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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

COVER SHEET

1. Institution Name

Arkansas State University

2. State

Arkansas

3. Date submitted

MM	DD	YYYY
03	10	2010

4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:

Deborah Owens

Phone: Ext.

(870) 680 - 8010

E-mail:

dowens@astate.edu

5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:

Gregory B. Meeks

Phone: Ext.

(870) 680 - 8011

E-mail:

gmeeks@astate.edu

6. Name of institution's program

MSE Reading

7. NCATE Category

Reading Specialist

8. Grade levels[1] for which candidates are being prepared

P-8, 7-12

_____

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

9. Program Type

- ʝ Advanced Teaching
- ʝ First teaching license
- ʝ Other School Personnel
- ʝ Unspecified

10. Degree or award level

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

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

- ʝ Yes
- ʝ No

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

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

Reading Specialist Licensure Endorsement

14. Program report status:

- ʝ Initial Review
- ʝ Response to One of the Folliwing Decisions: Further Development Required, Recognition with Probation, or Not Nationally Recognized
- ʝ Response to National Recognition With Conditions

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

jn Yes

jn 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)

[ ]

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)

[ ]

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

[ ]

4. Description of the relationship [2] of the program to the unit's conceptual framework. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

[ ]

(2): The response should describe the program's conceptual framework and indicate how it reflects the unit's conceptual framework.

5. Indication of whether the program has a unique set of program assessments and their relationship of the program's assessments to the unit's assessment system[3]. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

[ ]

(3) This response should clarify how the key accessments used in the program are derived from or informed by the assessment system that the unit will address under NCATE Standard 2.

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

MSE Reading Program Checksheet

See **Attachments** panel below.

7. 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.

8. Candidate Information

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

Program:		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers[4]

(4) 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.

9. 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[5]	
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[6]	
Faculty Rank[7]	
Tenure Track	∈ YES
Scholarship[8], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[9]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[10]	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[11]	

(5) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.
(6) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator
(7) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor
(8) 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.
(9) 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.
(10) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.
(11) 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 (12)	Type or Form of Assessment (13)	When the Assessment Is Administered (14)
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	Praxis II	State Licensure Exam (Praxis II for Reading Specialist K-12)	Completion of program or during the final semester of coursework
Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in reading education (required)	Master's Comprehensive Exam	Written Comprehensive Exam	Completed near the end of the program when candidates have mastered content knowledge at the reading specialist/literacy coach level
Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction (required)	Individualized Literacy Plan for an Adolescent Learner	An instructional plan with multiple componants, with generalizable applications to other adolescent learners	Completed in RDNG 6553: Adolescent Literacy, midway through the program
Assessment #4: Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience (required)	Leadership in Literacy Portfolio	Portfolio	Completed in RDNG 6353: Reading Practicum II, during the final semester of the program
Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning (required)	Classroom Assessment and Intervention Case Study	Semester-long project with multiple components	Completed in RDNG 6333: Reading Practicum I, in the semester prior to the final semester
Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (required)	Brain-Based Literacy Instruction Unit of Inquiry: Researching, Planning, Implementing, and Reflecting	Semester-long project with multiple components	Completed in RDNG 6563: Principles of Literacy Cognition, midway through the program
		Research Paper	

Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (optional)	Research paper: Connecting Theory and Research to Practice		Completed in RDNG 6313: Theory and Practice in Reading, during the first semester of the program
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (optional)	Research-Based Observation: Analysis and Reflection	Semester-long project with multiple components	Completed in RDNG 6513: Emergent Literacy, midway through the program

(12) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.
(13) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).
(14) 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 have knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. As a result, reading specialist/literacy coach candidates:

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
1.1 Refer to major theories in the foundational areas as they relate to reading. They can explain, compare, contrast, and critique the theories.	b	b	e	e	e	e	b	b
1.2 Summarize seminal reading studies and articulate how these studies impacted reading instruction. They can recount historical developments in the history of reading.	b	b	e	e	e	e	b	b
1.3 Identify, explain, compare, and contrast the theories and research in the areas of language development and learning to read.	b	b	e	e	e	b	b	b
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.	b	b	b	e	b	e	e	e

2. 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, reading specialist/literacy coach candidates:

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
2.1 Support classroom teachers and paraprofessional 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.	b	e	e	e	b	e	e	e
2.2 Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including								

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
technology-based practices. 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 (and demonstration) teaching.	b	b	e	e	b	b	e	e
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.	b	e	e	e	b	b	e	e

