself as a co-collaborator; and teach for understanding.
- How can candidates improve student literacy through student created questions?

We will meet on Centra to discuss Wilhelm's ideas about inquiry and unpack this assignment. Completed examples of this assignment from previous semesters are available in the Course Docs area of Blackboard.

Assignment:

Step 1: MLS students collaborate with their group to select a generative topic that meets Common Core State Standards and NC Essential Standards (e.g., culture, electricity, environment, weather, food).

Step 2: Individually, MLS students ask K-12 students to formulate questions that interest them and could guide learning about the topic. The goal of posing questions is to have students think deeply and critically (2.1.1) and creatively (1.2.3) about the topic as identified in the AASL *Standards for the 21st-Century Learner*. MLS students may gather these questions formally within a classroom or school library setting as well as informally; however a requirement of this assignment is to (1) engage K-12 students in a discussion about the selected theme, (2) determine its interest to its interest for these students, (3) model question formation so that students may learn to pose higher-order questions, and (4) have students pose questions about the topic.

Each MLS student completes the attached chart to describe the following: students who were asked to formulate questions (e.g., age, grade level, academic level, gender, ethnicity, special needs), when and where these discussions occurred, the questions students asked, and ways the candidate modeled question posing for students. Describe the difficulty or ease for students to generate higher-order thinking questions. Were you surprised by any of these findings?

Step 3: The collaborative group edits students' questions, into six guiding questions. Read pages 44-47 in the Wilhelm text to decide if reframing is necessary. Examples of guiding questions are:

- How does one clean oil slickened animals and what is their survival rate? An inquiry activity could be a demonstration of how to clean an oil-slickened animal.
- What is the prognosis for a body of water polluted by oil? Which organisms are most likely to be harmed by this pollution? An inquiry activity could be a chart comparing recovery from several different oil spills.
- How do people and communities survive a disaster? An inquiry activity could be the development of a disaster plan.

Step 4: For each essential question, the collaborative group develops one inquiry activity in the curricular areas of math, social studies, language arts, science, art, music, healthful living, and physical education. Activities must be differentiated to represent P-12 grade levels, diverse learning styles, and physical and intellectual abilities.

Step 5: For each essential question, the collaborative group incorporates one exemplary teaching strategy and one P21 skill (see the Partnership for 21st Century Skills at http://www.p21.org) into activities.

Step 6: The collaborative group represents this assignment using a technology of their choice. Candidates use this technology in a creative way.

Step 7: This is the portfolio artifact for the course. Along with the group's collaborative project, upload the reflection form to SETS.

**Please note that this is assignment consists of both individual as well as collaborative elements. Your grade for this assignment reflects your individual andj collaborative efforts.

f: Scoring rubric for the assessment

	Above Proficient (5 points)	Proficient (2 to <4 points)	Below Proficient (0 to <2 points)
Individual Scores			
Engagement with the Professional Learning Community AASL Standards: 1.2;1.3 5 points maximum	Meets proficiency. In addition, MLS student assumes a leadership role based on Maxwell's *21 Irrefutable* Laws of Leadership.	Engaged with group, attends meetings and actively participates in planning and discussion about assignment.	Little or no engagement with group. Rarely, or never, attends meetings.
Engagement with K-12 students to form questions AASL Standards: 1.1; 1.2 5 points maximum	Meets proficiency. In addition, MLS student models Wilhelm's process of question formation and K-12 students respond by producing deeper and more authentic questions. MLS student suggests strategies to improve question posing.	Engagement with students to identify 5-10 questions. Some evidence of using Wilhelm's process of question formation. Narrative describes engagement with students. MLS student reflects on students' ability to generate questions.	Little or no engagement with students. Five or fewer questions are identified. No evidence of using Wilhelm's process of question formation. Candidate addresses few required elements of assignment.
Reflection 5 points maximum	Meets proficiency. In addition, MLS student presents specific ways to improve project.	Candidate communicates importance of inquiry. Candidate presents general ways to improve project.	Candidate does not communicate importance of inquiry. Candidate provides no suggestions to improve project.

Group Scores			
Selection of generative topic AASL Standards: 1.1; 1.2 5 points maximum	Meets proficiency. In addition, group identifies a compelling topic that associates many aspects of curriculum.	Generative topic is appropriate for curriculum and suits students' interests	Generative topic does not support curriculum; topic has little interest for K-12 students.
Reframing of questions AASL Standards: 1.1;1.2 5 points maximum	Meets proficiency. In addition, all K-12 students' questions are reframed to develop higher-order thinking skills.	Most K-12 students' questions are reframed to reflect the revised Bloom's taxonomy to provide evidence of higher-order thinking.	Students' questions are not reframed to develop higher-order thinking.
Activities of inquiry AASL Standards: 1.1; 1.2;1.3;1.4; 2.4 5 points maximum	Meets, proficiency. In addition, all activities require students to create, evaluate, and analyze. Meaningfully incorporates six P21 skills that focus on higher-order thinking. Application of exemplary teaching strategies to all activities. Activities provide clear evidence of application of reading strategies and differentiation.	Development of 8 activities for each essential question. Most activities (40-48) activities require students to create, evaluate, and analyze. Application of P21 skills and exemplary teaching strategies to activities to support higher-order thinking and learning. Activities provide some evidence of application of reading strategies and differentiation.	Required number of activities is either not developed or focus on lower-order thinking such as applying, understanding, and remembering. P21 skills and exemplary teaching strategies may be identified but do not support higher-order thinking and learning. Little or no evidence of application of reading strategies and differentiation.
Technology AASL Standard: 1.4 5 points maximum	MLS students persevere to create the assignment using technology in a creative way.	MLS students create assignment using a suitable technology.	MLS students create assignment as a word processed document or template. No

				evidence of utilizing suitable technology.		

g. Chart that provides overall proficiency and disaggregated data for this assessment

Assessment 6: Collaborative Inquiry Plan						
	Above Proficient		**Proficient**		**Below Proficient**	
	Spring 2012 n=8 groups n=42 students	**Fall 2011 n=5 groups n=26 students**	**Spring 2012 n=8 groups n=42 students**	**Fall 2011 n=5 groups n=26 students**	**Spring 2012 n=8 groups n=42 students**	**Fall 2011 n=5 groups n=26 students**
Individual scores						
Engagement with collaborative group	32 (76%)	24 (92%)	9 (22%)	2 (8%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Engagement with K-12 students	15 (36%)	nd	25 (60%)	nd	2 (4%)	nd
Reflection	4 (10%)	6 (23%)	38 (90%)	20 (77%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Overall Proficiency	17 (41%)	15 (58%)	24 (57%)	11 (42%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Group scores *						
Generative topic	2 (25%)	4 (80%)	6 (75%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Reframing of questions	5 (63%)	3 (60%)	3 (37%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Inquiry activities	3 (37%)	3 (60%)	5 (63%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Technology	1 (13%)	2 (40%)	7 (88%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Overall Proficiency	3 (37%)	4 (80%)	5 (63%)	1 (20%)	(0%)	0 (0%)

Note: Individual and groups scores are averaged to provide the candidate's score for this assignment.

*Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

Assessment #7: Clustered Technology Assessment

    a. <u>Description of the Assessment</u>

In LIBS 6042 *Technologies for Library Services*, two clustered assignments address 1.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.   LIBS 6042 is a required course that is offered in Tier 1 of the program; therefore, it is one of the first three courses that a candidate takes. The first assignment requires that candidates locate an article about an assistive technology that can be implemented in libraries and educational settings, analyze what they have read, and write an essay on how this type of technology would improve access for students or library patrons. The second assignment, which also serves as the artifact for the course, requires that candidates develop a program or service that integrates at least one type of technology in a school or library setting. Candidates are required write to write an accompanying paper, incorporating a literature review and an analysis of the project's goals and how it will improve or enhance services or learning.

    b. <u>Description of how the assessment specifically aligns with the standards</u>

In investigating an assistive technology, candidates must interpret knowledge and use it to plan an improvement in practice (3.4). By analyzing this type of technology, they have to discuss solutions for addressing physical, social, or intellectual barriers to information and services, as well as discuss how certain technologies can facilitate access (3.2).

For the technology project, candidates first have to analyze the target audience by demonstrating a knowledge of the learners for the project, including possible learning styles or physical and intellectual abilities (1.1). They then must collect research data based on readings as part of the project to improve practice in school libraries (3.4). The project that is created by the candidates demonstrates their ability to engage students through the use of digital tools and resources and their ability to create a service or program using current and emerging digital tools (3.3).

    c. <u>Brief analysis of the data findings</u>

Assignment 1
Of the 14 candidates who completed the assistive technologies assignment in the spring of 2011, 71% scored above proficient in the overall assessment and 29% scored proficient, with no one scoring below proficient. Of the 35 candidates who completed the assistive technologies assignment in the fall of 2011, 43% scored above proficient, 51% below proficient, and 6% below proficient.

Assignment 2
Of the 14 candidates who completed the technology project assignment during the spring of 2011, 71% scored above proficient and 29% scored proficient, with no one scoring below proficient. Of the 35 candidates who completed the technology project assignment during the fall of 2011, 63% scored above proficient, 29% scored proficient, and 8% scored below proficient.

The disaggregated data provides evidence that almost all candidates meet or exceed the level of proficiency for all rubric elements, which are interpreted more completely below.

    d. <u>Interpretation of how the data provides evidence for meeting standards</u>

Assignments 1 and 2, which comprise Assessment 7, are part of LIBS 6042, *Technologies for Library Services*. LIBS 6042 is in the Tier 1 group of courses and is required for all MLS students. Assignment 1was selected because of its focus on providing access to information via adaptive technologies and digital tools. Assignment 2 was selected because candidates must analyze a target audience, then model and facilitate the effective use of current and emerging digital tools. The resulting project involves researching technological resources and the use of digital tools to create a service or product to support learning.

Assignment 1
Candidates must be able to provide an in-depth analysis of one technology and how that technology can provide a solution for "addressing physical, social, and intellectual barriers to equitable access to resources and services" (3.2). The first part of the assessment, stating the problem, begins with an identification of, or an addressing of a barrier. For spring 2011, 100% of candidates scored at above proficient or proficient for this component, and in the fall of 2011, 97% scored at these levels. These scores provide evidence of meeting this rubric component.

The second rubric element requires that candidates analyze how their selected technology can be integrated into a school library, which speaks to providing a solution to access (3.2). For spring 2011, 100% of candidates scored at above proficient or proficient for this component, and in the fall of 2011, 94% scored at these levels. The slight variation in scores might be attributed to the fact that three sections of LIBS 6042 were offered in the fall of 2011 with different instructors, as opposed to one section in spring 2011. Even with the variation, a substantial majority of candidates are meeting this aspect of the standard.

The third rubric element requires that candidates evaluate the applicability of the selected technology to a school library setting and whether the technology is more applicable to specific grade levels. For spring 2011, 100% of candidates scored at above proficient or proficient for this component, and in the fall of 2011, 95% scored at these levels. These scores provide evidence that candidates can demonstrate an ability to develop solutions to access barriers in order to provide access to information (3.2).

Given this interpretation of the data, we could expect candidates to identify impediments in accessing information (physical, social, or intellectual). Candidates would then devise solutions to facilitate access in formats or venues appropriate to the given situations.

Assignment 2
For the technology project, candidates develop a technology resource that supports learning and facilitates the effective use of current and emerging digital tools (3.3). The overview and purpose components of the rubric require that candidates research, analyze, and evaluate such tools. In the spring of 2011, 100% of the candidates scored above proficient on these aspects. In the fall of 2011, 100% scored either above proficient or proficient on the overview and 94% scored above proficient or proficient on developing a purpose for the project. These scores provide evidence of meeting 3.3.

The product or service developed for the project reflects a candidate's "ability to design and adapt relevant learning experiences…through the use of digital tools and resources" (3.3). In the spring of 2011, 100% of the candidates scored at above proficient or proficient for their artifact. In the fall of 2011, 91% scored at these levels. The slight variation in scores might be attributed to the fact that three sections of LIBS 6042 were offered in the fall of 2011 with different instructors, as opposed to one section in spring 2011. The 9% below proficiency rate could also indicate that increased mentoring is needed as candidates begin and develop projects. However, the scores in general provide evidence of meeting this portion of the rubric and 3.3.

Another component of the project is identifying a target audience, which speaks to a knowledge of learners and learning (1.1). In this component, candidates assess learner needs and design a project that reflects these needs. In both the spring and fall of 2011, 100% of the candidates scored above proficient for this element of the rubric, providing clear evidence of meeting this standard.

In developing the technology project, candidates complete a literature review related to the technology they will incorporate. This portion of the assignment reflects a way to "use data to create and share new knowledge to improve practice in school libraries" (3.4). In the spring of 2011, 100% of the candidates scored above proficient or proficient for this rubric element. In the fall of 2011, 97% scored at the same levels, demonstrating evidence of meeting 3.4.

