

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

McDaniel College

2. State

Maryland

3. Date submitted

MM DD YYYY

09 / 01 / 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]

6. Name of institution's program

Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership Program

7. NCATE Category

Reading Specialist

8. Grade levels⁽¹⁾ for which candidates are being prepared

K-12

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

9. Program Type

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

- ☐ 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

N/A

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

Advanced Professional Certification: Reading Specialist

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)

McDaniel College, chartered in 1866, as a private liberal arts institution, offers programs of study to meet the needs of undergraduate and graduate candidates. McDaniel College describes graduate studies as a logical extension of an institutional mission to develop liberally educated individuals who think "critically, creatively, and humanely". Our Graduate and Professional Studies division seeks to provide depth and breadth of educational experiences as candidates prepare themselves for future challenges in their professional lives and workplaces. The College's nineteen graduate degree programs provide specialized knowledge, enhanced professional expertise, and foster growth in speciality fields including the McDaniel College Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program.

External Policies:

McDaniel College successfully achieved initial accreditation and reaccreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) through joint NCATE/Maryland State Department of Education reviews (2004, 2009). The McDaniel College Reading Specialist (RDS) Program is currently "nationally recognized" by the International Reading Association (2002, 2008) and fully approved by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). The 36-credit RDS program meets MSDE Advanced Professional certification requirements for Reading Specialist, K-12. The Advanced Professional status incorporates the following three requirements: 1) an initial teaching certification in Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary, or Special Education; 2) three years of successful teaching experience; 3) a Master's degree from an approved program (e.g., the McDaniel College Master of Science degree from the Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program). The RDS program is also designed for incoming graduate candidates who have completed up to 12 credits of required reading coursework for initial teaching certification in the state of Maryland.

Institutional Policies and Program Revisions:

As part of Graduate and Professional Studies, the Reading Specialist (RDS) Program adheres to unit decisions regarding required components of course syllabi, performance assessments, and instructional assignments. In order to aggregate candidate performance across programs and assessments, the Education Unit adopted consistent terminology for all program level assessment rubrics. The four scoring terms used to evaluate candidate performance are "Exemplary", "Proficient", "Developing" and "Unsatisfactory". Exemplary performance is characterized by excellence on a consistent basis. Exemplary performance descriptors may include the terms and phrases "outstanding", "comprehensive", and "deeply invested". Candidates achieving a Proficient rating demonstrate above-average performances; whereas, those who perform at the Developing level show average achievement. The Unsatisfactory rating is reserved for candidates who demonstrate

below average performance that is inadequate and insufficient to document candidate competencies. All RDS rubrics and scoring tools reflect the four program level ratings for candidate performance.

Recent institutional revisions reflect the adoption and strategic implementation of the International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professionals Standards, 2010, and the addition of "Literacy Leadership" to our program title. The Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) program closely aligns with the International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professionals, 2010 and incorporates eight program level assessments for all Reading Specialist candidates. The program assessments and revised program title reflect our commitment to preparing candidates for all contemporary roles and responsibilities of Reading Specialists: interventionists, literacy coaches, and school-based facilitators.

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

The McDaniel College Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program is designed to create contemporary leaders in literacy education. The Program Plan describes required CORE coursework in a sequential numbering system that depicts three cumulative phases of candidate development including PHASE I: Foundational Knowledge, PHASE II: Diagnostic Teaching and Research Practices, and PHASE III: Literacy Leadership and Professional Development. This three-phase developmental sequence incorporates cumulative field based experiences that systematically support candidate growth and development in three distinctive roles: interventionist, literacy coach, and school-based facilitator. Our program rests on a firm foundation of research, theory, and practice, and every core RDS course includes substantial performance requirements using a combination of theory and practical applications.

In PHASE I early field experiences, candidates design and implement instructional plans, demonstrate "model" literacy lessons, develop materials and resources and collaborate with school-based inservice teachers in authentic settings (20 or more hours required). During PHASE II fieldwork, candidates complete a semester-long early literacy case study of sixteen or more individual intervention sessions, implement an on-site assessment-instruction coaching framework, administer and interpret diagnostic assessments with a range of primary, intermediate, and secondary readers/writers, analyze instructional context factors and school-based diversity initiatives as facilitators, and collaborate and coach school-based professionals (85 or more hours required). PHASE III candidates complete a comprehensive, supervised six-credit practicum experience through the McDaniel College Reading Clinic and design, implement, and facilitate longitudinal professional development initiatives with authentic literacy leadership teams in school settings (125 or more hours required).

The McDaniel College RDS Program requires the successful completion of a 6-credit Reading Specialist Practicum internship. Candidates are admitted to the Reading Specialist Practicum after the successful completion of Phase I and Phase II coursework (RDS 540, 542, 544, 546, and 548). Candidate must also demonstrate competency on five program level assessments (#3, #5, #6, #7, & #8) prior to the clinical practicum. Our Reading Specialist Practicum incorporates four weeks of intensive, individualized, and small group summer instruction for students receiving Title I summer services or targeted poverty grant support. All program candidates complete a minimum of 100 hours in our supervised practicum setting. This comprehensive field-based experience provides substantial opportunities to implement a systematic assessment-instruction process with diverse readers and writers. Candidates experience multiple leadership responsibilities and engage in analytic-reflective coaching cycles, study groups, and professional development training. In collaborative teams, candidates create socially, meaningful literate environments, develop individualized student goals, select and utilize high quality text and electronic resources, implement sound instructional practices, and deliver daily reading, writing, word study/vocabulary lessons. Candidates also actively engage in literacy coaching, mentoring, and professional communication with inservice teachers, parents/guardians, and colleagues. In addition to their knowledge of and experience with a variety of assessment tools and instructional techniques, candidates practice "how" to support inservice teachers through a collaborative team process.

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.)

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| McDaniel College Program of Study | McDaniel College Catalog Descriptions (RDS Program) |
|-----------------------------------|---|

See **Attachment** 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: | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| Academic Year | # of Candidates Enrolled in the Program | # of Program Completers ⁽²⁾ |
| 2012-2013 | 51 | 20 |
| 2011-2012 | 59 | 16 |
| 2010-2011 | 64 | 9 |

(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 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 ⁽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⁾ | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ⁽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"/> ES |
| 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"/> ES |
| 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 | |
| | |
| 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⁾ | |

(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 ⁽¹⁰⁾ | Type or Form of Assessment ⁽¹¹⁾ | When the Assessment Is Administered ⁽¹²⁾ |
|--|--|---|--|
| Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required) | Comprehensive Examination | Electronic Exit Examination: Content Based Essay Questions as Comprehensive Assessment of Cumulative Performance | End of RDS Program; Program Completion of Phases I-III |
| Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in reading education (required) | Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative | Professional Development Initiative: Literature Review, Evidence Based Synthesis with School-Based Facilitation and Leadership Opportunities | Phase III of the RDS Program; Core Course: RDS 554 |
| Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction (required) | Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs | Capstone Lessons: Planning, Implementing and Evaluating Demonstration Lessons and Instructional Designs with Inservice Teacher Collaboration | Phase I of the RDS Program; Core Courses: RDS 540 & RDS 542 |
| Assessment #4: Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience (required) | Reading Specialist Practicum Folio | Reading Specialist Practicum Folio: Comprehensive Documentation of Cumulative Performance with Analytic-Reflective Coaching Cycle | Phase III of the RDS Program; Core Course: RDS 552 |
| Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning (required) | Early Literacy Case Study | | Phase II of the RDS Program; Core Course: RDS 544 |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | Longitudinal Case Study: Impact on Student Learning Intervention with Primary Level Reader and Inservice Teacher Collaboration | |
| Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (required) | Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework | Assessment-Instruction Literacy Coaching Framework: Designing and Implementing Classroom Level Word Study Design with Coaching Experiences Diagnostic Portfolio: | Phase II of the RDS Program; Core Course: RDS 546 |
| Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (optional) | Diagnostic Portfolio | Assessment and Intervention Process for Intermediate/Secondary Level Reader with Inservice Teacher Collaboration | Phase II of the RDS Program; Core Course: RDS 546 |
| Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (optional) | Instructional Context Evaluation: Culturally Responsive Instruction and Equity for All Learners | Instructional Context Evaluation: Profile of Diversity Initiatives, Core Reading Series Audit, Literate Environment Evaluation, and Critical Reflection of Culturally Responsive Instruction & Equity for All Learners | Phase II of the RDS Program; Core Course: RDS 548 |

(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. | | | | | | | | |

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.

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. | | | | | | | | |

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. | | | | | | | | |

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. | | | | | | | | |

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. | | | | | | | | |

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

Assessment #1: Comprehensive Examination

See **Attachment** 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,⁽¹³⁾ and essays. (Answer required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment #2: Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative

See **Attachment** 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.

Assessment #3: Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs

See **Attachment** 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

Assessment #4: Reading Specialist Practicum Folio

See **Attachment** 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

Assessment #5: Early Literacy Case Study

See **Attachment** 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

Assessment #6: Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework

See **Attachment** 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

Assessment #7: Diagnostic Portfolio

See **Attachment** 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

Assessment #8: Instructional Context Evaluation: Culturally Responsive Instruction & Equity for All Learners

See **Attachment** 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)

The Reading Program Advisory Board convenes annually to examine contemporary issues and relevant concerns that impact the entire span of reading coursework from undergraduate through graduate levels. The Advisory Board and program faculty provide significant input concerning comprehensive program revisions, the program level assessment system, specific performance measures, curriculum revisions, and significant programmatic changes. Most recently, the Advisory Board provided essential feedback as relative to the following actions:

- 1) Modifying the program title to address the "Literacy Leadership" components of the course of study and program design;
- 2) Re-examining contemporary roles and responsibilities of Reading Specialists; more specifically, the International Reading Association

standards/elements and designing performance measures using the 2010 IRA standards/elements;

3) Revising all eight program level assessment scoring rubrics and systematically utilizing data analysis to strengthen the program, the specific coursework, and candidates' performance while comprehensively addressing the IRA, 2010 standards;

4) Redesigning the RDS coursework to incorporate more depth and breadth with writing instruction; adding a core writing course and a second writing elective (RDG 533 & RDG 537, approved by collegewide faculty);

5) Developing an innovative, multi-faceted performance measure to specifically address IRA Standard 4: Diversity (Assessment #8).

Membership on the Advisory Board includes tenured faculty, graduate reading instructors, school system administrators, professional development facilitators, Reading Specialists, classroom teachers, and a Reading Recovery teacher. The Advisory Board, in combination with the Program Coordinator and graduate faculty, collectively examine assessment data, interpret data patterns, and note areas for candidate development and/or program improvements. Principal findings and recommendations for modifications and program revisions are summarized below according to (1) Content Knowledge; (2) Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, & Dispositions; (3) Student Learning.

(1) Content Knowledge: Cumulative data findings suggest that upon completion of Phase III of the Reading Specialist (RDS) Program, candidates display substantial content knowledge that informs instructional practices and comprehensive literacy program design. Candidates demonstrate foundational knowledge and a solid understanding of theoretical orientations and historically shared perspectives that address literacy development, processes, and components. Data findings reflect a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession and use peer-reviewed scholarly works to effectively support professional development initiatives. Positive growth is noted in candidates' ability to align relevant research and evidence-based practices for specific professional development initiatives. However, some candidates displayed weaknesses when synthesizing research findings to develop a foundational evidence base and overarching professional development goals. Comprehensive exam results reflect growth in terms of candidates' refined theoretical understandings of integrated, balanced literacy practices and specific diversity elements. Fully developed written responses appear to substantiate our sustained commitment to foundational understandings as relative to culturally responsive instruction and diversity. However, some candidates display weaknesses in articulating ways in which diversity influences personal practice and impacts the literacy performance of students. Comprehensive exam responses also suggest that candidates' descriptions and written analysis of an optimal literate environment must more comprehensively address foundational concepts such as access to print, routines, grouping configurations, student choice, interest, and motivation.

Although growth is noted in using scholarly works and referencing theoretical orientations, candidates' abilities to synthesize research findings in a cohesively written evidence base reflects an area for further development. Program faculty suggestions for improving professional writing included a continued use of constructive feedback across instructors/courses, critiquing models/sample and writing styles in whole and small groups, and implementing peer review and writing conferences. In order to fully describe the salient conditions of a literate environment, candidates must more effectively integrate foundational understandings of physical, social, and instructional conditions. Further recommendations for enhancing candidate performance included expanding professional readings, developing additional simulations in course sessions, and implementing interactive applications in field based settings. Consciously addressing the foundational elements of the IRA standards and incorporating diversity elements provides a program level focus for sustained commitment and development of content knowledge.

(2) Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, & Dispositions: Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates in Phase I of the RDS Program effectively demonstrate their abilities to plan and implement comprehensive, balanced, and integrated literacy instruction. Results suggest that our candidates utilize assessment data and a variety of instructional materials to plan and implement developmentally appropriate and motivating lessons. Candidates also strategically integrate technological resources and hands-on manipulatives to design interactive, engaging instruction. Professional conversations and literacy coaching activities with school-based personnel appeared to enhance lesson development, implementation, and evaluation of multiple instructional approaches. However, candidates' variation of developmentally appropriate instructional materials within a lesson cycle of modeling, guided practice and independent application was identified as an area for improvement. Phase I course instructors also noted candidates' ability to more critically reflect on practice as an area for further development and suggested additional scaffolding, peer collaboration, and debriefing sessions.

Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates in Phase II of the RDS Program demonstrate pedagogical and professional abilities when utilizing in-depth assessment data to analyze the competencies of a range of at-risk readers and writers. Results from Phase II assessments suggest that candidates exhibited a more cumulative understanding of assessment tools and refined their analytical and reflective abilities. Candidates also displayed competencies in communicating assessment results and instructional implications, and in using print, digital, and online resources for instruction and professional development purposes. However, candidates displayed relative weaknesses when analyzing patterns of student performance to document specific reading/writing strengths and limitations. The candidates' abilities to evaluate multiple sources of data, to substantiate data patterns, and to develop relevant instructional goals represent an area for growth and improvement. Additional inconsistencies were noted in candidates' ability to assess, to plan, and to implement effective writing instruction.

In order to enhance candidate performance, Phase II instructors implemented a Diagnostic Portfolio process to improve candidates' abilities to interpret data patterns, to develop relevant goals, and to communicate instructional recommendations. Cumulative assessment results reflect noted improvement in candidates' abilities to triangulate multiple data sources, particularly through a two-part data analysis process. Phase II course instructors also recommended continued support in the development of long-range plans for instruction, reinforcement, and extension. Given this programmatic need, Phase II instructors recommended specific actions including increasing guided practice for the development of weekly and quarterly plans, providing additional in-class opportunities to analyze the relationships between reading, writing, and word study, tracking the effectiveness of instructional techniques, displaying students' cumulative progress, and utilizing technology applications for instructional and professional purposes. To more effectively address writing assessment and instruction, RDG 533: Teaching Narrative Writing was designated as a core program requirement rather than a course elective (fall, 2012). RDG 537: Teaching Informational and Argument Writing, a second writing course option, was also developed and implemented (approved, spring, 2013).

Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates in Phase III of the RDS Program display pedagogical and professional knowledge and demonstrate complex responsibilities and dispositions as literacy leaders. In addition to their knowledge of and experience with a variety of assessment tools and instructional techniques, candidates learn "how to" support in-service teachers through supervised practicum experiences, literacy coaching activities, and longitudinal professional development initiatives. Our candidates demonstrate their abilities to enthusiastically support in-service teachers in interpreting data and providing quality interventions for students most in need of assistance. RDS candidates also advocate for instructional practices that are responsive to diversity and positively impact student knowledge, beliefs and engagement.

3) Student Learning: Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates in Phase II of the RDS Program demonstrate an ability to plan and

implement effective interventions that impact student performance and literacy development. Through a pretest-posttest case study design, candidates document student growth and progress in reading, word study, and writing. Candidates examine cumulative results in terms of word identification, text level reading, strategic processing behaviors, and writing improvements. The pretest-posttest analysis and supporting documentation substantiates our candidates' impact on student learning.

Recent revisions to the case study process reflect a substantial addition of collaborative actions to develop candidates' technical skills and competencies as interventionists. Candidate performance also requires competency with multiple coaching activities including interpreting developmentally appropriate assessments, using data for collaborative decision-making for classroom instruction and intervention practices, and analyzing videotaped demonstration lessons. Candidates' in-class viewing of videotaped lessons provided scaffolded practice for developing mentoring and coaching capacities. Archiving of video clips in an interactive electronic library was recommended as a logical next step for program development. Phase II course instructors also suggested the following actions throughout the case study process: increasing the number of one-on-one discussions with individual candidates; examining multiple sources of data/work samples to inform interventions; and providing additional interactive writing instruction.

During the McDaniel College RDS Practicum, candidates also utilize a pretest-posttest design to systematically monitor student growth and progress in reading, word study, and writing. At the completion of the supervised practicum, candidates evaluate students' cumulative growth in text level reading, developmental spelling features, and writing. This additional documentation provides further substantiation of our candidates' effectiveness as relevant to student learning. Course instructors utilize assessment results, systematic observations, and candidate performance data to fine-tune learning opportunities and to refine RDS core courses and program level performance measures.

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.

McDANIEL COLLEGE
Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership Program
RDS/RDG Course Descriptions

| PHASE I: Foundational Knowledge (12 credits) | | |
|---|---|--------------------|
| RDS 540 | <p>Early Literacy Foundations</p> <p>This course examines the foundations of early literacy from an interactive perspective. The course content addresses assessment measures, data analysis, instructional methodologies, and materials for emergent and early readers. Candidates assume the role of the contemporary Reading Specialist to implement demonstration lessons in phonological awareness, phonics development, print concepts, and strategic reading behaviors.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| RDS 542 | <p>Comprehensive Literacy Instruction</p> <p>This course examines the design and implementation of a comprehensive literacy program. The course content addresses developmental benchmarks, instructional methodologies, selection and evaluation of reading materials, and guidelines for creating, organizing, and managing a literate environment. Candidates assume the role of the contemporary Reading Specialist to implement demonstration lessons in comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| RDG 532 | <p>Reading in the Content Areas, Part I</p> <p>This course examines essential components of the reading-to-learn process within the context of the secondary classroom. The course content addresses cognitive strategy instruction, vocabulary acquisition, comprehension development, writing to learn, and the strategic use of textbooks, trade books, and electronic resources. Candidates evaluate instructional techniques for enhancing reader-text interactions and integrating content reading across curricular areas.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| RDG 533 | <p>Teaching Narrative Writing with Children's Literature</p> <p>This course examines effective techniques for composing compelling personal and fictional narratives with vivid characters, plots, and settings. Building on the reading-writing connection, candidates apply a writer's lens to analyze elements of craft, recursive writing processes, and workshop structures. Through author studies, candidates identify strong mentor texts, develop literature-based craft lessons, and design instructional techniques to support writing apprenticeships.</p> | 3.0 Credits |

| PHASE II: Diagnostic Teaching & Research Practices (12 credits) | | |
|--|---|--------------------|
| RDS 544 | <p>Early Literacy Intervention</p> <p>This course examines intervention techniques and strategies for at-risk emergent and early readers. The course content addresses oral language, alphabetic knowledge, print concepts, and strategic reading behaviors. Candidates systematically analyze assessment data, implement instructional plans, and evaluate student performance in a longitudinal case study format.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| RDS 546 | <p>Diagnostic Assessment and Instruction</p> <p>This course examines the assessment instruction framework from an interactive perspective of reading. The course content addresses multiple assessment techniques, analysis of literacy contexts, and instructional designs for diverse learners. Candidates administer quantitative and qualitative assessments, analyze data sources, develop implications, and implement instructional plans with at-risk readers.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| RDS 548 | <p>Diagnostic Assessment and Instruction, Advanced</p> <p>This course extends the assessment-instruction framework from an interactive perspective of reading and writing. The course content addresses multiple assessment techniques, curriculum and instructional designs for diverse readers and writers, and the professional roles and responsibilities of the contemporary Reading Specialist. Candidates systematically analyze school-based instructional contexts and develop relevant implications and evidence-based recommendations for culturally responsive literacy instruction.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| RSM 550 | <p>Introduction to Research Methodology</p> <p>This course is directed toward an understanding of how research is conducted. The course content addresses the study of quantitative and qualitative strategies and their appropriate use. Candidates review appropriate statistical tools and their use in data collection and interpretation.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| PHASE III: Literacy Leadership & Professional Development (9 credits) | | |
| RDS 552 | <p>Reading Specialist Practicum</p> <p>This course fulfills the requirements for a comprehensive practicum experience. The course content addresses the design, implementation, and evaluation of instructional programs for diverse learners, and leadership roles of the contemporary Reading Specialist. Throughout the practicum,</p> | 6.0 Credits |

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------|
| | candidates assume responsibilities for team collaboration, professional development seminars, literacy coaching, and communication with parents, students, and colleagues. | |
| RDS 554 | <p>Literacy Leadership for Reading Professionals</p> <p>This course examines relevant literacy topics in their historical, social, and political contexts. The course content addresses research, legislative works, and policies and practices related to literacy leadership and professional development. Candidates conduct independent research on a school-wide literacy initiative and design a comprehensive framework for systematic professional development.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| ELECTIVE: Choose one of the following courses (3 credits). | | |
| RDG 524 | <p>Materials for Reading Instruction</p> <p>This course examines the selection, evaluation, and implementation of instructional materials for a variety of learners. The course content addresses the effective use of core and supplementary materials that incorporate quality children's literature, informational text, leveled book collections, and technological and multi-media resources. Candidates examine essential components of reading instruction, various text formats, and parent-school and community collaboration within the context of comprehensive literacy instruction.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| RDG 534 | <p>Reading in the Content Areas, Part II</p> <p>This course extends the concepts presented in Part I of Reading in the Content Areas. The course content addresses technical reading and writing, performance-based assessments, multi-genre research, and the integration of reading and writing instruction in secondary classrooms. Candidates explore instructional techniques, and design modifications for at-risk readers and writers (<i>Required Prerequisite: RDG 532</i>).</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| RDG 536 | <p>Using Technology in the Reading-Writing Classroom (Online)</p> <p>This interactive course examines the integration of instructional technology within K-12 reading and writing classrooms. The course content addresses theoretical as well as practical applications for enhancing literacy learning through the strategic use of computers and other digital devices. Candidates evaluate various software programs, design instructional materials, develop professional presentations, and create and critique Web-quests.</p> | 3.0 Credits |

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------|
| RDG 537 | <p>Teaching Informational and Argument Writing with Children's Literature</p> <p>This course introduces assessment-instruction frameworks for authentic inquiry and nonfiction writing. Candidates investigate and engage in research processes and critical analysis, developing instructional strategies to help learners generate focused questions, gather information from print and digital sources, analyze and evaluate ideas, and draw on relevant evidence. Using mentor texts as writing models, candidates compose original texts and plan instruction that addresses varied disciplines, purposes, and audiences in informative, procedural, and opinion/argument writing. (<i>RDG 533: Teaching Narrative Writing With Children's Literature</i> recommended pre-requisite but not required).</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| SLM 503 | <p>Literature for Children</p> <p>This course presents new and outstanding titles in literature for children in grades kindergarten through sixth. Topics include authors and illustrators, fiction and nonfiction, literature in other media formats, principles of selection, using literature in the classroom, and reading for pleasure and life-long learning. Candidates read books, discuss them in class, identify strategies for encouraging students to read, and create an annotated bibliography of books appropriate for elementary school students.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| SLM 504 | <p>Literature for Young Adults</p> <p>This course presents new and outstanding titles in literature for young adults in grades sixth through twelfth. Topics include authors, fiction and nonfiction, literature and other media formats, principles of selection, using literature in the classroom, and reading for pleasure and lifelong learning. Candidates read books, discuss them in class, and identify strategies for encouraging students to read, create an annotated bibliography of books appropriate for middle and high school students and present book talks with teens.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| WRT 501 | <p>Reading Like A Writer (Online)</p> <p>This course examines the writing craft of respected children and young adult authors. The course content explores craft elements, including audience, word choice, sentence construction, narration, plot, characters, and setting. Candidates identify, analyze, and model these elements by a thorough reading of selected picture books, fiction, and nonfiction books.</p> | 3.0 Credits |
| TOTAL CREDITS (Degree Completion): 36 Credits | | |

Name _____
 Student Identification Number _____

Date _____
 Contact # _____

McDANIEL COLLEGE
READING SPECIALIST: LITERACY LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Degree Status

Bachelor's _____
 Master's _____

**Initial Teaching
 Certification Status**

Elementary _____
 Secondary _____

Desired Program

Certification Only _____
 M.S. Only _____
 M.S. & Certification _____

GRADUATE PROGRAM PLAN

(36 Credits)

| I. FOUNDATIONAL KNOWLEDGE | II. DIAGNOSTIC TEACHING RESEARCH PRACTICES | III. LITERACY LEADERSHIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT |
|---|--|--|
| RDS: 540 Early Literacy Foundations (F) | RDS: 544 Early Literacy Intervention (Sp) | RDS: 552 Reading Specialist Practicum (Sum) (06 credits) |
| RDS: 542 Comprehensive Literacy Instruction (Sp; Sum) | RDS: 546 Diagnostic Assessment and Instruction (F) | RDS: 554 Literacy Leadership for Reading Professionals (F) |
| RDG: 532 Reading In the Content Areas, Part I (F; Sp; Sum; ONLINE) | RDS: 548 Diagnostic Assessment And Instruction, Advanced (Sp) | |
| RDG: 533 Teaching Narrative Writing With Children's Literature (F; Sp) | RSM: 550 Research Methodology (F; Sp; Sum) | |
| | ELECTIVE* | PROGRAM COMPLETION: • Comprehensive Examination _____ • Thesis OPTION _____ |
| * ELECTIVE: Choose one reading-related or advisor approved elective. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDG: 524 Materials for Reading Instruction • RDG: 534 Reading in the Content Areas, Part II (ONLINE Option) • RDG: 536 Using Technology in the Reading-Writing Classroom (ONLINE) • RDG: 537 Teaching Informational and Argument Writing With Children's Literature • SLM: 503 Literature for Children • SLM: 504 Literature for Young Adolescents • WRT: 501 Reading Like A Writer (ONLINE) | | |

TRANSFER CREDITS

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------|--------|--------------|
| <i>For Degree</i> | | | |
| College | Year | Number | Course Title |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| <i>For Certification</i> | | | |
| College | Year | Number | Course Title |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

MATRICULATION

___ Interview
 ___ Transcript: GPA
 ___ Initial Certification
 ___ Professional References
 ___ Praxis or MAT Scores
 ___ 9 Credits of Satisfactory Coursework: GPA

 Candidate Signature

 Advisor Signature

SECTION IV - Assessment #1: Comprehensive Examination

1. Description of Assessment and Use in Program:

The **Comprehensive Examination** consists of a three-part series of essay questions that reflect cumulative content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge from core Reading Specialist (RDS) coursework and performance outcomes. Fully developed written responses incorporate research, theory, and authoritative opinion as support for evidence-based literacy and intervention practices and require relevant citations from historical, seminal, and contemporary works. Candidates complete this three-hour exit examination during the final academic semester in the Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) degree program (**Phase III: End of Program**).

