

# Program Report for the Preparation of Reading Education Professionals International Reading Association (IRA) 2010 Standards Option A

NOTE: This form uses the IRA standards approved by NCATE in 2010. Programs have the option to use either the 2003 or 2010 standards for reports submitted through Spring 2012. Beginning in Fall 2012 ALL programs must use the new standards.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

## COVER SHEET

### 1. Institution Name

The College of Saint Rose

### 2. State

New York

### 3. Date submitted

MM DD YYYY

03 / 15 / 2013

### 4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:	
[REDACTED]	
Phone:	Ext.
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
E-mail:	
[REDACTED]	

### 5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:	
[REDACTED]	
Phone:	Ext.
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
E-mail:	
[REDACTED]	

Name:	
[REDACTED]	
Phone:	Ext.
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
E-mail:	
[REDACTED]	

### 6. Name of institution's program

Literacy Birth-Grade 6

### 7. NCATE Category

Reading Specialist

### 8. Grade levels<sup>(1)</sup> for which candidates are being prepared

Birth- Grade 6

(1) e.g. K-6, P-12

**9. Program Type**

- Advanced Teaching
- First Teaching License
- Other School Personnel
- Unspecified

**10. Degree or award level**

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only

**11. Is this program offered at more than one site?**

- Yes
- No

**12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered**

**13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared**

Literacy Birth-Grade 6

**14. Program report status:**

- Initial Review
- Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required or Recognition with Probation
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions

**15. Is your unit seeking**

- NCATE accreditation for the first time (initial accreditation)
- Continuing NCATE accreditation

**16. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:**

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

- Yes
- No

**SECTION I - CONTEXT**

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

New York State certifies two levels of literacy specialists: (1) Early Childhood/Childhood (birth to grade 6) and (2) Middle Childhood/High School (grades 5-12). Therefore, we are submitting two program reports in order to address each level of literacy certification. The graduate literacy program (MS in Literacy, Grades B-6) at the College of Saint Rose is designed to prepare candidates to support struggling readers and writers in or out of the classroom, to support teacher learning and to develop, lead, and evaluate the school-based reading and writing program. Our program is structured to meet all New York State Education Department's requirements for initial literacy certification at the birth to sixth grade level. The requirements set forth by the NYS Education Department for Literacy certification include completing a program of study registered with the department, institutional recommendation, passing certification examinations including the NYS Content Specialty Test in Literacy, and fingerprint clearance. The department also requires that our students meet a diversity requirement that gives them experience with parents, children in high-needs schools, students with disabilities, and English language learners.

The College of St. Rose School of Education has been accredited by NCATE since its first application in 2004. Its most recent accreditation was in October, 2009. Throughout this time, the School of Education has engaged in a continuous effort to self assess and engage in reflective, responsive change. Our Statement of Philosophy and Learning Outcomes for Professional Education Candidates was last revised in Fall, 2011. We review the Literacy Program at the B-6 level regularly to ensure that alignment with both the philosophy statement and the eight learning outcomes is scrupulously maintained. An example of how closely the St. Rose philosophy statement aligns with the IRA Standards for Reading Professionals at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level especially in terms of the Diversity Standard (4) and Professional Learning and Leadership Standard (6) can be seen in this excerpt:

Valuing the knowledge and culturally rich experiences of individuals in the educational process, our faculty strives to be responsible to candidate needs and interests and challenges them to broaden their awareness and sensitivity to diverse backgrounds, thereby becoming reflective, responsive, self-empowered advocates for their learners and communities. Leadership is at the heart of our efforts to encourage and create new initiatives through which our faculty and our candidates become mutually responsible agents of change. To ensure the actualization of our philosophy, we model its standards and values in our daily practices and relationships. This philosophy generates educational experiences that are formative and indelible. (Lally School of Education Conceptual Framework, 2011)

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

Candidates are required to do field work in all but two of the courses in the Literacy Program. They have assignments where they are required to work in collaboration with school districts in a coaching capacity in three courses, LRC 525, (Theories and Teaching of Writing), LRC 567 (Introduction to Literacy Coaching), and LRC 590 Research Seminar in Literacy. They diagnose and remediate particular students in the two pre-requisite courses to the clinical practicum (LRC 540 and LRC 545) and they complete 85 hours of supervised practicum experience within the program. In their second semester, they take LRC 552 which is a 35 hour classroom practicum experience under the supervision of a St. Rose faculty member. They are placed in classrooms in our two cooperating schools where they collaborate with classroom teachers to deliver a minimum of five whole class or small group literacy lessons. During their third semester, they take a 50 hour clinical practicum (LRC 550) in which they diagnose and remediate two different clients at their certification level in our new Center for Literacy Teaching and Learning. One of the pre-requisites for the clinical experience is LRC 540 (Diagnosis of Literacy Problems) in which they administer, analyze and interpret several assessments which they give to at least two students as they develop a diagnostic case study. They must submit audio tapes of all the testing for review by the instructor. Subsequently, they take LRC 545 (Remediation of Literacy Problems) in which they administer, analyze, and interpret several assessments which they give to a different student. In addition, they develop and implement 15 activities designed to remediate specific problems that have been diagnosed through their initial assessment. All activities are taped and reviewed by the instructor.

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

Literacy B-6 program of study	Literacy Grades 5-12 program of study
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------

See **Attachments** panel below.

**4. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.**

**5. Candidate Information**

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

Program: Literacy Birth- Grade 6		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers <sup>(2)</sup>
2009-2010	150	87
2010-2011	125	95
2011-2012	128	87

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

**6. Faculty Information**

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



Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in	

Professional Associations, and Service (7):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(8)	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(9)	

Faculty Member Name	
Highest Degree, Field, & University(3)	
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(4)	
Faculty Rank(5)	
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship(6), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (7):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(8)	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(9)	

Faculty Member Name	
Highest Degree, Field, & University(3)	
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(4)	
Faculty Rank(5)	
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship(6), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (7):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(8)	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(9)	

Faculty Member Name	
Highest Degree, Field, & University(3)	
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(4)	
Faculty Rank(5)	
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship(6), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (7):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(8)	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(9)	

Faculty Member Name	
Highest Degree, Field, & University(3)	
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(4)	
Faculty Rank(5)	
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship(6), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (7):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(8)	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(9)	

Faculty Member Name	
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	

Faculty Member Name	
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	

Faculty Member Name	
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	

Faculty Member Name	
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	
Tenure Track	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	

Faculty Member Name	Williams, Cynthia
---------------------	-------------------

Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	Adjunct
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

(3) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.

(4) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

(5) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

(6) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel. Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

(7) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.

(8) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.

(9) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

## SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

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

### 1. Please provide following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters each field)

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment <sup>(10)</sup>	Type or Form of Assessment <sup>(11)</sup>	When the Assessment Is Administered <sup>(12)</sup>
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	Content Specialty Test (CST) in Literacy	State Licensure Test	Completion of the program
Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in reading education (required)	Theory-Research-Practice Presentation	Project	Required course-LRC 530- Theories of Literacy
Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction (required)	Teaching/Coaching Portfolio	Project	Required course-LRC 591
Assessment #4: Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience (required)	Lesson Observation Report	Lesson observation project	Clinical Practicum-LRC 550/551- Practicum in Teaching Literacy
Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning (required)	Case Study	Project	Required course-LRC 545- Remediation of Literacy Problems
Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (required)	Diversity Project in Literacy	Project	Final course-LRC 590- Research Seminar
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (optional)	Needs Development & Professional Development Plan	Project	Required course-LRC 567- Introduction to Literacy Coaching
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (optional)	Professional Leadership Project	Project	Required course-LRC 525- Theories & Teaching of Writing

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

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

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

## SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

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

**Standard 1. Foundational Knowledge. Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.**

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections.  
1.2: Understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components.  
1.3: Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students’ reading development and achievement.

b	b	e	e	e	e	e	e

**2. Standard 2. Curriculum and Instruction. Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.**

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

2.1: Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.  
2.2: Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections.  
2.3: Use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.

b	e	b	b	b	e	e	b

**3. Standard 3. Assessment and Evaluation. Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.**

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

3.1: Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.  
3.2: Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes.  
3.3: Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.  
3.4: Communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences.

b	e	e	b	b	e	b	b

**4. Standard 4. Diversity. Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.**

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

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

b	e	b	e	e	b	e	b

**5. Standard 5. Literate Environment. Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.**

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

5.1: Design the physical environment to optimize students’ use of traditional print, digital, and online resources in reading and writing instruction.  
5.2: Design a social environment that is low-risk, includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students’ opportunities for learning to read and write.  
5.3: Use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another; discussions, and peer feedback).  
5.4: Use a variety of classroom configurations (i.e., whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction.

e	e	b	b	e	b	e	e

**6. Standard 6: Professional Learning and Leadership. Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility.**

#1 #2 #3 #4 #5 #6 #7 #8

6.1: Demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning theories and related research about organizational change, professional development, and school culture.  
6.2: Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.  
6.3: Participate in, design, facilitate, lead, and evaluate effective and differentiated professional development programs.  
6.4: Understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions.

b	e	e	b	e	b	b	b

**SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS**

**DIRECTIONS:** The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. Taken as a whole, the assessments must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. The key assessments should be required of all candidates. Assessments and scoring guides and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements [each relating to specific SPA standard(s)], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a cumulative score..

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas to be aligned with the elements in NCATE's unit standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare one document that includes the following items:

(1) A two-page narrative that includes the following:

- a. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
  - b. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
  - c. A brief analysis of the data findings;
  - d. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording;
- and

(2) Assessment Documentation

- e. The assessment tool itself or a rich description of the assessment (often the directions given to candidates);
- f. The scoring guide for the assessment; and
- g. Charts that provide candidate data derived from the assessment.

The responses for e, f, and g (above) should be limited to the equivalent of five text pages each, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

Note: As much as possible, combine all of the files for one assessment into a single file. That is, create one file for Assessment #4 that includes the two-page narrative (items a – d above), the assessment itself (item e above), the scoring guide (item f above, and the data chart (item g above). Each attachment should be no larger than 2 mb. Do not include candidate work or syllabi. There is a limit of 20 attachments for the entire report so it is crucial that you combine files as much as possible.

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

**Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

IRA Assessment 1- Content Specialty Test

See **Attachments** panel below.

**2. Assessment of content knowledge in reading education. IRA standards addressed in this entry include Standards 1 and 6. Examples of appropriate assessments include comprehensive examinations, research reports, child studies, action research, portfolio projects,<sup>(13)</sup> and essays. (Answer required)**

**Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

IRA Assessment 2- Theory-Research-Practice Presentation

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

portfolio may be considered individual assessments.

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

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

IRA Assessment 3 Teaching/Coaching Portfolio

See **Attachments** panel below.

**4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and/or 6. The assessment instrument used to evaluate internships, practicum, or other clinical experiences should be submitted. (Answer required)**

**Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

IRA Assessment 4- Lesson Observation

See **Attachments** panel below.

**5. Assessment that demonstrates and evaluates candidate effects on student learning and provision of supportive learning environments for student learning. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and/or 6. Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys. (Answer Required)**

**Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

IRA Assessment 5- Case Study

See **Attachments** panel below.

**6. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and/or 6. Examples of appropriate assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, professional study groups, leading a professional development session, research reports, child studies, action research, portfolio tasks, and follow-up studies. (Answer required)**

**Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

IRA Assessment 6- Diversity Project in Literacy

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

**Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

IRA Assessment 7- Needs Assessment & Professional Development Plan

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

**Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

IRA- Assessment 8- Professional Leadership Project

See **Attachments** panel below.

## SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

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

**(Response limited to 12,000 characters)**

### Content Knowledge:

The assessments that best demonstrate candidates' content knowledge are assessments 1 and 2. Candidates' performance on both these assessments has been strong. One hundred percent of our candidates have passed the CST in Literacy (Assessment #1) over the past five years. Assessment #2 was designed to measure competence in synthesizing research and presenting it to other teaching professionals. There was an improvement in results between the summer and fall application of this assessment. In the fall, 71% of B-6 candidates jumped to the exemplary level and 29% were at a distinguished level. One hundred percent of candidates at the 5-12 level scored at the distinguished level on two of the three standards measured (1.1, 1.2).

### Professional & Pedagogical Knowledge

We have designated Standard 6.3, the ability to design, implement and evaluate professional development programs as the best example of candidates' demonstration of professional knowledge. Assessment of their ability to provide professional development at coaching level 2 takes place in two courses in the middle of the program. They provide professional development to teachers for the projects evaluated by Assessments 7 and 8. Both B-6 and 5-12 candidates have 100% either exemplary or distinguished ratings for both semesters on both assessments for this standard

Pedagogical knowledge is measured by the full range of elements in Standards 2, 3, and 5. Standard 2 is measured in Assessments 3, 4 and 8. Perhaps the best measure of candidates' performance in terms of curriculum and instruction (Standard 2) is in Assessment #3 in which candidates must document varied instructional approaches (2.2) and use of a range of materials (2.3). Thirteen percent of B-6 candidates were at a developing level in the summer and 7% were developing and 7% did not meet the standard in the fall. In terms of instructional materials, 31% of B-6 candidates were developing in the summer and 20% were developing in the fall. Only two 5-12 candidates have taken this assessment and one (50%) scored at a developing level. We plan to reinforce instruction in these areas in courses in the beginning of the program (LRC 520/521).