Given this interpretation of the data, we could expect candidates to research technological developments, analyze technologies, and evaluate them as to their suitability to provide relevant learning experiences. Candidates would then create or design a service or product using digital tools and resources that would link student engagement and learning.

    e. Assessment tools

Assignment 1: Assistive Technologies and Access

Visit the Joyner Library website and search one of the databases that are available. Locate an article dealing with an assistive/adaptive technology in either a library or educational setting or with a technology that can be used to provide equitable access for students or patrons. Your article must be no more than five years old.

Submit a three-page minimum (double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12 font) essay on your reading on the class blog. Analyze how this particular technology would solve a physical, social, or intellectual barrier to access of resources and/or services. How could it be integrated into a school, public, or academic library? Would the technology you read about be appropriate in a school library, public library, or academic library setting? (Choose one) If it is applicable t a school library, what grade level(s) would be appropriate? Provide specific reasons why or why not. Provide the full APA citation to your article.

In addition, read two other class postings and comment on the technology discussed.

Assignment 2: Technology Project

LIBS 6042 provides an overview of technologies and how they are used in library and educational settings. You have completed several assignments dealing with technology and its use in providing engaged learning and enhanced access for patrons and students. For the technology project, you need to develop a program or service that integrates at least one type of technology covered in this course. Other types of technology require prior approval from the instructor. The project should incorporate the technology in full or include a well-designed and fleshed-out sample of it. For example, if you decide to create a wiki you should create sample wiki pages; if you decide to create a website, you may not be able to develop it fully, but could include the main pages as samples. You must provide a product for this project that has some substance. For example, if you create a blog, there must be activity on the blog and not just the framework. Please ask if you need to discuss the details of your project.

Accompanying the project itself, you must provide a detailed description of the program or service that includes the following:

• An overview of what you are proposing. (This is a summary of the project)

• How will the program or service integrate technology?

• An overview of the audience for the program or service. If you are designing a project for a school, provide the target grade level(s), as well as its applicability to the Common Core State/NC Essential Standards.

• What is the purpose of the program or service? What do you want to accomplish? If in a school setting, how will the project engage students in learning?

• Is there already a program or service like this? If so, how will this be different than what is already in place for the audience you want to serve? How will it extend or enhance what's already in place?

• What research has been done regarding this technology and its use in a library or educational setting? Provide a brief literature review with citations to at least three research studies dealing with this technology. The studies must be from peer-reviewed journals and must have been conducted within the past ten years. Include full citations in the proper APA format.

* A link to the project itself, if applicable.

The format for the narrative is Times New Roman, 12 point, double-spaced. It should be a minimum of five pages.

NOTE: *Your project requires prior approval. Please don't begin working on it until it's approved. If you'd like to discuss ideas, please contact me.*

f. Scoring guide

Scoring rubric for Assignment 1

Total Points=9	Above Proficient (3 points)	Proficient (2 points)	Below Proficient (1 point)
Problem *AASL Standard 3.2*	In-depth analysis of the access problem solved by the technology.	Partial analysis the access problem solved by the technology.	Little or no analysis of the problem solved by the technology.
Integration *AASL Standard 3.2*	In-depth analysis of how the technology can be integrated to provide equitable access.	Partial analysis of how the technology can be integrated to provide equitable access.	Little or no analysis of how the technology can be integrated to provide equitable access.
Appropriate to specific setting *AASL Standard 3.2*	In-depth analysis of applicability of the technology to a specific setting and/or grade level	Partial analysis of applicability of the technology to a specific setting and/or grade level	Little or no analysis of applicability of the technology to a specific setting
TOTAL	9	7-8	6 and below

Scoring Rubric for the Assignment 2

Total points=24	Above Proficient	Proficient	Below Proficient
Overview *AASL Standard 3.3*	The summary provides complete information about how technology will be integrated into the project, with no questions as to the method of integration. Value: 3	The summary provides adequate information about how technology will be integrated into the project, with minimal questions as to the method of integration. Value: 2	The summary provides little or no information about how technology will be integrated into the project. Value: 1
Target Audience	The target audience is	The target audience is	The target audience is not

	specified with a clear and complete description of past technology experience & applicable ties to Common Core.	specified, but the description of prior technology experience is not clearly addressed.	specified.
AASL Standard 1.1; 3.3	Value: 3	Value: 2	Value: 1
Purpose	The purpose of the project is included, with a clear description as to what is to be accomplished. A full explanation of how the service or program will enhance already existing ones is provided.	The purpose of the project is included, but there are questions as to what the project is meant to accomplish. If there is a similar service or program in place, how it will extend or enhance it is not specified.	The purpose of the project is not included.
AASL Standard 3.3	Value: 3	Value: 2	Value: 1
Literature Review	Review includes at least three peer-reviewed studies, with citations in correct APA format. Value: 3	Review includes at least three peer-reviewed studies, but citations are not in correct APA format. Value=2	Review includes fewer than three peer-reviewed studies. Value=1
AASL Standard 3.4			
Program/Service Example	Program/Service example is presented in a format that is clear and well-designed, with no technical problems.	Program/Service example is free from technical problems and is presented in a format that has only minor problems with design.	Program/Service example is presented in a format that is clear and well-designed, with no technical problems.
AASL Standard	Value: 8-9	Value: 6-7	Value: Below 6

3.3			
Writing	Narrative content has no grammatical and spelling errors. Information is presented in a logical sequence. Value: 3	Narrative content has only minor grammatical and spelling errors. Information is presented in a logical sequence. Value: 2	Narrative content has multiple grammatical and spelling errors and/or information is not presented in a logical sequence. Value: 1
TOTAL	23-24	20-22	19 and below

g. <u>Charts that provide candidate data for this assessment</u>

Assessment 7: Assignment 1						
	Above Proficient		**Proficient**		**Below Proficient**	
	Spring 2011 n=14	**Fall 2011 n=35**	**Spring 2011 n=14**	**Fall 2011 n=35**	**Spring 2011 n=14**	**Fall 2011 n=35**
Problem (3.2)	10 (71%)	16 (46%)	4 (29%)	18 (51%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
Integration (3.2)	10 (71%)	15 (43%)	4 (29%)	18 (51%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)
Appropriate to specific setting (3.2)	10 (71%)	17 (49%)*	4 (29%)	16 (46%)*	1 (7%)	2 (6%)*
Overall Proficiency	10 (71%)	15 (43%)	4 (29%)	18 (51%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)