An internal evaluation team of Reading Specialist (RDS) core program faculty utilizes an anonymous review process to score all Comprehensive Examinations. An attached scoring rubric highlights **foundational knowledge** elements and provides criteria for evaluating four levels of candidate proficiency for each targeted IRA standard. Across the six IRA elements measured on this assessment, a cumulative total of **32** quality points are possible. A Comprehensive Examination passing score reflects a total of **20-32** points. A score of **15-19** points denotes a need for further justification, clarification, or explanation through a candidate conference. A cumulative score of less than **15** points results in a decision of fail for the exit examination. According to Graduate and Professional Studies policy, the Comprehensive Examination may be taken for a total of three times.

2. Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards, 2010:

The three-part **Comprehensive Examination** addresses the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach **IRA Standards, 2010** through the following elements: **1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, and 6.1**. **Part I: Theoretical Design** incorporates an analysis of theoretical orientations, instructional models, and historically shared perspectives that provides a framework for literacy development and informs evidence-based and reflective literacy practices (**IRA 1.1, 1.2**). Foundational knowledge as relative to professional leadership roles and responsibilities is also documented through the organization and development of a strategic program design (**IRA 6.1**). **Part II: Comprehensive Literacy Instruction** consists of a synthesis of content knowledge that describes an integrated, comprehensive and balanced instructional program, addresses features of culturally responsive instruction, and highlights components of an optimal literate environment (**IRA 2.1, 4.1, and 1.1**). **Part III: Intervention Plans** requires a thoughtful analysis of intervention principles and practices for at-risk readers, foundational knowledge of a multi-tiered response to intervention framework, and a cumulative understanding of established purposes and uses of assessments (**IRA 1.2, 3.1**). A candidate-prepared bibliography and relevant citations of contemporary research, seminal works, and historically shared practices are utilized as theoretical and evidence-based support for written responses.

3. Initial Analysis of Data Findings:

Cumulative mean score results from the **2012** and **2013 Comprehensive Examinations** reveal patterns of strongest candidate performance in **Part I: Theoretical Design** and **Part III: Intervention Plans**. In terms of specific **IRA** elements, candidates

demonstrate a solid understanding of major theoretical orientations and historically shared perspectives that inform literacy development, processes, and components (1.1, 1.2). When developing a theoretical design for a school-wide literacy program, candidates incorporate a thoughtful and thorough analysis of professional leadership responsibilities in terms of adult learning, school culture, and organizational change (6.1). **Part III** findings suggest that candidates display foundational knowledge for designing evidence-based approaches to intervention and developing systematic assessment procedures for monitoring student progress (1.2, 3.1).

Cumulative mean scores results for **Part II: Comprehensive Literacy Instruction** identify strengths as well as potential areas for candidate growth and improvement (1.2, 4.1). As relevant to specific **IRA** elements, candidates consistently demonstrate foundational understanding of an integrated, balanced, and comprehensive literacy curriculum (2.1). Some candidates appear less proficient in comprehensively analyzing the features of a high quality classroom environment for fostering student motivation and engagement (1.2). Some candidates demonstrate weaker performance when articulating their understandings of the ways in which diversity impacts the literacy development of students. However, the **2013 Comprehensive Examination** results substantiate candidates' positive growth and progress on this particular element (4.1).

4. Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards, 2010:

Cumulative data findings reveal that candidates at the end of the Graduate Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program display a foundational knowledge base that informs assessment practices, instructional approaches, and an integrated, comprehensive curriculum design. Candidate performance is also consistent with our program focus of extending theory and research into informed practice through content knowledge, a continuous assessment-instruction framework, and active decision-making processes. This theoretical orientation is consistently reflected in comprehensive examination responses; Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) core courses utilize instructional paradigms for translating relevant theories and historically shared knowledge into authentic practices. Candidates also acquire a repertoire of assessment practices and instructional approaches that reflect current research and contemporary perspectives.

Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates' analysis of high quality literacy environments must address factors such as access to print, choice, challenge, routines, grouping configurations, and student interest in addition to the physical environment. In order to fully describe the salient features of a literate environment, candidates must more effectively integrate physical, social and instructional conditions as thoughtfully detailed in the elements of IRA Standard Five. Findings also reveal that some candidates display potential weakness in articulating ways in which diversity influences personal practice and impacts reading and writing development of students. The recent positive growth and candidates' refined and deeper responses provide evidence that substantiates our sustained commitment to culturally responsive instruction. Conscientiously addressing all elements of IRA Standard Four continues to be a focus for further development and expansion across the Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership Program. After thoroughly examining candidates' written responses over two consecutive years, RDS faculty also

recommend assessing leadership capacity across Parts I-III in the next revision of Assessment #1: Comprehensive Examination.

5. (a) Description of the Assignment:

The following description represents the **current** version of the **Comprehensive Examination** as aligned to the International Reading Association Standards, 2010.

**Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program
Assessment #1 - Comprehensive Exam (End of Program)**

IRA Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1 & 6.1

CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, & 3

As a reflective practitioner and literacy leader, you have consistently linked theory and research to inform instructional practices throughout the Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership Program core coursework. The following prompts address **foundational understandings** and **content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge** in a three-phase authentic application scenario. Each prompt has equal weight, so please develop thorough and complete responses in the three-hour examination period. A **bibliography** incorporating **relevant citations** of contemporary research, seminal works, and historically shared practices must be submitted to provide theoretical and evidence-based support for your written responses.

Scenario:

In your role as Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach, the current principal has appointed you as chairperson of a school-wide Literacy Committee. In order to design a comprehensive Strategic Plan for evidence-based literacy practices, the Committee's longitudinal charge incorporates the following significant actions:

- Interpreting and summarizing **major theories** and **historically shared knowledge** for understanding the foundations of literacy development, reading and writing processes, and essential components;
- Analyzing **leadership roles** and **responsibilities** of contemporary reading professionals in relationship to adult learners, school culture, and organizational change;
- Designing an **integrated, comprehensive, and balanced approach** to literacy instruction in **optimal literacy and learning environments**;
- Addressing the importance of **culturally responsive literacy** practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences;
- Developing a **multi-tiered approach to intervention** using multiple sources of assessment data and systematic procedures for monitoring student progress.

Part I: Theoretical Design: *Develop a comprehensive response to the Part I prompt. Incorporate references to support the theoretical design.*

Part I of the Strategic Plan incorporates the analysis of theoretical and evidence based foundations of reading and writing processes and literacy development in order to inform thoughtful, reflective literacy instruction. As preparation for a multi-grade level Strategic Planning meeting, develop a theoretical design that addresses the following three key features:

1. Interprets and summarizes **major theories** of reading and writing processes and literacy development that serve as a foundation for ensuring effective instructional practices and student success;
2. Explains a **strategic, evidence-based interactive model** and **implications** for addressing the needs of diverse readers;
3. Articulates literature and research findings about the **contemporary roles** and **responsibilities** of the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach in terms of **school culture, organizational change**, and job-embedded **professional development**.

Part II: Comprehensive Literacy Instruction: *Develop a comprehensive response to the Part II prompt. Incorporate references to support the program development.*

Part II of the Strategic Plan incorporates the development of an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced literacy program. Through a careful analysis of the current status, performance data, and school improvement goals, the principal recommended that the committee design a comprehensive instructional program that incorporates the following essential elements:

1. Describes the **major components** and **features** of comprehensive multi-grade level literacy instruction;
2. Addresses the importance of **culturally responsive instruction** in relationship to literacy development and the success of all learners including second language learners and at-risk readers/writers;
3. Highlights the important components of an optimal **literate environment** in order to foster success for all students.

Part III: Intervention Plans: *Develop a comprehensive response to the Part III prompt. Incorporate references to support the intervention plan.*

Part III of this Strategic Plan incorporates the development of an effective **intervention program** for early readers. As the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach, your principal requests that you propose a reading intervention plan for implementation with early readers. Outline your vision of this intervention plan to address the following important components:

1. Explains established purposes for assessment of all students including **assessment procedures** for systematic monitoring of student progress.
2. Incorporates **principles** for using multiple sources of student data to design, to implement, and to evaluate evidence based interventions;
3. Describes a multi-tiered **response to intervention** framework.

5. (b) Assessment Scoring Guide:

The following rubric represents the **current** version of the **Comprehensive Examination** scoring tool.

| PART ONE IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Quality Points |
|--|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 1.1 Understands major theories and empirical research that describes cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and socio-cultural foundations of literacy development. | Effectively and comprehensively describes and interprets major theories that inform literacy development and provides an evidence based foundation for thoughtful literacy instruction. | Describes major theories that inform literacy development and provides an evidence based foundation for literacy instruction. | Refers to some theoretical perspectives that inform literacy development and/or provides a foundation for literacy instruction. | Major theories that inform literacy development and a foundation for literacy instruction are not evident within the response. | /4 |
| 1.2 Understands historically shared knowledge of the profession that addresses literacy development, processes, and components to meet learners' needs. | Effectively and comprehensively describes and explains components and processes in a strategic, evidence-based, and interactive approach to literacy instruction. | Describes components and processes in a strategic, evidence-based, and interactive approach to literacy instruction. | Refers to some components or processes in an interactive approach to literacy instruction. | Components of a strategic, evidence-based interactive approach to literacy instruction are not evident within the response. | /4 |
| 6.1 Demonstrates foundational knowledge of adult learning and related research about school culture, professional development, and organizational change. | Effectively and comprehensively analyzes research and literature and demonstrates strong foundational knowledge and understanding of professional leadership responsibilities as relative to designing a school-wide literacy program. | Uses research and literature and demonstrates foundational knowledge and understanding of professional leadership responsibilities as relative to designing a school-wide literacy program. | Uses some research and literature and demonstrates some foundational knowledge of professional leadership responsibilities as relative to a school-wide literacy program. | Research and literature support, foundational knowledge and an understanding of professional leadership responsibilities are not evident within the response. | /4 |
| PART TWO IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | |
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced literacy curriculum. | Effectively and comprehensively demonstrates foundational knowledge and understanding of professional literature to describe and explain the essential elements of an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced literacy program. | Demonstrates foundational knowledge and understanding of professional literature to describe the essential elements of a comprehensive and balanced literacy program. | Demonstrates some foundational knowledge and understanding of professional literature to identify and list elements of a program. | Foundational knowledge, understanding of professional literature and essential elements of comprehensive program are not evident within the response. | /4 |
| 4.1 Recognizes, understands, and values the forms of diversity and their importance in learning to read and write. | Effectively and comprehensively demonstrates understanding of ways in which diversity influences literacy development and | Demonstrates understanding of ways in which diversity influences literacy development and describes the | Demonstrates some understanding of ways in which diversity influences literacy development and discusses culturally responsive | Understanding of ways in which diversity influences literacy development and the importance of culturally | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|------------|
| | thoughtfully describes and explains the importance of culturally responsive instruction. | importance of culturally responsive instruction. | instruction. | responsive instruction is not evident within the response. | |
| 1.1 Understands major theories and empirical research that describes cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and socio-cultural foundations of literacy development. | Effectively and comprehensively describes and explains an optimal literate environment for fostering motivation and optimizing student engagement. | Describes a quality literate environment for fostering motivation and student engagement. | Describes some components of a literate environment including motivation and/or student engagement. | Literate environment for fostering motivation and student engagement is not evident within the response. | /4 |
| PART THREE IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | |
| 1.2 Understands the historically shared knowledge of the profession that addresses the needs of all students. | Effectively and comprehensively interprets and summarizes historically shared knowledge base of principles and evidence-based practices for developing high quality interventions. | Interprets and summarizes historically shared knowledge base of principles and evidence-based practices for developing quality interventions. | Summarizes some historically shared knowledge of principles and practices for developing interventions. | Historically shared knowledge base of principles and practices for developing interventions is not evident within the response. | /4 |
| 3.1 Understands types of assessments and their established purposes for assessing the performance of readers. | Effectively and comprehensively demonstrates an understanding of established assessment purposes and practices as relative to intervention principles and a response to intervention framework. | Demonstrates an understanding of established assessment purposes and practices as relative to intervention principles and a response to intervention framework. | Demonstrates some understanding of established purposes and assessment practices as relative to intervention principles and/or a framework. | Established assessment purposes, intervention principles, and a response to intervention framework are not evident within the response. | /4 |
| | | | | Total Quality Points Earned: | /32 |

5. (c) Candidate Data Derived from Assessment:

The following data table summarizes candidate results from the two most recent administrations of the **Comprehensive Examination (2012 & 2013)**.

| Assessment #1: Comprehensive Examination Summary of Results: Academic Year, 2012 & Academic Year, 2013 IRA Standards, 2010 Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1 & 6.1 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| PART ONE IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.33 N = 16 | MEAN 2013 = 3.29 N = 14 |
| 1.1 Understands major theories and empirical research that describes cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and socio-cultural foundations of literacy development. | 7 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 3.38 | 3.07 |
| 1.2 Understands historically shared knowledge of the profession that addresses literacy development, processes, and components to meet learners' needs. | 6 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 3.18 | 3.29 |
| 6.1 Demonstrates foundational knowledge of adult learning and related research about school culture, professional development, and organizational change. | 8 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3.44 | 3.50 |
| PART TWO IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.00 N = 16 | MEAN 2013 = 3.00 N = 14 |
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced literacy curriculum. | 4 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| 4.1 Recognizes, understands, and values the forms of diversity and their importance in learning to read and write. | 4 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 2.94 | 3.07 |
| 1.1 Understands major theories and empirical research that describes cognitive, linguistic, | 3 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3.06 | 2.93 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| motivational, and socio-cultural foundations of literacy development. | | | | | | | | | | |
| PART THREE IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.22 N = 16 | MEAN 2013 = 3.11 N = 14 |
| 1.2 Understands the historically shared knowledge of the profession that addresses the needs of all students. | 6 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 3.19 | 3.21 |
| 3.1 Understands types of assessments and their established purposes for assessing the performance of readers. | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | 3.00 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PASS RATE, 2012: 100% PASS RATE, 2013: 100% | | | | | | | | | RANGE: 21-31 | RANGE: 20-32 |
| | | | | | | | | | MEAN SCORE: 25 | MEAN SCORE: 24 |

SECTION IV—Assessment #2: Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative

1. Description of Assessment and Use in Program:

The **Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative** is a multifaceted and comprehensive three-part literacy leadership project. Candidates develop a longitudinal school-based professional development program utilizing the following essential processes: (1) interviewing a Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach about school-based needs; (2) collaborating with a site-based literacy leadership team; (3) examining school-wide data sources, core standards, curriculum connections, and existing school improvement initiatives; (4) consulting with administrators, classroom teachers, and resource personnel to define a literacy focus for professional development; (5) reviewing a substantial body of research and professional literature to support the designated literacy focus; (6) developing an annotated bibliography, an evidence-based synthesis of relevant research findings, and overarching professional development goals; (7) designing an action plan of six professional development sessions; (8) presenting the professional development design and supporting research to the school-based literacy team; (9) planning, initiating, and evaluating job-embedded professional development session(s); (10) designing relevant coaching and mentoring opportunities. Candidates complete this evidence-based leadership initiative as a comprehensive capstone requirement in **Phase III** of the Reading Specialist (RDS) Program, **RDS 554: Literacy Leadership for Reading Professionals** (a fall only course offering).

2. Assessment Alignment with IRA, 2010 Standards:

The three-part **Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative** addresses the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach **IRA Standards, 2010** through the following elements: **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 3.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4**. **Part I: Defining the Literacy Focus** incorporates the initiation and design of a year-long professional development program through team collaboration and a systematic analysis of school-wide performance data, curriculum, core standards, and school improvement initiatives (**IRA 1.3, 3.3, 6.2, 6.3**). **Part II: Designing an Evidence Base** incorporates the development of an annotated bibliography of professional readings as relevant to the school-based initiative. This component also requires candidates to clearly articulate an evidence base to ground professional development through a synthesis of relevant research, historically shared perspectives, seminal works, and contemporary literature (**IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3**). **Part III: Implementing an Evidence-Based Action Plan** encompasses the development and initial implementation of a logical course of action through seeking endorsement by the literacy team, presenting a Professional Development (PD) session, developing a detailed plan for five additional PD sessions, designing job-embedded coaching and mentoring opportunities, and analyzing supports and challenges for further implementation and evaluation of this year-long professional development initiative (**IRA 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 3.3**).

3. Initial Analysis of Data Findings:

Cumulative mean score results from the **2011 and 2012 Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiatives** suggest patterns of strong candidate performance across all components of this capstone leadership measure. Two-year results reveal the strongest cumulative performance in **Part II: Designing an Evidence Base** followed by **Part III:**

Implementing an Evidence-Based Action Plan and Part I: Defining a Literacy Focus. In terms of specific **IRA** elements, candidates utilize empirical research, historically shared knowledge, and sound professional judgment to effectively design, facilitate, and lead professional development initiatives in authentic school contexts (**1.1, 1.2, & 1.3**). Candidates also display positive dispositions and leadership capacity through school-based collaboration, interactive professional development sessions, and differentiated coaching and mentoring opportunities (**6.1, 6.2, & 6.3**).

Cumulative mean score results for **Part II: Designing an Evidence Base** reflect candidates' use of peer-reviewed scholarly works to support professional development initiatives and demonstrate a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession (**1.1**). As relevant to specific **IRA** elements, growth is noted in candidates' ability to align relevant research and evidence-based best practices for their specific professional development focuses (**1.1, 2012**). However, results suggest that some candidates display weaknesses when synthesizing research findings to develop overarching professional development goals and a comprehensive evidence base. Candidates also demonstrated relative weaknesses in interpreting data patterns from school-wide student data sources and analyzing curriculum connections, core standards, and school improvement goals/plans to define a literacy focus for a school-based initiative (**3.2, 3.3, & 6.4**).

4. Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards, 2010:

Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates at the end of the Graduate Reading Specialist (RDS) Program display leadership abilities and understand the complex professional development responsibilities of a Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach (**IRA Standard Six**). Candidate performance requires competency with multiple coaching responsibilities such as chairing literacy meetings, interpreting assessment data, implementing interactive professional development sessions, utilizing a variety of multi-media materials and professional resources, and problem-solving through collaboration with colleagues and administrators. Throughout the development and implementation process, RDS 554 instructors systematically incorporated more rigorous requirements including on-site presentation components, coaching and mentoring elements, and the development of a two-fold evaluation process. These additional requirements periodically present logistical issues for some candidates; however significant benefits outweigh the challenges as candidates develop multiple literacy leadership capacities through authentic school-based professional development initiatives.

Candidates also demonstrated substantial content knowledge to support a longitudinal approach to evidence-based professional development (**IRA Standard One**). Throughout the candidates' completion of this comprehensive assessment, course instructors provide significant feedback, scaffolding, and ongoing support, particularly in terms of developing theoretical and evidence based foundations for professional development. Recommendations for improving this capstone literacy leadership assessment include (1) developing needs assessment surveys for school use; (2) improving the candidates' analysis of relevant data patterns including school-wide and large scale data sources, grade level comparisons, and more individualized student learning outcomes to inform professional development; (3) enhancing evaluative procedures for assessing teacher growth and the impact on student learning from longitudinal evidence-based initiatives.

5. (a) Description of the Assignment:

The following description represents the **current** version of the **Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative** as aligned to the International Reading Association Standards, 2010.

Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program
RDS 554: Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative
IRA Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 3.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, & 6.4
CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 3, 4, 5, & 6

The **Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative** is a multifaceted and comprehensive literacy leadership project. This **three-part** project provides an opportunity to implement an evidence-based process for developing job-embedded professional development and actively engaging in multiple levels of literacy coaching. The course rubrics display scoring guidelines and provide criteria for designated **IRA** elements and four specific levels of candidate performance.

Part I - Defining the Literacy Focus:

Part I of the **Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative** incorporates the following essential processes:

- ✓ interviewing a Reading Specialist/Literacy Leader to discuss contemporary leadership responsibilities and current school-based professional development needs;
- ✓ identifying a leadership team of teachers, administrators, and resource personnel at a self-selected school site (**3 or more team members**);
- ✓ analyzing relevant school-wide performance data using available assessment measures (state, county/district, local school data sources), school improvement goals, and current initiatives;
- ✓ examining common core standards, state/county/district curriculum, and developmental benchmarks;
- ✓ consulting with designated leadership team to define literacy focus through a formal Leadership Team meeting with team representatives and/or other school-based personnel;
- ✓ defining literacy focus for professional development, and identifying supports and challenges for the initiation of this project.