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, reading specialist/literacy coach candidates:

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
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 assessments 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.	b	b	b	e	b	e	e	e
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.	b	b	b	b	b	e	e	e
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 school-wide assessment data to implement and revise school reading programs.	b	b	b	b	b	b	e	e
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 teachers, and parents).	b	e	b	b	b	e	e	e

4. 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, reading specialist/literacy coach candidates:

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
4.1 Assist the classroom teacher and paraprofessional in selecting materials that match the reading levels, interests, and cultural and linguistic background of students.	b	b	b	e	b	e	e	e
4.2 Assist the classroom teacher in selecting books, technology-based information, and non-print materials representing multiple levels, broad interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	b	b	b	e	b	e	e	e
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	b	b	b	e	e	e	e	e

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
activities.								
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.	b	e	b	e	e	e	e	e

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

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
5.1 Articulate the theories related to the connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement.	b	b	b	e	e	e	e	b
5.2 Conduct professional study groups for paraprofessionals 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.	b	e	b	b	e	e	e	e
5.3 Positively and constructively provide an evaluation of their own or others' teaching practices. Assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals as they strive to improve their practice.	b	b	b	e	b	b	e	b
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.	b	b	b	e	e	e	e	e

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. The assessments must be those that all candidates in the program are required to complete and should be used by the program to determine candidate proficiencies as expected in the program standards. Assessments and scoring guides 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.

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 that are addressed 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 a document that includes the following items: a two page narrative that responds to questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 (below) and the three items listed in question 5

(below). This document should be attached as directed.

1. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
2. 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.
3. A brief analysis of the data findings;
4. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording; and
5. Attachment of assessment documentation, including:
(a) the assessment tool or description of the assignment;
(b) the scoring guide for the assessment; and
(c) candidate data derived from the assessment.

It is preferred that the response for each of 5a, 5b, and 5c (above) be limited to the equivalent of five text pages, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

All three components of the assessment (as identified in 5a-c) must be attached, with the following exceptions: (a) the assessment tool and scoring guide are not required for reporting state licensure data, and (b) for some assessments, data may not yet be avail

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

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

2. **Assessment of content knowledge in reading education. IRA standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to 1 and 5. Examples of appropriate assessments include comprehensive examinations, research reports, child studies, action research, portfolio projects,[8] and essays. (Answer required)**

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

Comprehensive Exam Data

See **Attachments** panel below.

---

[8] 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 Directions	Assessment #3 Scoring Rubric
Assessment #3 Data	

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

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

Assessment #4 Directions	Assessment #4 Scoring Rubric

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

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

Assessment #5 Scoring Rubric	Assessment #5 Data
Assessment #5 Directions	

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

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

Assessment # 6 Rubric	Assessment #6 Directions

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

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

Assessment #7 Directions	Assessment #7 Scoring Rubric
Assessment #7 Data	

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

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

Assessment #8 Directions	Assessment #8 Scoring Rubric
Assessment #8 Data	

See **Attachments** panel below.

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

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

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

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

1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in response to issues cited in previous recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report or a response to condition report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4 (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
Preparation of Reading Education Professionals

REJOINDER

In 2007 faculty within the Department of Teacher Education began the process of examining the MSE-Reading program and concluded that the program needed to be restructured in order to meet the needs of the teachers and schools served by Arkansas State University. During the course of the 2007-2008 school year, the Reading Group, composed of faculty qualified to teach in the MSE-Reading program (the majority of them newly-hired faculty), met numerous times and successfully restructured the MSE-Reading program, developed several new courses, and examined appropriate assessments for the program that would insure alignment with IRA standards.

The newly restructured MSE-Reading program was implemented in the fall of 2008. The initial Program Report of the Preparation of Reading Education Professions was submitted to the International Reading Association (IRA) on September 9, 2008, in anticipation of ASU's institutional review of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). At the time of the initial report to the IRA, data was not available for the newly restructured program.

Upon receipt of the National Recognition Report: Preparation of Reading Education Professionals on February 2, 2009, the Reading Group met to address the conditions established by the IRA for national recognition of ASU's MSE-Reading program. Over the course of several months each of the major reading courses in the program, along with their respective assessments, were analyzed. As a result, some assessments were substantially revised and others were rewritten to reflect alignment with IRA standards more clearly. Section II: List of Assessments provides a description of the current (newly-revised) list of assessments. Section III: Relationship of Assessment to Standards depicts the MSE-Reading program's alignment with IRA Standards.