Percentages rounded up to nearest whole number

Assessment 7: Assignment 2						
	Above Proficient		Proficient		Below Proficient	
	Spring 2011 n=14	Fall 2011 n=35	Spring 2011 n=14	Fall 2011 n=35	Spring 2011 n=14	Fall 2011 n=35
Overview (3.3)	14 (100%)	33 (94%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Target Audience (1.1; 3.3)	14 (100%)	33 (94%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
Purpose (3.3)	14 (100%)	30 (86%)	0 (0%)	3 (8%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)
Lit Review (3.4)	11 (78%)	27 (77%)	3 (22%)	7 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
Program/Service Example (3.3)	11 (78%)	28 (80%)	3 (22%)	4 (11%)	0 (0%)	3 (9%)
Writing	12 (86%)	22 (63%)	2 (14%)	13 (37%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Overall Proficiency	10 (71%)	22 (63%)	4 (29%)	10 (29%)	0 (0%)	3 (8%)

Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses ALA/AASL standards

Description of the assessment

Assessment 8 is a cluster of four assignments drawn from two required courses, LIBS 6135 *Materials for Children* and LIBS 6137 *Materials for Young Adults* that provide candidates with an understanding of the range of literature that supports the reading interests and developmental growth of primary-aged children to young adults. Neither of these courses by itself provides candidates the range of understanding about P-12 literature. These required Tier 3 courses follow other required courses such as reference, cataloging, collection development, and administration. Two assignments represented in this clustered assessment were drawn from LIBS 6153; two were drawn from LIBS 6137.

This clustered assessment requires candidates (1) to develop a pamphlet of 25 items selected from the ALA/Association for Library Services 2000-2011 Children's Notable list of books, audio recordings, videos, and software for children in P through 2nd grade that is appropriate for distribution at a PTA or open house, (2) create a lesson and activity plan using the International Children's Digital Library (3) evaluate public library teen services, resources, and programs, and (4) write and present a booktalk to young adults.

a.   Description of how the assessment specifically aligns with the standards

This assessment meets Standards 1: Teaching for Learning; 2: Literacy and Reading; 3: Information and Knowledge; 4: Advocacy and Leadership: and 5: Program Management and Administration. Standard 1 is met by candidates who are knowledgeable of and support various learning styles and developmental stages to support reading for pleasure and learning by producing appropriate pamphlets, handouts, and booktalks. Standard 2 is met by candidates who promote reading, understand major trends in children's and young adult literature to select materials in multiple formats, and use various strategies to reinforce reading instruction. Candidates apply their understandings of P-12 students to select reading materials by developing reading promotion tools. Standard 3 is met by candidates who promote ethical use of information by formatting proper citations and creating annotations that represent candidates' evaluation of materials. Candidates meet Standard 4 by connecting with school and public librarians to advocate for reading as well as develop handouts, pamphlets, and booktalks to promote reading. Candidates meet Standard 5 by evaluating materials in various formats to create collections that support K-12 reading for pleasure and learning.

Specifically, candidates meet NCATE/AASL elements in the following ways:

- 1.1 Candidates use census data to understand a community's demographics. Candidates conduct surveys, engage with students, and connect with stakeholders leading to **knowledge of learners and learning.**
- 2.1 Candidates **familiarize themselves with a wide range of children's, young adult, and professional literature** by reading and studying these books and using professional literature to evaluate and develop collections that support reading for pleasure and learning.
- 2.2 Candidates **promote K-12 reading** through development of pamphlets (print or digital) and booktalks. Candidates **model their personal enjoyment of reading** in the booktalk assignment.
- 2.3 Candidates provide evidence of **developing collections consisting of various formats that support diverse student populations** by developing handouts, pamphlets, and evaluating collections.
- 2.4 Candidates **reinforce reading strategies** through read-alouds, by creating interest in books, and by developing background knowledge leading to students' improved meaning from text.
- 3.2 Candidates **model ethical information-seeking behavior and legality of copyright** by formatting citations.
- 3.4 Candidates **collect data** in the booktalking assignment **to create new understandings** of K-12 reading that **improves practice**.
- 4.1 Candidates **network with the library community** by connecting with a school or public librarian(s) who act as host(s) for the booktalk. The host(s) helps the candidate to develop a theme of interest to a particular group of students. Candidates connect with the public library's young adult services librarian that leads to a clearer understanding of teens' reading and resource support in the community. These connections provide further opportunities for collaborations. Candidates **connect with a public librarian** during the YA Public Library Evaluation assignment.
- 4.4 Candidates **identify stakeholders and advocate for the school library program** and reading through the development of handouts, pamphlets, and booktalks.
- 5.1 Candidates **evaluate and select print, non-print, and digital resources and use professional tools** to build collections that meet the reading needs of students. Evidence of this is candidates' handouts, pamphlets, and booktalks and evaluation of public library collection/resources/services for teens.
- 5.3 Candidates **apply best practices** per standards after **evaluating human, information, and physical resources** of a public library's teen section.
- 5.4 Candidates **assess** their booktalking performance by **collecting and analyzing** students' and host's evaluation of the performance **leading to realignment of resources and services with standards**.

b. <u>Brief analysis of the data findings</u>

Assignment 1 Primary (grades P-2) Notable Children's Materials Pamphlet: For summer 2011, 89%, or 42 candidates, scored above proficient; 11%, or 4 candidates, scored at proficient; and no candidates scored below proficient. For spring 2011, 100%, or 16 candidates, scored above proficient.

Assignment 2 International Digital Children's Library Activity: For summer 2011, 94%, or 44 candidates, scored above proficient; 4%, or two candidates, scored proficient; and 2%, or 1 candidate, scored below proficient. For spring 2011, 100%, or 16 candidates, scored above proficient.

Assignment 3 YA Public Library Evaluation: For spring 2011, 93%, or 28 candidates, scored above proficient; 7%, or two candidates, scored proficient; and no candidates scored below proficient. For fall 2011, 96%, or 52 candidates, scored above proficient; 2%, or 1 candidate, scored proficient; and 2%, or 1 candidate, scored below proficient.