Part I - Submission:

Briefly describe the school location and introduce the school-wide mission and vision. Summarize the results of the Reading Specialist dialogue including interview questions and individualized responses. Describe and analyze relevant school-wide performance data and school improvement needs to support the literacy focus. Identify the Literacy Team membership and provide formal minutes that detail the conclusions of the Leadership Team including data analysis patterns, current school improvement initiatives, and informal consultation with colleagues. Submit the collaboratively defined literacy focus and a brief rationale for pursuing this project.

Part II - Designing An Evidence Base:

Part II-A requires the development of an **Annotated Bibliography** of professional readings as relevant to the school-based literacy initiative and incorporates **research studies, seminal works, and contemporary professional literature**. A **research study** often includes the following components and develops logical connections to the professional development initiative through a rationale and purpose of the study, research questions and hypotheses, a review of methods, results, interpretations and implications, and conclusions. A **practitioner article** often includes the following components and develops logical connections to the professional development initiative through a theoretical framework/historically shared knowledge, a purpose, an instructional context, important ideas, and conclusions.

Part II-A incorporates the following essential processes:

- ✓ summarizing relevant research studies and seminal works from peer-reviewed scholarly journals to develop an evidence base for the professional development initiative;
- ✓ summarizing relevant historically shared knowledge and practitioner articles from peer-reviewed journals to develop an evidence base for the professional development initiative;
- ✓ summarizing additional self-selected articles/chapters from peer-reviewed journals or volumes to develop an evidence base for the professional development initiative;
- ✓ designating specific readings for use by participants in the professional development initiative (* *on Bibliography and provide copies of the selected readings*).

Format for Bibliographic Entries:

- **Citation** using APA, 5th edition format (**bibliographic information**);
- **Annotation:** Each annotation incorporates a **concise summary** and **relevant findings** from the article/chapter and explains how the professional reading supports the school-based literacy initiative and/or be utilized as a selected reading for participants.

Part II-B requires the synthesis of theoretical perspectives and research-based instructional approaches and practices to establish an evidence base that grounds the school-based professional development initiative. The evidence base informs the development of a logical and sequential plan of action and overarching goals for interactive professional development sessions. **Part II-B** incorporates the following essential processes:

- ✓ synthesizing relevant theoretical perspectives/principles and best practices to establish an evidence base for the professional development initiative;
- ✓ developing overarching goals for the professional development initiative.

Part II Submission:

Submit **Annotated Bibliography, Evidence Base Synthesis, and Overarching Goals** for professional development initiative.

Part III – Implementing an Action Plan:

Part III requires the final development and implementation of a plan of action for longitudinal professional development as relative to the literacy focus. This **Action Plan** incorporates the design and implementation for **one** professional development session, the identification of relevant resources and materials, a menu of literacy coaching options, and the development of evaluation procedures as linked to the goals for the school-based initiative. **Part III** incorporates the following essential processes:

- ✓ designing **six** interactive sessions as a logical plan of action, using the evidence base, professional development goals, and curricular connections;
- ✓ developing **one** interactive session from the action plan (for delivery at a faculty meeting, team meeting and/or grade level meeting);
- ✓ identifying resources and multi-media materials for interactive session;
- ✓ designing relevant coaching and mentoring options (IRA Position Statement: Coaching for Intensity 1-3);
- ✓ presenting Action Plan, PD Session, and References to professional communities and sharing findings with the Leadership Team;
- ✓ developing, implementing, and sharing evaluations.

Part III - Submission:

Submit an **Action Plan** that incorporates the following components: overview of **six** sessions, materials for **one** interactive professional development session, list of resources and multi-media materials for sessions, longitudinal coaching and mentoring plans, an evaluation process, and conduct a **final presentation** for faculty, team, or grade level meeting. (*PD Session Template available @ Blackboard site for RDS: 554,* Course Documents*).

5. (b) Assessment Scoring Guide:

The following rubric represents the **current** version of the **Evidenced- Based Professional Development Initiative** scoring tool.

Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program
RDS 554: Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative
IRA Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 3.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, & 6.4
CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 3, 4, 5, & 6

| <i>Part A: Defining the Literacy Focus</i> | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--------------|
| <i>PART I: Defining the Literacy Focus IRA Standard/Criteria</i> | <i>Exemplary (4)</i> | <i>Proficient (3)</i> | <i>Developing (2)</i> | <i>Unsatisfactory (1)</i> | <i>Score</i> |
| 1.3 Uses professional judgment and practical knowledge to communicate with literacy professionals. | Effectively and comprehensively communicates with literacy professionals to develop and refine an appropriate focus for a year-long professional development initiative; provides reflective evidence of findings concerning the role of the Reading Specialist/Literacy Leader and school-based needs. | Communicates with literacy professionals to develop an appropriate focus for a year-long professional development program; provides evidence of findings concerning the role of the Reading Specialist/Literacy Leader and school-based needs. | Communicates with literacy professionals to identify a focus for a year-long professional development program; provides limited evidence of general findings concerning the role of the Reading Specialist/Literacy Leader and school-based needs. | Fails to communicate with literacy professionals to develop an appropriate focus for professional development; provides no evidence of findings concerning the role of the Reading Specialist/Literacy Leader and school-based needs. | /4 |
| 6.2 Pursues the development of professional knowledge and behaviors. 6.3 Participates in, designs, facilitates, and leads professional development initiatives. | Effectively and comprehensively collaborates with the school leadership team to develop and refine an appropriate focus for a longitudinal professional development initiative; leads and facilitates a highly effective literacy team meeting; provides reflective evidence of team collaboration, analysis, and professional commitment to the initiative; provides reflective evidence of supports and challenges. | Collaborates with the school leadership team to develop an appropriate focus for a longitudinal professional development initiative; leads and facilitates an effective leadership team meeting; provides evidence of team collaboration, analysis, and commitment; provides evidence of program supports and challenges. | Collaborates with professionals to identify a focus for a professional development initiative; holds team meeting; provides limited evidence of team collaboration or analysis; provides limited evidence of program supports or challenges. | Fails to collaborate with professionals to develop an appropriate focus for professional development initiative; provides no evidence of analysis or commitment to the initiative; provides no evidence of program supports or challenges. | /4 |
| 3.2 Leads analysis and interpretation of school-wide assessment data to examine student performance. 3.3 Analyzes and interprets school-wide assessment data to plan a literacy focus for professional development. 6.4 Understands and influences local, state, or national policy decisions. | Effectively and comprehensively analyzes school-wide data patterns, student performance, core standards, curriculum connections, and school improvement goals to plan and support a literacy initiative; advocates and promotes highly effective communication and collaboration among stakeholders. | Analyzes relevant data, patterns, student performance, core standards, curriculum connections, and school improvement goals to plan a literacy initiative; promotes effective communication and collaboration among stakeholders. | Presents some data, and curriculum, and school improvement goals to plan a literacy initiative; some communication with stakeholders is evident. | Fails to analyze data and/or school improvement goals to plan a literacy initiative; communication with stakeholders is not evident. | /4 |

| PART II: Annotated Bibliography & Synthesis IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | |
|--|--|--|--|--|----|
| 1.1 Understands empirical research that describes the foundations of reading and/or writing development, processes, and components for school-based initiative. | Effectively reviews and summarizes reading research from scholarly, peer-reviewed journals; identifies textually and contextually important ideas from the introduction, methods, results, and discussion sections; clearly articulates how these studies support the literacy focus. | Reviews and summarizes reading research in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals; identifies most textually and contextually important ideas from the introduction, methods, results, and discussion sections; articulates how these studies support the literacy focus. | Reviews and cites research findings in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals; identifies some textually and contextually important ideas from the introduction, methods, results, and discussion sections; articulates how these findings support the literacy focus. | Identifies minimal information from the introduction, methods, results, and discussion, sections of scholarly, peer-reviewed research articles; does not articulate how these studies support the literacy focus. | /4 |
| 1.2 Understands the role of historically shared knowledge for improving students' reading development and achievement for school-based initiative. | Effectively reviews and summarizes historically shared reading practice in peer-reviewed practitioners' journals/chapters; identifies textually and contextually important information from the purpose, instructional context, and core concepts; clearly articulates how the information supports the literacy focus. | Reviews and summarizes historically shared reading practice in peer-reviewed practitioners' journals/chapters; identifies most textually and contextually important information from the purpose, instructional context, and core concepts; articulates how the information supports the literacy focus. | Reviews and cites historically shared reading practice in peer-reviewed journals; identifies some textually and contextually important information from the theoretical framework, purpose, instructional context, and core concepts sections; articulates how the information supports the literacy focus. | Identifies minimal information from the theoretical framework, purpose, instructional context, and core concepts sections of scholarly, peer-reviewed practice articles; does not articulate how these studies support the literacy focus. | /4 |
| 1.1., 1.2, 1.3 Understands empirical research and historically shared knowledge and the role of professional judgment to develop an evidence base synthesis and goals for school-based initiative. | Effectively synthesizes empirical research, historically shared knowledge, and practitioner literature to develop an evidence base and goals for the professional development initiative using theoretical principles and evidence based instructional practices. | Synthesizes empirical research, historically shared knowledge, and practitioner literature to develop an evidence base and goals for the professional development initiative using theoretical principles and evidence-based instructional practices. | Summarizes research, historically shared knowledge, and practitioner literature to develop an evidence base and goals for the professional development initiative using theoretical principles and/or evidence-based instructional practices. | Fails to develop an evidence base and goals for the professional development initiative using theoretical principles and/or evidence-based instructional practices. | /4 |
| PART III: Action Plan & Presentation IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | |
| 6.1 Demonstrates foundational knowledge of adult learning, professional development, and school culture; 6.3 Designs, facilitates, and evaluates differentiated professional development initiatives. | Uses research base and school-based understandings to develop and implement highly effective professional development initiative; thoroughly designs evidence-based, interactive, and motivating sessions in a longitudinal professional development plan; thoughtfully identifies a | Uses research base and school-based understandings to develop and present effective professional development initiative; designs evidence-based, interactive, and motivating sessions in a longitudinal professional development plan; identifies a variety of relevant multi-media resources for use by professionals and students. | Uses some research base and/or school-based understandings to develop professional development initiative; Designs sessions in a longitudinal professional development plan; identifies some relevant multi-media resources for use by professionals and/or students. | Fails to utilize research base or school-based understanding to develop relevant professional development sessions or to identify appropriate resources for use by professionals and/or students. | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|-----------|
| | variety of relevant multi-media resources for use by professionals and students. | | | | |
| 6.3 Participates in, designs, facilitates and evaluates effective and differentiated professional development programs; 3.3 Uses assessment data to plan and evaluate professional development initiatives. | Effectively and comprehensively develops a multi-level coaching plan linked to professional development initiative; thoroughly evaluates professional development based on overarching goals, data, and intended outcomes for professionals and students. | Develops a multi-level coaching plan linked to professional development initiative; evaluates professional development based on overarching goals, data, and intended outcomes for professionals and students. | Develops a coaching plan; evaluates some aspects of professional development initiative based on goals, data, intended outcomes for professionals and/or students. | Fails to develop effective coaching plan or evaluative tools based on goals, data, and/or intended outcomes for professionals or students. | /4 |
| 6.2: Displays positive dispositions and pursues the development of professional knowledge and behaviors. | Exhibits exceptional professional communication and leadership capacity throughout initiative and presentations; displays and maintains highly positive professional dispositions as a model for colleagues. | Exhibits highly effective professional communication and leadership capacity throughout initiative and presentations; displays and maintains positive professional dispositions. | Exhibits professional communication and/or leadership capacity during professional presentation; comments on professional development plans. | Fails to demonstrate leadership capacity throughout the professional development presentation. | /4 |

(c) Candidate Data Derived from Assessment:

The following data table summarizes candidate results from the two most recent administrations of the **Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative**.

| Assessment #2: Evidence-Based Professional Development Initiative Summary of Results: Fall, 2011 & Fall, 2012 IRA Standards, 2010 Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 3.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, & 6.4 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| PART I: IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2011 | PRO. 2011 | DEV. 2011 | UNS. 2011 | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | MEAN 2011 = 3.59 N = 19 | MEAN 2012 = 3.60 N = 15 |
| 1.3 Uses professional judgment and practical knowledge to communicate with literacy professionals. | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.89 | 3.80 |
| 6.2 Pursues the development of professional knowledge and behaviors. 6.3 Participates in, designs, facilitates, and leads professional development initiatives. | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.89 | 3.80 |
| 3.2 Leads analysis and interpretation of school- | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| wide assessment data to examine student performance. 3.3 Analyzes and interprets school-wide assessment data to plan a literacy focus for professional development. | 4 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 3.20 |
| PART II IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2011 | PRO. 2011 | DEV. 2011 | UNS. 2011 | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | MEAN 2011 = 3.68 N = 19 | MEAN 2012 = 3.59 N = 15 |
| 1.1 Understands empirical research that describes the foundations of reading and/or writing development, processes, and components for school-based initiative. | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.42 | 3.70 |
| 1.2 Understands the role of historically shared knowledge for improving students' reading development and achievement for school-based initiative. | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.89 | 3.80 |
| 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 Understands empirical research and historically shared knowledge and the role of professional judgment to develop an evidence base and goals for school-based initiative. | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 3.73 | 3.27 |
| PART III IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2011 | PRO. 2011 | DEV. 2011 | UNS. 2011 | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | MEAN 2011 = 3.60 N = 19 | MEAN 2012 = 3.62 N = 15 |
| 6.1 Demonstrates foundational knowledge of adult learning, professional development, and school culture; 6.3 Designs, facilitates, and evaluates differentiated professional development initiatives. | 13 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3.63 | 3.66 |
| 6.3 Participates in, designs, facilitates and evaluates effective and differentiated | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3.32 | 3.46 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| professional development programs; 3.3 Uses assessment data to plan and evaluate professional development initiatives. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions and pursues the development of professional knowledge and behaviors. | 16 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3.84 | 3.73 |

SECTION IV—Assessment #3: Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs

1. Description of Assessment and Use in Program:

The **Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs** incorporate a two-part developmental sequence of lesson planning and implementation that displays candidates' pedagogical and professional knowledge in **Phase I** of the Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) core coursework. This sequence also provides multiple opportunities for developing literacy coaching competencies including conversing with colleagues, interpreting assessment data, modeling capstone lessons, co-planning lessons, analyzing student performance, debriefing and supporting in-service teachers. **Part I** consists of designing and implementing capstone lessons in a five-day instructional design for systematic, explicit phonics instruction. Candidates collaborate with primary level classroom teachers to administer and interpret multiple assessment measures, to examine more specific instructional needs of struggling readers/writers and English Language Learners, and to plan, deliver, and evaluate evidence-based approaches for explicit, systematic phonics instruction in authentic school-based settings. This component of the two-course performance measure is implemented in **RDS 540: Early Literacy Foundations** (fall only course offering).

Part II is designed to formally measure candidates' ability to develop and implement capstone lessons using evidence-based approaches for comprehension strategy instruction. Utilizing a gradual release instructional design, candidates plan, deliver, and evaluate capstone comprehension lessons in a school or summer clinic setting. The implementation process incorporates data analysis, grouping configurations, material selection, lesson planning, anecdotal records, professional collaboration, and a systematic analysis of lesson implementation through observations, debriefing, and critical reflection. This second component of the two-course performance measure is implemented in **RDS 542: Comprehensive Literacy Instruction** (spring/summer course offering).

2. Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards, 2010:

The two-part **Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs** address the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach **IRA Standards, 2010** through the following elements: **1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, and 6.3**. The **Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs** require candidates to interpret theoretical orientations and evidence-based best practices while actively displaying professional judgment and practical knowledge to plan and deliver comprehensive literacy instruction (**IRA 1.1, 1.3, 2.1**). Throughout a developmental sequence of lessons, candidates thoughtfully examine curriculum, create supportive learning environments, implement and evaluate a repertoire of instructional approaches, and utilize a range of traditional print, digital, and online resources (**IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**). **Parts I-II** also incorporate an in-depth analysis of assessment data to plan, implement, and refine instruction that motivates readers at diverse developmental stages while differentiating according to individual, small group, and classroom needs (**IRA 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2**). This longitudinal two-course process also requires literacy coaching actions including professional dialogues, reflective problem solving, and collaborative experiences with in-service teachers (**IRA 3.4, 6.2, 6.3**).

Part I: Capstone Phonics Lessons and Instructional Design presents unique opportunities to re-examine candidates' foundational knowledge through an analysis of multiple factors that impact language acquisition, early literacy development, and equity for struggling primary readers/writers and second language learners (**IRA 1.1, 4.1, 4.3**). **Part II: Capstone Comprehension Lessons and Instructional Design** requires candidates to articulate a comprehensive understanding of the integration of major literacy components as evidenced through developing comprehension strategy instruction and reading-writing connections (**IRA 1.1**). **Part II** highlights a process of modeling, guided and collaborative practice opportunities, and independent application while utilizing a range of developmentally appropriate instructional resources (**IRA 2.3**).

3. Initial Analysis of Data Findings:

Cumulative results from **Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs** display patterns of strong candidate performance in longitudinal lesson development, implementation, and evaluation. Two-year mean scores reveal the strongest cumulative performance in **Part I: Capstone Phonics Lessons and Instructional Design**. Mean scores for **Part I** suggest that candidates capably demonstrate developmentally appropriate, systematic and explicit phonics instruction through engaging instructional routines, grouping patterns, and differentiation according to students' needs (**IRA 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**). Candidates also triangulated data from multiple assessment tools including phonics inventories, developmental spelling assessments, running records, and writing samples to design and implement daily and week-long instructional sequences (**IRA 2.2, 3.2, 3.3**). In terms of specific **IRA** standards, candidates demonstrated consistently strong performance as reflected across multiple elements and sources of evidence.

Candidates were slightly less proficient in **Part II: Capstone Comprehension Lessons and Instructional Design**. Mean scores for **Part II** suggest that candidates effectively identified appropriate comprehension strategies using foundational knowledge, established curriculum, standards/benchmarks, and students' abilities and areas of need (**IRA 2.1, 2.3**). Candidates also displayed competency in selecting developmentally appropriate text as aligned to specific comprehension strategies, and developing and implementing interactive, motivating demonstration lessons (**IRA 2.2, 2.3**). While candidates' initial text selection was strong, instructional materials across the lesson cycle (guided, collaborative, and independent practice) most often utilized traditional texts thus suggesting a need for more variation with follow-up materials/resources. Results for **Part II** also revealed relative weaknesses in candidates' abilities to utilize constructive feedback and to critically reflect on lesson effectiveness, teaching performance, student outcomes, and relevant next steps.

4. Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards, 2010:

Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates in **Phase I** of the Graduate Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program design and implement effective literacy instruction. Results from this two-part sequence of lesson implementation suggest that candidates utilize assessment data and a variety of instructional materials to develop and deliver developmentally appropriate, motivational literacy instruction for diverse readers/writers. Candidates incorporated a combination of analogy, analytic, synthetic, and/or spelling based approaches to design systematic phonics instruction. Candidates also integrated technological resources (i.e., Smartboards, interactive websites, etc.) as

well as hands-on manipulatives to design interactive, engaging phonics lessons. Professional conversations with school-based colleagues appeared to enhance lesson development, implementation, and evaluation of instructional approaches and models for specific student needs. Results for Part II reflect candidates' ability to implement evidence-based practices for strategic comprehension instruction. RDS 542 course instructors noted developing more critical reflections as an area for further enhancement. Additionally, a wider range of high quality text types (traditional, digital, multi-media options) will be strategically introduced and incorporated through course revisions.

5. (a) Description of the Assignment: The following description represents the **current** version of **Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs** as aligned to the International Reading Association Standards, 2010.

Graduate Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program

Assessment #3: Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs

IRA Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4,

4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, & 6.3

CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

The **Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs** incorporate a two-part developmental sequence of lesson design and implementation that reflects cumulative pedagogical and professional knowledge as addressed in **Phase I** of the Reading Specialist (RDS) core coursework. This two-part sequence provides multiple opportunities for planning and implementing evidence-based reading instruction and actively engaging in literacy coaching actions. The attached rubric represents the scoring guidelines and provides criteria for specific **IRA** elements and four levels of candidate performance (*see 5 (b) Assessment Scoring Guide*).

Part I – RDS: 540 Capstone Phonics Lessons and Instructional Design (Five Days):

Part I of the **Capstone Instructional Plans and Instructional Design** incorporates the following essential processes during one semester of study. The components and subsequent actions align with course-embedded topics and require planning, implementation, and evaluation of systematic phonics instruction in a primary level classroom:

I-A. Lesson Implementation Process:

- ✓ consulting with primary grade colleagues to develop and refine active, engaging phonics lessons and to identify a targeted classroom;
- ✓ analyzing the primary classroom environment and describing each students' unique needs, especially English Language learners (ELLs) and struggling readers;
- ✓ administering and interpreting phonics assessments, spelling assessments, and analyzing student writing samples;
- ✓ demonstrating an understanding of the role of first and second language acquisition while evaluating reading and writing assessments;
- ✓ explaining and using standards/benchmarks and assessment data to identify a developmentally appropriate phonics goal/objective for primary level students;

- ✓ planning, implementing, and evaluating capstone phonics demonstration lessons using a combination of analogy, analytic, synthetic, or spelling-based instructional designs;
- ✓ incorporating a variety of hands-on alphabetic manipulatives and integrating technological resources;
- ✓ designing a five-day unit plan to reinforce goal/objectives and to provide authentic opportunities for guided practice and independent application;
- ✓ describing classroom configurations used to differentiate instruction for five days of lesson plans including whole class, small group, and individual plans;
- ✓ logging how equity is promoted by maximizing every student's learning and adapting instruction during the capstone lessons;
- ✓ specifying how instructional materials and approaches are adapted to provide equity for all learners including ELL learners and struggling readers including a variety of traditional print, digital, and online resources (use two or more interactive websites to support student learning).

I-B. Lesson Analysis and Professional Reflection:

- ✓ incorporating an analysis of students' performance using evidence that students achieved/did not achieve intended outcomes;
- ✓ reporting data findings to appropriate audiences for instructional purposes, relevant implications, and/or accountability;
- ✓ describing facilitation of professional learning through effective conversations (e.g., planning, reflective problem-solving) with other teachers and collaboration with colleagues (classroom teacher, Reading Specialist, ELL teacher, special educator, administrator);
- ✓ examining the established purposes for assessments and addressing the strengths and limitations of the assessment tasks in terms of systematic phonics approaches;
- ✓ developing a critical reflection that utilizes constructive feedback and analyzes lesson effectiveness, student and teacher performance, and relevant next steps;
- ✓ describing collaboration with others to build strong home-to-school and school-to-home connections;
- ✓ promoting and valuing reading and writing in and out of school and examining professional growth as a potential Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach.

Part I – Submission (RDS 540):

Submit an introduction that incorporates relevant background information about the classroom environment, instructional grouping plans, grade level benchmarks and curriculum, pre-assessment data, specific individual student needs, etc. Provide fully developed lesson plans that incorporate procedures for motivation, lesson development, teaching techniques, and instructional materials. Develop an analysis of results of capstone lessons, a self-evaluation of teacher and student performance, and reflective feedback from the primary classroom teacher. Design and implement a series of weekly plans as follow-up to the introductory lesson. Present cumulative evidence that reflects systematic and ongoing collaboration with school-based classroom teacher and a thoughtful analysis of strengths, areas of need, and next steps for sustained growth and

development as a potential Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach. (*Sample lessons available @ Blackboard site for RDS: 540,* Course Documents*).

Part II – RDS: 542 Capstone Comprehension Lessons & Instructional Design:

Part II of the **Capstone Comprehension Lessons & Instructional Design** incorporates the following essential processes during a second semester of study. The components and subsequent actions align with course-embedded topics and require planning, implementation, and evaluation of comprehension instruction in one elementary, intermediate, or secondary classroom. (During summer sessions, the comprehension lessons are implemented in the McDaniel College Reading Clinic).

