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**SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING COMPETENCIES**

**DIRECTIONS:** Information on the 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II and their findings must be reported in this section. 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 competencies. Competencies and assessments have been organized into the following three areas that are addressed in NCATE’s unit standard 1:

1. Content knowledge[[1]](#footnote-1)

2. Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions

3. Effects on student learning[[2]](#footnote-2)11

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 competencies it is cited

for in Section III. Cite OKLAHOMA competencies 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 competencies,

indicating the specific OKLAHOMA competencies 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). 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 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Data from licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge.**

Submit the following information:

1. The names of all licensure tests or professional examinations required by the state of Oklahoma for content and pedagogical or professional knowledge.

2. Description of the correlation between licensure test data and applicable state competencies.

3. Aggregated pass rates for each year over the past 3 years, including the most recent academic year. Data must be presented on all candidates, even if there were fewer than 10 test takers during a single year. Eighty percent of program completers[[3]](#footnote-3)12who have taken the **content** test must pass the state licensure test.

4. The mean and range of sub-scores for the most recent year.

(response limited to 2 pages)

**SECTION IV – EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS**

**ASSESSMENT #1: OSAT**

**Description of the Assessment:**

The Reading Specialist program uses the **Oklahoma Subject Area Test** for two purposes. First, passing grades are part of the qualification for teacher licensure. Second, university faculty receives student scores, and uses that information to identify areas where our graduates need more emphasis. In this regard, the **OSAT** results are useful because they do report sub scores.

**Alignment of the Assessment with Specific SPA Standards:**

The **Oklahoma Subject Area Test** is a reliable, valid measure of the candidates’ content knowledge with regard to the vital concepts of teaching subject area knowledge. The following paragraph is a table showing the alignment of the **IRA** Standards with the **Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensure and Certification** standards covered by **OSAT**.

**Oklahoma Reading Specialist Test Competencies**

**Aligned with IRA Standards**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Oklahoma Reading Specialist Test Competencies** | **IRA Standards** |
| FOUNDATIONAL KNOWLEDGE |  |
| 0001- Understand the linguistic foundations of reading | 1.1 |
| 0002 – Understand the foundations of reading | 1.1 |
| 0003 – Analyze how different factors (e.g. cultural, linguistic, developmental, environmental, social) may affect reading and reading instruction. | 1.3 |
| INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES |  |
| 0004 – Analyze instructional strategies and techniques used in reading instruction. | 2.2 |
| 0005 – Apply strategies for using students’ existing language skills to foster reading development. | 2.3, 4.1 |
| 0006 – Analyze the role of concepts of print, the alphabetic principles, and letter recognition in reading development, and apply strategies for promoting students’ knowledge and skills in these areas. | 2.3 |
| 0007 – Understand the role of phonological and phonemic awareness in reading development and strategies for promoting phonological and phonemic awareness skills. | 1.4, 2.2 |
| 0008 – Understand the role of phonics in reading development and strategies for promoting students’ phonics skills. | 1.4, 2.2 |
| 0009 – Understand the role of fluency in reading and strategies for promoting fluency at the word level and text level. | 1.4, 2.2 |
| 0010 – Analyze principles of vocabulary development and strategies for enhancing students’’ vocabulary knowledge. | 1.4, 2.2 |
| 0011 – Understand the nature of reading comprehension and factors related to comprehension of text. | 1.4, 2.2, 4.1 |
| 0012 – Apply knowledge for promoting students’ ability to become strategic readers of narrative text. | 2.2 |
| 0013 – Apply procedures for promoting students’ ability to become strategic readers of expository text across the content areas. | 2.2 |
| 0014 – Analyze instruction to address the needs of all student populations. | 2.3, 4.2 |
| 0015 – Apply procedures for selecting and using reading materials for classroom purposes. | 2.3, 4.2 |
| 0016 – Apply procedures for using technology in the reading program. | 2.2, 4.2 |
| Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation |  |
| 0017 – Analyze basic principles of reading assessment and the role of reading. | 3.1 |
| 0018 – Analyze formal reading assessment instruments and procedures. | 3.1 |
| 0019 – Analyze informal reading assessment instruments and procedures. | 3.1 |
| 0020 – Apply procedures for interpreting assessment results and using assessment information to plan reading instruction based on student needs. | 3.3 |
| 0021 – Analyze characteristics and purposes of screening procedures. | 3.3 |
| 0022 – Analyze characteristics and purposes of diagnostic procedures. | 3.3 |
| 0023 – Apply principles for evaluating reading programs and materials. | 4.1, 4.2 |
| Role of Reading Professional |  |
| 0024 – Analyze the role of the reading specialist and strategies for working with others inside and outside the school to promote students’ reading development. | 5.3 |
| 0025 – Apply procedures for developing and implementing the reading curriculum. | 5.4 |
| 0026 – Apply strategies for creating a literate environment that promotes the development of community of readers and the reading growth of all students. | 4.3, 4.4, 5.1 |
| 0027 – Analyze the role of reflection, self-evaluation, and professional development in reading instruction. | 5.3 |

**ANALYSIS OF DATA:**

Southwestern Oklahoma State University’s Reading Specialist Program has only three semesters of data because of it is a new program. The program has had only two candidates take the **OSAT**. Both candidates passed the exam.

Scores from the most recent exam have not yet been reported.

**INTERPRETATION OF DATA:**

The **OSAT** has four subtest areas. These areas are:

Foundations of Reading

Instructional Practices

Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation

The Role of the Reading Professional

The scaled scores of each subtest provide evidence that the candidates know, understand, and use the concepts of each of the **IRA standards**.

The SWOSU faculty feels that the student passage rate and scores on the subtests of the **OSAT** demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of the concepts, principles, theories, and research of content knowledge. Content knowledge required of a reading professional is all inclusive of each of the subtests.

**ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION**

**OSAT Scores**

**Subarea I**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number Tested** | | **Scaled Score** | |
| **Year** | **SWOSU** | **State** | **SWOSU** | **State** |
| April 2010 | 2 | 34 | 272 | 275 |

**Subarea II**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number Tested** | | **Scaled Score** | |
| **Year** | **SWOSU** | **State** | **SWOSU** | **State** |
| April 2010 | 2 | 34 | 282 | 275 |

**Total: Subareas III**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number Tested** | | **Scaled Score** | |
| **Year** | **SWOSU** | **State** | **SWOSU** | **State** |
| April 2010 | 2 | 34 | 275 | 265 |

**Total: Subareas IV**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number Tested** | | **Scaled Score** | |
| **Year** | **SWOSU** | **State** | **SWOSU** | **State** |
| April 2010 | 2 | 34 | 244 | 249 |

**Total: Subareas I- II-III-IV**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number Tested** | | **Percent Passed** | |
| **Year** | **SWOSU** | **State** | **SWOSU** | **State** |
| 2002-03 | 2 | 34 | 100% | 97% |

**#2 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge in (*Name of Program)*.**  Examples of assessments include comprehensive exams,[[4]](#footnote-4)13, GPAs or grades[[5]](#footnote-5)14, content major[[6]](#footnote-6)15, course projects[[7]](#footnote-7)16, and portfolio tasks. [[8]](#footnote-8)17

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

(response limited to 2 pages)

**ASSESSMENT #2: Theory to Practice Project**

**Description of the Assessment:**

Assessment two is a research based reflection which evaluates a candidate’s ability to articulate reading theories and the manner in which those theories impact that candidate’s classroom practice and peer coaching.

**Alignment of the Assessment with Specific SPA Standards:**

Assessment two addresses the following **IRA Standards: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1, 5.3, and 5.4.** Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of reading research and history, language development and reading acquisition, including variations related to culture and linguistic diversity, and major components and their integration into fluent reading (**1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4**). Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of and ability in selecting effective literacy instruction, using student interest, abilities, prior knowledge, technology, and multiple levels, interests, and cultures which will encourage learners to become life-long readers and writers. The Theory to Practice project requires candidates to examine their beliefs about reading and reading instruction, how those beliefs transfer to their classroom practice and dispositions, and the continued pursuit of professional development (**5.1, 5.3,5.4**).

**Analysis of Data Findings:**

Only one semester of data for Assessment #2 is available because classes required for the Reading Specialist are offered once every academic year. **RDNG Foundations of Reading** was offered during the Fall 2009. Starting in the Summer 2011, the class will be offered each summer.

Eleven candidates achieved target status on their portfolio requirement for **IRA Standards** **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1, 5.3, and 5.4** .

No candidates were at Acceptable or Unacceptable.

**Interpretation of Data Findings:**

There are three levels of evaluation possible:

**Target** – Demonstrates exemplary qualities

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects evidence that clearly correlates with the **IRA Standards**; is well organized and Graduate level work.

**Acceptable** – Demonstrates some evidence of acceptable work

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects some evidence that correlates with the **IRA Standards**; may need more work on formatting; and may not use appropriate grammar.

**Unacceptable** – Is not acceptable.

The candidate’s portfolio requirement does not reflect **IRA Standards**; submission is not at Graduate level.