This report will delineate efforts made by Reading Group faculty to resolve IRA's areas of concern.

1. Address IRA standards at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach Level.

Reading Group faculty examined each of the assessments associated with MSE-Reading courses in order to insure that each assessment addressed IRA standards at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level. Examples of assessments' alignment with IRA standards at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level include:

Assessment 3: RDNG 6553, Individualized Literacy Plan for an Adolescent Learner.
Candidates "develop a user-friendly handbook for teachers" -or- "create a presentation for teachers where you describe how you approached and developed the ongoing literacy plan for the student."
(See Section IV, Number 3, Assessment #3 Directions.)
Assessment 4: RDNG 6353, Literacy Leadership Portfolio.
Candidates will:
You will need to collect, analyze, and evaluate schoolwide reading assessment (formal and informal) data from the past three years to determine strengths and weaknesses of the school's reading program. These assessments will include the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment, and Accountability Program (ACTAAP) or other state administered norm referenced or criterion referenced standardized exams, and informal assessments such as the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), or other assessments administered at the school.
(See Section IV, Number 4, Assessment #4 Directions.)
Assessment 5: RDNG 6333, Classroom Assessment and Intervention Case Study.
Candidates will:
collaborate with reading professionals (teachers and literacy specialists or coaches) to identify and examine a variety of reading assessments … analyze data … work collaboratively with a colleague to plan reading instruction designed to meet the needs of all the students within their two classes using a variety of grouping practices and a wide range of evidence based instructional practices, approaches, and methods … The candidate will implement the instructional plan within his/her class and will facilitate

the implementation of the instructional plan within his/her colleague's class through modeling instructional strategies, peer observations, and peer evaluations.
(See Section IV, Number 5, Assessment #5 Directions.)
Assessment 6: RDNG 6563, Brain-Based Literacy Instruction Unit of Inquiry: Researching, Planning, Implementing and Reflecting.
Candidates will "implement the instructional plan and work collaboratively with a team of 4-5 colleagues/peer to evaluate the efficacy of the instructional plan throughout 6 weeks of implementation."

(See Section IV, Number 6, Assessment #6 Directions.)
Assessment 7: RDNG 6313, Research Paper: Connecting Theory and Research to Practice.
Candidates will "compare, contrast, and critique the major theories of reading."
(See Section IV, Number 7, Assessment #7 Directions.)
Assessment 8: RDNG: RDNG 6513, Research-Based Observation: Analysis and Reflection.
Candidates will "share research summaries and answers to reflective questions in an online forum and participate in a reflective dialogue about their own and their peers' professional practices."
(See Section IV, Number 8, Assessment #8 Directions.)
2. Provide evidence of 24 hours of reading/literacy courses in addition to the 6 credits of supervised practica.
Reading Group faculty developed a new course, entitled RDNG 6243, Reading in the Digital Age. RDNG 6243 will replace TE 6243, Technology as a Tool for Teaching. This course is now required as a core course in the MSE-Reading program and will be taught for the first time in the summer, 2010, semester. MSE-Reading candidates are required to take seven RDNG core/major courses, two RDNG specialty courses, and one RDNG elective course. Therefore, MSE-Reading candidates earn a total of 30 credit hours of reading courses. Of these, 6 credit hours are of supervised practica: RDNG 6333, Reading Practicum I – Diagnosis and Intervention, and RDNG 6353, Reading Practicum II – Leadership in Literacy. (See Section I, Number 6, MSE in Reading Education Program Checksheet.)
3. Provide data for assessments used in the program review.
Students entering the restructured MSE-Reading program began coursework in the fall of 2008. Data is reported for assessments associated with the courses that have been taught since the inception of the program; data is also reported for the Comprehensive Exam administered March 6, 2010. However, administration of Assessment #1 (Praxis II) and Assessment #2 (Master's Comprehensive Exam) will not be administered until mid-March of 2010, after submission of this report.
Assessment #1: Praxis II: State Licensure Test (Reading Praxis II for Reading Specialist K-12). Data is unavailable. Candidates will take this exam in mid-March, 2010. Data will not be available until after April, 2010.
Assessment #2: Master's Comprehensive Exam. Candidates enrolled in the newly revised MSE-Reading program were administered the Comprehensive Exam for the first time March 6, 2010. Of the 10 candidates taking the exam, 10% (n=1) scored at an exemplary level and 90% (n=9) scored at an acceptable level. One hundred percent, therefore, scored at an acceptable level or above.
Assessment #3: Individualized Literacy Plan with an Adolescent Learner (RDNG 6553, Adolescent Literacy). Data was collected in summer, 2009, the first time this course was offered. Of the 15 MSE-Reading candidates enrolled in RDNG 6553: 87% (n=13) met Standard 1.4 at an exemplary level; 13% (n=2) met Standard 1.4 at an acceptable level. Ninety-three percent (n=14) met Standard 3.2 at an exemplary level; 7% (n=1) met Standard 3.2 at an acceptable level. One hundred percent (n=15) met Standards 4.1, 4.2, and 5.1 at an exemplary level. (IRA Standards 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, and 4.4 were added to this assessment after revisions. Current data was collected in Summer, 2009, prior to revision. Therefore, this data reflects the original, unrevised assessment.)
Of the 15 candidates enrolled in RDNG 6553, 100% scored at the acceptable or exemplary level on all assessed standards.
(See Section IV, Number 3, Assessment #3 Data.)
Assessment #4: Leadership in Literacy Portfolio (RDNG 6353, Reading Practicum II). Data is