In terms of Standard #3 (Assessment and Evaluation), we are satisfied with candidates scores on this standard across three assessments. Their ability to evaluate and plan instruction for a particular child is measured in Assessment #5. Here 100% of candidates scored at either an exemplary or distinguished level on both Standards 3.2 and 3.3. Their ability to evaluate on a broader level and use the information to drive instructional decisions grade-wide is measured on Assessments 7 & 8. Here, too, 100% of candidates in both the B-6 and 5-12 programs scored at either an exemplary or distinguished level on both standards.

Candidates have a hard time documenting experiences in designing physical spaces in classrooms (Standard 5.1). This is part of an assignment measured by Assessment #6, where only 10% were developing in Summer, 2012 and all were at the 'exemplary' or 'distinguished' level in the fall. Candidates, however, did not adequately represent this standard in their teaching/coaching portfolios (Assessment #3). An assignment where they must evaluate the physical space during their classroom practicum (LRC 552/553) will be added to the topical outline for those courses. Although the importance of the social environment (Standard 5.2) is emphasized in all our courses, 37.5% of B-6 candidates were developing on this standard in the summer and 20% were developing in the fall on their teaching/coaching portfolios (Assessment #3). Of the two 5-12 candidates who completed assessment #3 in the summer, one was at the distinguished level and one was at the developing level. In the clinical experience, (Assessment #4) 100% of candidates in both programs were either exemplary or distinguished on this standard. Similarly, 100% of candidates were either exemplary or distinguished in describing routines (5.3) in the clinical assessment (#4) while 19% of B-6 candidates were 'developing in the summer and 27% were developing in the fall on the teaching portfolio (#3). Of the two 5-12 candidates, one scored at the exemplary level and one at the developing level on this standard. Documenting their capacity to use different grouping configurations (5.4) was also difficult in assembling their teaching/coaching portfolios (Assessment #3). Nineteen percent of B-6 candidates were developing in the summer and 13% were developing in the fall. One 5-12 candidate was at the exemplary level in the summer and one was at the developing level. Candidates will be guided in analyzing the literate environment in a more rigorous way in LRC 552/553 (Classroom Practicum).

### Skills

We have aligned skills with several standards that seem to describe candidates' abilities to develop expertise in both teaching (Standards 2.2, 4.2) and coaching (Standards 3.4, 4.3, 6.2) situations. Standard 2.2 measures their ability to use effective instructional approaches. Mixed performance on this standard in Assessment #3 is discussed above. This is somewhat mitigated by the fact that 100% of candidates were either exemplary or distinguished on Standard 2.2 in the fall on both Assessments # 4 and 8. Although concerns about performance on this standard are relatively minor, we are monitoring candidate instructional performance closely. We also consider performance on Standard 4.2, to reflect a teaching 'skill.' On Assessment #3 (Teaching/Coaching Portfolio), 19% of B-6 candidates were developing in the summer while 7% were developing in the fall. Seven percent did not meet this standard in the fall. One 5-12 candidate was developing and one was distinguished on this standard in the summer. On Assessment #6, 25% of B-6 candidates were developing in the summer while 100% were either exemplary or distinguished in the fall. The one 5-12 candidate to take this assessment was exemplary. We will continue to monitor the progress on this standard closely.

Skills in coaching situations seem to be captured by Standards 3.4 and 6.2 which both deal with candidates' skill in communicating. When reporting student progress to parents and other educational personnel on Assessment #5 (Standard 3.4), candidates did fairly well. Fifty percent of B-6 candidates scored at the exemplary level on the summer application and 54% scored exemplary in the fall. One student (4%) was developing this skill in the fall. The one 5-12 candidate scored exemplary. One hundred percent of candidates scored either exemplary or distinguished on Standard 3.4 on Assessment #7. Standard 6.2 is measured by Assessments # 3, 4, and 6. Our candidates seem to demonstrate the interpersonal and leadership skills associated with this standard on Assessment #4 where they are in direct remedial teaching situations. In Fall, 2012, 100% of candidates scored exemplary on this standard. They are a bit less successful in demonstrating this standard in their teaching/coaching portfolios, (Assessment #3). In the summer, one B-6 candidate (6.5%) was developing and one (6.5%) did not meet it. One 5-12 candidate was also at the developing level. In the fall, 13% B-6 candidates were at the developing level. On Assessment #6, 22% of B-6 candidates were at a developing level in the summer. The one 5-12 candidate was exemplary. In the fall, 100% were at either the exemplary or distinguished level.

#### Dispositions

Candidates must produce outside evaluations of their dispositions and professional judgment as part of their teaching/coaching portfolios (Assessment #3). Although 56% of B-6 candidates scored exemplary for Standard 1.3 in the summer and 47% scored exemplary in the fall, one student (6.5%) did not meet this standard in the summer and 13% were developing in the fall. Both 5-12 candidates were exemplary on this standard. As candidates become more aware of the teaching portfolio requirement as a culminating evaluation of their work in the program, they will improve their performance on this standard.

Standard 6.2 was already discussed under the Skills heading. Once again, it is measured by Assessments # 3, 4, and 6. Our candidates seem to demonstrate the interpersonal and leadership skills associated with this standard on Assessment #4 where they are in direct remedial teaching situations. In Fall, 2012, 100% of candidates scored exemplary on this standard. On Assessment #6 which monitors their progress in assuming leadership roles in improving services to refugee children in an after-school educational program, 22% of B-6 candidates were at a developing level in the summer. In the fall, 100% were at either the exemplary or distinguished level. The one 5-12 candidate was exemplary.

#### Effect on Student Learning

Candidates' ability to affect student learning is most directly measured on Assessments #4 and 5. Assessment # 5 is an evaluation of candidates' case study reports usually completed in the middle of the program (LRC 545). This assessment focuses on candidates' ability to gather appropriate assessment data and use it to provide effective instruction in a remedial situation. One hundred percent of B-6 candidates scored at either the exemplary or the distinguished level on both the standards dealing with assessment (3.1, 3.2, 3.3) and the standards dealing with instruction (2.2, 2.3). Overall exemplary scores on this assessment increased from 60% in the summer to 71% in the fall for B-6 candidates. The one 5-12 candidate performed at an exemplary level.

Assessment #4 is an observation of a lesson delivered during their clinical practicum (LRC 550/551) at the end of the program. This assessment measures all of the above standards except for 4.2 and 5.4. On the other standards that combine to reflect effect on student learning (2.3, 2.3, 3.3, 5.2, and 5.3) 100% of our B-6 candidates scored at either the exemplary or distinguished level on both the summer and fall administrations of this assessment. Three 5-12 candidates completed this assessment and all performed at the exemplary level.

Candidates' effect on student learning (Standards 2.2 and 2.3) is being measured at the coaching level on Assessment #8. In this assessment, candidates are not directly teaching students but providing support for district teachers in identifying grade level needs and responding with exemplary lesson plans. The instructional approaches that candidates are recommending and describing are improving. In the summer, 30% of B-6 candidates scored exemplary on Standard # 2.2, 40% scored distinguished and 30% scored developing. By fall, 84% of B-6 candidates had scored exemplary and 16% had scored distinguished. The materials they are recommending are improving but at a slower rate. In the summer, 30% had scored exemplary on Standard 2.3, 30% had scored distinguished and 40% had scored developing. By fall, 72% were at an exemplary level, 12% were at a distinguished level and 16% were at a developing level. One hundred percent of 5-12 candidates scored at either the exemplary or distinguished level for all standards on this assessment. This confirms our findings on Assessment #3 that candidates need more instruction on a wide range of resources.

In terms of effecting student learning in coaching situations, Assessment #6 is used to measure candidates' effectiveness in providing leadership and guidance at an after school refugee educational program. Standard 4.2 is used to measure how this affects student learning there. Performance on this standard is improving. In the summer, 57% of B-6 candidates had scored at an exemplary level, 18% at a distinguished level and 25% at a developing level. By fall, 47% of B-6 candidates were exemplary and 53% were distinguished. The one 5-12 candidate scored at the exemplary level.

## SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

**1. For Revised Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Revised Report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/RevisedProgramReports/tabid/453/Default.aspx>**

**2. For Response to Conditions Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the conditions cited in the original recognition report. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions Report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/ResponsetoConditionsReport/tabid/454/Default.aspx>**

**(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)**

**Please click "Next"**

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.

## **Literacy Grades 5 through 12**

The 30 semester hours of graduate credit include:

### **1. Educational Research 6 Credits**

EPY 500 Educational Research (3) *(Must be completed within the first six credit hours with a grade of B or better. Failure to do so may prevent students from registering for further course work.)*

#### **AND**

LRC 590 Research Seminar in Literacy (3) *(Taken in final semester)*

### **2. Literacy 24 Credits**

LRC 521 Advanced Literacy Improvement in the Secondary School *(Taken with or before LRC 553)* (3)

LRC 525 Theories and Teaching of Writing (3)

LRC 530 Theories of Literacy (3)

LRC 540\* Diagnosis of Literacy Problems (3) *(Taken before LRC 545)*

LRC 545\* \*\* Remediation of Literacy Problems (3) *(Taken before LRC 550)*

LRC 551\* \*\* Practicum in Teaching Literacy (Grades 5-12) (3)

LRC 553\* \*\* School Based Practicum in Teaching Literacy (Grades 5-12) (3)

LRC 567\* Introduction to Literacy Coaching (3)

*\* These courses require New York State fingerprint clearance in advance.*

*\*\* To register for these courses, a B or better must be earned in the prerequisite course(s).*

### **3. Required Workshops 0 Credits**

EPY 637 Substance Abuse Prevention Workshop\* (0)

EDU 603 Child Abuse and Abduction Prevention Workshop\* (0)

EDU 606 HIV/AIDS and Communicable Diseases Workshop\* (0)

EDU 602 Violence Prevention Workshop\* (0)

*\*All workshops should be completed within first six credit hours.*

A total of 24 hours of graduate credit must be earned in the Literacy program at The College of Saint Rose. All courses counted toward the degree must be completed within six years. Students may request that up to six previously earned graduate credits at another accredited institution or nine previously earned credits at The College of Saint Rose be applied to the degree program.

## **Final Evaluation**

Final evaluation of students in a Literacy degree program consists of the successful completion of the required program in Literacy (consisting of 30 hours; see list of courses). Components of the final evaluation are intended to enable students to demonstrate their competencies as literacy teachers and coaches. The components include:

1. Practicum in Teaching Literacy (LRC 551);

#### **AND**

2. Research Seminar in Literacy (LRC 590)

A teaching/coaching portfolio (LRC 591) must be submitted during the final semester.

*Note: For a second certificate in Literacy from The College of Saint Rose (i.e., the student already possesses or is currently enrolled in a degree program or a non-degree certification-only program that will result in a certificate in Literacy*

*Grades 5 -12 earned at The College of Saint Rose and is now seeking at a certificate in Literacy Birth- Grade 2 at the College), the student will take a nine-credit sequence for the second certificate (LRC 520, LRC 587 in which he/she will diagnose and offer remediation to an individual at or below the sixth grade level, and LRC 550.LRC 587 must be taken before LRC 550.)*

## **Literacy Birth through Grade 6**

The 30 semester hours of graduate credit include:

### **1. Educational Research 6 Credits**

EPY 500 Educational Research (3) *(Must be completed within the first six credit hours with a grade of B or better. Failure to do so may prevent students from registering for further course work.)*

#### **AND**

LRC 590 Research Seminar in Literacy (3) *(Taken in final semester)*

### **2. Literacy 24 Credits**

LRC 520 Advanced Developmental Literacy (Birth-Grade 6) *(Taken with or before LRC 552)* (3)

LRC 525 Theories and Teaching of Writing (3)

LRC 530 Theories of Literacy (3)

LRC 540\* Diagnosis of Literacy Problems (3) *(Taken before LRC 545)*

LRC 545\* \*\* Remediation of Literacy Problems (3) *(Taken before LRC 550)*

LRC 550\* \*\* Practicum in Teaching Literacy (Birth through Grade 6) (3)

LRC 552\* \*\* School Based Practicum in Teaching Literacy (Birth through Grade 6) (3)

LRC 567\* Introduction to Literacy Coaching (3)

*\* These courses require New York State fingerprint clearance in advance.*

*\*\* To register for these courses, a B or better must be earned in the prerequisite course(s).*

### **3. Required Workshops 0 Credits**

EPY 637 Substance Abuse Prevention Workshop\* (0)

EDU 603 Child Abuse and Abduction Prevention Workshop\* (0)

EDU 606 HIV/AIDS and Communicable Diseases Workshop\* (0)

EDU 602 Violence Prevention Workshop\* (0)

*\*All workshops should be completed within first six credit hours.*

A total of 24 hours of graduate credit must be earned in the Literacy program at The College of Saint Rose. All courses counted toward the degree must be completed within six years. Students may request that up to six previously earned graduate credits at another accredited institution or nine previously earned credits at The College of Saint Rose be applied to the degree program.

## **Final Evaluation**

Final evaluation of students in a Literacy degree program consists of the successful completion of the required program in Literacy (consisting of 30 hours; see list of courses). Components of the final evaluation are intended to enable students to demonstrate their competencies as literacy teachers and coaches. The components include:

1. Practicum in Teaching Literacy (LRC 550);

#### **AND**

2. Research Seminar in Literacy (LRC 590)

A teaching/coaching portfolio (LRC 591) must be submitted during the final semester.

