

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Preparation of Reading Education Professionals

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the International Reading Association (IRA).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Arkansas State University

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

08 / 01 / 2010

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Reading Specialist

Program Type

Other School Professionals

Award or Degree Level(s)

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

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comment:

Praxis II data are not available until April 2010; report was submitted in March, 2010.

Summary of Strengths:

Assessment 2, the comprehensive exam, reflects candidates' knowledge at the end of the program. The scoring rubric of Assessment 5 clearly aligns with the IRA standards. "Reading in Digital Age" reflects an addition of contemporary topics within the coursework. The program's revisions incorporate coaching experiences at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. Foundational Knowledge. Candidates have knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. As a result, candidates:

Standard 1.1. Refer to major theories in the foundational areas as they relate to reading. They can explain, compare, contrast, and critique the theories.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment:

Evidence found in data collected in assessments 7 and 8. On assessment 7, the two applications of data indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. On assessment 8, one application of data indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level.

Standard 1.2. Summarize seminal reading studies and articulate how these studies impacted reading instruction. They can recount historical developments in the history of reading

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment:

Evidence found in assignments and scoring rubrics 6, 7, 8. There are no data for assessment 6. On assessment 7, the two applications of data indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. On assessment 8, one application of data indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level.

Standard 1.3. Identify, explain, compare, and contrast the theories and research in the areas of language development and learning to read.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in data collected in assessments 6, 7 and 8. On assessment 7, the two applications of data indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. On assessment 8, one application of data indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level.

Standard 1.4. Are able to determine if students are appropriately integrating the components (phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation) in fluent reading.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in data from one application in assessments 3 and 5. The collection of data for assessments 3 and 5 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. The data from assessment 3 is from the unrevised assessment 3; however, this element was addressed in the unrevised assessment.

Standard 2. Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials. Candidates use a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, and curriculum materials to support reading and writing instruction. As a result, the candidates:

Standard 2.1. Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in their use of instructional grouping options. They help teachers select appropriate options. They demonstrate the options and explain the evidence-based rationale for changing configurations to best meet the needs of all students.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in data from one application in assessment 5. It is addressed at the coaching level. One hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level.

Standard 2.2. Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices. They help teachers select appropriate options and explain evidence-base for selecting practices to best meet the needs of all students. They demonstrate the options in their own (and demonstration) teaching.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in assessments and scoring rubrics 3 (revised assessment), 5, and 6. It is addressed at the coaching level in assessments 5 and 6. There are no data for assessment 6. The one application of data

for assessment 5 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. This element was not addressed in the unrevised assessment 3; therefore, there are no data for this element in assessment 3.

Standard 2.3. Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of curriculum materials. They help teachers select appropriate options and explain the evidence base for selecting practices to best meet the needs of all students. They demonstrate the options in their own teaching and in demonstration teaching.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j _n	j _n	j _n

Comment:

Evidence found in assignments and scoring rubrics in assessments 3, 5, and 6. It is addressed at the coaching level in assessments 5 and 6. There are no data for assessment 6. The one application of data for assessment 5 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. This element was not addressed in the unrevised assessment 3; therefore, there are no data for this element in assessment 3.

Standard 3. Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation. Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading instruction. As a result, candidates:

Standard 3.1. Compare and contrast, use, interpret, and recommend a wide range of assessment tools and practices. Assessments may range from standardized tests to informal tests and also include technology-based assessments. They demonstrate appropriate use of assessments in their practice, and they can train classroom teachers to administer and interpret these assessments.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j _n	j _n	j _n

Comment:

Evidence found in assessments and scoring rubrics of assessments 3 and 5. It is addressed at the coaching level in assessment 5. The one application of data for assessment 5 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. This element was not addressed in the unrevised assessment 3; therefore, there are no data for this element in assessment 3. This element is addressed in the revised assessment 3.

Standard 3.2. Support the classroom teacher in the assessment of individual students. They extend the assessment to further determine proficiencies and difficulties for appropriate services.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j _n	j _n	j _n

Comment:

Evidence found in assessments and scoring rubrics of assessments 3, 4, and 5. It is met at the coaching level in assessment 5. There are no data from assessment 4. The one application of data for assessment 5 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. This element was addressed in the unrevised assessment 3, and this element was met in the unrevised assessment. This element is addressed in the revised assessment 3; however, there are no data for the revised

assessment 3.