unavailable. Candidates are currently enrolled in this class (Spring, 2010) and, therefore, data will not be available until May, 2010.

Assessment #5: Classroom Assessment and Intervention Case Study (RDNG 6333, Reading Practicum I). Data was collected in fall, 2009, the first time the course was offered. Of the 11 MSE-Reading candidates enrolled in RDNG 6333: 64% (n=7) met Standard 1.4 at an exemplary level; 36% (n=4) met Standard 1.4 at an acceptable level. One hundred percent (n=11) met standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, and 3.3 at an exemplary level. Ninety-one percent (n=10) met Standards 3.1 and 5.3 at an exemplary level; 9% (n=1) met Standards 3.1 and 5.3 at an acceptable level. Fifty-five percent (n=6) met Standard 3.4 at an exemplary level; 45% (n=5) met Standard 3.4 at an acceptable level. Seventy-three percent (n=8) met Standards 4.1 and 4.2 at an exemplary rate; 27% met 4.1 and 4.2 at an acceptable rate.

Of the 11 candidates enrolled in RDNG 6333, 100% scored at the acceptable or exemplary level on all assessed standards.

(See Section IV, Number 5, Assessment #5 Data.)

Assessment #6: Brain-Based Literacy Instruction Unit of Inquiry: Researching, Planning, Implementing and Reflecting (RDNG 6563, Principles of Literacy Cognition). This assessment was not a part of the original program assessments as submitted in September, 2008. Data from this assessment will not be available until May, 2010.

Assessment #7: Research Paper (RDNG 6313, Theory and Practice in Reading). Data was collected in fall, 2008, and fall, 2009.

Fall, 2008, Data: Of the 22 MSE-Reading candidates enrolled in RDNG 6313 in fall, 2008, 32% (n=7) met Standards 1.1, 1.3, and 5.1 at an exemplary level; 68% met Standard 1.1, 1.3, and 5.1 at an acceptable level. Ninety-one percent (n=20) met Standard 1.2 at an exemplary level; 9% met Standard 1.2 at an acceptable level.

Fall, 2009, Data: Of the 14 MSE-Reading candidates enrolled in RDNG 6313 in fall, 2009, 86% (n=12) met Standards 1.1, 1.3, and 5.1 at an exemplary level; 14% met Standards 1.1, 1.3, and 5.1 at an acceptable level. Ninety-two percent (n=13) met Standard 1.2 at an exemplary level; 8% (n=1) met Standard 1.2 at an acceptable level.

Of the 36 candidates enrolled in RDNG 6313 during in 2008 and 2009, 100% scored at the acceptable or exemplary level on all assessed standards.

(See Section IV, Number 7, Assessment #7 Data.)

Assessment #8: Research-Based Observation: Analysis and Reflection (RDNG 6513, Research-Based Observation: Analysis and Reflection). Data was collected in summer, 2009. Of the 17 MSE-Reading candidates enrolled in RDNG 6513, 71% (n=12) met Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 at an exemplary level; 29% met Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 at an acceptable level. Eighty-eight percent (n=15) met Standards 5.1 and 5.3 at an exemplary level; 12% (n=2) met Standards 5.1 and 5.3 at an acceptable level.

Of the 17 candidates enrolled in RDNG 6513, 100% scored at the acceptable or exemplary level on all assessed standards.

(See Section IV, Number 8, Assessment #8 Data.)