*Note: For a second certificate in Literacy from The College of Saint Rose (i.e., the student already possesses or is currently enrolled in a degree program or a non-degree certification-only program that will result in a certificate in Literacy*

*Birth through Grade 6 earned at The College of Saint Rose and is now seeking at a certificate in Literacy Grades 5 through 12 at the College), the student will take a nine-credit sequence for the second certificate (LRC 521, LRC 587 in which he/she will diagnose and offer remediation to an individual at or above the fifth grade level, and LRC 551.LRC 587 must be taken before LRC 551.)*

Assessment # 1

: New York State Content Specialty Test in Literacy (Licensure Examination)

**1. Description.** This is a criterion referenced and objective based examination used in New York State for determining the content knowledge of Reading Professionals/Literacy Coaches. We use the results as an external evaluation, in order to confirm that our program is meeting the NYS requirements for licensure. The test covers four sub-areas: foundations of literacy, reading instruction and assessment, the role of the literacy professional and reading instruction and assessment. Although it is designed to meet all the IRA Standards in general, it is necessarily limited in that it is a multiple-choice exam with one extended response. We find it inadequate in measuring candidates' ability to demonstrate that they not only have knowledge in these areas but can effectively share it with students and other teaching professionals. The seven assessments we have developed for our program are not only more specifically aligned with individual IRA standards and elements but they also require candidates to demonstrate not only knowledge but application of knowledge in various teaching and coaching contexts

**2. Alignment.** In analyzing the descriptions of the four sub-areas of this test, we conclude that they best demonstrate candidate performance on the following Standards:

Test Section	IRA Standards
Foundations of Literacy	1.1, 1.2, 3.1, 4.1
Reading Instruction and Assessment	2.1, 2.2
Role of the Literacy Professional	1.3, 2.1, 3.4, 4.2, 6.2
Constructed Response (Instruction and Assessment)	2.2, 3.2

**3. Analysis of Data Findings.** For the past five years, 100% of our candidates have passed this exam. In examining overall scores over the five year period, B-6 candidates received marginally lower scores on subarea 1 (95%) and subarea 4 (95%). During the most recent year, 2011-2012 for which we have data, candidates received 100% passing scores in all areas except for B-6 in sub-area 1 (90%)

**4. Interpretation of Data.** One of the five objectives covered by subarea 1 is to 'understand individual differences in literacy development'. The standard that we have aligned this subarea with is standard 4.1. We have concluded that marginal weakness in this subarea can be explained by what we have perceived as a program weakness in focusing on diversity issues. The redesign of our program is being driven by a substantial effort to increase attention to diversity in every course. Candidates must now document how they have addressed Standards 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 on the culminating assessment for the program, the teaching portfolio (Assessment #3). Relative lower passing rates on the constructed response (subarea 4) in 2008-2009 (83%) led to more on-demand writing assignments in several courses. Candidates are carefully guided through their final research paper in LRC 590 with attention to writing issues as well as analysis of research. This seems to have improved performance in subarea 4 but the quality of our candidates' written work is an ongoing focus.

Test Frameworks available at [www.nystce.nesinc.com](http://www.nystce.nesinc.com)  
 Data Tables- Content Specialty Test in Literacy- IRA Assessment 1

Assessment # 1 – CST Literacy B-6

Year	Level	CSR	% Pass	Subarea	Subarea	Subarea	Subarea
		N		1	2	3	4
				% Pass	% Pass	% Pass	% Pass
2007-2008	GRAD	59	100%	95%	93%	98%	95%
2008-2009	GRAD	48	100%	98%	100%	98%	83%
2009-2010	GRAD	40	100%	100%	98%	98%	95%
2010-2011	GRAD	21	100%	90%	95%	95%	100%
2011-12	GRAD	21	100%	90%	100%	100%	100%
<b>Overall</b>	GRAD	189	100%	95%	97%	98%	95%

Assessment #1 CST Literacy 5-12

Year	Level	CSR	% Pass	Scaled Score Mean Range					
		N				1	2	3	4
						% Pass	% Pass	% Pass	% Pass
2007-2008	GRAD	4	100%	265.8	260-272	100%	100%	100%	100%
2008-2009	GRAD	1	100%	259		100%	100%	100%	100%
2009-2010	GRAD	3	100%	241.7	220-256	67%	100%	100%	67%
2010-2011	GRAD	4	100%	251.3	220-278	100%	80%	80%	100%
2011-12	GRAD	2	100%	260	242-278	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>Overall</b>	GRAD	14	100%	255.56	220-279	93%	96%	96%	93%

## **IRA Assessment #2 Theory-Research-Practice Presentation**

- 1) Description** This assignment is the culminating project for LRC 530 (Theories of Literacy) that candidates usually take in the second semester of the program. In this course, students explore literacy theories and how they are reflected in specific instructional practices. For this project, students create a multi-media presentation on a group of theories and relate them to specific practices. They include resources that illustrate the practices and trace how these practices both emerged from the theory and developed over time. Candidates are required to explain how the practices can be adjusted to support individual learners and situations. Finally, candidates are required to describe how the practices they describe can be adjusted to accommodate diverse students and how they specifically reflect non-discriminatory practice. Presentations are media streamed and become available to candidates in other literacy courses and in undergraduate methods courses in other education departments.
- 2) Alignment:** This is an assessment of content knowledge and is specifically aligned with IRA Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. The presentation analyzes the major theoretical perspectives of the profession (1.1), how these theories have evolved in scholarship over time (1.2) and relates this to how teachers can use this information to address the needs of individual learners (1.3).
- 3) Analysis of Data Findings:** In the summer, the first time this assessment was used, 70% of B-6 candidates performed at a distinguished level while 30% were developing competence in synthesizing research and presenting it to other teaching professionals. There was a tremendous improvement in results for the fall application where 71% of B-6 candidates jumped to the exemplary level and 29% were at a distinguished level. No B-6 candidates performed at either the developing or unmet level in the fall. There were only six 5-12 candidates who took this assessment in either the summer or the fall. One hundred percent of these candidates were distinguished in both Standards 1.1 and 1.3. There was a consistent weakness in meeting Standard 1.2 for 5-12 candidates. Sixty six and a half percent scored at a developing level on this standard in both summer and spring.
- 4) Interpretation of Data:** In discussing the summer results, faculty concluded that students were having difficulty synthesizing and integrating both theoretical and practical information in order for their presentations to be truly comprehensive. In order to improve presentations, candidates needed to consider individual student differences so that their practical applications would

be more relevant for their audience of teachers and teacher candidates. The fall data reflects the effort made to make B-6 candidates more aware of how their knowledge of the theories and scholarship of the profession could be more effectively presented to teachers and teacher candidates. Five – twelve candidates in both summer and fall seemed to be having a problem in describing how the practical application of theories has been refined by scholarship over the years.

## Assessment #2 Assignment and Grading Rubric

### Theory-Research-Practice Presentation

Students will use content they have developed as part of a wiki assignment to create a multi-media presentation to be used in informing fellow practitioners of ways in which knowledge of a select group of theories (perspective) can help them deliver evidenced-based instruction to regular progressing students as well as to those who struggle for a myriad of reasons. They will present:

1. The *intent* of the specific group of theories, that is, whether they seek to clarify instructionally relevant literacy components and the relationship among them; to explain how literacy competence develops and/or should be developed; to illuminate what people do – both overtly and covertly- when they engage in literacy activities; or to achieve a combination of these.
2. The key *tenets* of the theories as well as related instructional and assessment *practices*.
3. Practical *resources* that illustrate key practices related to the group of theories.
4. Supporting *research* that lends credence to the theories, showing in the form of a timeline how these have led to the refinement of the theories.
5. Contextual or individual *factors* (impacting literacy development) that the set of theories foreground and in so doing indicate possible *adjusted practices* for those negatively impacted by those factors.

Standard	Exemplary (3)	Distinguished (2)	Developing (1)	Unmet (0)
<b>1.1 Context, Theories, Research and Practice</b>	The presentation provides a comprehensive and detailed overview of the theories; intent, central tenets (both descriptive and prescriptive), key instructional practices (in both reading and writing), <i>supporting research</i> (both seminal and currently influential); and in addition provides <i>practical resources</i> demonstrating classroom application. The strengths and limitations of the theories are presented and contextual	Though minor details are lacking, the presentation provides a fairly comprehensive overview of the theories; intent, central tenets (both descriptive and prescriptive), <i>key instructional practices</i> (in both reading and writing), <i>supporting research</i> (both seminal and currently influential); and in addition provides <i>practical resources</i> demonstrating classroom application. The strengths and limitations of the theories are presented and contextual	The presentation provides a skeletal overview of the theories – their intent, central tenets, <i>key instructional practices</i> , and <i>supporting research</i> . The presentation does not adequately span the breadth of application for literacy teaching and learning. Strengths and limitations of the theories are presented and contextual <i>factor/s</i> addressed to some degree.	The presentation provides an incomplete overview of the set of theories-their intent, central tenets, <i>instructional practices</i> , and <i>supporting research</i> . Some <i>practical resources</i> are provided, and there is some attention to the strengths and limitation of the theories. Contextual <i>factor/s</i> foreground though not with adequate depth.

	<i>factor/s they foreground, highlighted.</i>	<i>factor/s they address, highlighted.</i>		
<b>1.2 Research and the Evolution of Thinking and Practice</b>	The presentation provides a detailed <i>timeline</i> depicting the evolution of the theoretical perspective as influenced by research, societal changes, and changing practice. The roots (motivation for seminal work) of the theories as well as <i>reasons for their evolution</i> are outlined. A synopsis of <i>follow-up studies</i> that have led to the theory's refinement is provided.	The presentation provides a detailed <i>timeline</i> depicting the evolution of the theoretical perspective as influenced by research, societal changes, and/or changing practice. The roots (motivation for seminal work) of the theories as well as <i>reasons for their evolution</i> are outlined. A synopsis of <i>follow-up studies</i> that have led to the theory's refinement is provided.	The presentation provides a basic <i>timeline</i> depicting the evolution of the theoretical perspective as influenced by research, societal changes, and/or changing practice. The roots (seminal work) of the theories and some <i>reasons for their evolution</i> are outlined. A synopsis of <i>follow-up studies</i> is limited.	The presentation provides an incomplete outline of the evolution of the perspective. No reason for the theories' evolution is provided, neither is their origin addressed. A synopsis of <i>follow-up studies</i> that have led to the theories' refinement is not provided.
<b>1.3 Adjusted Practices and Accommodations for Linguistically, Culturally and Otherwise Diverse Students</b>	The presentation indicates a variety of practical ways in which knowledge of the theories may be used to <i>adjust teaching, assessment, the learning environment/climate, and the curriculum</i> to meet the needs of culturally and otherwise different students. Concrete reference is made to <i>non-discriminatory practices, policies and the law.</i>	The presentation indicates at least three practical ways in which knowledge of the theories may be used to <i>adjust teaching, assessment, the learning environment/climate, and the curriculum</i> to meet the needs of culturally and otherwise different students. Adequate reference is made to <i>non-discriminatory practices, policies and the law.</i>	The presentation indicates at least three practical ways in which knowledge of the theories may be used to <i>adjust teaching, assessment, the learning environment/climate, and the curriculum</i> to meet the needs of culturally and otherwise different students. Adequate reference is made to <i>non-discriminatory practices, policies and the law</i> is inadequate.	The presentation indicates less than two ways in which knowledge of the theories may be used to provide <i>culturally responsive instruction</i> . No Practical example is provided. Reference to <i>non-discriminatory practices</i> is quite limited.