Assignment 4 Booktalking: For spring 2011, 80%, or 24 candidates, scored above proficient; 17%, or 5 candidates, scored proficient; and 3%, or 1 candidate, scored below proficient. For fall 2011, 94%, or 51 candidates, scored above proficient; 4%, or 2 candidates, scored proficient; and 2%, or 1 candidate, scored below proficient.

c. <u>Interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards</u>

Assessment 8 was selected because it provides evidence that the Department of Library Science's program is preparing candidates to promote reading for learning, enjoyment, and growth. Candidates understand the major trends of literature, can determine the developmental appropriateness of literature, and design lessons that incorporate literature with curricular standards. Candidates make professional connections with youth services public librarians and evaluate public library services and programming for teens. Candidates develop and present a thematically-based booktalk for teens that is developmentally appropriate and compelling to a specific group of teens. Candidates evaluate collected data from teens that provides the former with information about the reading interests of teens.

<u>For this assessment, three of the four rubrics were not identified at the NCATE/AASL element level. These assignments were scored holistically, and the scoring does not specifically identify particular elements candidates did, or did not, meet. The holistic scoring was very high which indicates that students did meet the NCATE/AASL elements. It is the comprehensive descriptions of these assignments that most closely aligns the assignment's requirements with the NCATE/AASL elements. The considerable length of these descriptions required that these be condensed.</u>

(2) #6 Assessment Documentation

e. <u>The assessment tool that is given to students</u>

The following descriptions of the assignments are condensed from the directions given to candidates. The length of the descriptions makes it prohibitive to include the original descriptions (e.g., booktalk was 12 pages) in this report.

(1) <u>Primary (grades P-2) Notable Children's Materials Pamphlet (25 points)</u>

Read Chapter 2 of the Vardell text *Children's Literature in Action: A Librarian's Guide*. Familiarize yourself with the ALA/ASLC website at http://www.ala.org/alsc and review the lists of Children's Notable resources at http://www.ala.org/alsc/awardsgrants/notalists Select 25 appropriate titles (books, audio recordings, videos, and software) for K-grade 2 interest level. Not all items on the Notable lists are suitable for P through grade 2 children. You must determine the suitability for P-2 children by accessing professional reviews and databases. Base your suitability ratings on readings about the cognitive, emotional, social, and physical development of P-2 children. Create an appropriate pamphlet/handout using any style/format you desire. The audience for this pamphlet is parents of primary age children. Create the pamphlet to use at an Open House, PTA, or public library to support children's reading. Grades are based on the pamphlets visual appeal and format, descriptions of developmental appropriateness of materials, brief annotations, and review. Let your creative side shine.

f: Scoring rubrics for Notable Children's Materials Pamphlet

Notable Pamphlet AASL Standards: 1.1; 2.1; 2.2; 2.3; 2.4; 3.1; 4.4; 5.1	Above Proficient 25 to 23.5 points	Proficient 23 to 21.5 points	Below Proficient Below 21 points
Pamphlet of 25 items from the 2000-2011 Notable Children's books, audio recordings, videos, and software for primary age (5-7) children in	Visually attractive pamphlet with a variety of 25 age appropriate items from a range of years; minimum of 5 non-print items (at least 1 from the 3 non-book lists); all citation elements	An acceptable variety of 25 items; less than 5 non-print items, citations acceptable in format, editing errors; information about titles lacking in	Less than 25 items; not age appropriate titles; citations missing elements; limited/no graphics or visually appealing fonts or color used; no attention getting sentences to supplement

grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade.	present; visually attractive; easy to read format; compelling descriptions; developmentally appropriate materials; less than 30 words in length. Few errors.	appeal and/or exceeds 30 words; lacks visual appeal; limited typing/editing errors.	citation; multiple typing/editing errors.

(2) International Children's Digital Library Activity Plan (10 points)

Children of all ages, even our youngest students in Kindergarten, are comfortable viewing illustrations and reading text on a computer screen. Digital copies of books can be quite expensive, as can books in other languages, for the diverse group of children and tweens librarians and teacher encounter daily.

The International Children's Digital Library Foundation has stepped forward to fulfill the need for reading materials for children from all cultures and countries via the library of books available free of charge on their web site: http://en.childrenslibrary.org/index.shtml

Activity Plan Introduction:
Use the general format for setting up your activity plan that is used in Core Activity 1 through 3 samples in the teacher training manual. Note the more detailed information that is expected of your Activity Plan than is listed in the Teacher's Manual. Feel free to adapt these to suit your chosen grade level, but do not use the same digital book(s) that is used in any of the Core Activities 1-3. These activities are for training adults/teachers how to use the ICDL, not for use with children or tweens.
Select a book(s) that piques your interest and design an activity plan for a grade level within K-8th grade.

No matter if you are a public library youth librarian, a school librarian (media coordinator) or a classroom teacher, you all teach. We may not think about librarians, especially public children's librarians, as teachers when they are leading a storytime activity, but every activity a librarian engages in has an instructional/learning element to it.

The main goal of story time may be to help create lifelong readers/learners, but as librarians and teachers share a book with children, they are modeling, if not outright instructing the listeners in

reading strategies as well as highlighting core curriculum content addressed in the story. If public library department managers and school principals become aware that librarians take the time to create a activity plan, based on trade books, that has a set of objectives that are being followed, our (I still see myself as a school librarian) value increases and we are less likely to be laid-off when funding is short. It all comes down to what role librarians have in increasing the learning experience of a child/tween. A great deal! Most school librarians have lesson plan books as they are considered part of the school's teaching team. If your principal does not give you one at the beginning of the school year, ask for one.

With the focus on what librarians can do to increase student learning, while enticing them to become lifelong readers/learners, this assignment will work with the North Caroline Course of Study documents. These may not be familiar to those of you who do not work in NC public schools, but they are important to know about no matter what type of library or educational environment you work in.

Creating the Activity Plan:

The activity plan required for this assignment will be more detailed than the lesson plan format you normally use, but think of this as an activity sheet you can set aside and hand to someone who has no idea how to design and present a book related activity. Everything they need to know, and forgot to ask, is in this plan. :-) If there is a handout for the students, include a copy of it with the Activity Plan. If you are using a chart, include it with the Activity Plan. Someone picking up this activity plan should be able to lead the activity with the specific grade level of children. Do not just add hot links to online materials, such as a chart you are using from an online source. Put the URL in the body of the Activity Plan and add a copy of the content of the page to be used in the Activity Plan.

Elements to Include in the Activity Plan:
Please set up the Activity Plan in the following order and include all 10 elements.

1. An Activity Title

2. Child/Tween Learning Objectives
These should be appropriate to the grade level chosen, which you should list. Include the basics you want the children/tweens to be able to do once they have experienced this activity. Make sure they are all measurable and your assessments measure the mastery of the objectives by the children or tweens. These are exactly what you want the children/tweens to be able to do when you finish up the activity. Be specific.