Candidate submissions are assessed with an Assessment Rubric. The rubric will indicate that the candidate has attained competency and met requirements. Summative evaluations are based upon **IRA** standards and the **Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensure and Certification.**

**Assessment #2**

**Theory to Practice Project**

**IRA: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4**

During **Foundations of Reading**, each candidate will analyze four reading theories and how those theories impact classroom practices. The purpose of this project is for a candidate to analyze him/herself, his/her classroom practices, and his/her development as a professional teacher of reading. The following directions and questions will help a candidate successfully complete the project.

1. Each of the four theories should be explained fully in detail. **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4**
2. How does each theory influence classroom practice? **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4**
3. How does each theory and practice correlate? **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1, 5.3**
4. Describe yourself and your classroom practices, including materials, technology, student writing, and student interests. **5.4**
5. Which theory best describes your classroom practices? **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4**
6. Which of your classroom practice/s needs to change? Which theory influenced this decision? **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4**

**SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**RDNG 5413 FOUNDATIONS OF READING**

**CUMULATIVE DATA SPRING 2010**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IRA Standards Addressed in the Assessment | No. of Candidates at Unacceptable  (1) | No of Candidates at Acceptable  (2) | No. of Candidates at Target  (3) |
| 1.1 |  |  | 11 |
| 1.2 |  |  | 11 |
| 1.3 |  |  | 11 |
| 1.4 |  |  | 11 |
| 5.1 |  |  | 11 |
| 5.3 |  |  | 11 |
| 5.4 |  |  | 11 |

**Assessment # 2 Scoring Guide: Theory to Practice Project**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**    **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1, 5.3, and 5.4**. | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Description of four reading theories. **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4** | There is a detailed description of each theory. Theories are compared and contrasted in detail. | Each theory is described in detail. Some comparison of each is included. | Each theory is described, but little detail is included. Little or no comparison or contrasting is done. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Description of how each theory impacts practice. **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1** | Detailed description of how each theory impacts practice. This description includes how practices are different following with each theory. | A description of theory and practice is included. Some contrasting is done. | Theory and practice is discussed, but little detail is included. Little or no contrasting between theories is done. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Description of self as a teacher of reading**. 1.2, 1.3, 1.4** | There is a detailed description of self as a teacher of reading. The discussion includes beliefs, why choices are made, what shapes practice.      **Target**  **3** | A description of your teaching self is included. There is some discussion of beliefs, choices, and practice.      **Acceptable**  **2** | A discussion of yourself as a teacher is included with little or no detail. Beliefs and the reasons for choices are not discussed in any detail.        **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **Assessment:** Description of classroom practices**. 1.4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4** | There is a detailed description of materials, practices, and student learning. | There is a description of materials, practices, and student learning. | There is a limited description of materials, practices, and student learning. |  |
| **Assessment:** Correlation of theory to practice and changes needed in the classroom. **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4** | There is a detailed discussion of the correlation between the theory that describes your teaching self, your classroom practices, and changes needed. Detailed examples of theory to practice are included. | There is a discussion of the correlation between theory, your teaching self, your classroom practices, and changes needed. Some examples are included. | There is a limited discussion of the correlation between theory, your teaching self, your classroom practices, and changes needed. Few or no examples are included. |  |

**RATING TOTAL = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**#3 (Required) PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom-based instruction (e.g., unit plan) or activities for other roles as a professional educator.**  Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates’ abilities to develop lesson or unit plans, teacher work samples, individualized education plans, needs assessments, or intervention plans. An example would be a differentiated unit of instruction.

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

**ASSESSMENT #3: Clinic Project With Artifacts**

**Description of the Assessment:**

Assessment three evaluates candidates’ ability to plan instruction related to the application of diagnostic information to instructional plans. The candidate will assess reading skills and write instructional unit plans for three students-an emergent reader, a delayed reader in the primary grades, and a delayed reader in the intermediate grades. For one case study student, a tutoring intervention will be organized to utilize the diagnostic information and provide instructional support. A case study will be written to summarize the assessments, strategies, and results when the individual tutoring is completed. The candidate will apply content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in assessment, in instructional planning, and in selecting curriculum materials and technology. A review of the assessments, instructional plans, and limited results are reviewed with peers and parents. A staff development event is presented to share assessment techniques, remediation strategies, and materials with teachers and paraprofessionals. A self-evaluation reflection and peer evaluation reflection are included.

**Alignment of the Assessment with Specific SPA Standards:**

Assessment three addresses the following **IRA Standards**:  **1.4,** **2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4**. Candidates determine if readers are integrating the components (phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation) in fluent reading by using appropriate assessment techniques for three students **(1.4,3.1).** Instructional plans are developed for these students using appropriate curriculum, technology, and materials that are developmentally appropriate and linked to assessment. **(2.2, 2.3, 3.3)**. One case study student will be selected from the three students tested and tutored for 10 hours with a wide range of selected materials and strategies reflected in daily lesson plans **(4.1, 4.2)**. A case study will be written to summarize the assessments, strategies, and results when the tutoring is completed **(3.1, 3.4)**. The instructional plans and assessment results are shared with peers and parents **(5.4).** A staff development event is presented to share assessment techniques, remediation strategies, and materials with teachers and paraprofessionals. **(2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2,5.4)**. Candidates reflect on their experience and those of their peers in a self-evaluation. **(5.1, 5.3).**

**Analysis of Data Findings:**

Only one semester of data for Assessment #3 is available because classes required for the Reading Specialist are offered once every academic year. Diagnosis and Remediation II is offered each Fall. The data available for this class is from Fall 2009.

Four candidates achieved target status on their portfolio requirement for **IRA Standards 1.4,** **2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4**.

No candidates were at the Acceptable or the Unacceptable levels.

**Interpretation of Data Findings:**

There are three levels of evaluation possible:

**Target** – Demonstrates exemplary qualities

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects evidence that clearly correlates with the **IRA Standards**; is well organized and Graduate level work.

**Acceptable** – Demonstrates some evidence of acceptable work

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects some evidence that correlates with the **IRA Standards**; may need more work on formatting; and may not use appropriate grammar.

**Unacceptable** – Is not acceptable.

The candidate’s portfolio requirement does not reflect **IRA Standards**; submission is not at Graduate level.

Candidate submissions are assessed with an Assessment Rubric. The rubric will indicate that the candidate has attained competency and met requirements. Summative evaluations are based upon **IRA** standards and the **Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensure and Certification.**

**Assessment #3**

**Clinic Project With Artifacts**

**IRA *Standards for Reading Professionals* (2003) 1.4,** **2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4**

Assessment three evaluates candidates’ ability to plan instruction related to the application of diagnostic information to instructional plans.

Candidates will submit to the instructor:

Candidates assessment of readers integrating the components in fluent reading using appropriate assessment techniques for three students **(1.4,3.1).**

Instructional plans developed for these students using appropriate curriculum, technology, and materials that are developmentally appropriate and linked to assessment. **(2.2, 2.3, 3.3)**

One case study selected from the three students tested, tutored for 10 hours, and written with a wide range of selected materials and strategies reflected in daily lesson plans **(4.1, 4.2, 3.1, 3.4)**.

The instructional plans and assessment results are shared with peers and parents during a staff development event **(5.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2,5.4)**.

A reflection on their experience and those of their peers in a self-evaluation. **(5.1, 5.3).**

**ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION**

**SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**RDNG 5433 DIAGNOSIS AND REMEDIATION II**

**CUMULATIVE DATA FALL 2009**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IRA Standards Addressed in the Assessment | No. of Candidates at Unacceptable  (1) | No of Candidates at Acceptable  (2) | No. of Candidates at Target  (3) |
| 1.4 |  |  | 4 |
| 2.2 |  |  | 4 |
| 3.1 |  |  | 4 |
| 3.2 |  |  | 4 |
| 3.3 |  |  | 4 |
| 3.4 |  |  | 4 |
| 4.1 |  |  | 4 |
| 4.2 |  |  | 4 |
| 5.1 |  |  | 4 |
| 5.3 |  |  | 4 |
| 5.4 |  |  | 4 |