**Data Findings –B-6 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14(70%)</b>	<b>6(30%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>2(10%)</b>	<b>11(55%)</b>	<b>7(35%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14(70%)</b>	<b>6(30%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14(70%)</b>	<b>6(30%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**Birth – 6 Fall, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>10 (71%)</b>	<b>4(29%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>7(50%)</b>	<b>7(50%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>10(71%)</b>	<b>4(29%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>10(71%)</b>	<b>4(29%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**5-12 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1(33.5%)</b>	<b>2(66.5%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

5 – 12 Fall, 2012

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
1.1	0	3(100%)	0	0
1.2	0	1(33.5%)	2(66.5%)	0
1.3	0	3(100%)	0	0
Overall	0	3(100%)	0	0

### **IRA Assessment # 3- Teaching/Coaching Portfolio (LRC 591)**

- 1) **Description:** This is a culminating assessment that takes place in the candidate's final semester in the program. The candidate is guided in reflecting on the IRA Standards that directly relate to his/her teaching and coaching experiences. Candidates prepare a narrative that explains how he/she met the standards and supports these assertions with attached assignments completed throughout the program.
- 2) **Alignment:** Since this is a culminating assessment, it is designed to address many of the standards that directly relate to student learning, namely standards 2, 4 and 5. It demonstrates how candidates can effectively plan reading and literacy instruction. Since Standard 3 is so well covered by other assessments (1,5,7, & 8), it is conspicuously absent here. On this assessment, candidates must supply evidence to support their ability to design and implement curriculum (2.1), use varied and appropriate instructional approaches (2.2), and a range of texts and materials (2.3). They must demonstrate how they have used their knowledge of diversity to benefit individual students who are struggling with reading and writing (4.1, 4.2, and 4.3). They must also cite examples of how they have designed physical environments (5.1), social environments (5.2) and implemented routines (5.3) and various classroom configurations (5.4) in order to maximize student learning. This assessment also requires that candidates provide external evaluations of their fair-mindedness, empathy (1.3) and positive dispositions (6.2). Most importantly, the rubrics measuring these standards require that candidates not only demonstrate their own ability in these areas, but their ability to support other teachers and educational personnel in these areas.
- 3) **Analysis of Data Findings:** Summer administration of this assessment revealed several weaknesses. There were significant 'developing' scores for several standards. Thirty-seven per cent of B-6 candidates were 'developing' on Standards 4.3 and 5.2. Thirty-one percent were 'developing' on Standards 2.1 and 2.3. Fifty percent of 5-12 candidates were developing on Standards 2.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 6.2. The fall administration revealed some improvements for B-6 candidates. 'Developing' scores for Standard 4.3 dropped from 37.5% to 27%. 'Developing' scores for Standard 5.2 dropped from 37.5% to 20%. Standard 2.1 saw reduced 'developing' scores from 31% to 27% and Standard 2.3 'developing' scores went from 31% to 20%. Although only 6% of B-6 candidates scored 'developing' on Standard 4.1 in the summer, 27% scored 'developing' in the fall.
- 4) **Interpretation of Data:** Interpreting the scores on this culminating assessment is vital to transforming our program to be more aligned with the 2010 IRA Standards. These results are particularly valuable since some of the artifacts candidates used predated our program changes. The standards that reveal the weakest scores are exactly those that we are most concerned with addressing in revising the program. This assessment reveals that candidates have not been given adequate opportunities to meet

Standards 4.1, 4.3, 2.1 and 2.3. Giving candidates more opportunities to focus on diversity (4.1, 4.3) at every stage of the program has driven our revisions. Curriculum changes are being made in LRC 520/521 to focus more on curriculum design (2.1) and evaluating a wide range of texts (2.3). Candidates are being given several opportunities to advocate for social justice (4.3) in LRC 590. Candidates are already being given opportunities to create positive social environments in LRC 552/553 and LRC 550/551 but we need to encourage them to give evidence for this in their teaching portfolios. Improvements in scores on the fall administration of this assessment reflect that the program is moving in the right direction.

### **Assessment # 3 Teaching/Coaching Portfolio- Assignment & Grading Rubric**

#### **Teaching/Coaching Portfolio**

**Upon entering the program, students are made aware that a final teaching portfolio project will be required during their final semester. They are told to save major class assignments as evidence of their performance in the program and are introduced to the 2010 IRA Standards for Reading Professionals. In LRC 590 (Research Seminar in Literacy), students are introduced to the rubric designed to measure particular standards. During a separate workshop scheduled early in their last semester, students are guided through the rubric and possible artifacts for meeting the standards are discussed. Students are instructed to write short essays for each standard explaining how they have met the standard through their work in the program and how attached artifacts provide the evidence for their level of compliance.**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>2.1</b> <i>(Curriculum design)</i>	Displays a thorough understanding of the research and literature that undergirds curriculum and directs teachers in constructing and evaluating a curriculum that is	Displays a substantial understanding of the research literature that undergirds curriculum and supports teachers in constructing and evaluating a curriculum that is comprehensive,	Displays some understanding of the research literature that undergirds curriculum and begins to collaborate with teachers in constructing and evaluating a curriculum that is somewhat	Lacks understanding of the research literature that undergirds curriculum. Curriculum design work is less than comprehensive and balanced or does not provide

	comprehensive, integrated, balanced and designed to meet the needs of struggling readers. Strongly supports teachers to design curriculum with horizontal and vertical alignment.	integrated balanced and designed to meet the needs of struggling readers. Demonstrates how to design curriculum with horizontal and vertical alignment.	comprehensive, balanced and designed to meet the needs of struggling readers. Makes teachers aware of horizontal and vertical alignment of curriculum plans.	adequate support for struggling readers. There is a lack of horizontal and vertical alignment in curriculum plan.
<b>2.2</b> <i>(instructional approaches)</i>	Displays a thorough knowledge of instructional approaches and provides appropriate, in-depth instruction for all learners especially struggling readers and writers. Provides guidance to teachers and support personnel in implementing appropriate instructional strategies.	Displays the necessary knowledge of instructional approaches and provides appropriate, instructional approaches for all learners especially struggling readers and writers. Supports teachers and teachers' aides in implementing appropriate instructional strategies.	Displays some knowledge of instructional approaches and provides adequate instruction for all learners especially for struggling readers and writers. Some collaboration with teachers and support personnel to design and implement instruction is evident.	Lacks understanding of various instructional approaches that undergird curriculum. Instruction does not adequately achieve objectives for all learners, especially for struggling readers and writers.
<b>2.3</b> <i>(Instructional materials)</i>	Displays in-depth knowledge of and a critical stance toward a wide range of instructional materials including traditional print, digital and on-line resources. Guides teachers in building and using quality materials that meet the needs and abilities of all learners. Leads collaborative, school efforts to evaluate, select or use a variety of materials to meet the needs of all learners.	Displays significant knowledge of and a critical stance toward a wide range of instructional materials including traditional print, digital and on-line resources. Supports teachers in building and using quality materials that meet the needs and abilities of all learners. Participates in collaborative, school efforts to evaluate, select or use a variety of materials to meet the needs of all learners	Displays adequate knowledge of a range of instructional materials including traditional print, digital and on-line resources. Collaborates with teachers in building and using quality materials that meet the needs and abilities of all learners. Is aware of collaborative, school efforts to evaluate, select or use a variety of materials to meet the needs of all learners	Lacks adequate knowledge of instructional materials. Contributes to teachers' efforts to use quality materials that meet the needs of all learners. No connection to collaborative school efforts to improve selection and evaluations of materials.
<b>4.1</b> <i>(Diversity factors)</i>	Demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the ways in which diversity influences reading and writing and shares this knowledge with the school community. Guides teachers in developing curriculum that is responsive to diversity. Assists teachers in understanding the relationship between first and	Demonstrates a substantial understanding of the ways in which diversity influences reading and writing and makes this knowledge available to the school community. Advises teachers in developing curriculum that is responsive to diversity. Assists teachers in understanding the relationship between first and second language	Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the ways in which diversity influences reading and writing and makes this knowledge available to the school community. Participates with teachers in developing curriculum that is responsive to diversity. Participates in efforts to understand the relationship	Lacks adequate understanding of the ways in which diversity influences reading and writing. No evidence of participating with teachers in developing curriculum responsive to diversity or in understanding the relationship between first and second language acquisition and literacy development.

	second language acquisition and literacy development.	acquisition and literacy development.	between first and second language acquisition and literacy development.	
<b>4.2</b> <i>(Differentiated Instruction)</i>	Provides exemplary differentiated instruction and instructional materials including print, digital and online resources that capitalize on an understanding of diversity. Guides other educators to recognize their own cultures in order to be more responsive to students' diverse backgrounds. Collaborates in programs that promote home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections. Provides guidance and support to the school community in valuing the contributions of diverse people.	Provides sufficient differentiated instruction and instructional materials including print, digital and online resources that capitalize on an understanding of diversity. Helps other educators to recognize their own cultures in order to be more responsive to students' diverse backgrounds. Collaborates in programs that promote home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections. Supports the school community in valuing the contributions of diverse people	Provides some differentiated instruction and instructional materials including print, digital and online resources that capitalize on an understanding of diversity. Participates with other educators in efforts to recognize their own cultures in order to be more responsive to students' diverse backgrounds. Is aware of programs that promote home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections. Supports the school community in valuing the contributions of diverse people	Instruction does not demonstrate an understanding of diversity. Materials do not represent an awareness of diverse perspectives. Little participation in efforts to recognize cultural backgrounds and promote sensitivity to students' backgrounds. Very little evidence of participation in home-to-school and school-to-home programs and programs designed to value the contributions of diverse people.
<b>4.3</b> <i>(home-school connections)</i>	Provides many opportunities for students to make linguistic, academic and cultural connections between what they learn in school and their background knowledge. Strong evidence of advocating for social justice and making it part of the literacy curriculum. Collaborates with teachers and administrators in implementing policies and instructional practices that promote equity and strengthen connections with the community.	Provides sufficient opportunities for students to make linguistic, academic and cultural connections between what they learn in school and their background knowledge. Adequate evidence of advocating for social justice and making it part of the literacy curriculum. Adequate evidence of collaboration with teachers and administrators in implementing policies and instructional practices that promote equity and strengthen connections with the community	Provides some opportunities for students to make linguistic, academic and cultural connections between what they learn in school and their background knowledge. Some evidence of advocating for social justice and making it part of the literacy curriculum. Collaboration with teachers and administrators in implementing policies and instructional practices that promote equity and strengthen connections with the community is limited.	Provides limited opportunities for students to make linguistic, academic and cultural connections between what they learn in school and their background knowledge. Very little evidence of advocating for social justice and making it part of the literacy curriculum. Little effort made to collaborate with teachers and administrators in implementing policies and instructional practices that promote equity and strengthen connections with the community.
<b>5.1</b> <i>(learning environment – access to</i>	Designs an exceptional learning environment that provides easy access to books and other instructional materials for a	Designs an effective learning environment that provides sufficient access to books and other instructional materials for a variety	Designs a basic learning environment that provides some access to books and other instructional materials for a	Learning environment gives students limited access to instructional materials. Arranging for individual and

<i>materials)</i>	variety of individual, small group and whole class activities. Modifies arrangement promptly to meet students' changing needs.	of individual, small group and whole class activities. Modifies arrangement regularly to meet students' changing needs	variety of individual, small group and whole class activities. Modifies arrangement occasionally to meet students' changing needs	small group instruction is problematic. Does not modify the arrangement.
<b>5.2</b> <i>(supportive social learning environment)</i>	Provides outstanding models of supportive social environments for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing and English language learners.. Supports other teachers in doing the same.	Provides effective models of supportive social environments for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing and English language learners.. Supports other teachers in doing the same.	Provides basic models of supportive social environments for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing and English language learners.. Supports other teachers in doing the same.	Problems in the social environment provided for students does not make it suitable as a model for other teachers.
<b>5.3</b> <i>(learning routines)</i>	Highly skilled and knowledgeable in providing effective routines for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. Models and provides guidance for other teachers to do the same.	Competent in providing effective routines for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. Provides guidance for other teachers to do the same.	Adequately skilled and knowledgeable in providing effective routines for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. Provides some guidance for other teachers to do the same.	Lacks knowledge and skill in providing students with effective routines. Does not provide help to other teachers in this area.
<b>5.4</b> <i>(grouping practices)</i>	Provides extensive support for teachers in using evidence based grouping practices to meet the needs of all learners especially those who struggle with reading and writing	Provides substantial support for teachers in using evidence based grouping practices to meet the needs of all learners especially those who struggle with reading and writing	Provides some support for teachers in using evidence based grouping practices to meet the needs of all learners especially those who struggle with reading and writing	Limited use of evidence based grouping practices in instructional practice. Little to no support for teachers in doing the same for all students.
<b>6.2</b> <i>(Teacher dispositions)</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the connection between teacher disposition and student learning. Embodies this by demonstrating outstanding interpersonal and leadership skills and modeling a positive attitude toward reading and writing with students, teachers, administrators and parents.	Demonstrates a good understanding of the connection between teacher disposition and student learning. Demonstrates adept interpersonal and leadership skills. Models a positive attitude toward reading and writing with students, teachers, administrators and parents.	Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the connection between teacher disposition and student learning. Demonstrates adequate interpersonal and leadership skills. Sometimes models a positive attitude toward reading and writing with students, teachers, administrators and parents.	Demonstrates a limited understanding of the connection between teacher disposition and student learning. Interpersonal and leadership skills are limited. Does not take opportunities to model a positive attitude toward reading and writing with students, teachers, administrators and parents.
<b>1.3</b> <i>(fair-</i>	Evaluations by teachers and college supervisor indicate that	Evaluations by teachers and college supervisor indicate that candidate is	Evaluations by teachers and college supervisor indicate that	Evaluations by teachers and college supervisor indicate that

<i>mindfulness &amp; empathy)</i>	candidate is outstanding in modeling fair-mindedness, empathy and ethical behavior and communicates the importance of such behavior to others.	proficient in modeling fair-mindedness, empathy and ethical behavior and communicates the importance of such behavior to others.	candidate is adequate in modeling fair-mindedness, empathy and ethical behavior and communicates the importance of such behavior to others.	candidate is limited in modeling fair-mindedness, empathy and ethical behavior .Does not communicate the importance of such behavior to others.