Standard 3.3. Assist the classroom teacher in using assessment to plan instruction for all students. They use in-depth assessment information to plan individual instruction for struggling readers. They collaborate with other education professionals to implement appropriate reading instruction for individual students. They collect, analyze, and use schoolwide assessment data to implement and revise school reading programs.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in assessments and scoring rubrics of assessments 3, 4, 5, and 6. It is met at the coaching level in assessments 5 and 6. There are no data from assessments 4 and 6. The one application of data for assessment 5 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. This element was not addressed in the unrevised assessment 3; therefore, there are no data for this element in assessment 3. This element is addressed in the revised assessment 3.

Standard 3.4. Communicate assessment information to various audiences for both accountability and instructional purposes (policymakers, public officials, community members, clinical specialists, school psychologists, social workers, classroom teacher, and parents).

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in assessments and scoring rubrics of assessments 3, 4, 5, and 6. It is met at the coaching level in assessments 5 and 6. There are no data from assessment 4. The one application of data for assessment 5 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. This element was not addressed in the unrevised assessment 3; therefore, there are no data for this element in assessment 3. This element is addressed in the revised assessment 3.

Standard 4. Creating a Literate Environment. Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, use of instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments. As a result, candidates:

Standard 4.1. Assist the classroom teacher and paraprofessional in selecting materials that match the reading levels, interests, and cultural and linguistic background of students.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in assessments and scoring rubrics of assessments 3 and 5. It is met at the coaching level in assessment 5. The one application of data for assessment 5 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. This element was addressed in the unrevised assessment 3, and this element was met in the unrevised assessment. This element is addressed in the revised assessment 3; however, there are no data for the revised assessment 3.

Standard 4.2. Assist the classroom teacher in selecting books, technology-based information, and nonprint materials representing multiple levels, broad interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in assessments and scoring rubrics of assessments 3 and 5. It is met at the coaching level in assessment 5. The one application of data for assessment 5 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. This element was addressed in the unrevised assessment 3, and this element was met in the unrevised assessment. This element is addressed in the revised assessment 3; however, there are no data for the revised assessment 3.

Standard 4.3. Demonstrate and model reading and writing for real purposes in daily interactions with students and education professionals. Assist teachers and paraprofessionals to model reading and writing as valued lifelong activities.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in the revised assignment and scoring rubric of assessment 3; however, there are no data for the revised assessment 3.

Standard 4.4. Use methods to effectively revise instructional plans to motivate all students. They assist classroom teachers in designing programs that will intrinsically and extrinsically motivate students. They demonstrate these techniques and they can articulate the research base that grounds their practice.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in assignment and scoring rubric of revised assessment 3; however, there are no data for revised assessment 3.

Standard 5. Professional Development. Candidates view professional development as a career-long effort and responsibility. As a result, candidates:

Standard 5.1. Articulate the theories related to the connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in assignments and scoring rubrics of assessments 3 and 8. The one application of data for assessment 8 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level. This element was addressed in the unrevised assessment 3, and this element was met in the

unrevised assessment. This element is addressed in the revised assessment 3; however, there are no data for the revised assessment 3.

Standard 5.2. Conduct professional study groups for paraprofessional and teachers. Assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in identifying, planning, and implementing personal professional development plans. Advocate to advance the professional research base to expand knowledge-based practices.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Assessment 4 addresses this element; however, there will be no data until the end of spring 2010 since it is a new assessment. The assignment and scoring rubric address this element at the coaching level.

Standard 5.3. Positively and constructively provide an evaluation of their own and others' teaching practices. Assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals as they strive to improve their practice.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Evidence found in assessments and scoring rubrics of assessments 4, 5, 6, and 8. It is met at the coaching level in assessments 5 and 6. There are no data for assessments 4, 6, and 8. The one application of data for assessment 5 indicate that one hundred percent of candidates performed at the acceptable or target level.