II-A. Lesson Implementation Process:

- ✓ explaining and using standards/benchmarks and assessment data to identify a relevant comprehension strategy for use with students;
- ✓ identifying appropriate comprehension strategies as relevant to group and individual reading abilities in collaboration with in-service teacher;
- ✓ developing specific learning objectives and teaching points using foundational knowledge and the established curriculum and explaining why this particular strategy is relevant to the learners;
- ✓ examining a range of developmentally appropriate texts and selecting texts that align with the designated comprehension strategy and explain how selected texts supports the students' learning;
- ✓ selecting instructional level text with appropriate supports and challenges in collaboration with in-service teacher(s);
- ✓ planning and implementing interactive, motivating comprehension lessons that incorporate establishing a purpose, introducing the strategy, developing an explicit script for modeling during reading, summarizing and generalizing after reading, and evaluating student learning;
- ✓ developing an observational tool to gather systematic, constructive feedback and observational data from in-service teacher(s);
- ✓ designing motivating, interactive instructional routines for comprehension strategy instruction using differentiated guided and collaborative practice, independent application, and written responses to text;
- ✓ identifying a variety of instructional materials to meet the specific needs and abilities of learners through the design of follow-up lessons and the identification of additional instructional resources.

I-B. Lesson Analysis and Professional Reflection:

- ✓ analyzing students' performance using evidence that the students achieved/did not achieve intended outcomes;
- ✓ describing facilitation of professional learning through effective conversations (e.g., planning, reflective problem-solving) with groups of teachers and individuals, and collaboration with colleagues (classroom teacher, Reading Specialist, ELL teacher, special educator, administrator);
- ✓ developing a critical reflection that uses constructive feedback and analyzes lesson effectiveness, student and teacher performance, and relevant next steps;

- ✓ documenting an understanding of reading theories and a gradual release model to develop instructional implications;
- ✓ reflecting on new understandings as relative to reading comprehension, strategic behaviors, and an instructional model for teaching comprehension strategies;
- ✓ sharing lesson results and instructional routines in a presentation with colleagues and candidates.

Part II – Submission (RDS 542):

Submit an introduction that incorporates relevant background information about the classroom configuration, the instructional grouping plans, grade level benchmarks and curriculum, pre-assessment data, and specific individual student needs. Provide a well-developed and comprehensive lesson plan that incorporates procedures for motivation, lesson development, teaching points and strategies, and instructional materials. Design and submit a systematic observational tool for use by the classroom teacher. Develop a critical analysis of results and a self-evaluation that incorporates teacher and student performance, adaptations and/or modifications, and potential next steps for students and classroom teacher. Present cumulative evidence that reflects systematic and ongoing collaboration with school-based classroom teacher and develop a presentation to share lesson results and instructional routines with colleagues and candidates (*Sample lessons available @ Blackboard site for RDS: 542,* Course Documents*).

5. (b) Assessment Scoring Guide: The following rubric represents the **current** version of **Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs** scoring tool.

**Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program
Assessment #3: Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs**

***IRA Standards Measured, 2010: 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3,
5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, & 6.3***

CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

| <i>PART I: Capstone Phonics Lessons & Instructional Design IRA Standard/Criteria</i> | <i>Exemplary (4)</i> | <i>Proficient (3)</i> | <i>Developing (2)</i> | <i>Unsatisfactory (1)</i> | <i>Score</i> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|
| 1.1 Understands major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and socio-cultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including the reading-writing connections. | Effectively recognizes and demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the major theories of reading and writing processes and development including first and second literacy acquisition. | Recognizes and demonstrates an understanding of the major theories of reading and writing processes and development including first and second literacy acquisition. | Demonstrates some understanding of the theories of reading and writing process and development and first and second literacy acquisition. | Inconsistently demonstrates an understanding of the theories and empirical research of reading and writing process and development. Inconsistently demonstrates an understanding of first and second literacy acquisition. | /4 |
| 5.2 Designs a social environment that is low-risk, includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write. | Effectively creates a supportive social environment for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Creates a supportive social environment for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Reveals some understanding of how to create a supportive social environment for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Reveals a lack of understanding of how to create a supportive social environment for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | /4 |
| 3.2 Selects, develops, administers, and interprets assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes. | Effectively administers and interprets appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Administers and interprets appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Demonstrates some understanding of administering and interpreting appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Reveals a lack of understanding of administering and interpreting appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | /4 |
| 3.3 Uses assessment data to plan and evaluate instruction. | Effectively and comprehensively analyzes individual readers' performance data and plans instruction. | Analyzes individual readers' performance data and plans instruction. | Demonstrates some ability to analyze individual readers' performance data and to plan instruction. | Reveals a limited understanding of analyzing readers' performance data to plan instruction. | /4 |
| 1.3 Understands and demonstrates the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving students' reading development and achievement. | Effectively demonstrates competence in creating and implementing effective lesson plans based on multiple sources of information (e.g. reading, writing, spelling, and phonics assessment data) to guide instructional planning and to improve reading achievement for | Demonstrates competence in creating and implementing effective lesson plans based on multiple sources of information (e.g. reading, writing, spelling, and phonics assessment data) to guide instructional planning and to improve reading | Demonstrates some understanding of how to create lesson plans based on multiple sources of information (e.g. reading, writing, spelling, and phonics assessment data) to guide instructional planning and to improve reading achievement for | Inconsistently demonstrates an understanding of how to create a lesson plan based on multiple sources of assessment information, such as reading, writing, spelling and phonics assessment data. | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|----|
| | students. | achievement for students. | students. | | |
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum. | Effectively and comprehensively plans with other teachers to design, adjust, and modify curriculum to meet students' needs using traditional print, digital sources, and online contexts. | Plans with other teachers to design, adjust, and modify curriculum to meet students' needs using traditional print, digital sources, and online contexts. | Limited uses of plans with other teachers to design, adjust, and modify curriculum to meet students' needs using traditional print, digital sources, and online contexts. | Reveals a lack of plans to design, adjust, and modify curriculum to meet students' needs using traditional print, digital sources, and online contexts. | /4 |
| 5.4 Uses a variety of classroom configurations (i.e., whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction. | Effectively and comprehensively uses a variety of evidence-based grouping practices to meet the needs of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Uses a variety of evidence-based grouping practices to meet the needs of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Reveals limited use of grouping practices to meet the needs of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Lacks a variety of grouping practices to meet the needs of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | /4 |
| 4.1 Recognizes, understands and values the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. | Effectively and comprehensively demonstrates an understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Demonstrates an understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Reveals some understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Reveals a limited understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | /4 |
| 4.3 Develops and implements strategies to advocate for equity. | Effectively and comprehensively promotes equity through differentiating instruction, instructional practices, and literacy curriculum to address the needs of a diverse range of readers. | Promotes equity through differentiating instruction, instructional practices, and literacy curriculum to address the needs of a diverse range of readers. | Demonstrates some understanding of differentiating instruction, instructional practices, and literacy curriculum to address the needs of readers to promote equity. | Reveals limited use of differentiation, instructional practices, and literacy curriculum to address the needs of readers to promote equity. | /4 |
| 2.3 Uses a variety of appropriate instructional materials including technology to meet the needs of diverse learners at differing stages of development. | Effectively and comprehensively demonstrates appropriate instructional material selection and technology integration to meet the needs of individual learners. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Demonstrates appropriate instructional material selection and technology integration to meet the needs of a group of learners. Provides evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Demonstrates some instructional material selection and technology integration to meet the needs of a group of learners. Provides some evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Instructional material selection and technology integration to meet the needs of a group of learners is not demonstrated. | /4 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional practices to meet the needs of diverse learners at differing stages of development. | Effectively and comprehensively demonstrates appropriate instructional practices to meet the diverse learning needs of ELL and struggling learners through adaptations to instructional materials. | Demonstrates appropriate instructional practices to meet the diverse learning needs of ELL and struggling learners through adaptations to instructional materials. | Demonstrates some understanding of adapting instructional practices to meet the needs of diverse ELL and struggling learners. | Demonstrates a lack of understanding of how to use instructional practices to meet the needs of a diverse group of learners. | /4 |
| 5.3 Uses routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions, from | Effectively and comprehensively plans routines for all students, through scaffolding, | Plans routines for all students, through scaffolding, modeling, transition, adapting | Demonstrates some routines for all students, through scaffolding, modeling, transitioning, | Reveals a lack of routines through scaffolding, modeling, transitioning, and | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|----|
| one activity to another: discussions, and peer feedback). | modeling, transitioning, adapting lessons to differentiate to meet individual learner's needs, and providing opportunities for student discussion and feedback. | lessons to differentiate to meet individual learner's needs, and providing opportunities for student discussion and feedback. | and adapting lessons to differentiate to meet individual learner's needs. Reveals some opportunities for student discussion and feedback. | adapting lessons to differentiate to meet individual learner's needs. Reveals limited opportunities for student discussion and feedback. | |
| 3.4 Communicates assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences. | Effectively and comprehensively analyzes assessment results and reports to a variety of appropriate audiences for relevant implications and instructional purposes. | Analyzes and reports assessment results to a variety of appropriate audiences for relevant implications and instructional purposes. | Demonstrates some understanding of analyzing and reporting assessment results to a variety of appropriate audiences. | Reveals a limited understanding of analyzing and reporting assessment results to a variety of appropriate audiences. | /4 |
| 4.2 Uses a literacy curriculum and engages in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs and engagement with the features of diversity. | Effectively and comprehensively provides differentiated instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online resources that capitalize on diversity to meet group needs. | Provides differentiated instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online resources that capitalize on diversity to meet group needs. | Provides some differentiated instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online resources that capitalize on diversity to meet group needs. | Reveals a lack of differentiated instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online resources that capitalize on diversity to meet group needs. | /4 |
| 4.1 Demonstrates an understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | Provides strong evidence, support, and reflection through collaboration with others to build strong home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections. | Provides evidence and reflection through collaboration with others to build strong home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections. | Provides some evidence of collaboration with others to build strong home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections. | Lack of evidence of collaboration or support with others to build strong home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections. | /4 |
| 6.3 Participates in, designs, facilitates, leads, and evaluates effective and differentiated professional development programs. | Effectively demonstrates ability to hold effective conversations for planning and reflective problem solving with individual and groups of teachers working collaboratively. | Demonstrates ability to hold effective conversations for planning and reflective problem solving with individual and groups of teachers working collaboratively. | Demonstrates some ability to hold effective conversations for planning and reflective problem solving with individual and groups of teachers working collaboratively. | Lacks ability to hold effective conversations for planning, reflective problem solving with individual and groups of teachers working collaboratively. | /4 |
| 3.1 Understands types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | Effectively and comprehensively demonstrates an understanding of the established purposes for assessing the performance of readers, using tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and outcomes. | Demonstrates an understanding of the established purposes for assessing the performance of readers, using tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and outcomes. | Demonstrates some understanding of the established purposes for assessing the performance of readers, using tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and outcomes. | Reveals a lack of understanding of the purposes for assessing the performance of readers, using tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and outcomes. | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--------------|
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions related to one's own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing and pursues the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. | Effectively promotes the value of reading and writing in school by modeling a positive attitude towards reading and writing with students, colleagues, administrators, and parents. | Promotes the value of reading and writing in school by modeling a positive attitude towards reading and writing with students, colleagues, administrators, and parents. | Demonstrates some valuing of reading and writing in school by modeling a positive attitude towards reading and writing with students, colleagues, administrators, and parents. | Reveals a lack of valuing reading and writing in school or modeling of a positive attitude towards reading and writing with students, colleagues, administrators, and/or parents. | /4 |
| PART II: Capstone Comprehension Lessons & Instructional Design IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| 3.1 Understands types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | Effectively demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of standards, student benchmarks, and assessment data to identify a relevant comprehension strategy for use with students. | Demonstrates an understanding of standards, student benchmarks, and assessment data to identify a relevant comprehension strategy for use with students. | Demonstrates some understanding of standards, student benchmarks, and assessment data to identify a relevant comprehension strategy for use with students. | Reveals a limited understanding of standards, student benchmarks, and assessment data to identify a relevant comprehension strategy for use with students. | /4 |
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design or implemented an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum. | Effectively demonstrates and uses comprehensive foundational knowledge and an established curriculum to design instruction that meets students' needs. | Demonstrates and uses foundational knowledge and an established curriculum to design instruction that meets students' needs. | Demonstrates some use of foundational knowledge and an established curriculum to design instruction that meets students' needs. | Reveals a limited use of foundational knowledge and established curriculum to design instruction that meets students' needs. | /4 |
| 2.3 Uses a variety of appropriate instructional materials to meet students' needs. | Effectively demonstrates appropriate instructional material selection that aligns with the comprehension strategy and the needs of the students. | Demonstrates appropriate instructional material selection that aligns with the comprehension strategy and the needs of the students. | Demonstrates instructional material selection to align with comprehension strategy. | Reveals a limited understanding of instructional material selection. | /4 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches that develop comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections. | Effectively demonstrates instructional approaches supported by literature and research to plan, develop, and implement motivating, interactive instruction. | Demonstrates instructional approaches supported by literature and research to plan, develop, and implement instruction. | Implements instructional approaches to plan and deliver instruction. | Reveals a limited understanding of instructional approaches and lesson delivery. | /4 |
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions related to one's own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing and pursues the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. | Effectively displays the development of individual professional knowledge and growth through thoughtful and in-depth reflections about teaching performance. | Displays the development of individual professional knowledge and growth through reflections about teaching performance. | Displays some development of professional knowledge through reflections about teaching performance. | Reveals a lack of professional knowledge and inadequate reflections about teaching performance. | /4 |
| 3.3 Uses assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction. | Effectively and comprehensively analyzes group and individual performance based on well designed evaluation procedures and evidence. | Analyzes group and individual performance based on evaluation procedures and evidence. | Analyzes group performance based on lesson and some evidence. | Reveals a limited understanding of analyzing performance. | /4 |
| 6.3 Participates in, designs, facilitates, leads, and | Effectively participates in instructional | Participates in instructional | Participates in conversations about | Reveals limited participation in | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|----|
| evaluates effective and differentiated professional development. | conversations and effectively leads professional development activities with teachers in order to implement and support high quality comprehension instruction. | conversations and leads professional development activities with teachers to implement and support comprehension instruction. | implementing comprehension instruction. | instructional conversations about implementing comprehension instruction. | /4 |
| 5.3 Uses routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another, discussions, and peer feedback). | Effectively plans and develops instructional routines using a model that supports students' reading and writing performance and provides differentiation according to all students' needs. | Plans and develops instructional routines using a model that supports students' reading and writing performance and provides differentiation according to most students' needs. | Plans and develops some instructional routines to support students' reading and writing performance and provides some differentiation. | Reveals limited instructional routines and limited differentiation. | /4 |
| 2.3 Uses a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources. | Effectively demonstrates knowledge and a critical stance toward selecting a range of high quality instructional resources (traditional print, digital, and online options) to meet the needs and abilities of all students. | Demonstrates knowledge and a critical stance toward selecting quality instructional resources (traditional print, digital, and online options) to meet the needs and abilities of most students. | Demonstrates some knowledge toward selecting instructional resources (traditional print, digital, and/or online options). | Reveals limited knowledge of available instructional resources. | /4 |
| 1.1 Understands major theories and empirical research that describes the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and socio-cultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components including reading-writing connections. | Effectively recognizes and comprehensively demonstrates understanding and implications of quality instructional models for developing reading comprehension and strategic readers/writers. | Recognizes and demonstrates an understanding and implications of instructional models for developing reading comprehension and strategic readers/writers. | Demonstrates some understanding of instructional models for developing reading comprehension. | Reveals limited understanding of instructional models for developing reading comprehension. | /4 |

5. (c) Candidate Data Derived from Assessment: The following data table represents candidate results from the two most recent administrations of **Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs** (fall 2011- summer 2013).

| Assessment #3: Capstone Lessons & Instructional Designs Summary of Results: Fall, 2011-Summer, 2013 IRA Standards, 2010 Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, & 6.3 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| PART I: Capstone Phonics Lessons & Instructional Design IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. Fall, 2011 | PRO. Fall, 2011 | DEV. Fall, 2011 | UNS. Fall, 2011 | EXE. Fall, 2012 | PRO. Fall, 2012 | DEV. Fall, 2012 | UNS. Fall, 2012 | MEAN Fall, 2011 = 3.82 N = 8 | MEAN Fall, 2012 = 3.91 N = 14 |
| 1.1 Understands major theories and empirical research that describe | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and socio-cultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including the reading-writing connections. | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.88 | 3.78 |
| 5.2 Designs a social environment that is low-risk, includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write. | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.75 | 4.00 |
| 3.2 Selects, develops, administers, and interprets assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes. | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.75 | 3.86 |
| 3.3 Uses assessment data to plan and evaluate instruction. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 3.86 |
| 1.3 Understands and demonstrates the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving students' reading development and achievement. | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.62 | 4.00 |
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum. | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.75 | 3.93 |
| 5.4 Uses a variety of classroom configurations (i.e., whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction. | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.75 | 4.00 |
| 4.1 Recognizes, understands and values the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.62 | 3.86 |
| 4.3 Develops and implements strategies to advocate for equity. | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.62 | 4.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| 2.3 Uses a variety of appropriate instructional materials including technology to meet the needs of diverse learners at differing stages of development. | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.75 | 4.00 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional practices to meet the needs of diverse learners at differing stages of development. | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.62 | 4.00 |
| 5.3 Uses routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions, from one activity to another: discussions, and peer feedback). | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.62 | 4.00 |
| 3.4 Communicates assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences. | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.88 | 3.93 |
| 4.2 Uses a literacy curriculum and engages in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs and engagement with the features of diversity. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 3.78 |
| 4.1 Effectively demonstrates an understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 3.86 |
| 6.3 Participates in, designs, facilitates, leads, and evaluates effective and differentiated professional development. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 3.86 |
| 3.1 Understands types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 3.86 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions related to one's own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing and pursues the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| PART II: Capstone Comprehension Lessons & Instructional Models IRA Standard/Criteria (spring/summer) | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.53 N = 11 | MEAN 2013 = 3.43 N = 6 |
| 3.1 Understands types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.91 | 3.50 |
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design or implemented an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum. | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.55 | 3.66 |
| 2.3 Uses a variety of appropriate instructional materials to meet students' needs. | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.90 | 4.00 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches that develop comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections. | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.63 | 3.66 |
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions related to one's own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing and pursues the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3.45 | 3.00 |
| 3.3 Uses assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction. | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3.45 | 2.33 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| 6.3 Participates in, designs, facilitates, leads, and evaluates effective and differentiated professional development. | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 3.33 |
| 5.3 Uses routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another, discussions, and peer feedback). | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.54 | 3.66 |
| 2.3 Uses a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources. | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.36 | 3.33 |
| 1.1 Understands major theories and empirical research that describes the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and socio-cultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components including reading-writing connections. | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.55 | 3.83 |

SECTION IV—Assessment #4: Reading Specialist Practicum Folio

1. Description of Assessment and Use in Program:

The **Reading Specialist Practicum Folio** is a five-part compilation of cumulative artifacts that reflect candidates' pedagogical and professional knowledge in a comprehensive **six-credit** practicum. Throughout the practicum experience, candidates complete specific performance requirements in literacy teams of two to three members. Consequently, **Parts I-V** of the Reading Specialist Practicum Folio requires documentation of thoughtful, reflective team collaboration and a comprehensive range of authentic and "hands-on" literacy coaching and leadership actions. **Part I** requires a comprehensive analysis of student performance through the implementation of an assessment-instruction framework. **Part II** documents the use of developmentally appropriate instructional approaches and details the effectiveness of intervention techniques, technology-based sources, and print/non-print resources to address the reading, word study, and narrative and informational writing needs of diverse learners. **Part III** describes and synthesizes results from analytic-reflective literacy coaching cycles in collaborative teams.

Part IV documents the development of an engaging, meaning-oriented literate environment within the context of a professional learning community. **Part V** includes final reports that describe each unique reader, specific instructional goals as linked to formal and informal assessment data, and a summary of effective instructional techniques for use by in-service teachers. Recommendations for parents and summer reinforcement learning materials are also documented in **Part V** of the folio. Our practicum design is enhanced through a collaborative Title I initiative and a targeted poverty grant. All identified students meet Title I criteria for summer services and represent a range of diversities including English Language Learners. Candidates complete the comprehensive practicum requirement in **Phase III, RDS: 552 Reading Specialist Practicum** (summer only course offering).

2. Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards, 2010:

The five-part **Reading Specialist Practicum Folio** addresses the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach **IRA Standards, 2010** through the following elements: **1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, and 6.4**. **Part I: Analysis of Student Performance** requires candidates to interpret multiple sources of formal and informal assessment data, to develop individual and group goals, to use assessment information to plan, revise, and evaluate instruction, and to monitor student progress (**IRA 3.1, 3.2, 3.3**). **Part II: Daily Log, Instructional Lessons, and Materials** documents the candidates' pedagogical knowledge, use of developmentally appropriate practices, and instructional materials that positively impact student outcomes and are responsive to diversity (**IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.2**). **Part III: Analytic-Reflective Coaching Cycle** describes the implementation of a pre-conference, observation, demonstration lesson, and post-conference cycle and documents candidates' professional competencies and technical skills as literacy coaches (**IRA 1.3, 2.2, 6.2**).

Part IV: Literate Environment depicts the systematic development of a meaning-oriented physical and socially engaging literacy environment and details the use and effectiveness of instructional routines and a variety of classroom configurations (**IRA**

5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4). **Part V: Final School Reports & Summer Learning Kits** displays candidates' ability to synthesize relevant understandings about students' cumulative progress, to thoughtfully analyze their impact on student learning, and to positively communicate recommendations to Title I and classroom teachers. This component also incorporates the development of strong parent partnerships, and comprehensive documentation for compliance with federal (Title I), state, and locally mandated policy guidelines (**IRA 3.4, 4.3, 6.4**).

3. Initial Analysis of Data Findings:

Cumulative mean score results from the **2012 and 2013 Reading Specialist Practicum Folio** reveal very strong candidate performance in **Part IV: Literate Environment** and **Part II: Daily Log, Instructional Plans, and Materials**. In terms of specific **IRA** elements, candidates demonstrated the strongest performance in designing physical and socially, engaging literate environments while utilizing multiple instructional routines and grouping configurations to optimize student performance (**IRA 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**). Two-year mean score results suggest increased competencies in candidates' abilities to design an integrated and comprehensive curriculum, to utilize evidence-based instructional approaches, and to thoughtfully select developmentally appropriate and culturally sensitive materials for interactive literacy instruction (**IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.2**).

Results for **Part III: Analytic-Reflective Coaching Cycle** also suggest improvement in coaching competencies as evidenced by descriptive observations, well-developed demonstration lessons, constructive feedback, and consistent collaboration with colleagues (**IRA 1.3, 2.2, 6.2**). **Part I: Analysis of Student Performance** documents candidate proficiencies in data analysis; however, the ability to interpret and triangulate multiple data sources represents a relative weakness. Documenting student strengths and weaknesses through multiple sources of evidence, and using assessment data to inform instructional decision-making and to monitor student progress are areas for further growth and development (**IRA 3.2, 3.3**). **Part V** results also suggest some inconsistencies in written communication and comprehensive documentation for federal, state, and local policy guidelines (**IRA 3.4, 6.4**).

4. Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards, 2010:

Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates at the completion of the Graduate Reading Specialist (RDS) Practicum display pedagogical and professional knowledge and demonstrate complex responsibilities as literacy leaders. In addition to their knowledge of and experience with a variety of assessment tools and instructional techniques, candidates learn "how" to support classroom teachers through this supervised practicum experience. A Reading Specialist (RDS) Practicum Director and three Teacher Mentors collaboratively evaluate the candidates' analysis of assessment data and student work samples, delivery of instructional lessons and materials, creation of literate environments, and implementation of multiple professional responsibilities including reflective-analytic coaching cycles. Throughout this comprehensive practicum experience, our candidates demonstrate their foundational knowledge and abilities to enthusiastically and effectively support classroom teachers through interpreting

assessment data and providing quality instruction/intervention for students most in need of reading assistance.

A thorough analysis of folio data, systematic observations, and formative/summative assessments are used to refine candidates' learning opportunities and to reexamine RDS core course content and course/program performance measures, as particularly noted in terms of assessment practices (Standard Three). A pretest-posttest design is also utilized to systematically monitor student growth and progress in reading, word study, and writing. This additional documentation provides further substantiation of our candidates' effectiveness as relevant to student performance.

5. (a) Description of the Assignment (Internship): The following description represents the **current** version of the **Reading Specialist Practicum Folio** as aligned to the International Reading Association Standards, 2010.

Graduate Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program

Assessment #4: Reading Specialist Practicum Folio

IRA Standards Measured: 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, & 6.4

CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

The **Reading Specialist Practicum Folio** is a five-part compilation of cumulative artifacts that reflect candidates' pedagogical and professional knowledge throughout a comprehensive **six-credit practicum**. The **Reading Specialist Practicum** incorporates the use of systematic assessment-instruction processes to design and implement effective instruction and targeted intervention within the context of a literate environment. Candidates actively assume leadership responsibilities through team collaboration, professional development, literacy coaching, and effective communication with a variety of audiences. The attached rubric represents the scoring guidelines and provides criteria for specific **IRA** elements and four levels of candidate performance (*see 5 (b) Assessment Scoring Guide*).

Reading Specialist Practicum Folio

Cumulative Artifact Submissions (Parts I-V):

I. Analysis of Student Performance:

Student progress is documented through systematic monitoring that incorporates formal and informal assessments (i.e., QRI-V, Observation Survey subtests, DRA-2 assessments, ongoing running records, developmental spelling inventories, and six-trait writing analysis), student work samples, and posttest data. The clinical team develops mutually agreed upon goals for reading, word study, and writing instruction, and specific intervention plans for individual cases. Candidates document student progress with **ongoing weekly assessments** and at least **three additional work samples** per week in compliance with Title I documentation mandates.

II. Daily Log, Instructional Lesson Plans, and Materials:

The daily schedule, the implementation of relevant instructional techniques, and the use of developmentally appropriate student materials is systematically documented through a **daily log** and **lesson format**. Each candidate designs, implements, and

evaluates reading, writing, and word study instruction. **Specific instructional lesson plans** incorporate systematic procedures and self-reflections as relative to student performance, instructional effectiveness, and growth/progress over time.

III. Analytic-Reflective Coaching Cycle:

Each candidate experiences the role of a literacy coach through an analytic and reflective coaching cycle. The **coaching cycle** involves the development and implementation of a demonstration lesson as well as the observation of a colleague's instruction. The process also incorporates a pre-conference and a post-conference for establishing observational purposes/rationale and for providing constructive feedback in the active role of literacy coach.

IV. Literate Environment and Professional Learning Community:

The clinical team develops a highly interactive, engaging **physical** and **social environment** that utilizes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support. Each candidate designs a variety of **instructional routines** and implements multiple **grouping plans** in order to differentiate instruction and to optimize student growth/progress. Each candidate exhibits **professional dispositions** and **actively engages** in the learning community.

V. Final Report (School) and Summer Learning Kit (Parents):

A final team report documents individual student growth and progress including strengths, weaknesses, instructional focuses, exit reading and word study levels, and intervention goals/techniques. Due to the Title I and targeted poverty funding sources, each candidate must actively maintain and submit professional records that detail all aspects of support as provided throughout the practicum experience. Candidates must initiate ongoing communication with parents, conduct parent conferences, and provide structured, individualized learning materials for summer reinforcement **during** and **after** the practicum experience. Final parent exit conferences provide a summary of concrete recommendations and individualized learning materials for additional summer reinforcement (summer kit).

5. (b): Assessment Scoring Guide: The following rubric represents the current version of the **Reading Specialist Practicum Folio** scoring tool.

Assessment #4: Reading Specialist Practicum Folio
IRA Standards Measured: 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.3,
5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, & 6.4
CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

| <i>IRA Standard/Criteria</i> | <i>Exemplary (4)</i> | <i>Proficient (3)</i> | <i>Developing (2)</i> | <i>Unsatisfactory (1)</i> | <i>Score</i> |
|--|--|---|---|--|---------------------|
| I. Analysis of Student Performance | | | | | |
| 3.1 Understands and uses assessments according to their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | Effectively and comprehensively uses, interprets, and recommends relevant assessment tools and practices to diagnose and to comprehensively monitor student performance and learning outcomes. Provides substantial analysis of assessment data and work samples. Provides reflective evidence of reflective team collaboration. | Uses, interprets, and recommends relevant assessment tools and practices to diagnose and to monitor student performance and learning outcomes. Provides analysis of assessment data and work samples. Provides consistent evidence of team collaboration. | Uses and recommends relevant assessment tools and practices to diagnose and to monitor student performance and learning outcomes. Provides some analysis of assessment data and work samples. Provides evidence of some team collaboration. | Appropriate assessment tools and practices are not demonstrated. Analysis of assessment data and work samples is limited. Team collaboration is not evident. | /4 |
| 3.2 Selects, administers, and interprets assessments for specific purposes. | Effectively and comprehensively selects, administers, and interprets assessments to examine strengths and limitations of struggling readers and writers. Systematically uses assessments to design and modify instruction and to monitor student progress. | Administers and interprets assessments to examine strengths and limitations of struggling readers and writers. Uses assessments to design instruction and to monitor student progress. | Determines strengths and limitations of instructional group. Some use of assessments to monitor student progress. | Proficiencies and limitations of students are not identified or used to monitor student progress. | /4 |
| 3.3 Uses assessment information to plan, evaluate, and revise instruction. | Effectively and comprehensively analyzes in-depth assessment data and utilizes results to meet group and individual needs. Provides reflective evidence of team collaboration. | Analyzes assessment data and utilizes results to meet group and individual needs. Provides consistent evidence of team collaboration. | Utilizes some assessment data to meet group and individual needs. Provides evidence of some team collaboration. | Utilizes limited assessment data to meet group needs. Team collaboration is not evident. | /4 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria | <i>Exemplary (4)</i> | <i>Proficient (3)</i> | <i>Developing (2)</i> | <i>Unsatisfactory (1)</i> | <i>Score</i> |
| II. Daily Log, Instructional Lessons and Materials | | | | | |
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design and implement an integrated and comprehensive curriculum. | Effectively and comprehensively develops and implements a literacy continuum that meets the needs of all learners. Systematically uses evidence-based professional resources. | Develops and implements a literacy continuum that meets the needs of all learners. Uses evidence-based professional resources. | Implements a literacy continuum that meets the needs of some learners. Uses some professional resources. | A literacy continuum that meets the needs of all learners is not evident. Use of professional resources is not apparent. | /4 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate instructional approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners. | Effectively and comprehensively implements developmentally appropriate instructional practices to meet the needs of all | Implements appropriate instructional practices to meet the needs of all learners. Provides consistent evidence of | Implements instructional practices to meet the needs of some learners. Provides evidence of some team collaboration. | Use of instructional practices to meet the needs of learners is not apparent. Team collaboration is not | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--------------|
| | learners. Provides reflective evidence of team collaboration. | team collaboration. | | evident. | |
| 2.3 Uses a wide range of texts (narrative, expository, poetry, etc.), print, and online resources. | Effectively and comprehensively implements a range of appropriate instructional materials to meet the needs of all learners. Effectively selects materials that align with reading levels, interests, and are sensitive to diverse needs. Provides reflective evidence of team collaboration. | Implements appropriate instructional materials to meet the needs of all learners. Selects materials that align with reading levels, interests, and diverse needs. Provides consistent evidence of team collaboration. | Implements instructional materials to meet the needs of some learners. Selects some materials that align with reading levels, interests, and/or diverse needs. Provides some evidence of team collaboration. | Use of instructional materials to meet the needs of a group of learners is not demonstrated. Team collaboration is not evident. | /4 |
| 4.2 Engages in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with features of diversity. | Effectively and comprehensively supports team and engages in practices for differentiating instruction and actively developing students as independent learners. Effectively collaborates with others to build strong school to home connections that are responsive and sensitive to diversity. | Supports team and engages in practices for differentiating instruction and developing independent learners. Collaborates with others to build school to home connections that are responsive and sensitive to diversity. | Supports team in providing some opportunities for differentiating instruction and developing independent learners. Collaborates with others to build some responsive school to home connections. | Options for differentiating instruction and developing independent learners are not evident. School to home connections are not apparent. | /4 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| III. Analytic-Reflective Coaching Cycle | | | | | |
| 1.3 Understands and demonstrates the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving students' reading development and achievement. | Effectively and consistently models fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in teaching students and in working with other professionals. Constructively reflects through self-evaluation as a literacy coach to develop technical coaching competencies and to improve instructional practices. Assists team member through systematic and thoughtful feedback. | Consistently displays fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in teaching students and in working with other professionals. Reflects through self-evaluation as a literacy coach to develop technical coaching competencies and to improve instructional practices. Assists team member through systematic feedback. | Displays some fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in teaching students and in working with other professionals. Reflects through some self-evaluation as a literacy coach. Provides some feedback to other professionals. | Inconsistently displays fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in teaching students and in working with other professionals. Presents limited feedback and self-evaluation as a literacy coach. | /4 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate instructional approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners. | Effectively observes and systematically demonstrates appropriate instructional practices in coaching cycle. Thoughtful analysis and constructive feedback is effectively documented and positively conveyed through the role of literacy coach. Effectively supports teacher in implementing evidence-based instructional approaches. | Observes and demonstrates appropriate instructional practices in coaching cycle. Constructive feedback is documented and conveyed through the role of a literacy coach. Supports teacher in implementing evidence-based instructional approaches. | Observes and demonstrates instructional practices in coaching cycle. Provides some constructive feedback and support in implementing instructional approaches. | Instructional practices do not meet the needs of learners. Feedback and support is inconsistent or inappropriate. | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--------------|
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions related to reading/writing and pursues the development of professional knowledge and dispositions. | Effectively and consistently demonstrates and models positive dispositions toward teaching, reading/writing, and student performance. Enthusiastically and actively pursues the development of professional knowledge and personal learning. Consistently displays effective interpersonal, communication, and strong leadership skills. | Demonstrates positive dispositions toward teaching, reading/writing, and student performance. Actively pursues the development of professional knowledge and personal learning. Displays effective interpersonal, communication, and adequate leadership skills. | Demonstrates some positive dispositions toward teaching, reading/writing, and student performance. Pursues the development of professional knowledge and personal learning. Displays some effective interpersonal, communication, and developing leadership skills. | Positive dispositions toward teaching, reading/writing, and student performance are inconsistent. The development of professional knowledge and personal learning and leadership skills are not evident. | /4 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| IV. Literate Environment and Professional Learning Community | | | | | |
| 5.1 Designs a physical environment to optimize students' use of instructional materials and resources. | Effectively and comprehensively selects a range of developmentally appropriate books, materials, and resources in a stimulating and inviting environment. Materials are thoughtfully and purposefully organized to reflect reading abilities, student interests, and backgrounds. Materials and arrangements are effectively modified to accommodate students' changing needs. | Selects a range of developmentally appropriate books, materials, and resources in an inviting environment. Materials are accessible and reflect reading abilities, student interests, and/or backgrounds. Materials and arrangements are modified to accommodate students' needs. | Some books, materials, and resources are available in the environment. Students have some accessibility to materials. Some materials and arrangements are modified to accommodate students' needs. | Books, materials, and resources are not readily available. Students have limited accessibility to materials. Materials and arrangements are not modified to accommodate students' needs. | /4 |
| 5.2 Designs a socially engaging environment to optimize students' reading and writing performance. | Effectively and comprehensively creates and maintains a socially engaging learning environment with scaffolded support for all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. Effectively reflects on motivational impact of instruction. Reflective team collaboration is evident. | Creates and maintains a socially engaging learning environment with appropriate support for all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. Reflects on motivational impact of instruction. Consistent team collaboration is evident. | Creates and maintains a learning environment with some support for learners. Acknowledges motivational impact of instruction. Some team collaboration is evident. | A socially engaging and motivating learning environment is not apparent. Team collaboration is not evident. | /4 |
| 5.3 Uses instructional routines to support reading and writing instruction. | Effectively and comprehensively creates and maintains a positive learning environment through a variety of successful classroom routines for all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. Reflective team collaboration is evident. | Creates and maintains a positive learning environment through successful classroom routines for all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. Consistent team collaboration is evident. | Creates and maintains a learning environment through some classroom routines for learners. Some team collaboration is evident. | Classroom routines are not apparent for learners. Team collaboration is not evident. | /4 |
| 5.4 Uses a variety of classroom configurations to differentiate instruction (e.g., interactive reading, guided reading, individual goals, word study and | Effectively and comprehensively utilizes evidenced-based grouping practices to meet the needs of all learners, especially struggling readers/writers | Utilizes evidenced-based grouping practices to meet the needs of all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. | Utilizes some grouping practices to meet the needs of some learners. Some team collaboration is evident. | Grouping practices to meet the needs of learners are not apparent. Team collaboration is not evident. | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--------------|
| writing). | and ELL learners. Reflective team collaboration is evident. | Consistent team collaboration is evident. | | | |
| IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| V. Final School Reports & Summer Learning Kits | | | | | |
| 3.4 Communicates assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences. | Effectively and consistently utilizes clear oral and written communication to document students' strengths, limitations, and instructional conclusions and implications. Effectively describes and explains how students integrate components of fluent reading/writing. | Uses oral and written communication to document strengths, limitations, and instructional conclusions and implications. Describes and explains how students integrate components of fluent reading/writing. | Some use of oral and written communication to document instructional conclusions and implications. Describes how students integrate some components of fluent reading/writing. | Oral and written communication does not effectively document instructional conclusions and implications. An understanding of components of fluent reading/writing is not evident. | /4 |
| 4.3 Develop and implement strategies to advocate for diversity. | Effectively and consistently provides students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link the community with the school. Collaborates with team, administrators, and parents to promote equity and to develop strong connections between home, school, and community. | Provides students with linguistic, academic, and/or cultural experiences that link the community with the school. Collaborates with team, administrators, and parents to promote equity and to develop appropriate connections between home, school, and community. | Provides students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link the community with the school. Some collaboration with team, administrators, and parents to promote equity and to develop connections between home, community, and school. | Linguistic, academic, and/or cultural experiences that link the community with the school are not evident. Collaboration to develop connections between home, community, and school is not apparent. | /4 |
| 6.4 Understands and implements local, state, and federal policies. | Effectively and comprehensively demonstrates an understanding of policies that affect reading and writing instruction and provides comprehensive documentation to meet all Title I guidelines and mandates. | Demonstrates an understanding of policies that affect reading and writing instruction and provides adequate documentation to meet Title I guidelines and mandates. | Demonstrates some understanding of policies that affect reading and writing instruction and provides some documentation to meet Title I guidelines and mandates. | Demonstrates limited understanding of policies that affect reading and writing instruction and provides inconsistent documentation to meet Title I guidelines and mandates. | /4 |

5. (c) Candidate Data Derived from Assessment: The following data table represents candidate results from the two most recent administrations of the **Reading Specialist Practicum Portfolio (summer, 2012 & summer, 2013)**.

| Assessment #4: Reading Specialist Practicum Summary of Results: Summer 2012 & Summer 2013 <i>Standards Measured: 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2 & 6.4</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.61 N= 16 | MEAN 2013 = 3.45 N= 17 |
| I. Analysis of Student Performance | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Understands and uses assessments according to their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3.63 | 3.59 |
| 3.2 Selects, administers, and interprets assessments for specific purposes. | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3.63 | 3.06 |
| 3.3 Uses assessments to plan, evaluate, and revise instruction. | 10 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3.56 | 3.71 |
| II. Daily Log, Instructional Lessons and Materials | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design and implement an integrated and comprehensive curriculum. | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.63 | 3.88 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate instructional approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners. | 8 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3.43 | 3.71 |
| 2.3 Uses a wide range of texts (narrative, expository, poetry), print and online resources. | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.88 | 3.88 |
| 4.2 Engages in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement. | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.81 | 3.94 |

| <i>III. Analytic-Reflective Coaching Cycle</i> | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.48 N= 16 | MEAN 2013 = 3.55 N= 17 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| 1.3 Understands and demonstrates the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving students' reading and writing development. | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 3.56 | 3.47 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate instructional approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners in the role of literacy coach. | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | 3.47 |
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions related to reading/writing and pursues the development of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3.63 | 3.71 |
| <i>IV. Literate Environment and Learning Community</i> | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.80 N= 16 | MEAN 2013 = 3.97 N= 17 |
| 5.1 Designs a physical environment to optimize students' reading and writing performance. | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 5.2 Designs a socially engaging environment to optimize students' reading and writing performance. | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.81 | 4.00 |
| 5.3 Uses instructional routines to support reading and writing instruction. | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.69 | 3.94 |
| 5.4 Uses a variety of classroom configurations to differentiate instruction. | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.69 | 3.94 |

| <i>V. Professional Reports and Summer Learning Materials</i> | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.77 N= 16 | MEAN 2013 = 3.61 N= 17 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| 3.4 Communicates assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences. | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3.63 | 3.53 |
| 4.3 Develops and implements strategies to advocate for diversity. | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.88 | 3.82 |
| 6.4 Understands and implements local, state, and federal policies. | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 3.81 | 3.47 |

SECTION IV—Assessment #5: Early Literacy Case Study

1. Description of Assessment and Use in Program:

The **Early Literacy Case Study** is a multi-faceted four-part project designed to document candidates' impact on student learning. Candidates develop and implement longitudinal intervention plans for at-risk primary readers utilizing the following essential processes: (1) administering appropriate assessments tools as pre-test documentation; (2) analyzing multiple data sources and utilizing assessment results to develop instructional goals for reading, writing, and word study; (3) designing an evidence-based intervention to meet individualized goals; (4) implementing and evaluating a minimum of sixteen 30-minute intervention session; (5) video-recording and sharing two demonstration lessons for onsite coaching sessions and debriefings; (6) consulting with classroom teachers to seek input and to share anecdotal records, developmental benchmarks, and student growth; (7) re-administering post-test assessments to analyze cumulative progress; (8) evaluating the effectiveness of intervention plans as relevant to instructional goals; (9) communicating case study results and implications with classroom teacher, fellow graduate candidates, and parent/guardian(s); (10) analyzing specific factors that impact first and second language acquisition and early literacy development. Candidates complete this comprehensive case study requirement in **Phase II, RDS 544 Early Literacy Intervention** (spring only course offering).

2. Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards, 2010:

The four-part **Early Literacy Case Study** addresses the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach **IRA, 2010 standards** through the following elements: **1.1, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 6.2**. **Part I: Assessing the Learner** requires candidates to administer developmentally appropriate assessments, to analyze data patterns, and to design individualized instructional goals for reading, writing, and word study (**IRA 3.1, 3.2, 3.3**). **Part II: Implementing the Intervention Plan** documents the candidates' ability to select and use relevant materials, to plan and execute effective instructional sequences, and to systematically collaborate with primary classroom teachers (**IRA 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 5.2, 5.3**). **Part III: Evaluating the Intervention Plan** provides an analysis of longitudinal effectiveness as relative to specific instructional goals and impact on student learning and to communicate pretest-posttest results and important implications with a classroom teacher and parent/guardian (**IRA 3.4, 4.1**). **Part IV: Reflecting on Action** requires candidates to critically evaluate early intervention practices, to analyze factors that impact language acquisition and early literacy development, and to constructively self-reflect through a comprehensive evaluation of professional and personal growth and focused video analysis (**IRA 1.1, 6.2**).

3. Initial Analysis of Data Findings:

Cumulative mean score results from the **2012 and 2013 Early Literacy Case Study** reveal very strong and consistent performance across **Parts I-IV** of this performance measure. In terms of specific **IRA** elements, candidates design socially engaging, supportive environments and scaffold instructional routines to facilitate early reading and writing development (**IRA 5.2, 5.3**). Candidates also display competencies in selecting developmentally appropriate instructional materials and using assessment tools to analyze

processing behaviors, to develop intervention goals, to determine teaching points, and to systematically monitor student growth and progress (**IRA 2.3, 3.1, 3.2**). Results also reveal that our candidates articulate foundational knowledge to ground their instructional practices and deliver highly effective interventions responsive to language acquisition and early literacy development (**IRA 1.1, 1.3, 2.2, 4.1**).

Cumulative mean scores for **Part III: Evaluating the Intervention Plan** and **Part IV: Reflecting on Action** suggest that candidates systematically analyze the longitudinal effectiveness of intervention strategies, and thoughtfully examine and communicate student learning outcomes and implications to multiple audiences including primary classroom teachers, fellow graduate candidates, and parents/guardians (**IRA 1.1, 3.4, 6.2**). Most candidates also demonstrate use of appropriate and varied instructional practices, however, a more comprehensive repertoire of interactive writing techniques reflects an area for further development (**IRA 2.2**). Candidates also display some relative weaknesses when triangulating multiple data sources in order to plan, to revise, and to evaluate instruction and interventions (**IRA 3.3**).

4. Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards, 2010:

Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates in **Phase II** of the Graduate Reading Specialist (RDS) Program demonstrate the ability to plan and implement effective interventions that impact student learning and early literacy development. Throughout the case study process, candidates synthesize content and pedagogical knowledge as relative to first and second language acquisition, assessment measures, curricular content, and intervention strategies for at-risk primary readers/writers. Through a pretest-posttest design, candidates document student growth and progress in reading, word study, and writing. Candidates examine cumulative results in terms of increases in letter and word identification, text level reading, strategic processing behaviors, and early writing abilities. The pretest-posttest analysis provides substantiation of our candidates' abilities to impact student performance and to systematically document and monitor learning outcomes.

The Early Literacy Case Study was developed, piloted, and re-crafted over multiple semesters. Recent revisions reflect the addition of substantial actions to develop and enhance candidates' abilities and technical skills as interventionists and literacy coaches. Candidate performance requires competency with a range of authentic coaching practices including conversing with colleagues, interpreting assessments, using data for collaborative decision-making, selecting developmentally appropriate texts and instructional resources for early readers, and thoughtfully analyzing two-day video clips of intervention sequences. The in-class viewing of video sessions provides focused, scaffolded practice for enhancing mentoring and coaching capacities as novice literacy coaches.

Throughout the candidates' completion of this comprehensive Early Literacy Case Study, course instructors provide significant feedback and ongoing support for all facets of this comprehensive project. The development of critical analytical abilities for triangulating data from multiple sources of evidence and using assessment information to thoughtfully plan, implement, and evaluate intervention are two areas for further development. RDS 544 instructors suggested the following actions to enhance candidate performance throughout the case study process: (1) implement two progress discussion sessions for the purpose of thoughtfully analyzing multiple sources of data/work samples

to inform intervention techniques (midpoint/end of semester); (2) collaboratively develop next steps/implications using a more systematic data analysis process; (3) provide additional course experiences with interactive writing techniques/options; (4) archive video clips to create an electronic library for use in future sessions and coaching scenarios.

5. (a) Description of the Assignment:

The following description represents the **current** version of the **Early Literacy Case Study** as aligned to the International Reading Association Standards, 2010.