**Assessment #3 Teaching/Coaching Portfolio Data Findings**

**B – 6 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>3(19%)</b>	<b>8(50%)</b>	<b>5(31%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>5(31%)</b>	<b>9(56%)</b>	<b>2(13%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>4(25%)</b>	<b>7(44%)</b>	<b>5(31%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>7(44%)</b>	<b>8(50%)</b>	<b>1(6%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>2(13%)</b>	<b>11(68%)</b>	<b>3(19%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>4(25%)</b>	<b>6(37.5%)</b>	<b>6(37.5%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>3(19%)</b>	<b>8(50%)</b>	<b>5(31%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>6(37.5%)</b>	<b>4(25%)</b>	<b>6(37.5%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>6(37.%)</b>	<b>7(44%)</b>	<b>3(19%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.4</b>	<b>4(25%)</b>	<b>9(56%)</b>	<b>3(19%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>3(19%)</b>	<b>11(68%)</b>	<b>1(6.5%)</b>	<b>1(6.5%)</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>9(56%)</b>	<b>6(37.5)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1(6.5%)</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3(19%)</b>	<b>11(68%)</b>	<b>2(13%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**B – 6 Fall, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
-----------------	------------------	----------------------	-------------------	--------------

<b>2.1</b>	<b>6(40%)</b>	<b>5(33%)</b>	<b>4(27%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>8(53%)</b>	<b>5(33%)</b>	<b>1(7%)</b>	<b>1(7%)</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>6(40%)</b>	<b>6(40%)</b>	<b>3(20%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>8(53%)</b>	<b>3(20%)</b>	<b>4(27%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>5(33%)</b>	<b>8(53%)</b>	<b>1(7%)</b>	<b>1(7%)</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>4(27%)</b>	<b>6(40%)</b>	<b>4(27%)</b>	<b>1(7%)</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>7(47%)</b>	<b>4(27%)</b>	<b>4(27%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>6(40%)</b>	<b>6(40%)</b>	<b>3(20%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>8(53%)</b>	<b>3(20%)</b>	<b>4(27%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.4</b>	<b>5(33%)</b>	<b>7(47%)</b>	<b>2(13%)</b>	<b>1(7%)</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>7(47%)</b>	<b>6(40%)</b>	<b>2(13%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>7(47%)</b>	<b>6(40%)</b>	<b>2(13%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>4(27%)</b>	<b>9(60%)</b>	<b>2(13%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**5 – 12 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>2.1</b>	1(50%)	0	1(50%)	<b>0</b>
<b>2.2</b>	1(50%)	1(50%)	0	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	1(50%)	1(50%)	0	<b>0</b>
<b>4.1</b>	1(50%)	1(50%)	0	<b>0</b>
<b>4.2</b>	0	1(50%)	1(50%)	<b>0</b>
<b>4.3</b>	1(50%)	0	1(50%)	<b>0</b>
<b>5.1</b>	0	1(50%)	1(50%)	<b>0</b>
<b>5.2</b>	0	1(50%)	1(50%)	<b>0</b>
<b>5.3</b>	1(50%)	0	1(50%)	<b>0</b>
<b>5.4</b>	1(50%)	0	1(50%)	<b>0</b>
<b>6.2</b>	1(50%)	0	1(50%)	<b>0</b>
<b>1.3</b>	2(100%)	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	1(50%)	0	1(50%)	<b>0</b>

**Fall, 2012 (No 5-12 candidates completed this assessment in the fall)**

#### **IRA Assessment # 4 Lesson Observation (Clinical Practicum LRC 550/551)**

- 1) Description** This is an assessment of candidate performance in the clinical practicum at the end of the program. It involves the instructor's evaluation of the candidate's performance but also measures the candidate's ability to evaluate both him/herself and a colleague. The final conference between the instructor and both candidates allows for focused reflection on all aspects of the clinical experience. It gives candidates practice in respectfully providing constructive feedback to a colleague after reviewing his/her teaching. This is an opportunity to practice literacy coaching at a level 3, according to IRA.
- 2) Alignment:** This instrument is used to assess candidate's ability to evaluate the specific literacy needs of a struggling learner (3.3) and provide appropriate instruction (2.2, 2.3) and a positive instructional environment for that learner (5.2, 5.3). It also gives candidates the opportunity to reflect on their own professional judgment (1.3) and effectiveness (6.2) and that of a colleague.
- 3) Analysis of Data Birth** – six candidates performed very well on this assessment especially in the areas of displaying positive dispositions (6.2) (69% 'exemplary in summer and 100% 'exemplary in fall); using professional judgment to increase student learning (1.3) (77% 'exemplary in summer and 92% 'exemplary' in fall) and creating positive social environments (5.2) (73% 'exemplary' in summer and 85% 'exemplary in fall.) The 5-12 candidates performed even better; 100% of the candidates performed at the exemplary level.
- 4) Interpretation of Data** The excellent results from this assessment reflect our program philosophy to give candidates the most individualized and rigorous training in dealing with specific literacy problems. This course reflects a programmatic decision to provide this training over a three course sequence. Intense feedback is provided in all three courses in the sequence (LRC 540, LRC 545 and LRC 550/551.) Clinical practicum (LRC 550/551) is a very strictly supervised experience and this assessment administered toward the end of the semester, reflects the abundance of modeling, and guided practice with specific feedback received by candidates. Candidates not only review instructional and assessment decisions with their clinical supervisor, they are also guided in carefully reviewing and reflecting on their practice. That said, we are now thinking about gathering more assessment data on candidates' instructional decisions in more independent contexts.

**Assessment # 4 – Documentation**  
**Lesson Observation Rubric 550 /551 – Clinical Practicum**

Guidelines for Observed Lesson, LRC 550/551,

NCATE Assessment #4, Lesson Observation Rubric

The following guidelines have been developed to help Practicum instructors complete NCATE Assessment #4 for Literacy Program students. Pairs of tutors will be assigned by the instructor. Each pair will be taped on the same day and will conference together with the Instructor.

- Observed lesson gets recorded with a digital camera. Copies of lesson plan are provided to instructor and to colleague-observer.
- Instructor gives video to colleague-observer, who views it and completes a review of the lesson using the Lesson Observation Rubric.
- Conference with instructor, tutor and colleague-observer takes place during class time, either before or following a tutoring session (For example, during fall sessions, 4:00-4:20 or 6:15 – 6:35).
- Following the conference, tutor writes a self-reflection on own lesson, based upon the Lesson Observation Rubric (IRA Standards) and the feedback received from the instructor and colleague-observer.
- The paper and completed rubrics are submitted to the instructor for grading. Grade includes the quality of the feedback provided to colleague and the quality of own self-reflection.
- Graded rubrics are returned to candidates to be submitted as an artifact for their portfolios.

<b>IRA STANDARD/CRITERIA</b>	<b>Exemplary (3)</b>	<b>Distinguished (2)</b>	<b>Developing (1)</b>	<b>Unmet (0)</b>
<p><b>2.1</b> <i>Use foundational knowledge to design and/or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum</i></p>	<p><b>Effectively</b> develops and implements the curriculum to meet the specific needs of struggling readers</p>	<p>Develops and implements the curriculum to meet the needs of struggling readers.</p>	<p>Development and implementation of the curriculum to meet the needs of struggling readers is <b>limited</b>.</p>	<p>Development and implementation of the curriculum to meet the needs of struggling readers is <b>inappropriate or not evident</b>.</p>
<p><b>2.2</b> <i>Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge and reading/writing connections.</i></p>	<p><b>Effectively</b> uses instructional approaches supported by literature and research for one or more of the following areas: concept of print, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, critical thinking, motivation, and writing (based on student's needs).</p> <p><b>Effectively</b> provides appropriate in-depth instruction for those who struggle with reading and writing.</p>	<p>Uses instructional approaches supported by literature and research for one or more of the following areas: concept of print, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, critical thinking, motivation, and writing (based on student's needs).</p> <p>Provides appropriate in-depth instruction for those who struggle with reading and writing</p>	<p>Instructional approaches are <b>somewhat</b> supported by literature and research for one or more of the following areas: concept of print, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, critical thinking, motivation, and writing (based on student's needs).</p> <p><b>Superficially</b> provides appropriate instruction for those who struggle with reading and writing.</p>	<p>Instructional approaches are <b>not supported</b> by literature and research for one or more of the following areas: concept of print, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, critical thinking, motivation, and writing or <b>not based</b> on student's needs.</p> <p>Provision of <b>inappropriate or lack of instruction</b> for those who struggle with reading and writing.</p>
<p><b>2.3</b> <i>Use a wide range of texts and traditional print and online resources.</i></p>	<p>As needed, <b>effectively</b> adapts instructional materials and approaches to meet the language-proficiency needs of English learners and/or students who struggle to learn to read and write.</p>	<p>As needed, adapts instructional materials and approaches to meet the language-proficiency needs of English learners and/or students who struggle to learn to read and write.</p>	<p>Adapts instructional materials and approaches to meet the language-proficiency needs of English learners and/or students who struggle to learn to read and write <b>somewhat</b>.</p>	<p>Does <b>not</b> adapt instructional materials and approaches to meet the language-proficiency needs of English learners and/or students who struggle to learn to read and write.</p>

### Lesson Plan Rubric 550 /551 – Clinical Practicum

<b>IRA STANDARD/CRITERIA</b>	<b>Exemplary (3)</b>	<b>Proficient (2)</b>	<b>Developing (1)</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (0)</b>
<b>3.3</b> <i>Use assessment information to plan and to evaluate instruction</i>	<b>Effectively</b> uses multiple data sources to analyze individual readers' performance and to plan instruction and intervention.	Uses multiple data sources to analyze individual readers' performance and to plan instruction and intervention.	<b>Limited</b> use of multiple data sources to analyze individual readers' performance and to plan instruction and intervention.	<b>Ineffectively or does not use</b> multiple data sources to analyze individual readers' performance and to plan instruction and intervention.
<b>3.3</b> <i>Use assessment information to collaborate with teachers to improve instruction</i>	<b>Effectively</b> analyzes and uses assessment data to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices and students' responses to instruction.	Analyzes and uses assessment data to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices and students' responses to instruction.	<b>Limited</b> use of analysis assessment data to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices and students' responses to instruction	<b>Ineffective or incorrect</b> use of analysis assessment data to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices and students' responses to instruction.
<b>1.3</b> <i>Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving students' reading development and achievement.</i>	<b>Effectively</b> models fair-mindedness, empathy and ethical behavior when teaching students.	Models fair-mindedness, empathy and ethical behavior when teaching students.	<b>Inconsistently</b> models one of the attributes –fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior when teaching students.	<b>Limited</b> demonstration of empathy despite fair-mindedness and ethical behavior when teaching students.
<b>5.2</b> <i>Design a social environment that is low-risk, includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write.</i>	<b>Effectively</b> creates supportive social environment that is characterized by choice and motivating lessons (incorporating students' interests) for those who struggle with reading and writing.	Creates supportive social environment with modicum of choice and motivating lessons (incorporating students' interests) for those who struggle with reading and writing.	Creates supportive social environment with little choice and some motivating lessons (incorporating students' interests) for those who struggle with reading and writing.	Fails to create a supportive social environment for those who struggle with reading and writing. Lessons do not contain choice or reflect incorporation of student' interests.
<b>5.3</b> <i>Create effective routines for all struggling readers and support teachers in doing</i>	<b>Effectively</b> establishes a consistent instructional routine that is explained to the student and improves	Establishes a consistent instructional routine that is explained to the student and improves his/her	Establishes a consistent instructional routine that is implicit in the lesson.	Fails to establish a consistent instructional routine that is explained to the student. This interferes with his/her

<i>the same for all readers.</i>	his/her receptiveness to the lesson.	receptiveness to the lesson		receptiveness to the lesson
<b>6.2</b> <i>Demonstrate effective interpersonal communication and leadership skills.</i>	<b>Effectively</b> provides accurate, detailed observation data of teacher/student interaction. Provides <b>effective evaluative</b> comments and suggestions for improvement if needed.	Provides accurate, detailed observation data of teacher/student interaction. Provides evaluative comments and suggestions for improvement if needed.	Provides adequate , observation data of teacher/student interaction. Provides adequate evaluative comments and suggestions for improvement if needed.	Provides limited observation data of teacher/student interaction. This interferes with the quality of evaluative comments and suggestions for improvement.