Standard 5.4. Exhibit leadership skills in professional development. They plan, implement, and evaluate professional development efforts at the grade, school, district, and/or state level. They are cognizant of and can describe the characteristics of sound professional development programs. They can articulate the evidence base that grounds their practice.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Assessment 4 addresses this element; however, there will be no data until the end of spring 2010 since it is a new assessment. The assignment and scoring rubric address this element at the coaching level.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Evidence cannot be taken from assessments 1, 3 (revised), 4, and 6 since there are no data for these assessments.

One application of assessment 2, the comprehensive exam, indicates that 100% of candidates scored either at the acceptable or target level.

Assessment 8 does require candidates to compare and contrast two theories in foundational areas of

reading and to share their summaries with colleagues. All candidates performed at the acceptable or target level.

Assessment 6 requires candidates to review brain based research with colleagues and use the findings to create a six-week unit; however there are no data for this assessment.

C.2 Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Revised assessment 3 will give evidence of candidates' pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills and dispositions. After assessing an adolescent student, the candidates develop and implement a literacy plan and shares the results with teachers either through a handbook or a presentation. However, there are no data for this revised assessment.

Assessment 5 provides evidence of candidates' pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills and dispositions. Candidates work with a colleague to assess the literacy needs of a class, and then provide intervention. With the colleague, the candidate analyzes data and shares the report with parents and student's support team. Data indicate that all candidates performed either at the acceptable or target level.

Assessment 6 will provide evidence of candidates' pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills and dispositions. Candidates must review brain-based research with 4 or 5 colleagues, create and implement a unit, and reflect on the process online with the professor. However, there are no data for this assessment.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

The revised assessment 3 is designed to provide evidence of candidates' effect on student learning. After assessing an adolescent student, candidates develop and implement an individualized literacy plan and shares the results with teachers. However, there are currently no data for this revised assessment.

Assessment 5 provides additional documentation of candidates' impact on student learning. Candidates work with a colleague to assess the literacy needs of a class, and then provide intervention plans for a struggling reader. With the colleague, candidates analyze data and share recommendations with parents and the student's support team. On assessment 5, candidates demonstrated target or acceptable levels of performance.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

There is evidence in Section VI that the assessment results were used to revise assessments. There are no data from assessments 1, 4 and 6 and revised assessment 3 to analyze since some assessment results are not available until May of 2010 at the earliest.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

Please provide further documentation as relative to the supervision of candidates in the six-credit practicum experience.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

While the program did submit its Response to Conditions report within the stipulated time frame, the original conditions have not been fully addressed and NCATE and IRA have concurred to allow the program one additional review cycle to address remaining conditions to national recognition. This decision was made because the program has made progress in addressing conditions, and reviewers believe the remaining issues can be remediated within an additional review cycle. A second Response to Conditions Report must be submitted in AIMS by March 15, 2011; if a report is not received by that date, the status of the program will revert to Not Recognized.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

None.

PART G -DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM DD YYYY

/ /

Subsequent action by the institution: To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below.

The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period.

If the program is submitting a Response to Conditions Report for the first time, the range of possible deadlines for submitting that report are 9/15/10, 3/15/11, 9/15/11, or 3/15/12. Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 3/15/12 submission date noted above. However, the program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this recognition report.

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a **second** Response to Conditions Report, the next report must be submitted by the date below.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM DD YYYY

03 / 15 / 2011

The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (or within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued). See above for specific date.

There is clear evidence that assessments were redesigned to meet conditions for recognition. However, there are no data from assessments 1 and revised assessments 3, 4, or 6 at the time of this submission. Consequently, some elements remain coded as "met with conditions" due to the lack of data. The missing data impact the cumulative analysis of candidate performance and implications for the program. As per the data policy for a response to conditions report, resubmit with a minimum of one application for all assessments, particularly for assessment 1, and revised assessments 3, 4, and 6. Furthermore, it remains unclear how candidates are supervised in their practicum experiences. Section VI suggests that candidates are supervised, however it is not apparent when or how they are supervised. Please provide clarification and further explanation concerning this aspect of the program.

Please click "Next"

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