Provisions for Unsuccessful Candidates: Because the MSE-Reading program is newly revised assessment data is available for only 5 assessments: #2, #3, #5, #7, and #8. Of the assessments that have been administered within the new program, the data indicates that 100% of MSE-Reading candidates have met the relevant standards at an acceptable or exemplary level. In the initial stages of implementation of the newly revised program, instructors discussed the need to insure that all candidates successfully completed each assessment at an acceptable (or exemplary) level. Therefore, it was decided that in the event a candidate experiences difficulty with any component of an assessment associated with a particular course (specifically, assessment #s 3 – 8), the instructor would make arrangements to meet individually with the candidate to assist him/her. In the courses that have been completed this approach has enabled our candidates to be successful and meet the expectations associated with each assessment and IRA standards at an acceptable or exemplary level. With respect to assessment #2, the comprehensive exam, candidates who are unsuccessful with particular questions on the exam will be given the opportunity to re-take all or portions of the exam. Likewise, candidates are able to retake

Praxis II in the event they do not earn a score of 560 or better in order to obtain the Reading Specialist Licensure Endorsement, Grades P-8 and 7-12 from the Arkansas Department of Education.
Collection and Maintenance of Data: Collection of data associated with assessment #s 3-8 is completed by instructors of the courses in which the assessments are completed. This data is maintained by the individual instructor. Additionally, this data is maintained in an electronic data bank established by the Reading Group through the university's Interactive Teaching and Technology Center. Data from assessment #2, the comprehensive exam, is maintained in the electronic data bank. Praxis II scores are submitted to the university's College of Education Professional Education Programs Office and subsequently provided to the MSE-Reading faculty. Praxis II data is maintained in the electronic data bank along with other MSE-Reading assessment data.
4. Revision of assessment directions to candidates to clearly link the standards to assignment directions and scoring rubrics.
Assessments 3-8 and their respective scoring rubrics have been revised to reflect clear linkage with IRA Standards. (See Section IV, Numbers 3 – 8; Assessments 3 – 8 Directions; Assessments 3 – 8 Scoring Rubrics.)
5. NCATE requires Assessment 3 to assess candidate's ability to plan instruction. Assessment 4 to assess candidate's internship and Assessment 5 to candidate's ability to impact student learning; it is not clear that each of the assessments submitted accomplish that goal.
Assessment #3 (RDNG 6553, Individualized Literacy Plan for an Adolescent Learner) has been revised. As a component of this assessment, MSE-Reading candidates interview an adolescent learner, "collect various artifacts of and for assessment," and "find varied comprehension strategies/scaffolding techniques or schemata that will assist the learner in making sense of textbooks or required readings from his/her courses." The emphasis in this assessment is on developing an understanding of a specific learner in order to plan instruction to meet the unique needs of that learner. (See Section IV, Number 3, Assessment #3 Directions.)
Assessment #4 (RDNG 6353, Literacy Leadership Portfolio) has been revised. As a component of this assessment, MSE-Reading candidates evaluate a school's literacy program, develop a "professional interest survey for a specific group of teachers/paraprofessionals at a school," and, based on the evaluation of the school's literacy program and survey findings, identify an area for study. The candidate will locate relevant research-based articles that address the identified area of study and will lead a collaborative discussion group with teachers at the school and discuss/reflect how the professional development impacts student learning. RDNG 6353 is the final course in the MSE-Reading program and serves as a synthesis experience for candidates. It is a field-based internship and supervised by the instructor. (See Section IV, Number 3, Assessment #4, Assessment #4 Directions.)
Assessment #5: (RDNG 6333, Classroom Assessment and Intervention Case) has been revised. As a component of this assessment, MSE-Reading candidates "administer a minimum of two different reading assessments to one class of students and a minimum of the same reading assessments to a colleague's class." Based on the analysis of the assessment data, the candidate will plan and implement a 6 week instructional plan "designed to meet the needs of all the students" within the two classrooms assessed. Candidates will collaborate with a colleague to conduct progress monitoring in order to evaluate the impact of the instructional plan on student learning. In addition, the candidate will "collaborate with a peer/colleague to develop a plan of intervention for a struggling reader," "facilitate implementation of the plan of intervention," and monitor student progress. The candidate will write a case study of the struggling reader which will include (1) the background of the student; (2) initial assessments of the student; (3) intervention plan; (4) monitoring notes/anecdotal records; (5) changes or adaptations in the intervention plan; (6) post-assessment information; (7) final results and recommendations to stakeholders; and (7) references. The emphasis in this assessment is on the use of assessment data to establish learners' specific literacy needs and guide instructional planning decisions, developing a plan to meet the needs of a learner experiencing specific difficulties developing as a reader, and monitoring the progress of that student to insure the effectiveness of the instructional plan. (See Section IV, Number 5, Assessment #5 Directions.)