**Data Tables- Assessment #4 Lesson Observation  
B-6 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>9(35%)</b>	<b>17(65%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>8(31%)</b>	<b>18 (69%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>11(42%)</b>	<b>15(58%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>11(42%)</b>	<b>15(58%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>20(77%)</b>	<b>6(23%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>19(73%)</b>	<b>7(26%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>16(62%)</b>	<b>10(38%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>18(69%)</b>	<b>8(31%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>11(42%)</b>	<b>15(58%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Assessment # 4  
B-6 Fall, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>11(85%)</b>	<b>2(15%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>9(69%)</b>	<b>4(31%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>6(46%)</b>	<b>7(54%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>9(69%)</b>	<b>4(31%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>12(92%)</b>	<b>1(8%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>11(85%)</b>	<b>2(15%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>11(85%)</b>	<b>2(15%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>13(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>10(87%)</b>	<b>3(13%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**5-12 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>2.1</b>	3(100%)	0	0	0
<b>2.2</b>	3(100%)	0	0	0
<b>2.3</b>	3(100%)	0	0	0
<b>3.3</b>	3(100%)	0	0	0
<b>1.3</b>	3(100%)	0	0	0
<b>5.2</b>	3(100%)	0	0	0
<b>5.3</b>	3(100%)	0	0	0
<b>6.2</b>	3(100%)	0	0	0
<b>Overall</b>	3(100%)	0	0	0

**Fall, 2012 (No 5-12 candidates took this assessment in the fall)**

### IRA Assessment 5- Case Study (LRC 545)

- 1) **Description** This case study report synthesizes the work done in diagnosing and remediating a specific struggling reader and/or writer in the LRC 545 (Remediation of Literacy) course that candidates usually take in their second semester after they have spent a full semester focusing on diagnosis (LRC 540). It clearly assesses candidates' effect on student learning. Candidates must demonstrate that not only have they identified the student's most serious literacy needs but they have designed and implemented five successful remedial lessons to address these needs. They also write a letter explaining the student's progress to parents and another educational professional and recommend what further services should look like.
- 2) **Alignment:** This assessment focuses on Standards 2 and 3. Candidates must administer a battery of assessments (3.1, 3.2) to determine the literacy needs of a struggling reader/writer and develop a short term course of remediation to address the most serious of these needs (3.3). Candidates are evaluated on their ability to develop a needs driven 'curriculum' (2.1) for the student; the effectiveness of their instruction (2.2) and their choice of texts (2.3) in achieving their objectives. They are also evaluated on their ability to communicate the student's progress with recommendations for further instruction (3.4) to parents and concerned educational personnel.
- 3) **Analysis of Data Findings:** Candidates did very well on this assessment. In the summer, 60% of B-6 candidates earned overall exemplary ratings and in the fall, that number had jumped to 71%. Our one 5-12 candidate performed at an exemplary level in the fall. Although scores were relatively high on all standards, Standards 3.3 and 3.4 received the highest percentages of distinguished rather than exemplary scores. In the summer, 45% of B-6 candidates scored 'distinguished' on Standard 3.3. Forty four per cent scored 'distinguished' rather than exemplary in the fall. Fifty per cent of candidates scored 'distinguished' on Standard 3.4 in the summer and 46% scored 'distinguished' in the fall. In the summer, 50% of candidates scored 'distinguished' on Standard 2.1. In the fall, this number was reduced to 34%.
- 4) **Interpretation of Data:** These case studies reflect on-going feedback from the professor. Initial assessments are evaluated and the instructional plan is reviewed. Every lesson receives specific feedback on both the lesson design and the teaching practices observed. It is not surprising that virtually all scores were within the exemplary/distinguished range. The lower scores on Standards 3.3 and 3.4 reflect some issues in responding to ongoing assessments to modify subsequent lessons and writing letters that adequately explain the diagnosis and suggestions for future instruction in terms that parents can also understand. Both these issues will be addressed in future sections of this course.

## Assessment 5- Case Study Documentation

### Remediation-Final Report

**Please include the following in your final report of the progress made by your student. This final report describes the progress your student has made to the objectives established over the course of five remedial lessons. The final report will be evaluated with the attached rubric.**

#### Demographics

Date:

Client's Name:

Date of Birth:

*Do not use the client's full name. Use*

Grade:

*initials or first name only.*

School:

Examiner's/Tutor's Name:

Ability Levels:

Student Needs:

Setting:

Learning Behaviors:

## **Diagnostic Summary**

### **Initial Assessment Results:**

Include assessment data from the initial report including all of the assessments you administered. Concisely discuss the student's performance in word identification, word analysis, reading comprehension, monitoring, spelling, writing and early literary competencies (if appropriate).

### **Summary of Assessment:**

Provide a systematic and thorough analysis of your student's strengths and needs in each area discussed above.

## **Short Term Remediation Program**

### **Remediation Schedule:**

Number of sessions:	<i>Use either a paragraph format and</i>
Length of sessions:	<i>include all this information or use</i>
Frequency of sessions:	<i>the subheading indicated and write</i>
Time of day of sessions:	<i>a numeral of a sentence fragment.</i>

### **Remedial Objectives:**

*List here all the objectives on which you worked during remediation. If you altered an objective in some way (e.g., level of material to be used, degree of accuracy required, etc.), it became a new objective although simply a variation of an earlier one. Group together any variations*

*of an objective and indicate the reason for the alteration. Tell the number of lessons devoted to each of the objectives. **Paragraph format is not required here but objectives should be clearly written so that a classroom teacher/paraprofessionals could use them for instruction.** Below is an example.*

Objective 1a.

Given 6 unknown words presented in isolation and containing single vowels in closed syllables, the student will decode the vowels correctly with 100% accuracy.

Objective 1b.

Given 6 unknown words with single vowels in closed syllables presented in sentences, the student will make no more than one error decoding any one vowel. (Altered presentation mode because it was too restrictive to test words only in isolation and altered accuracy criterion because 100% seemed too restrictive and unrealistic.)

#### **Description of Remedial Treatment:**

*Describe succinctly what you did in the course of your lessons. Did you select a variety of appropriate instructional approaches that were supported by literature and research to meet your student's specific needs in reading and writing?*

*Most likely there was a pattern to what you did each week (e.g., you reviewed what you did in the previous session, introduced new content, provided practice and tested to determine whether the objective had been met). Discuss both your methods and materials that support your instructional goals and objectives.*

*It may be helpful to organize the particular objectives mentioned in the previous section. Variations of a given objective may be treated as a unit. Explain any major changes made in your method or material as you progressed in your lessons. Below is an example. **Keep in mind that the purpose of this description is to provide the classroom teacher or paraprofessional working with the child with information about exactly how you constructed your lessons.** This will enable the next teacher/paraprofessional to make informed decisions about how he/she wishes to proceed with the client.*

The lessons devoted to symbol-sound associations for consonant blends (Objective #1 above) usually were carried out in the following manner:

1. (Review) The symbol-sound associations taught to that point were reviewed by means of flash drill, oral reading or teacher-constructed sentences or stories, or playing games such as Go Fish, concentration, or teacher-constructed board games in which the student was required to read aloud words with consonant blends.

2. (New Teaching) A new symbol-sound association was taught by means of modeling (i.e., the instructor showed the blend, gave the associated sound, and then required the student to imitate what has just been modeled and apply that symbol-sound association by reading aloud several words which contained that blend).

3. (Practice) The student engaged in practice activities such as the following:

- a. flash drill
- b. game playing
- c. list reading
- d. oral reading or teacher-constructed sentences or stories
- e. completing cloze exercises (free-response and multiple choice)
- f. oral reading of published texts such as \_\_\_\_\_

4. (Assessment) A test was given on all symbol-sound associations the student had not yet mastered, that is, had not yet applied at the level mandated in the objective in three consecutive lessons).

### **Assessing Ongoing Progress and Effectiveness**

*In paragraph format, tell **any professionals and/or paraprofessionals working with the child** where the child stands with respect to the objectives you addressed. What assessment tools did you use to evaluate your student's response to instruction and adjust your instruction accordingly?*

*Has he/she mastered everything you intended to cover in the various objective sessions? Be specific. For example, list words learned, symbol-sound associations learned, comprehension skills and strategies learned, etc. Are there still elements to be learned? What? Be specific. Are there elements he/she seems to be learning although not yet mastered? Which? Be specific.*

### **Updated Diagnosis**

***Report to professionals or paraprofessionals working with the child** any changes you would like to make in what you stated in your Initial Report. Perhaps you identified something as a weakness then, but you no longer feel the same way. State that. Perhaps during remediation you noticed some weakness or strength you had failed to observe earlier. State that. If there are no changes in your thinking, state that.*

### **Evaluation/Reflection**

*Your reflection should demonstrate that you have analyzed all aspect of the remedial program to ensure that instructional goals and objectives were met. Your lessons and objectives should demonstrate explicit and thorough connections to research and literature on best practices in reading and writing.*

### **Recommendations**

*Tell what techniques worked particularly well or particularly poorly. Tell what materials worked particularly well or particularly poorly. **Recommend to professionals and/or paraprofessionals working with this child any practices, approaches and methods to best meet student needs. These recommendations should be explicitly connected to your assessment data. They should be specific and clear to a variety of audiences.***

### LRC 545 Assessment #5 Case Study

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
	<b>Demographics</b> Provided thorough and complete information on grade level, ability levels, student needs, setting, and learning behaviors.	<b>Demographics</b> Provided complete information on grade/ability levels, student needs, setting, and learning behaviors.	<b>Demographics</b> Provided a description of most of the elements: ability/grade levels, setting, student needs, learning behaviors.	<b>Demographics</b> Relevant information on student demographics was missing from the description.
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Initial Assessment</b> Selected and administered a comprehensive battery of assessments of student performance in word identification, word analysis, reading comprehension, monitoring, spelling, writing, and early literacy competencies (if appropriate), using a variety of technically adequate and appropriate assessment tools.	<b>Initial Assessment</b> Selected and administered a comprehensive battery of assessments of student performance in word identification, word analysis, reading comprehension, monitoring, spelling, writing, and early literacy competencies (if appropriate), using technically adequate and appropriate assessment tools.	<b>Initial Assessment</b> Selected and administered an assessment of student performance in reading and writing missing one of the following areas: word identification, word analysis, reading comprehension, monitoring, spelling, writing, or early literacy competencies (if appropriate). Used appropriate but limited assessment tools.	<b>Initial Assessment</b> Selected and administered an assessment of student performance in reading and writing missing several of the following areas: word identification, word analysis, reading comprehension, monitoring, spelling, writing, or early literacy competencies (if appropriate). Used assessment tools that were inappropriate in terms of purpose for assessing or student's age.
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Analysis of Student's Strengths and Needs</b> Provided a systematic and thorough analysis of a student's strengths and needs in literacy in each area assessed.	<b>Analysis of Student's Strengths and Needs</b> Provided a competent analysis of a student's strengths and needs in literacy in each area assessed.	<b>Analysis of Student's Strengths and Needs</b> Provided an adequate analysis of a student's strengths and needs in literacy missing one area assessed.	<b>Analysis of Student's Strengths and Needs</b> Provided a less than adequate analysis of a student's strengths and needs in literacy missing several areas assessed.

<p>2.2</p>	<p><b>Short-term Remedial Program</b>  <i>a. Using appropriate instructional approaches</i></p> <p>Designed and implemented short-term remedial program that demonstrated candidate's competence in selecting a variety of appropriate instructional approaches, supported by literature and research, to meet student's specific needs in reading and writing.</p>	<p><b>Short-term Remedial Program</b>  <i>a. Using appropriate instructional approaches</i></p> <p>Designed and implemented short-term remedial program that demonstrated candidate's competence in selecting appropriate instructional approaches, supported by literature and research, to meet student's specific needs in reading and writing.</p>	<p><b>Short-term Remedial Program</b>  <i>a. Using appropriate instructional approaches</i></p> <p>Designed and implemented short-term remedial program that demonstrated candidate's adequate ability to select appropriate instructional practices to meet student's specific needs in reading and writing.</p>	<p><b>Short-term Remedial Program</b>  <i>a. Using appropriate instructional approaches</i></p> <p>Designed and implemented short-term remedial program that was less than adequate in meeting student's specific needs in reading and writing.</p>
------------	---	--	---	---

<p><b>2.3</b></p>	<p><b><i>b. Using quality materials</i></b>          Designed and implemented short-term remedial program where student's interests, prior knowledge and current ability level were taken into consideration through the use of a variety of engaging quality materials (i.e., traditional print, digital, and online resources) that support instructional goals and objectives.</p>	<p><b><i>b. Using quality materials</i></b>          Designed and implemented short-term remedial program where student's interests, prior knowledge and current ability level were taken into consideration through the use of engaging quality instructional materials that support instructional goals and objectives.</p>	<p><b><i>b. Using quality materials</i></b>          Designed and implemented short-term remedial program where some problems with selected material in terms of engagement, interests or prior knowledge were evident. However, selected materials matched student's current ability level and supported instructional goals and objectives.</p>	<p><b><i>b. Using quality materials</i></b>          Designed and implemented short-term remedial program where selected materials were inappropriate in terms of ability level or relevance to instructional goals and objectives.</p>
-------------------	---	---	---	---

<p>3.3</p>	<p><i>c. Assessing ongoing progress and effectiveness</i></p> <p>Where candidate demonstrated competence in systematically using a variety of appropriate assessment tools to evaluate student's response to instruction and to adjust instruction accordingly</p>	<p><i>c. Assessing ongoing progress and effectiveness</i></p> <p>Where candidate demonstrated competence in using appropriate assessment tools to evaluate student's response to instruction and to adjust instruction accordingly</p>	<p><i>c. Assessing ongoing progress and effectiveness</i></p> <p>Where candidate did not systematically use appropriate assessment tools to evaluate student's response to instruction or did not consistently adjust instruction in response to assessment data</p>	<p><i>c. Assessing ongoing progress and effectiveness</i></p> <p>Where candidate used assessment tools that were inappropriate to evaluate student's response to instruction or failed to adjust instruction in response to assessment data.</p>
<p>2.1</p>	<p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p>Reflection demonstrated a substantive effort at analyzing all aspects of the remedial program to ensure that instructional goals and objectives were met.</p> <p>Candidate provided explicit and thorough connections to research and literature on best practices in reading and writing.</p>	<p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p>Reflection included a clear analysis of all aspects of the remedial program to ensure that instructional goals and objectives were met.</p> <p>Candidate provided explicit connections to research and literature on best practices in reading and writing.</p>	<p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p>Reflection attended to only certain aspects of the remedial program.</p> <p>Candidate connections to research and literature on best practices in reading and writing were limited.</p>	<p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p>Reflection was vague and did little to evaluate the effectiveness of intervention.</p> <p>Candidate failed to provide relevant connections to research and literature on best practices in reading and writing.</p>