Graduate Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program

Assessment #5: Early Literacy Case Study

IRA Standards Measured (2010): 1.1, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 5.2, 5.3, & 6.2

CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

The **Early Literacy Case Study** is a multi-faceted and comprehensive project designed to document candidates' impact on student learning and early literacy acquisition. This **four-part** project provides an opportunity to develop and implement a longitudinal evidence-based intervention design with an at-risk primary reader. Case study procedures also incorporate the development of collaborative working relationships with primary classroom teachers and parent/guardians. The attached rubric represents the scoring guidelines and provides criteria for specific **IRA** elements and four levels of candidate performance (*see 5 (b) Assessment Scoring Guide*).

Part I – Assessing the Learner:

Part I of the **Early Literacy Case Study** incorporates the following essential processes:

- √ identifying a primary level student in need of reading assistance;
- √ consulting with parent/guardian and primary classroom teacher to gather relevant background information and to obtain consent/written permission for participation in case study;
- √ administering and summarizing pretest assessment tools including a complete Observation Survey (OS) and the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA-2) to identify easy, instructional and difficult text levels;
- √ analyzing multiple data sources and utilizing assessment results to develop instructional goals for reading, writing, and word study.

Part I Submission:

Submit an introduction that incorporates relevant background information, a rationale for selecting the specific reader, and perspectives from classroom teacher and parent/guardians. Describe significant factors that impact early literacy acquisition and student performance (i.e., second language learner; physical and/or emotional factors; developmental issues or special needs, etc.). Provide a summary of data analysis and all relevant documentation including the OS and DRA-2 forms, and signed parental permissions. Present developmentally appropriate instructional goals for reading, writing, and word study as relevant to the data analysis.

Part II - Implementing the Intervention Design:

Part II of the **Early Literacy Case Study** incorporates the following essential processes:

- √ designing evidence-based intervention to meet individualized goals;
- √ implementing intervention sessions that incorporate familiar text re-readings, formative assessments, letter and word study, interactive writing, new text introductions, and first readings of unfamiliar texts;
- √ developing anecdotal records and progress notes to analyze effectiveness of individual sessions as relative to instructional goals, teaching points, and next steps;
- √ video-recording designated segments of lessons from two intervention sessions;
- √ collaborating with classroom teacher to analyze progress and to develop implications for a cohesive classroom reading program and interventions.

Part II Submission:

The number of 30-minute intervention sessions is extremely vital to success with the primary reader. **Sixteen** or more intervention sessions are required for successful completion of the Early Literacy Case Study (excluding testing sessions). Submit all lesson plans and supporting documentation that describes appropriate reading, word study, and writing instruction for each intervention session. Supporting documentation include running records and analyses, interactive writing samples, fluency measures, word sorting activities, writing vocabulary, retelling/comprehension protocols, etc. Submit two-day video-clips that incorporate a day one book introduction, initial reading, and formative assessment, and day two teaching points with an accompanying lesson. Provide evidence that supports systematic collaboration with classroom teacher.

All RDS 544 candidates view short segments of videotaped lessons and discuss implications for teacher and student performance in the role of literacy coaches. The in-class viewing of videotaped lessons provides scaffolded practice for developing technical skills as a mentor and coach. Candidates should prepare to discuss instructional goals, book choice, effective teaching techniques, and next steps for the video-recorded lessons.

Part III – Evaluating the Intervention Design:

Part III of the **Early Literacy Case Study** incorporates the following essential processes:

- √ re-administering all assessment tools as post-test documentation of student growth and progress;
- √ evaluating the longitudinal effectiveness of intervention plan as relevant to instructional goals and impact on student learning;
- √ communicating case study results and findings with classroom teacher and parent/guardian(s) through conferences and written follow-up.

Part III Submission:

Use the pretest-posttest results to describe and analyze student progress. Submit an analysis of the effectiveness of the intervention plan as relevant to each instructional goal and the impact on the student's reading/writing growth and development. Cite professional references to support specific intervention techniques. Submit final

documentation of collaboration with classroom teacher and parent/guardian (i.e., graphs to depict pretest-posttest results, final written report, and formal letter to parent/guardian(s), etc).

Part IV– Reflecting on Action:

Part IV of the **Early Literacy Case Study** incorporates the following essential processes:

- √ analyzing specific factors that impact reading acquisition and early literacy development;
- √ developing a critical self-reflection that evaluates the effectiveness of intervention practices and impact on student performance and describes your professional and personal growth in the roles of interventionist and literacy coach.

Part IV Submission:

Submit a critical self-reflection that describes how the case study enhanced your cumulative understanding of reading acquisition and early literacy development. Articulate how new and refined understandings impact your professional knowledge, skills, and expertise as an interventionist and literacy coach.

5. (b) Assessment Scoring Guide:

The following rubric represents the **most recent** version of the **Early Literacy Case Study** scoring tool.

Assessment #5: Early Literacy Case Study

IRA Standards Measured (2010): 1.1, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 5.2, 5.3, & 6.2

CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

| <i>IRA Standard/Criteria</i> | <i>Exemplary (4)</i> | <i>Proficient (3)</i> | <i>Developing (2)</i> | <i>Unsatisfactory (1)</i> | <i>Score</i> |
|---|---|---|---|--|--------------|
| I. Assessing the Learner | | | | | |
| 3.1 Understands types and purposes of assessment tools including strengths and limitations. | Demonstrates thorough understanding and effectively uses tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and measuring outcomes over time. | Demonstrates understanding and effectively uses tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and measuring outcomes over time. | Demonstrates some understanding and uses some tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and measuring outcomes over time. | Understanding and an effective use of tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and measuring outcomes over time is not demonstrated. | /4 |
| 3.2 Selects, administers, and interprets assessments for specific purposes. | Effectively and comprehensively uses, interprets, and recommends relevant assessment tools and practices to analyze student performance and growth. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Uses, interprets, and recommends relevant assessment tools and practices to examine student performance and growth. Provides evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Uses and recommends relevant assessment tools and practices to examine student performance. Provides evidence of some collaboration with classroom teacher. | Appropriate assessment tools and practices are not demonstrated. | /4 |
| 3.3 Uses assessment information to plan, revise, and evaluate instruction. | Uses substantial, comprehensive documentation and analysis of multiple data sources to plan, revise, and evaluate intervention. | Uses documentation and analysis of multiple data sources to plan, revise, and evaluate intervention. | Uses some documentation and analysis of data to plan and revise intervention. | Documentation and analysis of multiple data sources to plan and revise intervention is not evident. | /4 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| II. Implementing the Intervention Plan | | | | | |
| 1.3 Understands professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving reading development and achievement. | Effectively demonstrates exceptional fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior when teaching students and collaborating with professionals. | Demonstrates consistent fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior when teaching students and collaborating with professionals. | Demonstrates some fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior when teaching students and collaborating with professionals. | Inconsistently demonstrates fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior when teaching students and collaborating with professionals. | /4 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional practices to meet the needs of a diverse learner at differing stages of development. | Effectively demonstrates appropriate and varied evidence-based instructional practices and adapts approaches to meet the needs of individual learner. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Demonstrates appropriate evidence-based instructional practices and adapts approaches to meet the needs of individual learner. Provides evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Demonstrates some instructional practices to meet the needs of individual learner. Provides evidence of some collaboration with classroom teacher. | Instructional practices to meet the needs of individual learner is not demonstrated. | /4 |
| 2.3 Uses a wide range of instructional materials to meet the needs of diverse learners. | Effectively demonstrates appropriate instructional material selection to meet the needs of individual learner. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with | Demonstrates appropriate instructional material selection to meet the needs of individual learner. Provides evidence of | Demonstrates instructional material selection to meet the needs of individual learner. Provides evidence of some | Instructional material selection to meet the needs of individual learner is not demonstrated. | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| | classroom teacher. | collaboration with classroom teacher. | collaboration with classroom teacher. | | |
| 5.2 Designs a socially engaging environment that incorporates choice, motivation, and scaffolded support. | Effectively develops an engaging environment that optimizes opportunities to read and write through choice, motivation, guidance, and strategic feedback. | Develops an environment that provides multiple opportunities to read and write through choice, motivation, guidance, and feedback. | Develops an environment that provides some opportunities to read and write through limited choice some motivation, inconsistent guidance and feedback. | Environment does not provide appropriate opportunities to read and write. | /4 |
| 5.3 Uses instructional routines to support reading and writing development. | Effectively maintains positive learning environment through time allocation, transitions, appropriate discussions, relevant feedback, and opportunities for reading and writing. | Maintains positive learning environment through time allocation, transitions, appropriate discussions, feedback, and opportunities for reading and writing. | Maintains environment through some time allocation, transitions, discussions, feedback, and opportunities for reading and/or writing. | Environment and routines do not provide appropriate opportunities for reading and writing. | /4 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| III. Evaluating the Intervention Plan | | | | | |
| 3.4 Communicates assessment results and implications to various audiences. | Effectively uses clear and comprehensive communication to document assessment results and implications with classroom teacher and parent/guardian. | Uses consistent communication to document assessment results and implications with classroom teacher and parent/guardian. | Uses communication to document some assessment results and implications with classroom teacher and parent/guardian. | Communication does not effectively document assessment results and implications with classroom teacher and parent/guardian. | /4 |
| 4.1 Recognizes, understands, and values the importance of diversity in learning to read and write. | Effectively demonstrates reading and writing instruction that is highly responsive to first and second language acquisition and literacy development. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher, and school -to- home connections. | Demonstrates reading and writing instruction that is responsive to first and second language acquisition and literacy development. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher, and school -to-home connections. | Demonstrates reading and/or writing instruction that is somewhat responsive to language acquisition and/or literacy development. Provides some evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher, and school -to-home connections. | Reading and writing instruction is not responsive to language acquisition and/or literacy development. | /4 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| IV. Reflecting on Action | | | | | |
| 1.1 Demonstrates knowledge of cognitive, linguistic, and socio-cultural foundations of early reading and writing development. | Effectively explains and analyzes rationale for instructional sequences and student performance using foundational knowledge. Thorough knowledge of cognitive, linguistic, socio-cultural factors is evident. | Describes and analyzes rationale for instructional sequences and student performance using foundational knowledge. Knowledge of cognitive, linguistic, socio-cultural factors is evident. | Describes instructional sequences using some foundational knowledge. Limited knowledge of cognitive, linguistic, socio-cultural factors is evident. | Describes instructional sequences using limited foundational knowledge. An understanding of cognitive, linguistic, socio-cultural factors is not evident. | /4 |
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions to reading/writing and the teaching of reading/writing and pursues the development of professional and personal knowledge. | Effectively displays positive dispositions toward teaching and learning. Constructively reflects through critical self-evaluation to improve instructional practices and to enhance professional knowledge and growth. | Displays positive dispositions toward teaching and learning. Consistently reflects through self-evaluation to improve instructional practices and to develop professional knowledge and growth. | Displays some positive dispositions toward teaching and learning. Limited self-reflection presents some basic instructional practices and growth. | Positive dispositions toward teaching and learning are not evident. Self-reflection is not apparent. | /4 |

5. (c) Candidate Data Derived from Assessment:

The following data table summarizes candidate results from the two most recent administrations of the **Early Literacy Case Study (spring, 2012 & spring, 2013)**.

| Assessment #5: Early Literacy Case Study Summary of Results: Spring 2012 & Spring 2013 IRA Standards, 2010 <i>Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 5.2, 5.3, & 6.2</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.80 N= 10 | MEAN 2013 = 3.75 N= 8 |
| I. Assessing the Learner | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Understands types and purposes of assessment tools including strengths and limitations. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 3.2 Selects, administers, and interprets assessments for specific purposes. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 3.75 |
| 3.3 Uses assessment information to plan, revise, and evaluate instruction. | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.40 | 3.50 |
| II. Implementing the Intervention Plan | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3 Understands professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving reading development and achievement. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 3.88 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional practices to meet the needs of a diverse learner at differing stages of development. | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.90 | 3.63 |
| 2.3 Uses a wide range of instructional materials to meet the needs of diverse learners. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 3.88 |
| 5.2 Designs a socially engaging environment that incorporates | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 4.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| choice, motivation, and scaffolded support. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.3 Uses instructional routines to support reading and writing development. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| III. Evaluating the Intervention Plan | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.95 N= 10 | MEAN 2013 = 3.94 N= 8 |
| 3.4 Communicates assessment results and implications to various audiences. | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.90 | 3.88 |
| 4.1 Recognizes, understands, and values the importance of diversity in learning to read and write. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| IV. Reflecting on Action | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 4.00 N=10 | MEAN 2013 = 4.00 N= 8 |
| 1.1 Demonstrates knowledge of cognitive, linguistic, and socio-cultural foundations of early reading and writing development. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions to reading/writing and the teaching of reading/writing and pursues the development of professional and personal knowledge. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 4.00 |

SECTION IV - Assessment #6: Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework

1. Description of Assessment and Use in Program:

The **Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework** incorporates a three-part literacy coaching sequence designed for assisting classroom teachers with the implementation of developmentally appropriate word study instruction. Candidates initiate an assessment-instruction process based on the following operational procedures: (1) training in-service teachers to administer, score, and interpret developmental spelling inventories; (2) strategically using technology to collate individual student data and to compile results through feature guides and classroom composites; (3) charting instructional grouping options and developmental implications for all students; (4) analyzing students' ranges of word study proficiencies in relationship to reading and writing performance; (5) identifying students who are potentially at-risk as a target group for further study; (6) designing and implementing word study demonstration lessons for the designated target group; (7) debriefing with classroom teacher to evaluate progress and to design an implementation plan; (8) developing a weekly schedule of appropriate reinforcement and extension activities; (9) designing additional job-embedded professional development activities as relevant to a word study initiative; (10) developing a critical reflection that focuses on word study in an integrated, balanced, and comprehensive curriculum and effectiveness as a literacy coach. Candidates complete the assessment-instruction coaching framework requirement in **Phase II, RDS 546** Diagnostic Assessment and Instruction (a fall only course).

2. Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards, 2010:

The three-part **Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework** addresses the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach **IRA Standards, 2010** through the following elements: **2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, and 6.3. Part I: Assessment Design** requires candidates to train and support classroom teachers in administering and interpreting developmentally appropriate assessment tools, to collaboratively analyze students' strengths and limitations, to utilize a complete set of class data to inform instruction, and to develop classroom configurations and grouping plans (**IRA 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.4**). **Part II: Instructional Support** documents the candidates' ability to design and implement a word study program, to plan and model effective instructional routines, to recommend and use engaging print, digital, and online materials/manipulatives, and to systematically support classroom teachers (**IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.4**). **Part III: Reflective Practices & Professional Development** reflects candidates' leadership abilities and capacities to implement evidence-based practices and to provide job-embedded professional development through a responsive literacy coaching framework (**IRA 6.2, 6.3**).

3. Initial Analysis of Data Findings:

Cumulative mean score results from the **2012 and 2013 Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework** reveal proficient to strong candidate performance in **Part I: Assessment Design** and **Part III: Reflective Practices & Professional Development** of this performance measure. In terms of specific **IRA** standards, candidates effectively administered and interpreted assessment tools, analyzed students' proficiencies on a developmental continuum, and designed classroom configurations and grouping plans for

differentiating instruction, particularly for students who struggle with reading and writing (**IRA 3.2, 3.3, 5.4**). Results suggest that candidates exhibited professional knowledge and leadership abilities and successfully supported in-service classroom teachers through an assessment-instruction coaching framework. Mean scores (2013) also reflect improvement in the design, facilitation, and evaluation of job-embedded professional development and the use of instructional routines to support a developmental range of students in authentic classroom settings (**IRA 6.2, 6.3, 5.3**).

Cumulative mean score results reveal that candidates display competency in their abilities to communicate assessment results and instructional implications, and to use print, digital, and online resources for interactive instruction and professional development needs (**IRA 3.4, 2.2**). However, some candidates are less proficient in analyzing the relationships between reading, writing, and word level performance within an integrated, literacy curriculum, and using more comprehensive instructional approaches as supported by professional literature and research (**IRA 2.1, 2.2**). These specific weaknesses are most evident in the analysis of word study proficiencies in relationship to reading and writing abilities, and the development of follow-up reinforcement and extension activities.

4. Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards, 2010:

Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates in **Phase II** of the Graduate Reading Specialist (RDS) Program demonstrate the ability to actively support classroom teachers through a responsive literacy coaching framework. Candidate performance requires competency with multiple coaching activities including conversing with colleagues, assisting with assessing students, interpreting data patterns, analyzing classroom work samples, developing instructional materials, sharing collective resources, modeling and discussing lessons, and co-planning short and long-term instruction for all learners. Cumulative critical reflections suggest that candidates establish productive professional relationships through clear and open communication, mutual respect, data driven decision-making, and proactive “student-centered” problem-solving. Candidates also recognize the benefits and challenges of implementing classroom-based word study instruction for multiple developmental stages.

The Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework is a three-part program level assessment specifically designed to assess candidates’ pedagogical and professional knowledge, and technical skills as novice literacy coaches. Results suggest that candidates demonstrate leadership capacities and learn “how to” coach through a structured assessment-instruction framework, guided and collaborative practice, and independent application in authentic classroom-based experiences. Parts I-III also reflects our candidates’ ability to utilize technology for instructional and professional purposes and to compile and analyze student proficiencies across classroom data sets. However, candidates need additional opportunities to examine relationships between reading, writing, and word study performance within an integrated, comprehensive literacy curriculum.

RDS 546 course instructors recommend continued support in the development of long-term plans for instruction, reinforcement, and extension opportunities. Suggestions for improvement include incorporating additional word sorting activities, linking word study to authentic reading materials, designing interactive games, and developing

systematic approaches to informal assessment. In order to enhance candidate performance, RDS 546 instructors also recommend the following actions: (1) presenting more guided practice for developing weekly and quarterly plans for a span of developmental stages/grade levels; (2) continuing to use technological resources for analyzing data, implementing instruction, and identifying supplementary professional resources; (3) providing additional in-class opportunities to share, discuss, and analyze reading, writing, and word study relationships with an integrated, balanced, and comprehensive literacy curriculum.

5. (a) Description of the Assignment:

The following description represents the **current** version of the **Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework** as aligned to the International Reading Association Standards, 2010.

Graduate Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program

Assessment #6: Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework

IRA Standards Measured: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, & 6.3

CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

The **Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework** incorporates a literacy coaching sequence designed for assisting classroom teachers with the implementation of developmentally appropriate word study instruction. This **three-part** framework incorporates the administration and analysis of a developmental spelling inventory, the strategic use of technology to compile results and to organize grouping options, the development of word study instruction with interactive print/electronic materials, and the systematic support of a self-selected classroom teacher. The attached rubric represents the scoring guidelines and provides criteria for specific **IRA** elements and four levels of candidate performance (*see 5 (b) Assessment Scoring Guide*).

Part I – Assessment Design:

Part I of the **Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework** incorporates the following essential processes:

- √ identifying a classroom teacher interested in enhancing word study practices;
- √ initiating professional dialogue to develop an honest, trusting relationships;
- √ overviewing the assessment-instruction process as relevant to word study;
- √ articulating the rationale and purpose for word study as relative to reading, and writing instruction;
- √ training classroom teacher to administer, score, and interpret a developmentally appropriate spelling inventory;
- √ utilizing the scoring CD to collate data including a Feature Guide for every student, a Classroom Composite, and an Organizational Chart;
- √ charting instructional grouping options and developing implications for all students using assessment results in consultation with classroom teacher;
- √ analyzing students' range of word study proficiencies in relationship to reading and writing performance in consultation with classroom teacher;
- √ identifying students who are potentially at-risk as a target group for further study in consultation with classroom teacher.

Part I Submission:

Submit all copies of assessment documentation including Feature Guides, Classroom Composite, and Classroom Organization Chart. Present anecdotal notes and an assessment timeline to summarize collaboration with classroom teacher. Create a self-designed organizational chart to depict the students' spelling stages, instructional reading levels, and writing abilities. Describe essential characteristics of the developmental spelling abilities, and provide a rationale for the identification of the targeted group for Part II: Instructional Support.

Part II – Instructional Support:

Part II of the **Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework** incorporates the following essential processes:

- √ viewing the professional training DVD in order to develop a four-step instructional lesson plan (i.e., demonstration, sort and check, reflect, and extend);
- √ designing and implementing a developmentally appropriate demonstration lesson with the target group;
- √ debriefing with classroom teacher to analyze student performance, teaching actions, and relevant next steps;
- √ designing a weekly schedule of appropriate reinforcement and extension activities in consultation with classroom teacher.

Part II Submission:

Submit a developmentally appropriate four-step lesson plan with all supporting materials for use by classroom teacher and students. Provide anecdotal notes describing the implementation of the lesson and an analysis of student performance, teaching actions, and logical next steps. Present a weekly schedule that includes follow-up classroom reinforcement and extensions for homework.

Part III – Reflective Practices & Professional Development:

Part III of the **Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework** incorporates the following essential processes:

- √ outlining an implementation plan and describing additional support in terms of professional development activities for a word study initiative;
- √ developing a critical reflection that focuses on technical competencies and effectiveness as a literacy coach.

Part III Submission:

Outline and submit an implementation plan and provide relevant recommendations for providing additional support for classroom teachers. Develop a final reflection that summarizes the effectiveness with the assessment-instruction coaching framework and describes personal goals and next steps for professional growth.

Word Study Reference Source:

- * Bear, D.R., Invernizzi, M., Templeton, S., & Johnston, F. (2012). *Words their way: Word study for phonics, vocabulary, and spelling instruction, 5th edition*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson, Inc.
(*With **CD** for Scoring & **DVD** for Professional Training)

5. (b) Assessment Scoring Guide:

The following rubric represents the **most recent** version of the **Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework** scoring tool.