**Assessment #3 Scoring Guide: Clinic Project with Artifacts**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Candidates determine through appropriate assessment whether three readers are integrating the components of fluent reading which includes phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation. **3.1,** **1.4** | Appropriate assessment is correctly completed for three readers in order to determine whether each student has integrated the components of fluent reading. | Most of the assessment is adequate for three readers in order to determine whether each student has integrated the components of fluent reading. | Assessment is inadequate for three readers in order to determine whether each student has integrated the components of fluent reading. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Candidatesselect and use curriculum materials, and instructional practices in three instructional programs written to meet the identified needs of the target readers and linked to assessment results. **2.2, 2.3, 3.3** | A wide variety of materials, and instructional practices covering the identified needs of the target readers are used. A clear link to assessment results is shown. | An adequate variety of materials, and instructional practices covering the identified needs of the target readers are used. There is an adequate link to assessment results. | An inadequate variety of materials, and instructional practices covering the identified needs of the target readers are used. There is little or no link to assessment results. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Candidates select, use, and interpret appropriate formal and informal assessments to determine the reading level and remediation needs of three students tested. **3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4** | Appropriate assessment tools were well chosen, used, and interpreted to determine the reading level and remediation needs of three students tested. | Assessment tools were adequately chosen, used, and interpreted to determine the reading level and remediation needs of three students tested. | Assessment tools were inadequately chosen, used, and/or interpreted to determine the reading level and remediation needs of three students tested. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Candidates will utilize a wide range of materials, technology and appropriate books that match reading and interest levels as well as the cultural and linguistic background of the case study student selected. These will be included in specific daily lesson plans to instruct one student. **4.1, 4.2,** | Excellent instructional plans include appropriate texts, technology, and materials that are developmentally appropriate. Lesson plans are well developed. | Adequate instructional plans include some appropriate texts, technology, and materials that are developmentally appropriate. Lesson plans are less well developed. | Inadequate instructional plans include few appropriate texts, technology, and materials. Lesson plans are not well developed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Candidates write a case study to summarize the assessments, strategies, and results for the student receiving 10 hours of instruction. The candidate will include tests given, results of tests, instruction and remediation techniques, and student attitudes toward instruction. **3.1, 3.4** | The case study is detailed in its record of assessment results, strategies, and results. The content is complete and includes tests given, results of tests, instruction and remediation techniques, and student attitudes toward instruction. Remediation plans are easy to follow. | The case study is adequate in its record of assessment results, strategies, and results. The content is fairly complete and includes an adequate accounting of the following--tests given, results of tests, instruction and remediation techniques, and student attitudes toward instruction. Remediation plans are adequate. | The case study is inadequate in its record of assessment results, strategies, and results. The content is incomplete and omits part or all of the following-- tests given, results of tests, instruction and remediation techniques, and student attitudes toward instruction. Remediation plans are not easy to follow. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Candidates share instructional programs, lessons plans, assessments, and results with peers and parents. **5.4** | A detailed review is given of the instructional programs, lessons plans, assessments, and results to peers and parents. | An adequate review is given of the instructional programs, lessons plans, assessments, and results to peers and parents. | An inadequate review is given of the instructional programs, lessons plans, assessments, and results to peers and parents. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Candidates sharea staff development presentation of the clinic project to assist and support individual teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of assessment strategies, curriculum materials, and instructional practices. The presentation will provide assistance in using materials that match reading and interest levels of target students. Candidates focus on demonstrating the appropriate use of assessments and their proper interpretation, as well as planning instruction for struggling readers. **2.2,** **2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1,** **4.2,** **4.3, 5.4** | A detailed staff development presentation is shared which includes assessment strategies, unit planning and content, and provides high level knowledge of assessment tools, test interpretation, instructional practices, and a wide range of curriculum materials. | An acceptable staff development presentation is shared which includes assessment strategies, unit planning and content, and provides adequate knowledge of assessment tools, test interpretation, instructional practices, and an acceptable range of curriculum materials. More detail would be desirable. | A limited staff development presentation is shared which includes assessment strategies, unit planning and content, but it provides very limited knowledge of assessment tools, test interpretation, instructional practices, and a range of curriculum materials. The detail provided is limited. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Candidates complete a reflection on their experience which includes self- and peer-evaluation of the clinic project, including assessment, planning, and instruction. An explanation of theories related to connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement is written. **5.1, 5.3** | The reflection is well written and complete in the description of the clinic project, including assessment, planning, and instruction. An excellent explanation of theories related to connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement is written. | The reflection is adequate in the description of the clinic project, including assessment, planning, and instruction. An adequate explanation of theories related to connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement is written. | The reflection is inadequate in the description of the clinic project, including assessment, planning, and instruction. An inadequate explanation of theories related to connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement is written. |  |

**RATING TOTAL = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**#4 (Required) PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice.** The assessment instrument used in student teaching and the internship or other clinical experiencesshould be submitted.

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

(response limited to 2 pages)

**Assessment # 4—Lab Practicum Evaluation**

**Description of the Assessment:**

Assessment four evaluates candidate performance during a supervised practicum. The assessment demonstrates candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions as they are applied in practice. Candidates will demonstrate proficiency in foundational knowledge, instructional strategies and curriculum material, the assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation of students, and the ability to create a literate environment.

**Alignment of the Assessment with Specific SPA Standards:**

Assessment four addresses the following **IRA Standards: 1.1, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.3.** Candidates apply their knowledge of content, pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in assessment **(1.1, 1.4)** as well as demonstrate instructional strategies, knowledge of reading curriculum, supportive classroom environment, and collaboration with other education professionals **(2.1, 2.2, 2.3**. Candidates will demonstrate appropriate use of student assessments and will support the classroom teacher in the administration and interpretation of assessments as well as in instructional planning. The candidate will communicate assessment data and instructional plans to parents, classroom teacher, and university supervisor **(3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4).** The candidate will further assist the classroom teacher by providing lesson plans, selecting appropriate reading material, revising instructional plans in order to motivate students, and appropriate modeling of reading and writing **(4., 4., 4.3, 4.4).** Candidates will engage in self-evaluation and will receive evaluation from the classroom teacher and the university supervisor during the clinical experience **(5.3).**

**Analysis of Data Findings:**

Only one semester of data for Assessment #4 is available because classes required for the Reading Specialist are offered once every academic year. **RDNG 5443 Practicum in Reading (Individual)** was offered during the Spring 2010.

Seven candidates achieved **Target** status on their portfolio requirement on **IRA Standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 5.3**.

Six candidates achieved Target status on **IRA Standards 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4.**

Four candidates **achieved Target** status on **IRA Standard 1.4.**

One candidate **achieved Acceptable** status on **IRA Standards 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4.**

No students achieved Unacceptable status.

**Interpretation of Data Findings:**

There are three levels of evaluation possible:

**Target** – Demonstrates exemplary qualities

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects evidence that clearly correlates with the **IRA Standards**; is well organized and Graduate level work.

**Acceptable** – Demonstrates some evidence of acceptable work

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects some evidence that correlates with the **IRA Standards**; may need more work on formatting; and may not use appropriate grammar.

**Unacceptable** – Is not acceptable.

The candidate’s portfolio requirement does not reflect **IRA Standards**; submission is not at Graduate level.

Candidate submissions are assessed with an Assessment Rubric. The rubric will indicate that the candidate has attained competency and met requirements. Summative evaluations are based upon **IRA** standards and the **Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensure and Certification.**

**Assessment #4**

**Lab Practicum Evaluation**

**IRA *Standards for Reading Professionals* (2003): 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.2**

Introductory readings for **RDNG 5443 Practicum in Reading (Individual)** include “The Role and Qualifications of the Reading Coach in the United States” – a position statement by the International Reading Association and The Literacy Coach’s Survival Guide (Toll, C.A., 2005).

1. Following the readings and class discussion, candidates will write an *initial* vision statement. This is an expression of the candidate’s personal **vision of coaching activities at Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3.**
2. Candidate will secure a 30-hour field experience in an elementary setting. Candidate is responsible for documenting **coaching hours** at each of the **three levels of intensity** (see rubric). **(2.1, 2.2, 2.3)**
3. Candidate will assist the classroom teacher with assessing individual students **(Level 1 Coaching Activity)** according to the school district’s Reading Sufficiency Plan.
4. For an idividual student, candidate will score the assessments, interpret the data, and compare/contrast the data collected from all sources **(3.1, 3.2, 3.3).**
5. Candidate will prepare a report to be submitted to the classroom teacher, to the course instructor, and to the student’s parents. Include all assessment data, interpretation of data, and a remediation plan for the student **(3.3, 3.4). (Level 2 Coaching Activity)** Candidate will select the most significant reading problems for attention. Research and explain the methods to be used in the instructional plan. This plan will be the focus of the lesson plans utilized during the remainder of the semester in on-on-one interaction with designated student.
6. Candidate will prepare lesson plans to assist the classroom teacher in remediation efforts for individual students. All plans should be divided into four parts: the reading lesson, sub-skill development, independent reading, and diagnostic focus **(1.4).** In the materials portion of the structured lesson plan, the candidate will reference appropriate curriculum materials selected for instruction by title and publisher. This will include technology **(2.2, 2.3, 3.3)**. Candidate will cite research that supports choices in grouping, strategies and materials in the materials section of the lesson plan **(2.1, 2.2, 2.3).** Candidate will include space on the lesson plan form for anecdotal records of the student’s reading errors and the student’s affective response to the lesson materials **(1.1, 1.4, 3.2, 3.3).**
7. Candidate will synthesize the collaborative literacy team experience by writing a report of the field experience. Report will contain all previously mentioned data and will conclude with a section in which the candidate reflects on what worked and what needs refining **(5.3).**

**ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION**

**SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**RDNG 5443 PRACTICUM IN READING - (Elementary Level)**

**CUMULATIVE DATA SPRING 2010**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IRA Standards Addressed in the Assessment | No. of Candidates at Unacceptable  (1) | No of Candidates at Acceptable  (2) | No. of Candidates at Target  (3) |
| 1.1 |  | 1 | 6 |
| 1.4 |  | 3 | 4 |
| 2.1 |  | 1 | 6 |
| 2.2 |  | 1 | 6 |
| 2.3 |  | 1 | 6 |
| 3.1 |  |  | 7 |
| 3.2 |  |  | 7 |
| 3.3 |  |  | 7 |
| 3.4 |  |  | 7 |
| 4.1 |  | 1 | 6 |
| 4.2 |  | 1 | 6 |
| 4.3 |  | 1 | 6 |
| 4.4 |  | 1 | 6 |
| 5.3 |  |  | 7 |

**Assessment # 4 Scoring Guide: Lab Practicum Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **1, 2, 3, 4, 5.3** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **Section I: Initial Vision Statement**  Candidate will construct avision statement regarding their role as a reading coach to a classroom teacher, including specific coaching activities at Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3. **2.1, 2.2, 2.3** | Candidate accurately identifies at least two coaching activities from each of the three levels of intensity, as identified by the IRA position statement. | Candidate accurately identifies at least one coaching activity from each of the three levels of intensity, as identified by the IRA position statement. | Candidate incorrectly identifies coaching activities in regards to the three levels of intensity or neglects to mention an activity from each of the three levels of intensity, as identified by the IRA position statement. |  |
| **Section II: Assessment and Analysis of Student Performance**  Assessment selection is appropriate for determining instructional level and strengths and weaknesses in reading for the individual child and is in line with the District’s Reading Sufficiency Plan. **3.1, 3.2, 3.3** | The data obtained with the selected assessment tool is appropriate and useful in determining instructional level and strengths and weakness in reading for the individual child. | Some of the data obtained with the selected assessment tool is appropriate and useful for determining instructional level and strengths and weaknesses for the individual child. | The assessment tool provides little useful data for determining instructional level and strengths and weaknesses for the individual child. |  |
| **Section II: Assessment and Analysis of Student Performance**  Qualitative analysis of miscues is complete and accurate. Strengths and weakness in word recognition and comprehension are noted. **3.2, 3.3** | Miscues are listed with a correct decision of graphic, syntactic, and semantic acceptability for each item. Summary of strengths and weaknesses in word recognition and comprehension are accurate. | Most of the miscues are listed and categorized appropriately as graphically, syntactically, and semantically acceptable. Most of the strengths and weaknesses in word recognition and comprehension are noted. | Significant analysis problems exist. Miscues are not categorized properly more than half the time. Few strengths and weaknesses in word recognition and comprehension are noted. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **1, 2, 3, 4, 5.3** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **Section III: Instructional Strategies and Lesson Plans.**  Remediation activities are selected which are appropriate to the needs of the individual student. The effect on student learning is recorded through anecdotal records. Research-based materials and children’s literature are selected. The lesson plan reflects high quality instruction and knowledge of reading systems. **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4** | The remediation activities are well selected and meet the needs of the student who is being assessed. The effect on student learning is demonstrated through detailed anecdotal records. Research-based materials and children’s literature are selected and clearly noted. | Most of the remediation activities selected meet the needs of the student who is being assessed. Some required areas are not emphasized in the lesson plans. There is some anecdotal material given. Research-based materials and children’s literature are well selected and noted most of the time. | The lesson plans are too brief and required areas of emphasis are missing or are only mentioned a few times. There are minimal or no anecdotal records. There is little specific evidence of the type of materials or children’s literature selected. Specific notations are few in number or missing. |  |
| **Section IV:** **Synthesis of Collaborative Literacy Team Experience**  Candidate will provide a written report of the collaborative field experience. **2.1, 2.2, 2.3** | Candidate accurately reports at least two coaching activities from each of the three levels of intensity, implemented to assist the classroom teacher. | Candidate accurately reports at least one coaching activity from each of the three levels of intensity, implemented to assist the classroom teacher. | Candidate incorrectly reports coaching activities in regards to the three levels of intensity or neglects to mention an activity from each of the three levels of intensity, implemented to assist the classroom teacher. |  |
| **Section IV: Synthesis of Collaborative Literacy Team Experience**  Candidate documents interaction with classroom teacher, including instructional grouping options, curriculum, and technology. **2.1, 2.2, 2.3** | Candidate clearly documents interaction with classroom teacher by providing at least five examples. Candidate includes instructional grouping options, curriculum, and technology discussed and implemented. | Candidate documents interaction with classroom teacher by providing at least three examples. Candidate includes instructional grouping options, curriculum, and technology discussed and implemented. | Candidate is vague about interaction with classroom teacher and provides less than three examples. Candidate fails to include instructional grouping options, curriculum, and/or technology discussed and implemented. |  |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **1, 2, 3, 4, 5.3** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **Section IV: Synthesis of Collaborative Literacy Team Experience**  Candidates reflect on their learning experience and teaching practices. **5.3** | Candidate reflects on their learning experience and teaching practices by providing at least five specific examples from the practicum. Candidate states how experience will benefit them in the future as a literacy coach. | Candidate reflects on their learning experience and teaching practices by providing at least three specific examples from the practicum. Candidate states how experience will benefit them in the future as a literacy coach. | Candidate reflects on their learning experience and teaching practices by providing less than three specific examples from the practicum. Candidate fails to state how experience will benefit them in the future as a literacy coach. |  |
| **Section V, Documentation Forms:** Candidate will provide copies of:   1. Self-Evaluations   2. Parent Correspondence  3. Team Meeting Documentation Forms  4. Classroom Teacher Evaluation  5. University Supervisor Evaluation | Candidate includes all completed documentation forms. | Candidate includes most of the completed documentation forms. | Candidate does not provide completed documentation forms. |  |
| **Communication:**  Candidates present professional written work that appropriately communicates with parents and other education professionals. **3.4, 5.3** | Candidate writes in a professional manner by making no errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content. | Candidate writes in a careful manner by making only 1-3 error in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content. | Candidate writes in a careless manner by making more than 4 errors in grammar or spelling that distract the reader from the content. |  |

**Rating Total \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning.** Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys.

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

(response limited to 2 pages)

**ASSESSMENT #5: Work Sample Unit**

**Description of the Assessment:**

Assessment five evaluates candidates’ ability to develop a work sample, teach it to a class for a period of two weeks, and share the contents and results with teachers and paraprofessionals in a professional development setting. The candidate develops a six subject cross-curricular thematic unit with a multicultural connection, quality focus literature from selected trade books, research for background and procedure development, and writing for real purposes. The unit requires objectives be aligned with lesson planning; pre-, formative, and post-assessment; and remediation strategies for each of the cross-curricular unit activities. The candidate employs a wide range of curriculum materials, grouping options, instructional practices including technology, and assessments. Research from professional journals, trade books, and internet sources will be used in unit planning. Instructional focus topics include specific objectives, varied learning activities, instructional procedures, and grouping patterns. The cross-curricular unit focuses on engagement of students with a variety of print and non-print materials, use of formal and informal assessment, and demonstration teaching of the unit. A separate staff development presentation will focus on assisting teachers and paraprofessionals in using formal and informal assessment, grouping patterns, varied learning activities, and a wide variety of curriculum materials, and appropriate remediation strategies. Candidates reflect on the unit’s effectiveness and make connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement.

**Alignment of the Assessment with Specific SPA Standards:**

Assessment five addresses the following **IRA Standards**: **2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4.** Students will prepare a cross-curricular thematic unit which employs related research from professional journals, trade books, and internet sources which are shared in a professional development event to assist teachers and paraprofessionals (**4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4**). The unit materials and instructional procedures consider the needs of delayed readers in both reading and writing, have a multicultural connection, and are shared in a professional development event to assist teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of related strategies and materials (**2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**).Instructional focus topics include specific objectives; pre-formative, and post-assessment procedures; varied learning activities including technology; instructional procedures, and grouping patterns **(2.1, 2.2, 2.3).** Candidates teach the unit to students for two weeks and assess the effect on student learning. In a professional development event, candidates share all unit information to assist teachers and paraprofessionals with a wide range of materials, grouping options, instructional techniques, and formal and informal assessments **(2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)** A reflection is completed to assess the thematic unit’s effectiveness as a demonstration teaching event and as professional development sharing event. An explanation of theories related to connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement is written **(5.1).**

**Analysis of Data Findings:**

Only one semester of data for Assessment #5 is available because classes required for the Reading Specialist are offered once every academic year. **RDNG 5423 Diagnosis and Remediation I** was offered during the Spring 2010

Six candidates achieved **Target** status on their portfolio requirement on **IRA Standards 4.1, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4**.

Five candidates achieved Target status on **IRA Standards 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, and 4.4.** Four candidates achieved **Target** status on **IRA Standards 2.1,2.2, and 3.1.**

Two candidates achieved **Acceptable** status on **IRA Standards 2.1, 2.2,and 3.1.**

Three candidates achieved **Acceptable** status on **IRA Standard 2.3.**

One candidate **achieved Acceptable** status on **IRA Standards 3.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.4.**

No students achieved Unacceptable status.

**Interpretation of Data Findings:**

There are three levels of evaluation possible:

**Target** – Demonstrates exemplary qualities

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects evidence that clearly correlates with the **IRA Standards**; is well organized and Graduate level work.