When you design learning objectives, make sure they are measurable. The ones in the Teacher's Manual are not all measurable. The ones in your Activity Plan must be. For example, how do you measure understanding?

I don't know how to measure understanding, but I can take a subset of that idea: Students will be able to use the ICDL Simple Search feature to select the appropriate age level and locate at least two books about Real Animal Characters. This is a measurable objective. What level of mastery are you going to assess? 80% of the students will be able to locate two books on the ICDL without assistance is a means to assess how well the class mastered the objective for the activity. I would measure group and individual mastery by creating a handout on which the students could write down the title and author of the two books they found. Grading these will allow me to determine if 80% of the students were able to complete the assignment. And, a check list to note any children who needed assistance is also measurable.

3. Curriculum Objectives

Use the NC Standard Course of Study Curriculum Area that best matches the books(s) and activities you plan to introduce. http://www.ncpublicschools.org/curriculum/   Note the grade level, list the subject area heading as well as the Goal and Objective(s) covered. Not all of these objectives are as specific as the learning objectives you are required to write for this activity. Some of them are broader objectives that may not be measurable. Design an activity that will allow you to assess a more defined objective within these general set of objectives.

4. Information Literacy Objectives

Use the NC Standard Course of Study for Information Skills as well as Information Skills Curriculum Integration Strategies to determine the correct objectives for the appropriate grade level. http://www.ncpublicschools.org/curriculum/information/scos/

5. Group/classroom Organization

Describe the group setting- whole group, small groups, pairs, or individual. Will the children/tweens be seated in any specific format?

6. Key Background Information

Describe why you chose this activity and what you hope to accomplish with it. Is this in support of a larger unit of study that is done at the grade level? Did you choose it because it is introducing a new way for students to interact with picture book content? See page 8 in the Teacher Manual for the background on why a scavenger hunt was chosen.

7. Resources Needed

List all of the resources needed for this activity.

8. Activity Tasks (include time needed for each task area)

Before (time needed)

What the teacher/librarian needs to do to prepare for the activity. Schedule the computer lab, set out pencils, crayons on tables, arrange tables for group work, etc.

During (time needed)
Describe the instructional activity that will take place. What will the librarian/teacher be doing and what will the children/tweens be doing?

After (time needed)
Wrap-up discussion with the children/tweens as well as what the librarian/teacher needs to do to close out the activity.

9. Extension Activities
Activities that can be done by the child/tween at home or follow-up activities the teacher can do in the classroom, etc. These are for the same group of children/tweens you worked with. How can they further expand their knowledge of the topic/subject covered?

10. Assessment Opportunities
Describe how you will assess the success of this activity. The assessments should be tied into the objectives, which is why you need measurable objectives.

There should be enough detail in this activity plan that you could hand it to a colleague in youth services in a public library or to a librarian or K-8th grade teacher and they could readily present the activity with children/tweens.

f: Scoring rubric for International Children's Library Activity Plan

International Children's Library Activity Plan AASL Standards: 1.1; 1.2; 2.1; 2.2; 2.3; 2.4; 4.4	Above Proficient 10-9.5 points	Proficient 9.25-8.75 points	Below Proficient 8.5 points and below
Grade level appropriate, measurable objectives focused activity plan focused on a book(s) in the International Children's Digital	Detailed activity plan with all 10 areas included; focused on a book or books in the ICDL; appropriate objectives for selected grade level; appropriate	Acceptable activity plan with all 10 areas included; focused on a book or books in the ICDL; appropriate but limited objectives for selected grade level;	Limited in detail activity plan with missing or limited description; lacks clear focus on a book or books in the ICDL; limited appropriateness of objectives for

Library (ICDL). Must include curriculum and information literacy objectives and mastery based assessments.	curriculum; objectives; appropriate information literacy objectives; group organization; background information and resources needed; tasks and time for before, during and after the activity; extension opportunities; assessments; well written text with minimal typing or editing errors.	appropriate curriculum objectives; appropriate information literacy objectives; limited group organization description; background information and resources needed; tasks for before, during and after the activity; extension opportunities; mastery based assessments; adequately written text with some typing or editing errors.	selected grade level; appropriate but limited curriculum; objectives; appropriate but limited information literacy objectives; no clear group organization; background information and resources needed not listed; tasks for before, during and after the activity limited in nature; inappropriate or lack of extension opportunities; assessments; poorly written text with many typing or editing errors.

(3) Checklist for Public Library Young Adult Section/Services Evaluation (10 points)

Read Anderson's edited book *Serving Older Teens*. For this assignment you will evaluate a public library's young adult section to identify multiple ways it meets the developmental stages of older adolescents as they move towards independence, interest in careers, concern with social relationships, and become more self-directed. Evaluate the public library's YA section/services using the checklist form that is uploaded to the Course Docs area of Blackboard.

The intent of this assignment is to build a foundation of knowledge of what exemplary services to older teens (high school age) entail as well as the ability to evaluate the level of these services in a public library.

Step 1: Readings

In addition to Anderson's edited book, read the following materials:

Trucillo, D. P. (2005). Successful teen advisory groups: Teen driven…with guidance and a helping hand. *Voice of Youth Advocates.* Retrieved January 04, 2011 from
http://www.voya.com/2010/04/26/successful-teen- advisory-   groups/

American Library Association. (2010). *Young Adult Library Services Association Competencies.* Retrieved January 5, 2011 from

http://ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/yalsa/profdev/youngadultsdeserve.cfm

The Young Adult Library Services Association (YALSA) has developed a set of competencies expected of librarians working with teens in the public and school library environment. These will help you evaluate the various competency areas in relation to a particular library.

Journal Articles:
(Access from Joyner Database – Library Literature and Information Science Full Text.)

Ayar, C. (2009). Making the best of it: YA librarians share how they're coping in a tough economy. *Young Adult Library Services, 8*(1), 31-32.
Bernier, A., Chelton, M. K., Jenkins, C. A., & Pierce, J. B. (2005). Two hundred years of young adult library services history: The chronology. *Voice of Young Adult   Advocates, 28*(2)*,* 106-111.
Caplan, A. L. (2009). Defending the YA budget: One library's experience. *Young Adult Library Services, 8*(1), 24-25.
Chelton, M. K. (2005). Perspectives on YA practice: Common YA models of service in   public libraries: Advantages and disadvantages. *Young Adult Library Services,   3*(4), 4-11.
Feinberg, S. & Keller, J. R. (2010). Designing space for children and teens in libraries   and public spaces. *American Libraries, 42*(4): 34-37.