<p>3.3</p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b>  <b>a. Planning future instruction</b>  Recommendations for continued work with the student are explicitly connected to a variety of assessment data presented in the case study.</p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b>  <b>a. Planning future instruction</b>  Recommendations for continued work with the student are explicitly connected to the assessment data presented in the case study.</p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b>  <b>a. Planning future instruction</b>  Recommendations for continued work with the student are only partially connected to the assessment data presented in the case study.</p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b>  <b>a. Planning future instruction</b>  Recommendations for continued work with the student are not based on the assessment data presented in the case study.</p>
<p>3.4</p>	<p><b>b. Communicating implications to a variety of audiences</b>  Recommendations are thorough, specific and clear to a variety of appropriate audiences (e.g., caregivers, teachers) for relevant implications and instructional purposes.</p>	<p><b>b. Communicating implications to a variety of audiences</b>  Recommendations are specific and clear to a variety of appropriate audiences for relevant implications and instructional purposes.</p>	<p><b>c. Communicating implications to a variety of audiences</b>  Recommendations have occasional problems with focus and clarity but are still usable for a variety of appropriate audiences for relevant implications and instructional purposes.</p>	<p><b>d. Communicating implications to a variety of audiences</b>  Recommendations are not specific enough and/or so poorly written that they are unusable.</p>

**Data Findings- Assessment 5, Case Study**

**B-6 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>6(60%)</b>	<b>4(40%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>7(70%)</b>	<b>3(30%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>6(60%)</b>	<b>4(40%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>6(60%)</b>	<b>4(40%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>11(55%)</b>	<b>9(45%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>5(50%)</b>	<b>5(50%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>5(50%)</b>	<b>5(50%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>6(60%)</b>	<b>4(40%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**B-6 Fall, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>21(88%)</b>	<b>3(12%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>19(79%)</b>	<b>5(21%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>17(71%)</b>	<b>7(29%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>17(71%)</b>	<b>7(29%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>27(out of 48) 56%</b>	<b>21(out of 48) (44%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>16(66%)</b>	<b>8(34%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>13(54%)</b>	<b>11(42%)</b>	<b>1(4%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>17(71%)</b>	<b>7(21%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**5 – 12 Summer, 2012**

**(No 5-12 students in this class for this semester)**

**5 – 12 Fall, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## IRA Assessment # 6 Diversity Project in Literacy

- 1) **Description:** The final course in the program is a research seminar where candidates not only produce a literature review that summarizes research in an area that deals with diverse learners, they also apply their research findings to a number of projects designed to support the learning of refugee children in an after school education program. This assessment measures their competence in completing these projects. Projects include providing training videos on particular aspects of teaching second language learners; engaging in grant writing to support programs at the center; developing additional projects to further the center's mission to improve parent involvement in students' education; evaluating the materials and their accessibility at the center; and making recommendations for redesigning space at the center.
- 2) **Alignment:** The emphasis of this assessment is on Diversity (Standard 4) and Professional Learning and Leadership (6). Meeting these two standards are areas where our program is most in need of improvement. Candidates meet standards 4.1 and 6.1 by developing training videos focused on particular aspects of improving the literacy of second language learners at an after-school refugee program. They meet standards 2.3 and 5.1 by analyzing the materials collection (2.3) and suggesting improved accessibility and redesign of reading areas (5.1). They participate in a grant writing project (6.4) and implement projects funded by previous grants. This hands-on experience with refugee children and their families allows us to evaluate their progress in addressing standards 4.2, 4.3 and 6.2.
- 3) **Analysis of Data Findings:** During the summer administration of this assessment, 28% of B-6 candidates received 'developing' ratings on Standard 6.4; 25% on Standard 4.2 and 22% on Standard 6.2. Our one 5-12 candidate received exemplary ratings on all standards. In the fall, scores on all standards measured by this assessment had improved for B-6 candidates. One hundred percent of candidates scored at either the 'exemplary' or 'distinguished level on all standards. The one standard that seemed to lag in improvement is Standard 4.2. Seventy percent or more scores were at the exemplary level for all standards but this one. For Standard 4.2, 47% were exemplary and 53% were distinguished.
- 4) **Interpretation of Data:** The projects developed for this course are evolving and must be coordinated with the needs of the refugee center that we serve. During the summer, candidates collaborated on securing a grant to support a Reading Incentive Program. During the fall, candidates were involved in monitoring and evaluating the grant's success. Grant writing will resume in the spring and summer so that funded projects can be implemented next fall. During the summer, candidates were exploring grant opportunities but had limited opportunities to interact with students and families at the center. During the fall, there were

more opportunities for them to address Standards 4.2 and 6.2 since they were implementing the grant program rather than planning it. Since Standard 4.2 measures candidates' ability to affect individual student learning through leadership projects, this is an area that merits serious monitoring if we are going to expand the way we evaluate the results of candidates' literacy coaching experiences.

### **Assessment # 6 Diversity Project in Literacy**

This is a culminating project completed in LRC 590 in which students provide training to teachers and tutors in a program designed to support the literacy development of diverse learners in an after school education center for refugee students. They also contribute to a collaborative school effort to evaluate, select and make accessible a variety of instructional materials at the center to meet the specific needs and abilities of these students. They collaborate on a project designed to build strong home to school and school to home connections that is also designed to celebrate the contributions of diverse people. The documents students must submit for this rubric are the observation rubric of their training presentation with reflection, and descriptions with support of their contributions to the instructional materials project, grant writing project and home-to-school project.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>4.1</b>	Training presentation demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the research literature on accommodating diverse learners.	Training presentation demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the research literature on accommodating diverse learners.	Training presentation demonstrated some knowledge of the research literature on accommodating diverse learners.	Training presentation lacked sufficient knowledge of the research literature on accommodating diverse learners.

<b>6.1</b>	<p>Presentation was specific to the topic requested by the school and information was comprehensive.</p> <p>Delivery reflected a comprehensive understanding of how to engage and teach adult learners.</p> <p>Materials distributed enhanced the effectiveness of the presentation</p>	<p>Presentation was mostly specific to the topic requested by the school and information was substantial.</p> <p>Delivery reflected an understanding of how to engage and teach adult learners.</p> <p>Materials distributed contributed to the effectiveness of the presentation</p>	<p>Presentation was partially specific to the topic requested by the school and information was adequate.</p> <p>Delivery reflected a partial understanding of how to engage and teach adult learners.</p> <p>Materials distributed did not interfere with the effectiveness of the presentation</p>	<p>Presentation lacked focus and did not adequately engage the audience.</p> <p>Materials did not add to the effectiveness of the presentation.</p>
<b>2.3</b>	<p>Candidate took a leading role in the effort to evaluate, select and make accessible a variety of instructional materials.</p> <p>He/she demonstrated how his/her contribution was essential to the success of the project.</p>	<p>Candidate took an important role in the effort to evaluate, select and make accessible a variety of instructional materials.</p> <p>He/she demonstrated how his/her contribution was useful to the success of the project.</p>	<p>Candidate took a subsidiary role in the effort to evaluate, select and make accessible a variety of instructional materials.</p> <p>He/she demonstrated how his/her contribution was somewhat useful to the success of the project and contributed to</p>	<p>Candidate took a minimal role in the effort to evaluate, select and make accessible a variety of instructional materials.</p> <p>Documentation of his/her contribution was insufficient.</p>
<b>5.1</b>	<p>Plan for making materials more accessible to students was written with detail and reflection.</p>	<p>Plan for making materials more accessible to students was written with some detail and reflection.</p>	<p>Plan for making materials more accessible to students was adequate.</p>	<p>Plan for making materials more accessible to students was insufficient.</p>

<b>6.4</b>	Candidate's contribution to grant proposal was integral to the success of the project.	Candidate's contribution to grant proposal was important to the success of the project.	Candidate's contribution to grant proposal was somewhat useful to the success of the project.	Candidate's role in contributing to the grant writing project was less than satisfactory.
<b>4.2</b>	Candidate's participation in the home-to-school project greatly contributed to its successful outcome	Candidate's participation in the home-to-school project contributed to its successful outcome.	Candidate's participation in the home to school project partially contributed to its successful outcome.	Candidate's participation in the home to school project was extremely limited.
<b>4.3</b>	Candidate's work on behalf of refugee children reflected a deep and abiding commitment to social justice issues	Candidate's work on behalf of refugee children reflected a substantial commitment to social justice issues	Candidate's work on behalf of refugee children reflected a moderate commitment to social justice issues	Candidate's work on behalf of refugee children reflected a limited commitment to social justice issues.
<b>6.2</b>	Candidate could document exceptional interpersonal, communication and leadership skills that contributed to guiding students and families in their participation.	Candidate could document proficient interpersonal, communication and leadership skills that contributed to guiding students and families in their participation.	Candidate's documentation of his/her guidance or students and families was limited by gaps in interpersonal, communication and leadership skills.	Documentation for work with students and families was insufficient. Concerns about interpersonal, communication and leadership skills were observed.

**Data Findings- Assessment 6, Diversity Project in Literacy**

**B – 6 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>17(61%)</b>	<b>9(32%)</b>	<b>2(7%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>17(61%)</b>	<b>9(32%)</b>	<b>2(7%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>20(71%)</b>	<b>6(22%)</b>	<b>2(7%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>19(68%)</b>	<b>6(22%)</b>	<b>3(10%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.4</b>	<b>14(50%)</b>	<b>6(22%)</b>	<b>8(28%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>16(57%)</b>	<b>5(18%)</b>	<b>7(25%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>16(57%)</b>	<b>9(32%)</b>	<b>3(11%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>13(46%)</b>	<b>9(32%)</b>	<b>6(22%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>17(61%)</b>	<b>9(32%)</b>	<b>2(7%)</b>	<b>0</b>

**B- 6 Fall, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>13(76%)</b>	<b>4(24%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>15(88%)</b>	<b>2(12%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>13(76%)</b>	<b>4(24%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>13(76%)</b>	<b>4(24%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.4</b>	<b>14(82%)</b>	<b>3(18%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>8(47%)</b>	<b>9(53%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>13(76%)</b>	<b>4(24%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>12(71%)</b>	<b>5(29%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>13(76%)</b>	<b>4(24%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**5 – 12 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>1(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>1(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>1(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>1(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.4</b>	<b>1(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>1(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>1(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**No 5-12 Candidates took this assessment in Fall, 2012**

## **IRA Assessment #7 Needs Assessment and Professional Development Plan (LRC 567)**

- 1) Description** Students complete this assignment in LRC 567 Introduction to Literacy Coaching which is usually taken in the first or second semester of the program. Students are guided in understanding and analyzing school wide assessment data and propose a specific professional development plan to deal with the revealed areas of weakness in student achievement. The plan is presented and reviewed by school personnel who make decisions about possible implementation.
- 2) Alignment** This assessment is designed to prepare our candidates to meet Standards 3 (Assessment and Evaluation) and 6 (Professional Learning and Leadership). Candidates analyze multiple years of school wide assessment data (3.1, 3.2); use the assessments to identify areas of need and plan professional development to address these needs (3.3). They then present these professional development plans to interested district personnel (3.4). Data analysis must reflect knowledge of local, state and national policy (6.4). District presentations are evaluated in terms of effectiveness of presentation in connecting with the professional audience (6.1, 6.2, 6.3)
- 3) Analysis of Data Findings** Candidates seem to do very well on this assessment. In the summer, one hundred percent of candidates were evaluated as overall 'exemplary.' In the fall, when there were twice as many candidates in two sections of the course, 78% scored overall 'exemplary' and 22% scored 'distinguished.' Candidates seem to have particular problems with standards 3.2 and 3.4. In the summer, 2 students or 18% scored at a 'distinguished' level on 3.2 and one student or 9% scored at a distinguished level on Standard 3.4. In the fall, 43% scored at a 'distinguished' level on 3.2 and 70% scored at a 'distinguished' level on 3.4. We have no data results for 5-12 candidates on this assessment.
- 4) Interpretation of Data** It is important to note that in both administrations of this assessment, 100% of candidates scored at either the 'exemplary' or 'distinguished' level. This assessment is well established and instruction supporting it has been improved continuously through the years. Faculty has concluded that class instruction should be re-examined and increased in analyzing school wide data (3.2). Faculty will also give candidates more instruction and more opportunities to practice their presentations on each other before addressing the designated school personnel (3.4).

### **Assessment #7 Developing a Needs Assessment and Professional Development Plan**

The purpose of the Needs Assessment assignment is to analyze trends and to determine needs for an English Language Arts program for a specific school. It is a process of evaluation which involves collecting and examining multiple years of school-wide assessment data to determine the current status of student achievement and to recommend areas for professional development, which will address areas of instruction that impact student achievement. The assignment will be completed as professional learning communities, which will be assigned by the instructor.

The purpose of the Professional Development Plan is to demonstrate understanding of an aspect of literacy leadership. Following the analysis of school assessment data and the development of recommendations for instructional improvement, the professional development plan describes and plans the implementation and evaluation of initiatives for student achievement.