**Acceptable** – Demonstrates some evidence of acceptable work

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects some evidence that correlates with the **IRA Standards**; may need more work on formatting; and may not use appropriate grammar.

**Unacceptable** – Is not acceptable.

The candidate’s portfolio requirement does not reflect **IRA Standards**; submission is not at Graduate level.

Candidate submissions are assessed with an Assessment Rubric. The rubric will indicate that the candidate has attained competency and met requirements. Summative evaluations are based upon **IRA** standards and the **Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensure and Certification.**

**ASSESSMENT #5**

**Work Sample Unit**

**IRA *Standards for Reading Professionals* (2003) 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4.**

Assessment five evaluates candidates’ ability to develop a work sample, teach it to a class for a period of two weeks, and share the contents and results with teachers and paraprofessionals in a professional development setting.

Candidates will submit to the Instructor:

A cross-curricular thematic unit which employs related research from professional journals, trade books, and internet sources (**4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4**).

Put into practice a two week lesson plan for assessment and instruction **(2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4).**

A professional development event which assists teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of related strategies and materials (**2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**).

A completed reflection which assesses effectiveness of the thematic and the professional development sharing event. An explanation of theories related to connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement is included **(5.1).**

**ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION**

**SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**RDNG 5423 DIAGNOSIS AND REMEDIATION I**

**CUMULATIVE DATA SPRING 2010**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IRA Standards Addressed in the Assessment | No. of Candidates at Unacceptable  (1) | No of Candidates at Acceptable  (2) | No. of Candidates at Target  (3) |
| 2.1 |  | 2 | 4 |
| 2.2 |  | 2 | 4 |
| 2.3 |  | 3 | 3 |
| 3.1 |  | 2 | 4 |
| 3.2 |  | 1 | 5 |
| 3.3 |  | 1 | 5 |
| 3.4 |  | 1 | 5 |
| 4.1 |  |  | 6 |
| 4.2 |  | 1 | 5 |
| 4.3 |  |  | 6 |
| 4.4 |  | 1 | 5 |
| 5.1 |  |  | 6 |
| 5.2 |  |  | 6 |
| 5.3 |  |  | 6 |
| 5.4 |  |  | 6 |

**Assessment #5 Scoring Guide: Work Sample Unit and Sharing Event**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **2, 3, 4, 5** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT:** The  cross-curricular thematic unit  employs related research  from professional journals,  trade books, and Internet sources.  **4.2** | A wide variety of detailed background research from many different types of sources is cited. The unit covers six areas of the curriculum. Required references are cited. | A variety of quality background research from different types of sources is cited. The unit covers six areas of the curriculum. One required reference is omitted. | Brief background research is cited from limited sources. The unit covers fewer than six areas of the curriculum. More than one required reference is omitted. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** The materials used consider the reading levels, interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds of target readers. The unit emphasizes both reading and writing for real purposes and has a multicultural connection.  **2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3** | A wide variety of materials covering the varied needs of target readers is used. There are multiple quality activities in the unit that emphasize reading and writing for real purposes. The unit has a clearly defined multicultural connection. | A variety of materials covering the varied needs of target readers is used. There is at least one quality activity that emphasizes reading and writing for real purposes. The unit has a multicultural connection. | Limited materials covering some needs of target readers are used. The unit has a limited or missing multicultural connection. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Instructional focus topics include specific objectives, assessment procedures, varied learning activities including technology, instructional procedures, and grouping patterns. **2.1, 2.2, 2.3** | A clear description of all the instructional focus topics is included. Detailed discussion of procedures in the unit includes impact on student learning. | An adequate description of all the instructional focus topics is included. Discussion of procedures in the unit is somewhat detailed and includes impact on student learning. | An inadequate description of most of the instructional focus topics is included. Description of procedures in the unit includes little detail, and discussion of impact on student learning is brief or missing. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **2, 3, 4, 5** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Two weeks of lesson plans and assessments are aligned with stated (PASS) learner outcomes. Formal and informal measures influence unit planning and content. **3.1** | Lesson plans are well aligned with stated learner outcomes. Pre-, formative, and post-assessments are aligned with stated learner outcomes. Formal and informal measures influence unit planning and content. | There is adequate alignment of lesson plans and pre-, formative, and post-assessments with stated learner outcomes. Formal and informal measures have some influence on unit planning and content. | There is inadequate alignment of lesson plans and pre-, formative, and post-assessments with stated learner outcomes.  Assessment does not adequately influence unit planning and content. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Remediation techniques and materials are incorporated in each lesson to modify instruction in reading for target readers. Assessment information influences what and how information is taught for maximum effect on student learning. **2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3** | Appropriately selected remediation techniques and materials are defined in detail for each cross-curricular lesson to modify instruction in reading for target readers. Assessment influences teaching strategies utilized. | Remediation techniques and materials are adequate to describe remediation for target readers. Assessment information is given in general terms related to what and how information is taught. Some assessment information is used during planning. | Remediation techniques and materials are limited in scope or missing. Little or no assessment information was used in decision making during planning. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** A professional format is used to prepare a set of plans for the cross-curricular thematic unit. Varied instructional practices, technology, grouping, and literacy materials are used to engage and motivate students. **2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4** | A professional format is used to prepare a set of plans for the cross-curricular thematic unit. Varied creative literacy activities, technology, grouping, and motivational practices are included to engage learners. | An acceptable professional format is used to prepare a set of plans for the cross-curricular thematic unit. Some creative literacy activities, technology, grouping, and motivational practices are included to engage learners. | A less than desirable professional format is used to prepare a set of plans for the cross-curricular thematic unit. Fewer than desired literacy activities, technology, grouping, and motivational practices are included. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **2, 3, 4, 5** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT:** A staff development presentation of thematic unit content is shared to assist and support teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of curriculum materials, grouping options, instructional practices, and assessment. This is done both as demonstration teaching and also to assist other professionals in using materials that match reading and interest levels of target students. **2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1,** **4.2,** **4.3, 5.1, 5.2,** **5.3, 5.4** | A lively and detailed staff development presentation of thematic unit content is shared and provides high level knowledge of grouping, instruction practices, and a wide range of curriculum materials which includes multiple and varied trade books, technology-based information, and non-print materials representing multiple levels, broad interests, and cultural ties. | An acceptable staff development presentation of thematic unit planning and content is shared and provides adequate knowledge of grouping, instruction practices, and a range of curriculum materials which includes some trade books, some technology-based information, and some non-print materials adequately representing multiple levels, broad interests, and cultural ties. More detail would be desirable. | A limited staff development presentation of unit planning and content is shared but provides very limited knowledge of grouping, instructional practices, and a range of curriculum materials which represent multiple levels, broad interests, and cultural ties. The detail provided is limited. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** A reflection is completed to assess the thematic unit’s effectiveness as a demonstration teaching event and as a professional development activity which assists the classroom teacher and the paraprofessional. An explanation of theories related to connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement is written. **2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1** | A detailed summary of the thematic unit’s effectiveness as a demonstration teaching event and as a professional development activity is professionally written and meets stated criteria. A well supported written discussion is provided of theories related to the connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement. | A summary of the unit’s effectiveness as a demonstration teaching event and as a professional development activity is adequately written and meets most stated criteria. An adequate written discussion is provided of theories related to the connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement. | A brief summary of the unit’s effectiveness as a demonstration teaching event and as a professional development activity is inadequately written and meets few stated criteria. An limited written discussion is provided of theories related to the connections between teacher dispositions and student achievement. |  |

**RATING TOTAL = \_\_\_\_**

**#6 (Required): Additional assessment that addresses state competencies.** 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 as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

**ASSESSMENT #6: Graduate Portfolio**

**Description of the Assessment:**

Assessment six evaluates candidate performance and knowledge over each of the five IRA standards. The purpose of the portfolio is to gain and maintain a more holistic perspective on the issues, theories, research, and classroom practices related to literacy. In addition, this portfolio will become a meaningful vehicle to inform classroom practice, professional development, and the progress of literacy education in the community. The portfolio will provide a means which can ground classroom practice and assessment in theory and research.

**Alignment of the Assessment with Specific SPA Standards:**

Assessment six addresses the following **IRA Standards: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**. The portfolio is divided into three sections. These sections represent content knowledge **(1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4),** pedagogical and professional development knowledge **(5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4),** and skills and dispositions toward literacy instruction **(4.4)** Each of the three sections of the portfolio will include artifacts drawn from assignments given throughout the program.

**Analysis of Data Findings:**

Only one semester of data for Assessment #6 is available because classes required for the Reading Specialist are offered once every academic year. **RDNG 5953 Reading Capstone Experience** is offered each Spring. The data available for this class is from Spring 2010.

Two candidates achieved **Target** on their portfolio requirement on **IRA Standards** **1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**.

No candidates achieved Acceptable or Unacceptable.

**Interpretation of Data Findings:**

There are three levels of evaluation possible:

**Target** – Demonstrates exemplary qualities

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects evidence that clearly correlates with the **IRA Standards**; is well organized and Graduate level work.