MacRae, C. D. (2007). The Power of radically trusting teens. *Voice of Youth Advocates,   30*(2), 101.
Tep, E. O. (2009). No staff, no money, what to do?!?!?!: Improving teen   services in   hard economic times. *Young Adult Library Services, 8*(1), 29-30.

Step 2. Library Visits

Having built a foundation knowledge of the history of public library young adult services in the U.S. and what a teen/young adult area in a public library can/should look like based on your pre-visit research and reading, evaluate a public library's Young Adult (YA) area that is separate from the children's area.

Two visits to the library being evaluated are required. An initial visit during which you will work on your own with no help from the library staff. After you have completed your initial visit, stop on the way out at the circulation desk and ask to set up an interview time with the librarian who is in charge of the YA section and services, or call to set up the interview. Give yourself time to go over your notes from the first visit before you speak to the librarian in charge of the YA services/collection.

1. Initial Visit – This visit must be done <u>during after school or weekend hours</u> so you can determine if older teens are in the YA area and using the YA materials, as well as in other areas of the library. With the checklist of questions in hand, answer as many of the questions that you can answer on your own, without requesting assistance. This is normally what a teen will do - try to figure it out on his/her own. Teens don't tend to ask for help.

The checklist template is found in the Course Docs area of Blackboard.

2. Second Visit – During this visit, speak to the librarian who is in charge of the YA section. He/she may also be assigned to another area of the library. Do not expect the librarian to answer all the questions on the checklist. You should have answered as many as you can prior to the interview, based on your initial visit.

Do not arrive unannounced and expect the librarian to stop and answer your questions. Call or visit the library and request an interview time with the librarian who is in charge of the YA section. He/she may be the same librarian who is in charge of the children's section, but <u>make sure your interview is with the person who is "in charge" of the YA section.</u>

Correspondence via email to set up an interview time is acceptable, but you are expected to speak in person to the librarian in charge of services for older teens. There must be some face to face interaction, not just communication via email.

Step 3. Completing the Checklist

The checklist is located in the Course Docs area and is a Word document template to which you are to add your answers and comments. Feel free to change the font size and/or column widths. The template is just that – a template - and you can modify as you see fit, but <u>you must answer all of the questions included</u>. Please add extensive comments to explain your answers. For example, if you answer yes, explain why. Remember – the instructor has not likely ever been in this library.

f: Scoring rubric for Public Library YA Evaluation

Public Library YA Evaluation AASL Standards: 1,1; 2.2; 5.3	Above Proficient 15 – 13.75 points	Proficient 13.5 – 12.75 points	Below Proficient 12.5 points and below
Evidence of knowledge based on pre-visit reading in exemplary library services to older teens indicated through a thoroughly completed checklist with both short answers and explanatory comments for each of the areas.	Fully completed checklist template; Research content and knowledge based thorough answers to all questions; Thoughtful evaluative comments to support answers; Minimal editing errors.	Adequately completed checklist; Adequate answers to questions; Adequate comments but lack clear evaluative content; A limited number of editing errors.	Limited checklist completion; Lack of supporting comments; Multiple editing errors. 12.5 – 11.75 points.

(4) Young Adult Booktalking (40 points)

This is the major project for LIBS 6137 *Materials for Young Adults*. You will prepare and *present* a theme-based, six-book booktalking to a group of at least 10 high school age teens in a classroom, school library, teen book club, after school program, public library, or other environment approved by the instructor. This is a multi-part project consisting of the following steps:

(1) Preparation for booktalking. Read assigned textbook chapters and articles in Anderson's edited book *Serving Older Teens*, Lupa's *Thinking Outside the Book: Non-print Collections for Older Teens*; Mahood's chapter of booktalking in *Serving Older Teens*; and Dr. Clark's articles on booktalking. Watch Dr. Clark's video on booktalking, and other identified sources of information about booktalking. Read the booktalking articles uploaded to the Course Docs area of Blackboard.

(2) Find an instructor-approved host.

(3) Select the theme and books. Work with the host to ensure that the theme and books are engaging to this group and developmentally appropriate. What is the makeup of this group—gender, ethnicity, and culture? Booktalks are used to engage participants and advocate for reading. Themes should have appeal to these teens. Select six titles that connect with teens.

(**4) Write the booktalking session transcript** that includes a self-introduction, explanation of styles of booktalks (first person, excerpt, and description/discussion), introduction of the theme; appropriate transitions between books, and a conclusion that pulls together the books.

(5) Create the student handout that you will give to students to help them locate the books you booktalked as well as other similar items once you have left. Create an attractive handout that students won't want to throw in the trash on their way out the door. Make sure annotations of the books pique their attention. Handouts are to include a catchy theme title, booktalked titles, similar books, similar non-book items. Follow checklist of handout elements that is uploaded to Course Docs area in Blackboard.

(6) Have students evaluate the booktalk. Use the form that is available from Blackboard. Edit this form to meet your needs by adding the booktalked items.

(7) Prepare the host survey by downloading this form from Blackboard. Edit this form by including your name. Mail the completed form to the instructor.

(8) Self-evaluation narrative. Write a 4-6 page double spaced 12 point font self-evaluative narrative based on your analysis of the Student Evaluation Chart and the booktalking experience. Elements to include are: (1) date and location of booktalking and description of this group; (2) address questions about preparation, student experience, and your experience (list is uploaded to Blackboard).

f: Scoring rubric for YA Booktalking

LIBS 6137 Booktalking Project (40 points)

Scoring Rubric

** The tenured faculty member responsible for this course went on medical leave beginning summer 2011. In fall 2011, two adjuncts taught three sections of this course and each changed point values for three rubric elements; however, the course content remained the same. Point values for the following rubric elements were changed: Book Talking Transcript; Booktalk Evaluation Chart, and Host Evaluation. A chart showing the changed point value of these rubric elements is below:

Booktalking Scores by Rubric Element Comparisons for Spring and Fall 2011 (40 pt. assignment)			
	Spring 2011 Tenured fac.	Fall 2011 Adjunct 1 Sec. 601 and 602	Fall 2011 Adjunct 2 Sec. 603
Booktalking transcript	15 points	10 points	10 points
Student handout	10 points	10 points	10 points
Booktalk evaluation chart	5 points	10 points	5 points
Self evaluation	10 points	10 points	10 points
Host evaluation	2 points extra credit	Not required	Required element: 5 points

Below is the rubric used by the tenured faculty member who designed the Booktalking Project.