Assessment #6: Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework
IRA Standards Measured: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, & 6.3
CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

| Part I: Assessment Design IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
|---|--|--|---|---|--------------|
| 3.2 Selects, develops, administers, and interprets assessments for specific purposes. | Comprehensively and effectively supports the classroom teacher through well-developed rationale, selection of assessments, administration of assessments, and interpretation of data sources for all students. | Supports the classroom teacher through rationale, selection of assessments, administration, and interpretation of data sources for all students. | Supports the classroom teacher in selection, administration and reporting of some data. | Administration and interpretation of assessment data is not evident. | /4 |
| 3.3 Uses assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction. | Leads teacher in thoughtful analysis of assessment data for instructional decision-making. Effectively analyzes assessment data and utilizes the results to plan and evaluate instruction. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Leads teacher in analysis and use of assessment data for instructional decisions. Analyzes assessment data and utilizes the results to plan and evaluate instruction. Provides evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Utilizes some assessment data to plan instruction. Provides some evidence of leadership capacity and collaboration with classroom teacher. | Assessment data to meet the classroom needs is not utilized. Leadership capacity and collaboration with classroom teacher is not evident. | /4 |
| 3.4 Communicates assessment results for relevant implications, accountability, and instructional purposes. | Thoughtfully analyzes and effectively communicates assessment results for relevant implications and instructional purposes including classroom, groups, and individuals. | Analyzes and communicates assessment results for implications and instructional purposes for classroom, groups, and individuals. | Reports assessment results for implications and/or instructional purposes for classroom, groups, or individuals. | Assessment results are not analyzed or reported. | /4 |
| 5.4 Uses a variety of classroom configurations to differentiate instruction. | Comprehensively and effectively demonstrates evidence-based grouping practices to meet needs and intended outcomes for all students, especially at-risk readers and writers. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Demonstrates evidence based grouping practices to meet the needs and intended outcomes for all students, especially at-risk readers and writers. Provides evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Demonstrates limited evidence of grouping practices to meet the needs and intended outcomes for students. Provides some evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Evidence of grouping practices to meet the needs and intended outcomes are not evident. Provides no evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | /4 |

| Part II: Instructional Support IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design and implement comprehensive, integrated curriculum. | Thoughtfully plans and effectively develops and implements word study practices to meet the needs of at-risk students. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Plans, develops, and implements word study practices to meet the needs of at-risk students. Provides evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Plans and implements word study practices to meet the needs of at-risk students. Provides evidence of some collaboration with classroom teacher. | Word study practices to meet the needs of at-risk readers are not evident or collaboratively shared with classroom teacher. | /4 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches supported by literature and research. | Effectively demonstrates appropriate instructional practices that provide in-depth instruction to meet the needs of at-risk students. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Demonstrates appropriate instructional practices that provide instruction to meet the needs of at-risk students. Provides evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Demonstrates instructional practices to meet the needs of students. Provides evidence of some collaboration with classroom teacher. | Instructional practices to meet the needs of students are not demonstrated or collaboratively shared with classroom teacher. | /4 |
| 2.3 Uses a wide range of texts including print, digital, and online resources. | Effectively develops and utilizes a variety of appropriate instructional resources to meet the needs of at-risk students. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Develops and utilizes appropriate instructional resources to meet the needs of at-risk students. Provides evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Develops and uses instructional resources to meet the needs of at-risk students. Provides some evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Instructional resources to meet the needs of at-risk students are not demonstrated or collaboratively shared with classroom teacher. | /4 |
| 5.3 Uses instructional routines to support literacy development. | Effectively develops and creates a variety of engaging instructional routines within the context of a positive classroom learning environment. Provides reflective evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Develops and creates instructional routines within the context of a positive classroom learning environment. Provides evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Develops some instructional routines within a classroom learning environment. Provides some evidence of collaboration with classroom teacher. | Instructional routines within the context of a positive learning environment are not demonstrated or collaboratively shared with classroom teacher. | /4 |
| Part III: Reflective Practices & Professional Development IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| 6.2 Display positive dispositions and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. | Effectively demonstrates interpersonal communication and leadership abilities through responsive coaching practices. Productively supports the classroom teacher in using research-based practices to implement an assessment-instruction framework. | Demonstrates interpersonal communication and leadership abilities through coaching practices. Supports the classroom teacher in using research-based practices to implement an assessment-instruction framework. | Demonstrates interpersonal communication and some coaching practices. Minimally supports the classroom teacher in using research-based practices to implement an assessment-instruction framework. | Interpersonal communication and coaching practices are not evident. Support with research-based practices within an assessment-instruction framework is not evident. | /4 |
| 6.3 Designs, facilitates, and evaluates effective professional development actions. | Effectively leads comprehensive job-embedded professional development activities. | Leads job-embedded professional development activities. Analyzes | Meets for some professional development. Participates in | Professional development, effective conversations, and | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Thoroughly analyzes the ability to engage in effective conversations and to plan comprehensive next steps. Effectively supports teacher in efforts to utilize technology in literacy assessment. | the ability to engage in effective conversations and to plan next steps. Supports teacher in efforts to utilize technology in literacy assessment. | conversations and some planning. Provides support in efforts to utilize technology in literacy assessment. | support with technology are not evident. | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

5. (c) Candidate Data Derived from Assessment:

The following data table summarizes the candidate results from the most recent administrations of the **Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework (fall, 2011 & fall, 2012)**

| Assessment #6: Assessment-Instruction Coaching Framework Summary of Results: Fall 2011 & Fall 2012 IRA Standards, 2010 <i>Standards Measured: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, & 6.3</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2011 | PRO. 2011 | DEV. 2011 | UNS. 2011 | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | MEAN 2011 = 3.52 N= 19 | MEAN 2012 = 3.45 N= 15 |
| I. Assessment Design | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 Selects, develops, administers, and interprets assessments for specific purposes. | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3.53 | 3.47 |
| 3.3 Uses assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction. | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3.53 | 3.47 |
| 3.4 Communicates assessment results for relevant implications, accountability, and instructional purposes. | 8 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 3.37 | 3.33 |
| 5.4 Uses a variety of classroom configurations to differentiate instruction. | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3.63 | 3.53 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2011 | PRO. 2011 | DEV. 2011 | UNS. 2011 | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | MEAN 2011 = 3.45 N= 19 | MEAN 2012 = 3.33 N= 15 |
| II. Instructional Support | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design and implement integrated curriculum. | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 3.58 | 3.00 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| and varied instructional approaches supported by literature and research. | 3 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 3.16 | 3.20 |
| 2.3 Uses a wide range of texts including print, digital, and online resources. | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 3.58 | 3.40 |
| 5.3 Uses instructional routines to support literacy development. | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.47 | 3.73 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria III. Reflective Practices & Professional Development | EXE. 2011 | PRO. 2011 | DEV. 2011 | UNS. 2011 | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | MEAN 2011 = 3.60 N= 19 | MEAN 2012 = 3.64 N= 15 |
| 6.2 Display positive dispositions and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3.94 | 3.67 |
| 6.3 Designs, facilitates, and evaluates effective professional development actions. | 6 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3.26 | 3.60 |

SECTION IV—Assessment #7: Diagnostic Portfolio

1. Description of Assessment and Use in Program:

The **Diagnostic Portfolio** features a series of artifacts that document candidates' abilities to use in-depth assessment information to design intervention for at-risk **intermediate** or **secondary level** readers. Candidates implement an assessment-instruction model that incorporates the following essential processes: (1) consulting with classroom and/or content teacher(s) to gather relevant background information; (2) utilizing an interest inventory to examine reading preferences, personal interests, and meta-cognitive processing behaviors; (3) analyzing word identification, fluency, oral/silent reading comprehension, developmental spelling, and writing abilities; (4) interpreting results from multiple data sources; (5) comparing findings for narrative, expository, and classroom-based instructional texts; (6) identifying patterns of strengths, weaknesses, and potential sources of interference; (7) recommending and administering further diagnostic assessments to fine-tune analysis; (8) interpreting cumulative results and developing individualized intervention goals in collaboration with classroom and/or content teacher(s); (9) proposing valid, evidence-based instruction and intervention techniques; (10) negotiating a plan of action to accelerate student growth and progress through a systematic response to intervention framework. Candidates complete the diagnostic portfolio requirement in **Phase II, RDS 546** Diagnostic Assessment and Instruction (a fall only course).

2. Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards, 2010:

The three-part **Diagnostic Portfolio** addresses the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach **IRA Standards, 2010** through the following IRA elements: **2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 6.2. Part I: Analysis of Initial Data** requires candidates to administer and interpret developmentally appropriate assessment tools for an intermediate/secondary level student, to use multiple sources of evidence to document patterns of strength and areas of need, and to communicate assessment results and instructional implications with classroom and/or content teacher(s) (**IRA 3.2, 3.3, 3.4**). **Part II: Analysis of Cumulative Data Sources** incorporates a more in-depth examination of potential sources of interference through the administration of additional diagnostic assessment measures, a re-evaluation of cumulative data patterns, and further professional collaboration with classroom and/or content teacher(s) (**IRA 3.2., 3.3**). **Part III: Intervention Goals, Implications, and Recommendations** document the candidates' abilities to use assessment data to develop individualized goals, to plan effective instructional approaches, and to design evidence-based interventions as relative to documented strengths and needs (**IRA 2.2, 3.3**). This performance measure also requires candidates to examine assessment tools for multiple purposes including diagnosis, progress monitoring, and measuring student learning outcomes. Candidates analyze significant factors that impact adolescent literacy development of at-risk intermediate/secondary students and articulate new and refined understandings about assessment practices within a response to intervention tiered framework (**IRA 3.1, 6.2**).

3. Initial Analysis of Data Findings:

Cumulative mean score results from the **2011 and 2012 Diagnostic Portfolio** reveal strong candidate performance in **Part I: Analysis of Initial Data** and **Part II: Analysis of Cumulative Data Sources**. In terms of specific **IRA** elements, candidates successfully identified, administered, and interpreted developmentally appropriate assessments for at-risk intermediate/secondary students. Candidates utilized multiple sources of assessment data to substantiate patterns of strength and areas of need. Results also suggest that candidates examined students' unique interests, reading potential, school-based expectations, and variability with a range of text types to thoughtfully design instruction and intervention practices (**IRA 3.2, 3.3**).

Cumulative mean score results for **Part III: Intervention Goals, Implications, and Recommendations** verify that candidates demonstrate an understanding of established assessment purposes including diagnosis, progress monitoring, and measuring student learning outcomes (**IRA 3.1**). Candidates also displayed their abilities to effectively communicate assessment results and relevant implications and to thoughtfully collaborate with in-service classroom/content teacher(s) (**IRA 3.4**). As evidenced in **Part III**, candidates displayed a range of performance when utilizing assessment results to develop individualized goals. However, improvement (fall, 2012) was noted in the alignment of designated goals with developmentally appropriate, viable instructional techniques and evidence-based intervention practices (**IRA 3.3, 2.2**). The use of in-depth assessment information to plan individualized goals, to further develop instructional approaches, and to support in-service teachers in designing and implementing highly effective intervention practices represent areas for additional consideration.

4. Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards, 2010:

Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates in **Phase II** of the Graduate Reading Specialist (RDS) Program demonstrate the ability to use in-depth assessment data to analyze the individual reading competencies of at-risk intermediate and/or secondary level students. Furthermore, results reflect candidates' abilities to analyze multiple data sources through the use of additional diagnostic assessments in combination with precise, specific instructor feedback during a three-phase submission process. This performance measure also requires candidates to examine the strengths and limitations of struggling readers in relationship to "content literacy" and intermediate and/or secondary curriculum and subject matter expectations.

Candidate performance reflects competency with a range of coaching activities including dialoguing with intermediate and/or secondary level teachers, interpreting assessment data, and using assessment information for instructional decision-making purposes. The Diagnostic Portfolio also requires candidates to reexamine evidence-based instructional techniques supporting "reading to learn" and to thoughtfully recommend modifications or adaptations to existing materials/resources, particularly relevant for expository text considerations. In order to further enhance candidate performance, RDS: 546 course instructors suggest the following actions: (1) implementing a "diagnostic teaching framework" to systematically analyze responses to specific intervention technique, instructional practices, and variations in print/electronic resources; (2) designing intervention sequences and demonstration lesson(s) for use with

classroom/content teacher(s); (3) adding a more in-depth writing assessment component to the data collection process.

5. (a) Description of the Assignment:

The following description represents the **current** version of the **Diagnostic Portfolio** as aligned to the International Reading Association Standards, 2010.

Graduate Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program

Assessment #7: Diagnostic Portfolio

IRA Standards Measured: 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, & 6.2

CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

The **Diagnostic Portfolio** features a series of artifacts to document the use of in-depth assessment information to plan instruction for an at-risk **intermediate** or **secondary level** at-risk reader. This **three-part** portfolio incorporates an initial data analysis, an examination of additional sources of assessment data, and the development of individualized goals and relevant instructional recommendations for evidence-based instruction and intervention. The attached rubric represents the scoring guidelines and provides criteria for specific **IRA** elements and four levels of candidate performance (*see 5 (b) Assessment Scoring Guide*).

Part I – Analysis of Initial Data:

Part I of the **Diagnostic Portfolio** involves the following essential processes:

- ✓ identifying an **intermediate** or **secondary** level student in need of reading assistance;
- ✓ consulting with classroom and/or content teacher(s) to document educational history and to identify student's observable strengths and limitations;
- ✓ administering and analyzing an interest inventory to examine individual reading preferences, student interests, and meta-cognitive processing behaviors;
- ✓ administering and coding *Qualitative Reading Inventory-V (QRI-V)* narrative text selections;
- ✓ analyzing word identification, fluency, oral/silent reading, retelling, and comprehension abilities;
- ✓ interpreting results and discussing preliminary findings with the classroom and/or content teacher.

Part I Submission:

Submit an introduction that incorporates relevant background information, a rationale for selecting the specific reader, and perspectives from the classroom and/or content teacher(s). Provide a written summary of data analysis and an interpretation of initial assessment results. Incorporate all relevant documentation as portfolio artifacts including the Interest Inventory and the *QRI-V* results for Independent, Instructional, and Frustration reading levels for narrative text, and the analysis of data patterns. Provide evidence that describes communication with classroom and/or content teacher(s).

Part II – Analysis of Cumulative Data Sources:

Part II of the **Diagnostic Portfolio** involves the following essential processes:

- ✓ administering and coding *Qualitative Reading Inventory-V* (QRI-V) expository text selections;
- ✓ analyzing word identification, fluency, oral/silent reading, retelling, and comprehension abilities for expository text selections;
- ✓ administering and analyzing developmental spelling abilities;
- ✓ interpreting cumulative results and comparing findings as relevant to text types (narrative vs. expository);
- ✓ analyzing reading performance with classroom-based instructional materials;
- ✓ examining student writing samples to note patterns of strength and limitations as well as similarities and differences across student performance;
- ✓ developing and administering further assessments to fine-tune analysis of specific weaknesses (i.e., diagnostic tools and classroom-based instruments);
- ✓ consulting with classroom or content teacher(s) to review assessment results and to identify student strengths and limitations from multiple data sources.

Part II Submission:

Submit a written summary of data analysis and an interpretation of cumulative assessment results. Incorporate all relevant documentation as portfolio artifacts including the *QRI-V* results for Independent, Instructional, and Frustration reading levels for expository text selections, Feature and Error Guides, additional assessments including diagnostic tools, classroom-based measures, and student writing samples. Provide evidence that describes communication with classroom and/or content teacher(s).

Part III: Intervention Goals, Implications, and Recommendations:

Part III of the **Diagnostic Portfolio** involves the following essential processes:

- ✓ developing individualized intervention goals in collaboration with classroom and/or content teacher(s);
- ✓ examining and documenting use of professional literature and research to designate valid, evidence-based techniques for intervention;
- ✓ aligning individualized goals with instructional techniques and developing in-depth recommendations for diagnostic teaching and intervention;
- ✓ identifying developmentally appropriate materials for instructional purposes including instructional text level rationale, and recommendations for modification and/or adaptations;
- ✓ negotiating a “plan of action” through collaboration with classroom and/or content teacher(s) including recommendations for intervention practices, differentiation, progress monitoring, and measuring student learning outcomes/goals;
- ✓ articulating new and/or refined understandings about the “assessment-instruction” process within a response to intervention framework.

Part III Submission:

Submit individualized instructional goals for developmentally appropriate reading and word study instruction. Design a “plan of action” that charts individualized goals, specific instructional techniques, and professional references/resources to support all

recommendations. Incorporate recommendations for an intervention framework, progress monitoring as relative to instructional goals, and measuring learning outcomes. Provide evidence to document collaborative efforts as relative to proposed actions for the classroom and/or content teacher(s) and next steps as an interventionist and literacy coach. Develop a self-reflection to articulate new and refined understandings while utilizing a diagnostic model within a response to intervention tiered framework.

5. (b) Assessment Scoring Guide:

The following rubric represents the **most recent** version of the **Diagnostic Portfolio** scoring tool.

Assessment #7: Diagnostic Portfolio
IRA Standards Measured: 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, & 6.2
CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

| Part I: Analysis of Initial Data IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
|---|---|---|--|--|--------------|
| 3.2 Selects, administers and interprets appropriate assessments for students who struggle with reading. | All assessment tools are administered, scored, and thoroughly and accurately interpreted. Effectively analyzes student's interests, and literacy abilities using narrative texts. | Most assessment tools are administered, scored, and accurately interpreted. Analyzes student's interests and literacy abilities using narrative texts. | Some assessment tools are administered, scored, and interpreted. Mentions student's interests and general literacy abilities using narrative texts. | Assessment tools are not administered, scored accurately, or interpreted. Student's interests and literacy abilities are not analyzed using narrative texts. | /4 |
| 3.3 Uses multiple sources of assessment data to analyze reader's performance to plan instruction/intervention. | Substantial documentation and in-depth analysis of data support patterns of strengths and weaknesses. | Documentation and analysis of data support patterns of strengths and weaknesses. | Some documentation and analysis of data support patterns of strengths and weaknesses. | Documentation does not support strengths and weaknesses. | /4 |
| 3.4 Communicates assessment results for intended audiences. | Effectively analyzes and comprehensively reports assessment results for multiple audiences; uses clear written communication to document assessment results and conclusions. | Analyzes and reports assessment results for multiple audiences; uses consistent written communication to document assessment results and conclusions. | Reports some assessment results; some use of written communication to document assessment results and conclusions. | Written communication does not effectively document assessment results and conclusions. | /4 |
| Part II: Analysis of Cumulative Data Sources IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| 3.2 Selects, administers and interprets appropriate assessments for students who struggle with reading. | All assessment tools are administered, scored, and thoroughly and accurately interpreted. Effectively analyzes literacy abilities with expository texts, instructional level classroom materials, and developmental word study stage. | Most assessment tools are administered, scored, and accurately interpreted. Analyzes literacy abilities with expository texts, instructional level classroom materials, and developmental word study stage. | Some assessment tools are administered, scored, and interpreted. Mentions student's general literacy abilities with expository, instructional level materials, and word study stage. | Assessment tools are not administered, scored accurately, or interpreted. Student's literacy abilities are not analyzed for expository texts, instructional level materials or word study stage. | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| 3.3 Uses multiple sources of assessment data to analyze reader's performance and to plan intervention. | Substantial and comprehensive documentation and analysis provide cumulative evidence of strengths and weaknesses for planning highly effective intervention. | Documentation and analysis of data provide evidence of strengths and weaknesses for planning effective intervention. | Some documentation and analysis provide evidence of strengths and weaknesses for planning intervention. | Documentation does not provide evidence of strengths and weaknesses for planning intervention. | /4 |
| Part III: Intervention Goals, Implications, and Recommendations IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| 3.3 Uses multiple sources of assessment data to plan intervention. | Substantial documentation and use of analysis to develop relevant intervention goals for reading and word study. | Documentation and use of analysis to develop relevant intervention goals for reading and word study. | Some documentation and use of analysis to develop intervention goals for reading and word study. | Documentation and analysis does not support intervention goals for reading or word study. | /4 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches to support instructional needs. | Effectively utilizes instructional approaches supported by research and literature that align with and address the student's specific instruction/intervention needs. | Utilizes instructional approaches supported by research and literature that align with and address the student's specific instruction/intervention needs. | Utilizes some instructional approaches supported by research and literature that align with and address the student's specific needs. | Instructional approaches do not align with or address the student's specific instruction/intervention needs. | /4 |
| 3.1 Understands types of assessments, their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | Effectively and comprehensively demonstrates understanding of established purposes for assessments, and develops a comprehensive plan for progress monitoring and measuring intended outcomes; comprehensively describes new and refined understandings of assessment types and process. | Demonstrates understanding of established purposes for assessments, and develops a sufficient plan for progress monitoring and measuring intended outcomes; describes new and refined understandings of assessment types and process. | Describes some understanding of purposes for assessments, and develops a basic plan for progress monitoring and measuring intended outcomes; articulates some understanding of assessment types and process. | Demonstrates limited understanding of purposes for assessments, plan for progress monitoring and measuring intended outcomes is not developed; understanding of assessment types and process is not described. | /4 |
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions and pursues the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. | Effectively demonstrates interpersonal communication and leadership abilities through collaboration with classroom/content teacher(s). Productively supports in-service teacher(s) in using research-based practices to design a highly effective intervention framework. | Demonstrates interpersonal communication and leadership abilities through collaboration with classroom/content teacher(s). Supports in-service teacher(s) in using research-based practices to design an effective intervention framework. | Demonstrates interpersonal communication and some communication with classroom/content teacher(s). Minimally supports in-service teachers in using research-based practices to design an intervention framework. | Interpersonal communication with classroom/content teacher(s) is not evident. Support for in-service teachers with an intervention framework is not evident. | /4 |

5. (c): Candidate Data Derived from Assessment:

The following data table summarizes the candidate results from the most recent administrations of the **Diagnostic Portfolio (fall, 2011 & fall, 2012)**.

| Assessment #7: Diagnostic Portfolio Summary of Results: Fall 2011 & Fall 2012 IRA Standards, 2010 Standards Measured: 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, & 6.2 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2011 | PRO. 2011 | DEV. 2011 | UNS. 2011 | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | MEAN 2011 = 3.59 N= 18 | MEAN 2012 = 3.73 N= 15 |
| I. Analysis of Initial Data | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 Selects, administers and interprets appropriate assessments for students who struggle with reading. | 16 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.83 | 3.80 |
| 3.3 Uses multiple sources of assessment data to analyze reader's performance to plan instruction/intervention. | 10 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.33 | 3.80 |
| 3.4 Communicates assessment results for intended audiences | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3.61 | 3.60 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2011 | PRO. 2011 | DEV. 2011 | UNS. 2011 | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | MEAN 2011 = 3.86 N= 18 | MEAN 2012 = 3.90 N= 15 |
| II. Analysis of Cumulative Data Sources | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 Selects, administers and interprets appropriate assessments for students who struggle with reading. | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.78 | 3.93 |
| 3.3 Uses multiple sources of assessment data to analyze reader's performance and to plan instruction/intervention. | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.94 | 3.87 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria | EXE. 2011 | PRO. 2011 | DEV. 2011 | UNS. 2011 | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | MEAN 2011 = 3.53 N= 18 | MEAN 2012 = 3.55 N= 15 |
| III. Instructional Goals, Implications, & Recommendations | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|-------------|-------------|
| 3.3 Uses multiple sources of assessment data to plan intervention. | 8 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3.38 | 3.27 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches to support instructional needs. | 11 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3.50 | 3.67 |
| 3.1 Understands types of assessments, their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | 11 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3.56 | 3.53 |
| 6.2 Displays positive dispositions and pursues the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.67 | 3.73 |

SECTION IV—Assessment #8: Instructional Context Evaluation: Culturally Responsive Instruction and Equity for All Learners

1. Description of Assessment and Use in Program:

The **Instructional Context Evaluation** addresses foundational knowledge and an in-depth understanding of theoretical orientations, characteristics, and salient features of culturally responsive instruction. This relatively new performance measure specifically addresses diversity and elements of the instructional context. Candidates engage in culturally responsive literacy practices through the following essential processes: (1) examining demographic data, teacher belief statements, and existing school-based diversity initiatives; (2) involving a school community in conversations about the impact of diversity on instruction, student performance, and equity; (3) implementing an audit of core reading materials, technological resources, skills/strategies instruction, diversity factors, and differentiation options for distinctive student groups including English Language learners; (4) developing and implementing an evaluative tool to analyze instructional frameworks, lesson plan formats, assessment measures, and grouping configurations; (5) developing recommendations for strengthening program features, instructional design, and student factors using concrete evidence from evaluations; (6) examining literate environment and classroom collections as relative to genres, text levels, multicultural titles, and cross-curricular connections; (7) sharing suggestions for enriching classroom collections through multi-cultural selections and cross-curricular resources; (8) developing instructional implications and evidence-based recommendations for enhancing diversity initiatives; (9) discussing cumulative findings with school based professionals; (10) synthesizing professional readings and critically reflecting on culturally responsive practices and promoting equity for all learners through awareness, understanding, respect, and valuing of differences in society and contemporary classrooms. Candidates complete the instructional context evaluation in **Phase II, RDS 548** Diagnostic Assessment and Instruction, Advanced (a spring only course).

2. Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards, 2010:

The three-part **Instructional Context Evaluation** addresses the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach **IRA Standards, 2010** through the following IRA elements: **1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.2, and 6.3.** **Part I: School-Based Project Overview** requires candidates to evaluate school demographics and large scale assessment data to analyze school-wide, grade-level, and subgroup performance, and to thoughtfully dialogue about diversity initiatives, culturally responsive practices, school community attributes, and equity for all learners (**IRA 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3**). **Part II-A: Core Reading Series Audit** incorporates an in-depth examination of the literacy curriculum, program features, instructional approaches, traditional print, digital, and online resources, and relevant student factors for promoting equity (**IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2**). **Part II-B: Literate Environment Assessment & Classroom Collections** document the candidates' abilities to analyze physical arrangements and organizational features and to evaluate the quality and accessibility of classroom collections to support diverse learners' abilities and needs. Through collaborative efforts with in-service teachers, candidates advocate for instructional practices and resources/materials that are responsive to diversity and positively impact student knowledge, beliefs, and engagement

(IRA: 3.4, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.2). **Part III: Reflective Practices and School-Based Enhancements** incorporate critical reflection describing personal and professional understandings, theoretical and practical implications, and viable school-based recommendations. Candidates also demonstrate leadership capacity through facilitating conversations about instructional implications, professional development enhancements, and diversity initiatives (IRA: 1.1, 1.3, 4.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3).

3. Initial Analysis of Data Findings:

Cumulative mean score results from the **2012 and 2013 Instructional Context Evaluation: Culturally Responsive Instruction & Equity for All Learners** reveal the strongest candidate performance in **Part II-A: Core Reading Series Audit** and **Part II-B Literate Environment Assessment & Classroom Collections**. In terms of specific IRA elements, candidates successfully analyzed and evaluated instructional approaches, text types, differentiation options, and classroom configurations in relationship to advocating and developing equity for all learners (IRA 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 6.2). Candidates demonstrated their abilities to articulate distinctive features of the physical environment that optimize students' use of instructional resources and support diverse learners' abilities and needs (IRA 5.1). Substantial improvement (spring, 2013) was also noted in the candidates' ability to use foundational knowledge to analyze and evaluate an integrated, comprehensive, and culturally responsive literacy curriculum (IRA 2.1, 4.2).

Cumulative mean score results for **Part I: School Based Overview** suggest that candidates effectively examined school demographics and school-wide assessment data and thoughtfully analyzed current diversity initiatives, culturally responsive practices, and school community attributes (IRA 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3). Progress (spring, 2013) was also evident in candidates' use of assessment information to evaluate school, grade level, and subgroup performance on large scale measures (IRA 3.3, 3.4). As evidenced in **Part III**, candidates demonstrated very strong critical reflections that incorporated inspiring, transformative statements about their depth of personal and professional understanding as refined through this comprehensive performance measure (IRA 1.1, 1.3, 4.1, 6.2). A range of competency was noted in candidates' abilities to productively facilitate school-based conversations about instructional implications, professional development enhancements, organizational changes, and diversity initiatives (IRA 6.1, 6.3).

4. Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards, 2010:

Cumulative data findings suggest that candidates in **Phase II** of the Graduate Reading Specialist (RDS) Program demonstrate the ability to thoroughly analyze and thoughtfully engage in literacy practices that develop awareness, respect, and a valuing of differences within contemporary classrooms. Furthermore, results reflect candidates' abilities to develop and utilize multiple evaluative tools and data sources to effectively assess salient instructional context factors and to support school-based personnel in fine-tuning and enriching school-based diversity initiatives. In order to enhance candidate performance, RDS: 548 course instructors suggest the following actions: (1) expanding course-based readings and developing an electronic database professional literature and resources with access for all participating schools; (2) highlighting high quality multicultural titles and authors through semester-long book talks; (3) addressing core series limitations through

designing more strategic comprehension instruction and enhancing academic vocabulary development for all learners.

5. (a) Description of the Assignment

The following description represents the **current** version of the **Instructional Context Evaluation** as aligned to the International Reading Association Standards, 2010.

Graduate Reading Specialist: Literacy Leadership (RDS) Program

Assessment #8: Instructional Context Evaluation:

Culturally Responsive Instruction & Equity for All Learners

IRA Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.2, & 6.3

CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

The **Instructional Context Evaluation** addresses foundational knowledge and an in-depth understanding of theoretical orientations, characteristics, and salient features of culturally responsive instruction. This performance measure specifically highlights diversity and elements within the instructional context. This **three-part** process incorporates an overview of school-based diversity initiatives, a comprehensive audit of instructional practices and core reading materials, an analysis of literate environment and classroom collections, and recommendations for diversity initiatives and further professional development. The attached rubric represents the scoring guidelines and provides criteria for specific **IRA** elements and four levels of candidate performance (*see 5 (b) Assessment Scoring Guide*).

Part I: School-Based Project Overview:

Part I incorporates an overview that profiles demographic data, teacher belief statements, and current status of school-based diversity initiatives. This component focuses on the importance of engaging in conversations about the impact of diversity on instruction, student performance, and equity for all learners. Part I involves the following essential processes:

- ✓ using and explaining demographic statistics and school assessment data to analyze school-wide, grade-level, and subgroup performance to plan and evaluate culturally responsive instruction;
- ✓ summarizing assessment data and implications with relevant school-based audiences;
- ✓ actively engaging in conversations to describe current school-based initiatives for culturally responsive instruction;
- ✓ collaborating with school-based personnel to evaluate policies and instructional practices that are responsive to diversity and promote equity for all learners;
- ✓ evaluating distinctive community attributes and providing support and leadership in establishing and/or enhancing strong home-to-school connections and school-to-home literacy partnerships.

Part I Submission:

Submit an introduction that overviews demographic statistics, school performance data across subgroups, teacher belief statements, and the current status of school-based diversity initiatives. Provide a summary of distinctive community attributes and opportunities to support home-to-school connections and school-to-home literacy

partnerships.

Part II-A: Core Reading Series Audit:

Part II-A involves collecting relevant information about various aspects of the instructional context including an audit of a core reading series and ancillary materials, supporting technological resources, skills/strategies instruction, diversity factors, and differentiation options including suggestions for English Language Learners. An **evaluative tool** is designed to describe the instructional framework, lesson plan formats, assessment measures, and grouping patterns. A **cumulative analysis** describes the strengths and weaknesses of the core reading series program and supporting materials as well as recommendations for improvement and change as relative to program features, instructional design, and specific student factors. Part II-A involves the following essential processes:

a. Evaluative Tool Design and Data Collection:

- √ identifying a specific grade level of a core reading series and collecting instructional materials including a teacher's manual, student text, and additional core reading series resources such as leveled texts, supplementary materials, and intervention components;
- √ designing an evaluative tool to analyze integral **Program features, Instructional design, and Student factors**;
 - **Program features:** Specific genres and/or themes, scope and sequence, developmental progression of skills and strategies, technological resources;
 - **Instructional approaches:** Lesson plan formats, explicit instruction, guided practice, and independent application of strategies/skills, assessment options, supplementary resources;
 - **Student factors:** Multicultural literature choices, differentiation options and grouping recommendations, assistance for struggling readers and English Language Learners.
- √ utilizing the self-designed evaluative tool to analyze the selected core reading series and related materials for the designated grade level.

b. Data Analysis and Recommendations:

- √ analyzing program strengths of the core reading series according to program features, instructional design, and student factors;
- √ analyzing potential weaknesses of the core reading series according to program features, instructional design, and supplementary materials;
- √ developing specific recommendations for improving or enhancing program features and instructional design as relative to the specific grade level and support/assistance for classroom teachers;
- √ developing specific recommendations for improving or enhancing student factors as relative to the targeted grade level audience and school demographics.

Part II-A Submission:

Submit the self-designed evaluative tool with concrete evidence and data findings from use of this assessment instrument. Submit an analysis of core reading series strengths and weaknesses including bulleted points with brief explanations. Provide

specific recommendations for improving and enhancing the use of the core reading series and supplementary materials in relationship to the identified grade level audience and specific school or school system demographics.

Part II-B: Literate Environment Assessment & Classroom Classrooms:

Part II-B involves examining a literate environment and classroom collection of resources as relative to physical aspects, organizational features, and the range of genres, leveled texts, multicultural titles, and cross-curricular connections. This component also features interactions with teachers and students and the development of instructional implications and recommendations. Candidates develop suggestions for enhancing classroom collections including developmentally appropriate multi-cultural selections and cross-curricular resources. Part II-B involves the following essential processes:

- ✓ describing the physical arrangement and organizational features of a classroom literacy environment, using the same grade level as the core audit;
- ✓ creating a literate environment checklist to record specific features such as inviting visual displays and charts, word walls, literacy stations, classroom library, visual images from a multicultural perspective, student work samples, instructional areas for a variety of group configurations (whole class, small group, individual) and available technologies;
- ✓ analyzing the classroom library in terms of number of books, ranges of text difficulty, genre representation, multicultural titles, and cross-curricular resources aligning with Science, Technology, & Math (STEM), and/or Reading & Social Studies (Humanities) curriculum and units of study;
- ✓ developing recommendations for enhancing the classroom library including multicultural representations and cross-curricular resources utilizing the results from this analysis and school demographics;
- ✓ consulting with classroom teacher to describe additional resources as utilized for literacy instruction;
- ✓ interviewing one highly able reader and one struggling reader to more closely examine students' insights about home and school literacy habits;
- ✓ summarizing findings and implications from the student interviews and from consultation with the classroom teacher.

Part II-B Submission:

Submit the literacy environment and classroom collections evaluations with concrete evidence and data findings from use of the assessment checklists. Provide specific recommendations for improving and enhancing the literate environment and/or the classroom collections in relationship to the identified grade level audience and specific school and school system demographics. Summarize findings and implications from the two student interviews and consultation with the in-service teacher.

Part III: Reflective Practices & School-Based Enhancements:

Part III incorporates a synthesis of course assigned professional readings and a critical reflection describing refined personal and professional understandings, implications, and relevant next steps. This component also addresses instructional implications and further school-based recommendations for enhancing professional development and diversity initiatives. Candidates discuss their findings and viable next

steps with school based personnel including classroom teacher(s), a teaching team, and/or administrative staff. Part III involves the following essential processes:

- ✓ developing a critical reflection that describes personal and professional understandings about culturally responsive instruction and promoting equity for all learners using professional readings, in-class diversity tasks, and an evaluation of instructional context factors (i.e., characteristics of a culturally responsive teacher, the selection of instructional materials, the development of a literate environment, physical arrangement, and organizational features of classrooms);
- ✓ developing recommendations for enhancing the school-based diversity initiative and identifying potential topics for professional development from reviewing current diversity plans (Part I), instructional context evaluations (Part II), and course assigned professional readings;
- ✓ utilizing the school demographics and the Parts I-II analysis to develop a one-page handout of findings, recommendations, and next steps for school-based professionals;
- ✓ facilitating an informal meeting to discuss findings with two or more school-based professionals and summarizing the proceedings, participants' feedback, input, and cumulative responses through anecdotal records.

Part III Submission:

Submit a critical reflection incorporating personal insights and professional understandings as relative to culturally responsive instruction and equity for all learners. Provide a copy of the one-page handout, concrete recommendations for school based enhancements, potential professional development topics, and proposed next steps. Utilizing minutes and anecdotal notes, summarize the effectiveness of the school-based diversity meeting including participants' feedback, input, and outcomes.

5. (b) Assessment Scoring Guide:

The following rubric represents the **most recent** version of the **Instructional Context Evaluation: Culturally Responsive Instruction & Equity for All Learners** scoring tool.

Assessment #8: Instructional Context Evaluation:**Culturally Responsive Instruction & Equity for All Learners**

IRA Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.2, & 6.3

CF Outcomes Measured: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

| Part I: School-Based Project Overview IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
|---|--|---|--|--|--------------|
| 3.3, 3.4 Uses assessment information to evaluate school, grade-level and student performance; summarizes assessment results and implications with relevant audiences. | Comprehensively and effectively demonstrates an analysis of school-wide, grade-level, and student subgroup performance in relationship to literacy instruction; clearly articulates data and implications using evidence. | Demonstrates an analysis of school-wide, grade-level, and student subgroup performance in relationship to literacy instruction; articulates data and implications using evidence. | Demonstrates some analysis of school-wide, grade-level, and student subgroup performance in relationship to literacy instruction; articulates some data and implications. | Reveals limited analysis of school-wide, grade-level, and student subgroup performance in relationship to literacy instruction; data and implications are limited. | /4 |
| 4.1, 4.3 Recognizes, understands, and values the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance to learning to read and write; advocates for practices that support equity. | Comprehensively and effectively engages the school community in thoughtful conversation about diversity and evaluates current initiatives and responsive practices that promote equity for all learners. | Engages the school community in conversation about diversity and explains current initiatives and responsive practices that promote equity for all learners. | Engages the school community in some conversation about diversity and states current initiatives and practices that promote equity for learners. | Reveals limited conversation about diversity, current initiatives, and responsive practices for equity. | /4 |
| 4.2 Uses literacy curriculum and instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement. | Comprehensively and effectively evaluates community attributes and assets and provides guidance and support in building/enhancing strong home to school literacy connections. | Evaluates community attributes/assets and provides guidance and support in building/enhancing home to school literacy connections. | Lists community attributes/assets and provides some guidance and support in building home to school literacy connections. | Reveals a limited understanding of community attributes/assets are relative to building home to school connections. | /4 |
| Part II-A: Core Reading Series Audit IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum. | Comprehensively and effectively demonstrates an understanding of research and literature that undergirds a culturally responsive reading and writing curriculum; Effectively leads strong collaborative efforts to analyze core reading series program features using a self-designed evaluative tool. | Demonstrates an understanding of research and literature that undergirds a culturally responsive reading and writing curriculum; Leads efforts to analyze core reading series program features using a self-designed evaluative tool. | Demonstrates some understanding of research and literature that undergirds a culturally responsive reading and writing curriculum; Presents some core reading series program features using a self-designed evaluative tool. | Reveals limited understanding of research and literature that undergirds a culturally responsive reading and writing curriculum; Limited analysis of core reading series program | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--------------|
| | | | | features using a self-designed evaluative tool. | |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches to develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections. | Comprehensively analyzes instructional approaches and lesson design formats as supported by research and literature (decoding, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, motivation, writing); Effectively leads strong collaborative efforts to evaluate instructional approaches and designs in relationship to specific needs and abilities of a range of learners using self-designed evaluative tool. | Analyzes instructional approaches and lesson design formats as supported by research and literature (decoding, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, motivation, writing); Leads efforts to evaluate instructional approaches and designs in relationship to specific needs and abilities of a range of learners using self-designed evaluative tool. | Lists some instructional approaches and lesson design formats (decoding, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, motivation, writing); Presents some instructional approaches and designs in relationship to student needs and abilities using self-designed evaluative tool. | Reveals limited analysis of instructional approaches and lesson design formats (decoding, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, motivation, writing); Limited analysis of instructional approaches and designs in relationship to student needs and abilities using self-designed evaluative tool. | /4 |
| 2.3 Uses a wide range of texts (e.g. narrative, expository, & poetry) from traditional print, digital, and/or online resources to meet students' needs. | Comprehensively and effectively demonstrates knowledge of and a critical stance toward a wide variety of materials to meet instructional needs of students; Effectively leads strong collaborative efforts to evaluate instructional materials using self-designed evaluative tool. | Demonstrates knowledge of and a critical stance toward a wide variety of materials to meet instructional needs of students; Leads efforts to evaluate instructional materials using self-designed evaluative tool. | Demonstrates some knowledge of materials to meet instructional needs of students; Presents some instructional materials using self-designed evaluative tool. | Reveals limited knowledge of materials to meet instructional needs of students; Presents limited instructional materials using self-designed evaluative tool. | /4 |
| 4.1, 4.2 Recognizes, understands, and values importance of diversity in learning to read and write; Uses a literacy curriculum and engages in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement including features of diversity. | Comprehensively and effectively demonstrates knowledge of and a critical stance toward instructional resources; Comprehensively evaluates instructional practices/program and provides relevant, concrete recommendations for enhancing program, design, and student features using evaluative tool. | Demonstrates knowledge of and a critical stance toward a variety of instructional resources; Evaluates instructional practices/program and provides recommendations for enhancing program, design, and student features using evaluative tool. | Demonstrates some knowledge of instructional resources; Presents instructional practices/program and provides some recommendations for enhancing program, design, and/or student features using evaluative tool. | Reveals limited knowledge of instructional resources; Presents limited instructional materials and recommendations using self-designed evaluative tool. | /4 |
| Part II-B: Literate Environment Assessment & Classroom Collections IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| 5.1 Designs the physical environment to optimize students' use of instructional resources for reading and writing instruction. | Thoroughly analyzes physical classroom arrangement and organizational features of a literate environment using self-designed checklist; Effectively leads collaborative efforts to analyze classroom environment. | Analyzes physical classroom arrangement and organizational features of a literate environment using self-designed checklist; Leads collaborative efforts to analyze classroom environment. | Lists some elements of physical classroom arrangement and organizational features of a literate classroom environment using self-designed checklist. | Reveals limited knowledge of physical classroom arrangement and organizational features in a literate classroom environment. | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--------------|
| <p>2.3 Uses a wide range of texts (e.g. narrative, expository, and poetry).</p> <p>4.2 Uses a literacy curriculum and engages in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement including features of diversity.</p> | Effectively supports teacher in analyzing and building a quality, accessible classroom library that addresses needs and abilities of diverse learners; Effectively leads collaborative efforts to provide instructional materials that are responsive to diversity. | Supports teacher in analyzing and building an accessible classroom library that addresses needs and abilities of diverse learners; Leads collaborative efforts to provide instructional materials that are responsive to diversity. | Supports teacher in analyzing a classroom library that addresses needs and abilities of some learners; Recommends some instructional materials for the classroom library. | Reveals limited knowledge of accessible classroom library as relative to needs and abilities of learners; Recommends limited instructional materials for the classroom library. | /4 |
| <p>4.3 Develops and implement strategies to advocate for equity.</p> <p>6.2 Displays positive dispositions related to the teaching of reading and writing, and pursues the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.</p> | Effectively advocates for instructional practices and materials to promote equity for all learners and link home and school communities; Effectively assesses and values reading and writing in and out of school and actively pursues and exhibits professional knowledge and behaviors. | Advocates for instructional practices and materials to promote equity for most learners and link home and school communities; Assesses and values reading and writing in and out of school and exhibits professional knowledge and behaviors. | Recommends instructional practices and materials to promote equity for learners and link home and school communities; Assesses reading and writing in and out of school and exhibits some professional knowledge and behaviors. | Reveals limited knowledge of practices and materials to promote equity for learners and to link home and school communities; Exhibits limited understanding, professional knowledge, and behaviors. | /4 |
| Part III: Reflective Practices & School-Based Enhancements IRA Standard/Criteria | Exemplary (4) | Proficient (3) | Developing (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) | Score |
| 1.1, 4.1 Understands theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, and socio-cultural foundations of literacy development; recognizes, understands, and values forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and to write. | Thoughtfully demonstrates a critical stance toward literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success; effectively demonstrates a thorough understanding of developing culturally responsive instruction that equitably meets the needs of all learners. | Demonstrates a critical stance toward literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success; demonstrates essential understanding of developing culturally responsive instruction that equitably meets the needs of learners. | Demonstrates a stance toward literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success; demonstrates some understanding of developing culturally responsive instruction that meets the needs of learners. | Reveals limited stance toward literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success; demonstrates limited understanding of culturally responsive instruction. | /4 |
| 1.3, 6.2 Understands the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving literacy development; displays professional dispositions and pursues the development of professional knowledge and behaviors. | Comprehensively and effectively communicates the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical professional behavior; thoughtfully engages the school community in effective conversation about diversity; assists teachers in effectively evaluating initiatives and responsive practices that promote equity for all learners; demonstrates highly effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership capacities. | Communicates the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical professional behavior; engages the school community in effective conversation about diversity; assists teachers in evaluating initiatives and responsive practices that promote equity for learners; demonstrates effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership capacities. | Communicates with fair-mindedness and ethical professional behavior; engages the school community in some conversation about diversity; assists teachers in examining initiatives and responsive practices that promote equity for learners; demonstrates some interpersonal, communication, and leadership capacities. | Reveals limited communication and conversation about diversity, current initiatives, and responsive practices for equity; provides limited assistance in examining initiatives and responsive practices; demonstrates limited interpersonal, communication, and leadership | /4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|----|
| 6.1, 6.3 Demonstrates foundational knowledge of adult learning, organizational change, professional development and school culture; designs, facilitate, and leads professional development programs. | Effectively uses knowledge of teachers, students, and school culture to evaluate and enhance school-based diversity initiatives; effectively facilitates meeting and works with school-based personnel in order to analyze professional development needs. | Uses knowledge of teachers, students, and school culture to evaluate and enhance school-based diversity initiatives; facilitates meeting and works with school-based personnel in order to address professional development needs. | Uses some knowledge of teachers, students, and/or school culture to evaluate school-based diversity initiatives; facilitates meeting and provides some support for school-based personnel. | capacities. Uses limited knowledge of teachers, students, and/or school culture to consider school-based diversity initiatives; holds meeting, provides limited support for school-based personnel. | /4 |
|--|--|--|--|--|----|

5. (c): Candidate Data Derived from Assessment:

The following data table summarizes the candidate results from the most recent administrations of the **Instructional Context Evaluation: Culturally Responsive Instruction & Equity for All Learners** (spring, 2012 & spring, 2013).

| Assessment #8 - Instructional Context Evaluation: Culturally Responsive Instruction & Equity for All Learners Summary of Results: Spring, 2012 & Spring, 2013 IRA Standards, 2010 IRA Standards Measured: 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.2, & 6.3 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| IRA Standard/Criteria I. School-Based Project Overview | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.51 N= 17 | MEAN 2013 = 3.58 N= 16 |
| 3.3, 3.4 Uses assessment information to evaluate school, grade-level and student performance; summarizes assessment results and implications with relevant audiences. | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3.29 | 3.50 |
| 4.1, 4.3 Recognizes, understands, and values the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance to learning to read and write; advocates for practices that support equity. | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3.59 | 3.50 |
| 4.2 Uses literacy curriculum and instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement. | 14 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.65 | 3.75 |

| IRA Standard/Criteria II-A: Core Reading Series Audit | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.50 N= 17 | MEAN 2013 = 3.82 N= 16 |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| 2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum. | 3 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.94 | 3.88 |
| 2.2 Uses appropriate and varied instructional approaches to develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections. | 11 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3.59 | 3.63 |
| 2.3 Uses a wide range of texts (e.g. narrative, expository, & poetry) from traditional print, digital, and/or online resources to meet students' needs. | 13 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.71 | 4.00 |
| 4.1, 4.2 Recognizes, understands, and values importance of diversity in learning to read and write; Uses a literacy curriculum and engages in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement including features of diversity. | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.76 | 3.75 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria II-B: Literate Environment Assessment & Classroom Collections | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.86 N= 17 | MEAN 2013 = 3.79 N= 16 |
| 5.1 Designs the physical environment to optimize students' use of instructional resources for reading and writing instruction. | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | 3.94 |
| 2.3, 4.2 Uses a wide range of texts (e.g. narrative, expository, and poetry); Uses a literacy curriculum and engages in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and | 14 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3.82 | 3.56 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| engagement including features of diversity. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3, 6.2 Develops and implement strategies to advocate for equity; Displays positive dispositions related to the teaching of reading and writing, and pursues the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3.76 | 3.88 |
| IRA Standard/Criteria III: Reflective Practices & School- Based Enhancements | EXE. 2012 | PRO. 2012 | DEV. 2012 | UNS. 2012 | EXE. 2013 | PRO. 2013 | DEV. 2013 | UNS. 2013 | MEAN 2012 = 3.76 N= 17 | MEAN 2013 = 3.64 N= 16 |
| 1.1, 4.1 Understands theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, and socio-cultural foundations of literacy development; recognizes, understands, and values forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and to write. | 14 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.82 | 3.81 |
| 1.3, 6.2 Understands the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving literacy development; displays professional dispositions and pursues the development of professional knowledge and behaviors. | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.88 | 3.87 |
| 6.1, 6.3 Demonstrates foundational knowledge of adult learning, organizational change, professional development and school culture; designs, facilitate, and leads professional development programs. | 11 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3.59 | 3.25 |