**Acceptable** – Demonstrates some evidence of acceptable work

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects some evidence that correlates with the **IRA Standards**; may need more work on formatting; and may not use appropriate grammar.

**Unacceptable** – Is not acceptable.

The candidate’s portfolio requirement does not reflect **IRA Standards**; submission is not at Graduate level.

Candidate submissions are assessed with an Assessment Rubric. The rubric will indicate that the candidate has attained competency and met requirements. Summative evaluations are based upon **IRA** standards and the **Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensure and Certification.**

**Assessment #6**

**Graduate Portfolio**

**IRA *Standards for Reading Professionals* (2003) 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**.

1. The portfolio will consist of three sections which will include artifacts for each of the five **IRA Standards** drawn from assignments given throughout the program and will culminate with the design and presentation of a professional development opportunity for peers in the education community.
2. Section I will consist of graded assessment artifacts from designated coursework which will document knowledge of, and competency in, the five IRA Standards **(IRA Standards 1,2,3,4,5).**
3. Section 2 will consist of an essay collection completed and graded during **EDUC 5953 Graduate Reading Capstone Experience**. The essay collection will contain four journal article reviews and three book study designs to demonstrate the practice of continuous lifelong learning via current reading research and publications. Format will follow APA guidelines **(1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 4.4, 5.1).**
4. Section3 will document the candidates ability to plan, prepare, and present a

professional development opportunity for education professionals within **(4.4,**

**5 .2, 5.3, 5.4).**

**ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION**

**SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**RDNG 5453 READING CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE**

**CUMULATIVE DATA SPRING 2010**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IRA Standards Addressed in the Assessment | No. of Candidates Below Standard    (1) | No of Candidates at Standard  (2) | No. of Candidates Above Standard  (3) |
| 1.1 |  |  | 2 |
| 1.2 |  |  | 2 |
| 1.3 |  |  | 2 |
| 1.4 |  |  | 2 |
| 4.4 |  |  | 2 |
| 5.1 |  |  | 2 |
| 5.2 |  |  | 2 |
| 5.3 |  |  | 2 |
| 5.4 |  |  | 2 |

Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Final Scoring Rubric for the Graduate Portfolio

Reading Specialist

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | Date: | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| E-Mail | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | Phone: | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

*Directions: Section 1 requires documentation of graded artifacts from the courses listed below, providing clear evidence of understanding and implementation of IRA standards.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Target** | **Acceptable** | **Unacceptable** | **Comments** |
| **Section 1:**  **Assessment Artifacts** | **Course** |  |  |  |  |
| **Theory to Practice Project** | **RDNG 5413**  **Foundations of Reading** |  |  |  |  |
| **Clinic Project** | **RDNG 5433**  **Diagnosis & Remediation II** |  |  |  |  |
| **Lab Practicum Evaluation** | **RDNG 5443**  **Practicum in Reading (Indiv)** |  |  |  |  |
| **Work Sample Unit** | **RDNG 5423**  **Diagnosis & Remediation I** |  |  |  |  |
| **Systemic Reading Program** | **RDNG 5183**  **Analysis of Reading Systems** |  |  |  |  |
| **Assessment Instruction Coaching Initiative** | **RDNG 5463**  **Organization & Supervision of Reading Programs** |  |  |  |  |

*Directions: Section 2 of the Graduation Portfolio is comprised of the essay collection. The following rubric will be used to assess the essay collection, completed during EDUC 5953 Graduate Reading Capstone Experience.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Total** |
| **Section 2:**  **Essay Collection**  **IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 4.4, 5.1** |  |  |  |  |
| **Journal Article Review 1** | Article review clearly articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least four examples of classroom implementation. | Article review clearly articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least two examples of classroom implementation. | Article review vaguely articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least one example of classroom implementation. |  |
| **Journal Article Review 1** | All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented in the desired format. | All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but a few are not in the desired format. | All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but many are not in the desired format. |  |
| **Journal Article Review 2** | Article review clearly articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least four examples of classroom implementation. | Article review clearly articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least two examples of classroom implementation. | Article review vaguely articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least one example of classroom implementation. |  |
| **Journal Article Review 2** | All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented in the desired format. | All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but a few are not in the desired format. | All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but many are not in the desired format. |  |
| **Journal Article Review 3** | Article review clearly articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least four examples of classroom implementation. | Article review clearly articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least two examples of classroom implementation. | Article review vaguely articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least one example of classroom implementation. |  |
| **Journal Article Review 3** | All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented in the desired format. | All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but a few are not in the desired format. | All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but many are not in the desired format. |  |
| **Journal Article Review 4** | Article review clearly articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least four examples of classroom implementation. | Article review clearly articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least two examples of | Article review vaguely articulates current reading research. Candidate relates theory to practice by providing at least one example of classroom implementation. |  |

*Directions: Section 3 of the Graduate Portfolio documents the candidate’s participation in the planning, design, and presentation of a professional development opportunity for para-professionals and/or classroom teachers.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Total** |
| **Section 3:**  **Professional Development Workshop and Handbook**  **IRA 4.4, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4** |  |  |  |  |
| **Workshop Topic** | Candidate has selected a topic of current research interest and has completed a 50-100 word abstract for the instructor’s approval. Abstract clearly details how the presentation will relate research theory to classroom implementation. | Candidate has selected a topic of current research interest and has completed a 50-100 word abstract for the instructor’s approval. Abstract provides sufficient detail as to how the presentation will relate research theory to classroom implementation.. | Candidate has selected a topic of current research interest and has completed an abstract for the instructor’s approval. Abstract vaguely details how the presentation will relate research theory to classroom implementation. |  |
| **Presentation Visual Aid**  **(Powerpoint or Poster)** | Project includes all material needed to gain a comfortable understanding of the topic. It is a highly effective study guide. | Project includes most material needed to gain a comfortable understanding of the material but is lacking one or two key elements. It is an adequate study guide. | Project is lacking several key elements and has inaccuracies that make it a poor study guide. |  |
| **Preparedness** | All content throughout the presentation is accurate. There are no factual errors. | Most of the content is accurate but there is one piece of information that might be inaccurate. | Content is typically confusing or contains more than one factual error. |  |
| **Oral Presentation** | Candidate shows a full understanding of the topic. Candidate speaks clearly and distinctly throughout presentation. | Candidate shows a good understanding of the topic. Candidate speaks clearly and distinctly through most of the presentation. | Candidate does not seem to understand the topic very well. Candidate often mumbles or is unclear in the presentation of material. |  |
| **Collaboration with Peers and Instructor** | Candidate listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others in the group. Candidate tries to keep people working well together and provides materials in a timely manner. | Candidate often listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others in the group but sometimes is not a good team member. Candidate provides materials in a timely manner. | Candidate rarely listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others in the group. Candidate is a poor team member and is late in providing matrials. |  |

**Total Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Additional Comments:**

**Evaluator’s Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**#7 (Optional): Additional assessment that addresses state competencies.** 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 as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

**ASSESSMENT #7: Systemic Reading Program**

**Description of the Assessment:**

In assessment seven candidates assess and design a plan for their school which covers school climate, family involvement, and professional development as they are related to the reading program. This assessment evaluates the candidate’s ability to:

1. examine school staff development plan
2. examine school climate
3. examine school policy toward parental involvement
4. make recommendations for change based on research in professional literature and standards
5. design a three-pronged initiative to improve these areas of the reading program in their school.
6. positively and constructively provide the initiative as an evaluation of colleagues teaching practices. Assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in implementing the initiative.
7. reflect on the process

**Alignment of the Assessment with Specific SPA Standards:**

Assessment seven addresses **IRA Standards 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**. Candidates assess and design a comprehensive three-pronged initiative for their school **(1.1, 1.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**). Information provided targets the community, district, school, and student population. Candidates identify strengths and weaknesses in each area, use a wide range of curriculum materials and assessment tools to meet the needs of students, parents, and peers **(2.2, 3.4, 4.4).** Candidates create a presentation to share the information gathering process, findings, and recommendations with peers, parents, and administration. Candidates reflect on their assessment, evaluation, recommendations, and sharing by aligning their process with the **IRA Professional Standards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5).**

**Analysis of Data Findings:**

Only one semester of data for Assessment #7 is available because classes required for the Reading Specialist are offered once every academic year. The data available for **RDNG 5183 Analysis of Reading Systems** is from Summer 2010. Starting in the Fall 2010, the class will be offered each Fall.

Three candidates achieved **Target** status on their portfolio requirement on **IRA Standards** **1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**. No candidates were at the Acceptable or the Unacceptable levels.

**Interpretation of Data Findings:**

There are three levels of evaluation possible:

**Target** – Demonstrates exemplary qualities

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects evidence that clearly correlates with the **IRA Standards**; is well organized and Graduate level work.

**Acceptable** – Demonstrates some evidence of acceptable work

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects some evidence that correlates with the **IRA Standards**; may need more work on formatting; and may not use appropriate grammar.

**Unacceptable** – Is not acceptable.

The candidate’s portfolio requirement does not reflect **IRA Standards**; submission is not at Graduate level.