Booktalking Session Transcript AASL Standards: 1.1; 2.2; 2.4	Above Proficient 15 – 14.25 points	Proficient 14 – 12.75 points	Below Proficient 12.50 points and below
A transcript for a theme based booktalking session of 6 booktalks on HS age appropriate YA titles published between 2005-2011, with an introduction, booktalks, transitions, and conclusion.	Well written self introduction; well written definition of the 3 booktalk styles; clearly introduced age/group appropriate theme; 6 age and audience appropriate booktalks: 2 first person, 2 descriptive, 2 excerpt; content based transitions between books; a conclusion related to theme	Incomplete self introduction; Incomplete theme introduction; incomplete booktalk styles introduction; acceptable booktalks, but limited theme focus; no indication of the style of booktalks; limited audience appropriateness of booktalk content; too long excerpts; inclusion of inappropriate children's or adult titles; limited conclusion.	No clear theme; omission of self introduction; omission of booktalk styles; unclear or missing transitions; inappropriate booktalks; poorly written booktalks; books published prior to 2005; less than 3 different booktalk styles.

Student Handout AASL Standards: 3.2; 3.4	Above Proficient 10-9.5 points	Proficient 9.25-8.75 points	Below Proficient 8.5 points and below
A teen friendly theme titled handout of the 6 booktalked books as well as 5 additional books published between 2000 and 2010, and 5 non-book items (at least 3 different formats) related to the booktalk theme, with full citations and attention-getters for all items.	Theme based title; visually attractive; Age appropriate graphics; error free citations; includes attention getters for all titles; attention-getters 40 words or less; attention-getters are interest piquing, not summaries; includes 6 books booktalked, 5 similar books published between 2000 and 2011 and a variety (at least 3 of each format) of 5 non-book items.	Theme based; properly formatted handout; limited typing and grammatical errors; limited entries for the 6 books booktalked; similar titles not clearly theme based; initial publication date of similar titles older than 2000; limited attention-getters; summary style, lengthy attention-getters; less than 5 similar book titles; less than 5 non-book items; less than 3 different non-book formats.	Theme not evident; multiple errors in citation format; poorly written attention- getters; missing booktalked book entries; similar titles and/or non-book items are inappropriate for theme or audience.
Booktalk Evaluation Chart AASL Standards: 3.4;5.4	Above Proficient 5 to 4.75 points	Proficient 4.5 to 3.75 points	Below Proficient 3.5 and below
Completed template with statistical information based on evaluation of student surveys.	Fully completed chart; all elements present for 10+ HS age teens; titles and styles added to questions 6 and 7; students' comments included, comments separated by M/F.	Partially completed chart; styles missing in questions 6 and/or 7; No M/F designation on student comments.	Incomplete chart, missing elements.

Self Evaluation Narrative AASL Standards: 1.2; 3.4	Above Proficient 10-9.5 points	Proficient 9.25-8.75 points	Below Proficient 8.5 points and below
Thoughtful, reflective, improvement focused self evaluative narrative. Reading and research done in preparation to the booktalking session evident in the interaction with the host to choose a theme and books appropriate for the group of teens, examination of student surveys, chart data, interaction with students and host during and after the booktalking session, as well as addresses the questions in the directions.	Detailed discussion of pre-booktalking session preparation; acceptable analysis of student comments; clear analysis of student survey results; reflective improvement based self evaluative comments about the experience; content addresses questions in the directions; future implications of booktalking to career.	Limited analysis of the student comments; limited analysis of student survey results; limited self evaluative comments based on questions in directions; limited self analysis of the experience based on input from the students and host(s); limited indication of value of booktalking in career.	Minimal analysis of the students' survey results; minimal self reflection/analysis; limited answers to questions in directions; little or no discussion of host(s) and student responses.
Host Evaluation AASL Standard: 4.1	2 points extra credit		

g. Charts that provide overall proficiency and candidate data for this assessment

Assignment 1: Primary Notable Children's Pamphlet						
	Above Proficient		Proficient		Below Proficient	
	Summer 2011 n=47	Spring 2011 n=16	Summer 2011 n=47	Spring 2011 n=16	Summer 2011 n=47	Spring 2011 n=16
Pamphlet assignment*	42 (89%)	16 (100%)	5 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0)%

Graded holistically according to requirements identified in the assignment directions

Assignment 2: International Digital Children's Project						
	Above Proficient		**Proficient**		**Below Proficient**	
	Summer 2011 n=47	**Spring 2011 n=16**	**Summer 2011 n=47**	**Spring 2011 n=16**	**Summer 2011 n=47**	**Spring 2011 n=16**
IDCP assignment*	44 (94%)	16 (100%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)

Graded holistically according to requirements identified in the assignment directions

Assignment 3: Public Library Young Adult Section/Services Evaluation						
	Above Proficient		**Proficient**		**Below Proficient**	
	Spring 2011 n=30	**Fall 2011 n=54**	**Spring 2011 n=30**	**Fall 2011 n=54**	**Spring 2011 n=30**	**Fall 2011 n=54**
Evaluation assignment*	28 (93%)	52 (96%)	2 (7%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)

Graded holistically according to requirements identified in the assignment directions

Assignment 4: Young Adult Booktalking					
	Above Proficient		**Proficient**		**Below Proficient**	
	Spring 2011 n=30	**Fall 2011 n=54**	**Spring 2011 n=30**	**Fall 2011 n=54**	**Spring 2011 n=30**	**Fall 2011 n=54**
Booktalking transcript*	20 (67%)	50 (93%)	10 (33%)	4 (7%)	0 (9%)	0 (0%)
Student handout	24 (80%)	50 (93%)	5 (17%)	4 (7%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Booktalk evaluation chart*	30 (100%)	52 (96%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)
Self evaluation	29 (97%)	53 (98%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Host evaluation * sec. 603 *n*=19 (no host evaluation for sec. 601 and 602)		18 (95%)		0 (0%)		1 (5%)
Overall Proficiency	24 (80%)	51 (94%)	5 (17%)	2 (4%)	1 (3%)	1 (2%)
Host evaluation* Extra credit	29 (extra credit) (97%)		0 (0%)		1 (3%)	---

*Please see note about how scores for rubric elements were changed. This chart represents proficiency level although some rubric element amounts differed. Asterisked rubric elements indicate which were scored differently. The content of each course section remained the same.