6. Assessment 4 does not clearly state what assessment information is communicated to different audiences.

Assessment #4: Leadership in Literacy Portfolio (RDNG 6353, Reading Practicum II) has been revised for clarification. The assessment now states:

You will need to collect, analyze, and evaluate schoolwide reading assessment (formal and informal) data from the past three years to determine strengths and weaknesses of the school's reading program. These assessments will include the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment, and Accountability Program (ACTAAP) or other state administered norm referenced or criterion referenced standardized exams, and informal assessments such as the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), or other assessments administered at the school.

Additionally, Assessment 4 clarifies the stakeholders to whom assessment information will be communicated:

Using this information, complete an evaluation of a school's literacy program (see outline below) for your school that you will share with stakeholders (teachers, paraprofessionals, literacy leaders, principal, grade level chairs, and parents).
(See Section IV, Number 4, Assessment #4 Directions.)

7. In Assessments 5 and 6 it is not clear if candidates work with one student or a group of students.

Assessment #5: (RDNG 6333, Classroom Assessment and Intervention Case). As a component of this assessment, candidates will "administer a minimum of two different assessments to one class of students and assist in the administration" of assessments to a colleague's class. The analysis of data resulting from these assessments will be used to plan instruction for the two classes of students. Additionally, the "candidate will collaborate with a peer/colleague to develop a plan of intervention for a struggling reader." (See Section IV, Number 5, Assessment #5 Directions.)

Assessment #6 was originally entitled, Stakeholders' Report and was completed in RDNG 6333: Reading Practicum I: Diagnosis and Intervention. This original assessment has been combined with Assessment #5. The stakeholders' report, therefore, is now one component of Assessment #5.

8. Assessment 7 is labeled a Research Paper, yet candidates write a grant; however there are no guidelines given for grant writing.

Assessment #7 (RDNG 6313, Research Paper) has been revised. Elements of the grant writing activity have been eliminated. Assessment #7 is now entitled Research Paper: Connecting Theory and Research to Practice. (See Section IV, Number 7, Assessment #7 Directions.)

9. There is no evidence that candidates impact student learning; they work with students, but do not show HOW they impact student learning.

Assessments 4, 5, 6, and 8 have been revised to assess/demonstrate candidates' impact on student learning:

Assessment #4 (RDNG 6353, Literacy Leadership Portfolio). Candidates locate relevant research-based articles that address the identified area of study and will lead a collaborative discussion group with teachers at the school and discuss/reflect how the professional development impacts student learning. (See Section IV, Number 4, Assessment #4 Directions.)

Assessment #5: (RDNG 6333, Classroom Assessment and Intervention Case). Candidates demonstrate their use of assessments to plan reading instruction using a variety of grouping practices and evidence based instructional practices, approaches, and methods. Candidates work collaboratively with a colleague to conduct progress monitoring to evaluate instructional impact on student learning. Additionally, candidates use assessment data to develop a plan of intervention for a struggling reader. Throughout the implementation of the plan of intervention, candidates monitor the progress of the struggling reader and provide an analysis of the plan's effect on student learning through anecdotal records and charting of pre- and post-test data. (See Section IV, Number 5, Assessment #5 Directions.)

Assessment #6: (RDNG 6563, Brain-Based Literacy Instruction Unit of Inquiry: Researching, Planning, Implementing and Reflecting). Candidates review research related to literacy cognition and brain-based research and apply their knowledge of research findings to develop a 6-week instructional unit designed

to meet the needs of individual students based on their reading levels, interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds. At the conclusion of 6 weeks of implementation of the instructional plan, candidates will "critically analyze and evaluate … the effectiveness of the instructional plan to impact student learning (based on data analysis of pre-test/post-test or other qualitative method for evaluation)." (See Section IV, Number 6, Assessment #6 Directions.)

Assessment #8: (RDNG 6513, Research-Based Observation: Analysis and Reflection). Candidates will summarize the literature review component of the research paper they will write and address reflective questions about their professional practice: "Based on my understanding of national standards, current research, and contemporary state and federal policies, how can I improve my professional practice to positively impact student learning?" (See Section IV, Number 8, Assessment #8 Directions.)

Please click "Next"

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