Candidate submissions are assessed with an Assessment Rubric. The rubric will indicate that the candidate has attained competency and met requirements. Summative evaluations are based upon **IRA** standards and the **Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensure and Certification.**

**Assessment # 7**

**Systemic Reading Program**

**IRA *Standards for Reading Professionals* (2003) 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**

You will examine, assess, and design a plan for your school which covers school climate, family involvement, and professional development as these three are related to the reading program. You are to:

1. examine your school’s staff development plan
2. examine your school’s climate
3. examine your school’s policy toward parental involvement
4. make recommendations for change based on research in professional literature and **IRA** **Standards** in a detailed critique
5. design a three-pronged initiative to improve these areas of the reading program in their school.
6. positively and constructively provide the initiative as an evaluation of colleagues teaching practices. Assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in implementing the initiative.
7. reflect on the process
8. Information you provided must target your community, district, school, and student population. You must identify strengths and weaknesses in each area; use a wide range of curriculum materials and assessment tools to meet the needs of students, parents, and colleagues. You are to create a presentation to share the information gathering process, findings, and recommendations with parents, and administration. Positively and constructively provide the initiative as an evaluation of colleagues teaching practices. Assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in implementing the initiative. You will write a reflection on the assessment, evaluation, recommendations, and sharing. In the reflection you must align the process with the **IRA Professional Standards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**.

Candidates will submit to the instructor:

1. The detailed power point presentation prepared to share the information gathering process, findings, and recommendations with parents, and administration. **(1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**.**)**
2. The evaluations of the presentation completed by attendees.
3. The schedule and plan of your assisting classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the implementation of the initiative. **(Coaching)**
4. The evaluations completed by the classroom teachers and paraprofessionals.
5. A critical self-reflections on the assessment, evaluation, recommendations, and sharing. In the reflection you must align the process with the **IRA Professional Standards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**.

**ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION**

**SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**RDNG 5183 ANALYSIS OF READING SYSTEMS**

**CUMULATIVE DATA SUMMER 2010**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IRA Standards Addressed in the Assessment | No. of Candidates Below Standard  (1) | No of Candidates at Standard  (2) | No. of Candidates Above Standard  (3) |
| 1.1 |  |  | 3 |
| 1.2 |  |  | 3 |
| 2.2 |  |  | 3 |
| 3.4 |  |  | 3 |
| 4.4 |  |  | 3 |
| 5.1 |  |  | 3 |
| 5.2 |  |  | 3 |
| 5.3 |  |  | 3 |
| 5.4 |  |  | 3 |

**Assessment #7 Scoring Guide Systemic Reading Program**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT: IRA - 1** Foundational Knowledge  **1.1, 1.2** | Detailed discussion of theories and/or research and the impact on instruction and student learning. Research is related to current practice and change needed. | Adequate discussion of theories and/or research and the impact on instruction and student learning. Research is related to current practice and change needed. | Inadequate discussion of theories and/or research and the impact on instruction and student learning. Research may or may not be related to current practice and change needed. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT: IRA – 2** Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials **2.2** | Detailed discussion of a wide range of practices, approaches, and technology-based practices. Research is cited. | Adequate discussion of a wide range of practices, approaches, and technology-based practices. Limited research is cited. | Inadequate discussion of classroom practices, approaches, and technology-based practices. Little or no research is cited. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT: IRA – 3** Assessment and Evaluation  **3.4**  **IRA Standards Met**  **1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4** | Effective evaluation and interpretation of policies and practices in the reading program to meet the needs of students, parents, and colleagues are evident. A detailed description of findings is provided. Research is cited.  **Target**  **3** | Adequate evaluation and interpretation of policies and practices in the reading program to meet the needs of students, parents, and colleagues are evident. An adequate description of findings is provided. Limited research cited.    **Acceptable**  **2** | Inadequate evaluation and interpretation of policies and practices in the reading program are evident. An inadequate description of findings is provided. Limited/no research is cited.  **Unacceptable**  1 | **Rating** |
| **Assessment: IRA – 4** Creating a Literate Environment **4.4** | A wide range of materials, practices, strategies, and grouping opportunities are discussed and/or modeled. Research is related to current practice and change needed. Research is widely cited. | An adequate range of materials, practices, strategies, and grouping opportunities are discussed and/or modeled. Research is related to current practice and change needed. Limited research is cited. | An inadequate range of materials, practices, strategies, and grouping opportunities are discussed and modeled. Research is not related to current practice and change needed. Limited/no research is cited. |  |
| **Assessment: IRA – 5** Professional Development  **5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4**  **IRA Standards Met**  **1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4** | Detailed strengths and weaknesses in each area to meet the needs of students, parents, and colleagues are presented in a presentation to share the information gathering process, findings, and recommendations with colleagues, parents, and administration. Positive and constructive assistance is provided to classroom teachers striving to improve their practice.    **Target**  **3** | Strengths and weaknesses in some areas to meet the needs of students, parents, and colleagues are adequately presented in a presentation to share the information gathering process, findings, and recommendations with colleagues, parents, and administration.    **Acceptable**  **2** | Strengths and weaknesses in few areas to meet the needs of students, parents, and colleagues are inadequately presented in a presentation to share the information gathering process, findings, and recommendations with colleagues, parents, and administration.    **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **Assessment: IRA – 5** Professional Development  **5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4** | A detailed reflection on the assessment, evaluation, recommendations, and sharing is written in which the process is aligned with **IRA Professional Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.** | An adequate reflection on the assessment, evaluation, recommendations, and sharing is written in which the process is aligned with **IRA Professional Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.** | An inadequate reflection on the assessment, evaluation, recommendations, and sharing is written in which the process is not aligned with **IRA Professional Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5**. |  |

**RATING TOTAL = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**#8 (Optional): Additional assessment that addresses state competencies.** 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 as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

**ASSESSMENT #8: Assessment-Instruction-Coaching Initiative**

**Description of the Assessment:**

Assessment eight evaluates the candidate’s ability to apply content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in assessment, instructional methods, curriculum materials, technology, coaching, and professional self-evaluation. Candidates initiate a nine week assessment-instruction-coaching process by training two teachers to administer, score, and interpret developmental spelling inventories, use technology to collate individual student data and to compile results, chart instructional grouping options and developmental implications for all students, identify at-risk students, design and implement word study lessons, provide additional professional development activities, and provide a critical self-evaluation.

**Alignment of the Assessment with Specific SPA Standards:**

The three-part **Assessment-Instruction-Coaching Initiative** addresses the following **IRA standards: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4.** Candidates use instructional grouping options **(2.1),** a wide range of instructional approaches, practices, methods, technology **(2.2)**, and curriculum materials **(2.3)** for learners at differing stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds **(2.1, 2.2, 2.3)**. A wide range of assessment tools are used **(3.1)** to place students on a developmental continuum that identifies students’ proficiencies and difficulties **(3.2).** This assessment is used to plan, evaluate, and revise effective instruction to meet the needs of all students **(3.3).** **(3.1, 3.2, 3.3)**.An instructional plan is developed using appropriate texts, technology, and materials that are developmentally and interest area appropriate **(4.1,4.2).** The candidate coaches two classroom teachers through the processes of development, implementation, and evaluation of the evidence-based practices in the plan **(5.1,5.2, 5.3,5.4).**

**Analysis of Data Findings:**

Only one semester of data for Assessment #8 is available because classes required for the Reading Specialist are offered once every academic year. **RDNG 5463 Organization and Supervision of Reading Instruction** is offered each Spring. The data available for this class is from Spring 2010.

Two candidates achieved **Target** on their portfolio requirement on **IRA Standards** **2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4.**

No candidates achieved Acceptable or Unacceptable.

**Interpretation of Data Findings:**

There are three levels of evaluation possible:

**Target** – Demonstrates exemplary qualities

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects evidence that clearly correlates with the **IRA Standards**; is well organized and Graduate level work.

**Acceptable** – Demonstrates some evidence of acceptable work

The candidate’s portfolio requirement reflects some evidence that correlates with the **IRA Standards**; may need more work on formatting; and may not use appropriate grammar.

**Unacceptable** – Is not acceptable.

The candidate’s portfolio requirement does not reflect **IRA Standards**; submission is not at Graduate level.

Candidate submissions are assessed with an Assessment Rubric. The rubric will indicate that the candidate has attained competency and met requirements. Summative evaluations are based upon **IRA** standards and the **Oklahoma General Competencies for Teacher Licensure and Certification.**

**ASSESSMENT #8**

**Assessment-Instruction-Coaching Initiative**

**IRA *Standards for Reading Professionals* (2003) 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4.**

**Assessment-Instruction-Coaching Initiative**

1. Identify a third or fourth grade teacher and a seventh or eighth grade teacher interested in vocabulary and spelling instructional practices.