The Professional Development Plan has two parts, a written report and practical application.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>Demonstrates a deep understanding of large- scale assessment designs, state and district frameworks, proficiency standards, and benchmarks</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>Demonstrates a substantial understanding of large-scale assessment designs, state and district frameworks, proficiency standards, and benchmarks</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the large-scale assessment designs, state and district frameworks, proficiency standards, and benchmarks</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>Demonstrates a limited understanding of the large-scale assessment designs, state and district frameworks, proficiency standards, and benchmarks</p>
<b>6.4</b>	Provides comprehensive information about national, state and	Provides substantial information about national, state and district policies that	Provides adequate information about national, state and district policies that	Provides inadequate information about national, state and district policies that

	district policies that affect the assessment process	affect the assessment process	affect the assessment process	affect the assessment process
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Data Analysis:</b> Analyzes data provided by school district systematically and thoroughly and provides guidance to teachers and administrators on using the data to make instructional decisions.	<b>Data Analysis:</b> Analyzes data provided by school district competently and provides guidance to teachers and administrators on using the data to make instructional decisions.	<b>Data Analysis:</b> Analyzes data provided by school district adequately and provides some guidance to teachers and administrators on using the data to make instructional decisions.	<b>Data Analysis:</b> Data analysis is not thorough and systematic enough to guide teachers and administrators to make instructional decisions
<b>3.3</b>	Suggests several comprehensive alternative assessments that will contribute to a systemic framework for assessing reading, writing, and language growth of all students	Suggests several alternative assessments that will contribute to a systemic framework for assessing reading, writing, and language growth of all students	Suggests one or two alternative assessments that will contribute to a systemic framework for assessing reading, writing, and language growth of all students	. Less than adequate suggestions for alternative assessments that will provide a systemic framework for assessing reading, writing, and language growth for all students.
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Recommendations:</b> Effectively plans and evaluates instructional initiatives using the assessment data.	<b>Recommendations:</b> Capably plans and evaluates instructional initiatives using the assessment data..	<b>Recommendations:</b> Adequately plans and evaluates instructional initiatives using the assessment data.	<b>Recommendations:</b> Instructional initiatives are inadequately connected to the assessment data..
<b>3.4</b>	Successfully	Adeptly	Satisfactorily	Communication with

	communicates results to a variety of appropriate audiences for relevant implications, instructional purposes and accountability.	communicates results to a variety of appropriate audiences for relevant implications, instructional purposes and accountability	communicates results to a variety of appropriate audiences for relevant implications, instructional purposes and accountability.	appropriate audiences is less than successful
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Professional Development Plan</b> Demonstrates a thorough understanding in formulating the professional development plan of the research about adult learning, organizational change, professional development and school culture.	<b>Professional Development Plan</b> Demonstrates a substantial understanding in formulating the professional development plan of the research about adult learning, organizational change, professional development and school culture.	<b>Professional Development Plan</b> Demonstrates some understanding in formulating the professional development plan of the research about adult learning, organizational change, professional development and school culture.	<b>Professional Development Plan</b> Professional Development Plan lacks adequate understanding of the research about adult learning, organizational change, professional development and school culture.
<b>6.3</b>	Demonstrates exceptional ability in working with individuals and groups in professional development activities.	Demonstrates considerable ability in working with individuals and groups in professional development activities.	Demonstrates adequate ability in working with individuals and groups in professional development activities	Limited ability in working with individuals and groups in professional development activities.
<b>6.3</b>	<b>Follow-Up</b> Effectively provides	<b>Follow-Up</b> Capably provides	<b>Follow-Up</b> Adequately provides	<b>Follow-Up</b> Follow up plan is

	structures for teachers to engage in self evaluation and follow-up support. Successfully provides teachers with a framework for holding effective conversations for planning and reflective problem solving.	structures for teachers to engage in self evaluation and follow-up support. Effectively provides teachers with a framework for holding effective conversations for planning and reflective problem solving.	structures for teachers to engage in self evaluation and follow-up support. Adequately provides teachers with a framework for holding effective conversations for planning and reflective problem solving.	limited. Inadequate opportunities for teachers to engage in self evaluation and to receive follow up support. Framework for teachers to hold effective conversations for planning and reflective problem solving is limited.
<b>3.4</b>	Presentation to school personnel was enthusiastically received	Presentation to school personnel was respectfully received	Presentation to school personnel was adequately received	Presentation to school personnel was poorly received

**Assessment #7 Needs Assessment and Professional Development Plan**

**Data Findings**

**B- 6 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>11(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.4</b>	<b>11(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>9(82%)</b>	<b>2(18%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>11(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>10(91%)</b>	<b>1(9%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>11(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>11(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>11(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**B – 6 Fall, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>19(83%)</b>	<b>4(17%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.4</b>	<b>15(65%)</b>	<b>8(35%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>13(57%)</b>	<b>10(43%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>14(61%)</b>	<b>9(39%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>7(30%)</b>	<b>16(70%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>22(96%)</b>	<b>1(4%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>6.3</b>	<b>15(65%)</b>	<b>8(35%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>18(78%)</b>	<b>5(22%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**No 5-12 candidates took this assessment in either summer or fall, 2012.**

## IRA Assessment # 8 – Professional Leadership Project (LRC 525)

- 1) **Description:** One of our partner schools submits writing samples from specific grade levels using NYSELA exams each semester and candidates in LRC 525 (Theories and Teaching of Writing) work in groups to evaluate them. Using holistic and analytic rubrics, candidates analyze and detect patterns of weakness in the writing samples. In groups, they prepare summaries of the data collected and sample lesson plans for dealing with the weakness. These are presented to teachers in a workshop at the end of the semester.
- 2) **Alignment:** This assessment is designed to align with a range of standards since candidates are both assessing and evaluating (Standard 3), developing curriculum (Standard 2), focusing on diversity (Standard 4), and providing professional development (Standard 6). Candidates determine writing needs of students based on grade-wide student writing samples submitted by teachers at a partnering school district. (3.3). Candidates develop model lesson plans to effectively address the weaknesses in student performance based on the assessments submitted. (2.2, 2.3). They contribute to a final report and professional development session at the partnering school to discuss lesson plans and how to individualize instruction for diverse students (6.3, 4.1).
- 3) **Analysis of Data Findings:** Although 100% of the B-6 candidates performed overall at a distinguished level on the summer administration of this assessment, there were some areas that needed improvement. Forty percent of B-6 candidates scored at a ‘developing’ level in terms of using a wide range of texts in their proposed lesson plans for teachers (Standard 2.3). Thirty percent were ‘developing’ in terms of their choice of instructional strategies for these lesson plans and 30% were ‘developing’ in their ability to structure lessons to meet students’ specific needs. By fall, ‘developing’ scores had been substantially reduced. Only 16% of B-6 candidates were at the ‘developing’ level for one standard, 2.3 (using a wide range of texts). All other standards were met at either the exemplary or distinguished level by B-6 candidates in the fall. Two of our 5-12 candidates (66.5%) scored at an overall exemplary level in the fall while one (33.5%) scored at a distinguished level.
- 4) **Interpretation of Data:** Scores on this assessment reflect the growing partnership we are developing with the participating school. In the fall, district teachers had developed a lesson plan template for this project that better reflected their needs and the district’s priorities. This helped candidates identify the instructional strategies, texts and individualization strategies that would be most useful to teachers.

**Assessment # 8 – Document**

**LRC 525 Professional Leadership Project:**

During the course, candidates will have an important opportunity to collaborate with a local school district to perform a detailed analysis of student writing across grade levels. The teachers in the school district administer writing tasks from previous NYS ELA exams to their students and collect these data for candidates’ review. In small groups candidates will evaluate each student’s writing response using analytical and holistic assessment instruments to identify students’ writing strengths and areas in need of improvement. Candidates will develop sample lesson plans to address weaknesses identified in students’ writing pieces. As a result, candidates will generate a final written report for school personnel that will contain a summary of data collected and sample lesson plans. Selected candidates will present the data and the lesson plans to teachers during a professional development workshop. The information will be also shared with teachers as an online resource.

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>Sample Lesson Plans</b>				
<b>3.3</b>	<p><b>Rationale for a sample lesson</b> Writing needs of students are clearly and convincingly tied to the assessment data; there are clear writing development goals based on the writing needs of the students that are rooted in a specific</p>	<p><b>Rationale</b> Writing needs of students are clearly convincingly tied to the assessment data; writing development goals are rooted in a specific writing genre.</p>	<p><b>Rationale</b> Writing needs of students are connected to the assessment data; some vagueness can be present in the description of writing development goals. Goals may be not rooted in a specific writing genre.</p>	<p><b>Rationale</b> Writing needs of students are either vaguely described or not connected to the assessment data.</p>

	writing genre.			
2.2	<p><b>Strategies and Activities</b> The strategies are varied, engaging and consistent with the learning needs identified in the rationale, the target writing genre and stage of the writing process. All of the strategies form a comprehensive and logical delivery of lesson content.</p> <p>Grouping practices that will meet the needs of struggling writers are thoroughly explained.</p>	<p><b>Strategies and Activities</b> The strategies are consistent with the learning needs identified in the rationale, the target writing genre and stage of the writing process. All of the strategies form a logical delivery of lesson content.</p> <p>Grouping practices that will meet the needs of struggling writers are explained.</p>	<p><b>Strategies and Activities</b> The strategies are consistent with some of the learning needs identified in the rationale and/or the target genre and stage of the writing process but do not address all of the needs. The logic of content delivery may be flawed.</p> <p>Grouping practices that will meet the needs of struggling writers are mentioned.</p>	<p><b>Strategies and Activities</b> The choice of strategies is problematic: strategies do not connect to learning needs identified in the rationale, may not address the specified target writing genre and stage of the writing process.</p> <p>No mention of grouping practices designed to meet the needs of struggling writers.</p>
2.3	<p><b>Materials</b> A variety of necessary materials (i.e., traditional print, digital and online resources), including sources for reading writing connection, are listed and appropriately chosen for the specified age and writing needs.</p>	<p><b>Materials</b> All necessary materials, including sources for reading writing connection, are listed and appropriately chosen for the specified age and writing needs.</p>	<p><b>Materials</b> Some of the necessary materials are listed and appropriate for age and specified writing needs, however they are not sufficient for a successful delivery of the lesson.</p>	<p><b>Materials</b> The materials listed are not age appropriate and/or do not correspond to the specified writing needs.</p>

3.2	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>The assessment strategies are customized to meet the specific goals of the writing project and are age appropriate.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>The assessment strategies adequately address the learning goals in the rationale and are age appropriate.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>The assessment strategies may not adequately address the learning goals in the rationale or may not be age appropriate.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>The assessment strategies do not adequately address the learning goals in the rationale and are not age appropriate.</p>
4.1	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Relevance to Target Audience: Assisting Teachers</b></p> <p>The information presented in the lesson will assist teachers in developing writing instruction that is responsive to the writing needs of all students, including students who struggle with reading and writing.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Relevance to Target Audience: Assisting Teachers</b></p> <p>The information presented in the lesson will inform classroom teachers' practices and/or thinking.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Relevance to Target Audience: Assisting Teachers</b></p> <p>The information may be regarded by teachers as interesting but have little impact on their teaching: Teachers will not be able to readily apply presented information in classroom practices.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Relevance to Target Audience: Assisting Teachers</b></p> <p>Teachers will fail to see the relevance of a sample lesson to their teaching.</p>
6.3	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Relevance to Target Audience: Student Understanding</b></p> <p>Candidate's contribution to the final report to school personnel reflects a profound understanding of the school's literacy program and an</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Relevance to Target Audience: Student Understanding</b></p> <p>Candidate's contribution to the final report to school personnel reflects a substantial understanding of the school's literacy program and a</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Relevance to Target Audience: Student Understanding</b></p> <p>Candidate's contribution to the final report to school personnel reflects some understanding of the school's literacy program and a developing ability to</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Relevance to Target Audience: Student Understanding</b></p> <p>Candidate's contribution to the final report to school personnel lacks understanding of the school's literacy program. Candidate is limited in his/her</p>

	excellent ability to provide effective professional development.	proficient ability to provide effective professional development	provide effective professional development	ability to provide effective professional development.
--	--	--	--	--

**Assessment # 8 – Professional Leadership Project**

**Data Findings**

**B – 6 Summer, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>3(30%)</b>	<b>7(70%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>3(30%)</b>	<b>4(40%)</b>	<b>3(30%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>3(30%)</b>	<b>3(30%)</b>	<b>4(40%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>3(30%)</b>	<b>4(40%)</b>	<b>3(30%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**B -6 Fall, 2012**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unmet</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>25(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>21(84%)</b>	<b>4(16%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>21(84%)</b>	<b>4(16%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>18(72%)</b>	<b>3(12%)</b>	<b>4(16%)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>21(84%)</b>	<b>4(16%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>25(100%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>21(84%)</b>	<b>4(16%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**No 5-12 candidates took this assessment during Summer, 2012**

5 – 12 Fall, 2012

Standard	Exemplary	Distinguished	Developing	Unmet
3.2	3(100%)	0	0	0
3.3	2(66.5%)	1(33.5%)	0	0
2.2	2(66.5%)	1(33.5%)	0	0
5.4	2(66.5%)	1(33.5%)	0	0
2.3	2(66.5%)	1 (33.5%)	0	0
4.1	2(66.5%)	1(33.5%)	0	0
6.3	3(100%)	0	0	0
Overall	2(66.5%)	1(33.5%)	0	0