1. Train the classroom teachers to administer, score, and interpret a developmentally appropriate spelling/vocabulary inventory.
2. Using technology, collate the data for each student and develop a classroom composite.
3. Consult with the teachers to chart instructional grouping options and implications for all students. These options must be research-based.
4. Design and present a developmentally appropriate lesson for training each teacher. These training lessons must be videotaped.
5. Design and implement a weekly schedule of reinforcement and extension activities for each teacher. This should include research-based suggestions for changing group members and group structure. The candidate must meet with each teacher weekly to explain, discuss, train, and help implement these activities and group structures. This schedule will have duration of nine weeks.
6. Complete a critical self-reflection on the process and your effectiveness as a literacy coach.

**Candidates will submit to the Instructor:**

1. Collated data and the classroom composite **(2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 5.4)**
2. Instructional grouping options **(2.1, 2.3, 3.3)**
3. The plans and video tapes for the developmentally appropriate training lesson **(5.1, 5.3, coaching)**
4. The weekly schedule of reinforcement, extension, and grouping activities for each teacher **(2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 coaching)**
5. A weekly summation of implementation meetings with the teachers **(5.1,5.2,5.3)**
6. A critical self-reflection on the process and your effectiveness as a literacy coach. **(5.1, 5.2)**
7. The teachers will submit a confidential critique of the process and your effectiveness. **(5.1, 5.2, 5.3, coaching)**

**ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION**

**SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**RDNG 5463 ORGANIZATION AND SUPERVISION OF READING PROGRAMS**

**CUMULATIVE DATA SPRING 2010**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IRA Standards Addressed in the Assessment | No. of Candidates Below Standard  (1) | No of Candidates at Standard  (2) | No. of Candidates Above Standard  (3) |
| 2.1 |  |  | 3 |
| 2.2 |  |  | 3 |
| 2.3 |  |  | 3 |
| 3.1 |  |  | 3 |
| 3.2 |  |  | 3 |
| 3.3 |  |  | 3 |
| 4.1 |  |  | 3 |
| 4.2 |  |  | 3 |
| 5.1 |  |  | 3 |
| 5.2 |  |  | 3 |
| 5.3 |  |  | 3 |
| 5.4 |  |  | 3 |

**Assessment # 8 Scoring Guide: Assessment-Instruction-Coaching Initiative**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IRA Standards Met**  **2.1, 2.2, 2.3,3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4** | **Target**  **3** | **Acceptable**  **2** | **Unacceptable**  **1** | **Rating** |
| **ASSESSMENT:** Candidates use instructional grouping options **(2.1),** a wide range of instructional approaches, practices, methods, technology **(2.2)**, and curriculum materials **(2.3)** for learners at differing stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds **(2.1, 2.2, 2.3)**. | A wide variety of materials covering the varied needs of all levels of readers are used. A clear link to assessment results is shown. | An adequate variety of materials covering the varied needs of many levels of readers are used. There is a link to assessment results. | An inadequate variety of materials covering the varied needs of readers are used. There is little or no link to assessment results. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** A wide range of assessment tools are used **(3.1)** to place students on a developmental continuum that identifies students’ proficiencies and difficulties **(3.2).** This assessment is used to plan, evaluate, revise effective instruction to meet the needs of all students **(3.3).** **(3.1, 3.2, 3.3)**. | Multiple assessments were used pre, during, and post instruction so that student learning is assessed and information used during instruction. There is a vivid description and analysis of processes and responses. | Some assessments were used pre, during, and post instruction so that student learning is assessed and some information used during instruction. There is a description and analysis of processes and responses. | Little or no assessments were used pre, during, and post instruction so that student learning is assessed and little or no information used during instruction. There is little or no description and analysis of processes and responses. |  |
| **Assessment:** An instructional plan is developed using appropriate texts, technology, and materials that are developmentally and interest area appropriate **(4.1, 4.2).** | Lesson plans are well developed. Varied literacy, technology, grouping, and motivation practices are included so that all learners are engaged and instructional practices are developmentally appropriate. A rich explanation of future instruction is included. | Adequate lesson plans are developed with literacy, technology, grouping, and motivation practices included so that all learners are engaged and instructional practices are developmentally appropriate. An adequate explanation of future instruction is included. | Inadequate lesson plans are developed with little or no literacy, technology, grouping, and motivation practices included. Inadequate instructional practices are developmentally appropriate. An inadequate explanation of future instruction is included. |  |
| **ASSESSMENT:** The candidate coaches two classroom teachers through the processes of development, implementation, and evaluation of the evidence-based practices in the plan (**5.2, 5.3).** | A detailed review of the assessment, program plan, instruction plan, and limited results are reviewed with colleagues and parents. | An adequate review of the assessment, program plan, instruction plan, and limited results are reviewed with colleagues and parents. | An inadequate review of the assessment, program plan, instruction plan, and limited results are reviewed with colleagues and parents. |  |

**RATING TOTAL = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

ATTACHMENT A

**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. Please report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master’s, doctorate) being addressed in this report.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program:** | | |
| **Academic Year** | **# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program** | **# of Program Completers[[9]](#footnote-9)** |
| 2009/2010 | 10 | 2 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**SECTION V—USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE**

**CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE**

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) effects on student learning and on creating environments that support learning.

(response limited to 3 pages)

The following information is related to the institutional plan for how faculty use the synthesized data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and effects on student learning.

The eight assessments outlined in the program are analyzed as they relate to these aspects of the reading program, specifically (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) effects on student learning and creating environments that support learning,. The **Oklahoma Subject Area Test** is a key indicator of success and leads to certification. The **OSAT** objectives are correlated to the International Reading Association Standards, as noted in **Assessment One**. Scores on this exam are and will continue to be analyzed by faculty in the Reading Specialist program as to area of need, and changes needed in coursework to support learning. Also, specific reading category results from the **OSAT** are analyzed in order to improve targeted program areas of weaknesses. At this early point in the program, Southwestern Oklahoma State University candidates scored higher than state candidates on Subtests 2 and 3 and within five points of state candidates on Subtest 1 and 4.

The areas of (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) effects on student learning and on creating environments that support learning are reflected in the scoring guides for **Assessments Two, Three, Seven, and Eight**. Data analyzed from the scoring guides and the results synthesized provide information on which to base course improvements. The candidate rubrics and OSAT scores reflect no apparent weaknesses in these areas. Faculty will continue to monitor to ensure continued candidate success.

The effect on student learning is specifically addressed in **Assessment Four**, the Lab Practicum Evaluation of RDNG 5443 Lab Practicum (Individual) and **Assessment Five**, the Work Sample Unit of RDNG 5423 Diagnosis and Remediation I. The tutorial reports developed in these courses document the candidate’s effect on student learning. The detailed scoring rubrics provide data to improve course content and support student learning.

In **Assessment Four**, the Lab Practicum Evaluation of RDNG 5443 Lab Practicum (Individual) on the practicum evaluation for Spring 2010, the rubric item which had the lowest markings was item 2. Based upon candidate performance outcomes on the practicum evaluation, five out of seven candidates failed to address all five elements of reading. To improve future outcomes for this item, faculty have rewritten instructions so that candidates note the importance of addressing all five elements of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension and a model of a written report which addresses all five elements appropriately was added.

In **Assessment Five,** the Work Sample Unit of RDNG 5423 Diagnosis and Remediation I, based on student performance outcomes on the Work Sample in the Spring 2010, faculty made the changes to improve future outcomes for items 3 and 4 on the rubric. Instructions were rewritten so that students note the importance of specific, student-oriented objectives in the lesson plans they write, the variety of cross-curricular activities used, and the need for specific instructional procedures. Faculty added models of excellent thematic unit plans and gave lists of additional resources for better access to strategies to use to improve the remediation component required to modify each lesson in the thematic unit work sample.

In **Assessment Six**, the Graduate Portfolio of RDNG 5953 Reading Capstone Experience during the Spring 2010 semester, only two candidates were enrolled in the Reading Capstone. Due to this small cohort, each candidate received individualized attention and they were able to collaborate easily. Only one candidate received a grade “at standard level” due to her inexperience with coaching.

The reading program uses a graduate portfolio to assure standards are met as seven key assessments are completed at various points during the professional sequence. Having the portfolio as a vehicle for data collection assists faculty in an ongoing synthesis of assessment data. Section one of the portfolio consists of artifacts completed during core coursework. Section two of the portfolio consists of an essay collection in which candidates document their ability to secure research-based information on which lesson plans and instructional strategies may be based. This encourages candidates to remain abreast of current research findings long after their coursework is completed. Lastly, section three documents the candidate’s ability to plan, prepare, and present reading information to their education colleagues via a professional development seminar format, thus demonstrating leadership skills and advocating the sharing of knowledge-based practices.

1. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 11 Effects on student learning include the creation of environments that support student learning. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 12 Oklahoma 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 13 If grades are used as the assessment or included in the assessment, provide information on the criteria for those grades and describe how they align with the competencies. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 14 If grades are used as the assessment or included in the assessment, provide information on the criteria for those grades and describe how they align with the competencies. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 15 If completion of a content major is used as the assessment or included in the assessment, describe how the program of study aligns with the competencies. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 16 If completion of a content major is used as the assessment or included in the assessment, describe how the program of study aligns with the Oklahoma competencies. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 17 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Oklahoma uses the NCATE definition of *Program completers* as 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)