

INTERIM ASSESSMENT REPORT AY 2013-2014

OVERVIEW

Department: Reading and Language Arts

Report Preparer: Helen R. Abadiano, Professor & Chair

Program Name and Level: Master of Science in Reading and Language Arts

Program Assessment Question	Response
1. URL: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.	http://www.reading.ccsu.edu/Academic_Programs.htm
2. LO Changes: Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., LO more discrete, LO aligned with findings).	None
3. Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well?	Program assessments and rubrics are cohesive and aligned with the IRA professional standards at the reading specialist level. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments at multiple points before program completion. Faculty are involved in the design and implementation of assessments and rubrics. Data are used for improvement of program and courses. Effects of any changes in program and courses based on data are also assessed to assure that these changes have positive impact on program.
4. Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan should be reported here)	<p>The department needs to examine the validity and utility of data produced through assessments and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures.</p> <p><u>About the University Assessment Process:</u> The university assessment process and increasing expectations in terms of the annual assessment report imposed upon us without appropriate support/resources are not helpful. The UAC can better assist department in their assessment efforts when they have the knowledge and understanding of the department program goals, assessments and rubrics. If the intent of the UAC is truly “to assist departments in their assessment efforts” UAC should confirm/validate what they think they know and understand about these programs through their assessment reports by meeting with departments. This is one of the reasons why accrediting bodies do offsite/onsite visits. Otherwise, all this will be an exercise in futility.</p>
For Each Learning Outcome (LO) complete questions 5, 6 and 7 (you may add more rows if you have more than 5 LOs)	
LO #1: <i>Candidates understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections.</i>	
5. Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)	<p>Assessments and Rubrics</p> <p>The Research Study Project demonstrates candidates’ critical stance toward the scholarship of the discipline. Candidates review major and influential literature and research and provide in-depth discussion of their understanding of historically shared knowledge of the research topic and the changes that have occurred over time that influenced the current frameworks and approaches for teaching reading and writing, and how they applied this knowledge and understanding to guide their research study. The Blogs capture the depth and breadth of candidates’ understanding of the literature and research that have strongly influenced the changes in the discipline over time and how these have influenced the ways in which we address the needs of all</p>

	<p>readers. The Reflective Narrative demonstrate candidates' solid understanding of the connection between major and influential literature and research that contribute to their understanding of historically shared knowledge of the research topic <u>and</u> how these influence the changes that have occurred over time as well as the current frameworks and approaches for teaching reading and writing, especially for English learners and those who struggle with reading and writing.</p> <p>The Phonics Research Paper reflects candidates' depth of understanding of theories related to the foundations and teaching of phonics through an investigation into the history of phonics, seminal studies, key controversies, the findings of the National Reading Panel, and current theories, instructional approaches, and assessments.</p>
<p>6. Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, administrative assistant, etc.) If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p>Faculty</p>
<p>7. Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Based on assessment data, 100 percent of candidates meet LO #1. The department will begin to examine the validity and utility of data produced through the assessments.</p>
<p>LO #2: <i>Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.</i></p>	
<p>5. Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>Assessments and Rubrics</p> <p>Diagnostic & Remedial Case Portfolio demonstrates candidates' ability to meet LO #2 particularly at the interventionist and coaching levels. It is a multifaceted and comprehensive project designed to document candidates' planning, implementation and evaluation of diagnostic and corrective processes that place students on a learning continuum and use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.</p> <p>Remedial Reading & Language Arts Case Portfolio shows evidence of candidates' ability to fulfill the role of interventionist by providing appropriate in-depth instruction for primary and elementary readers and writers, especially those who struggle with reading and writing through the selection of appropriate instructional strategies and curriculum materials for these students, and being able to explain the evidence-base for selecting these practices and materials, including use of a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources in instruction for primary/elementary readers and writers, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.</p>
<p>6. Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, administrative assistant, etc.) If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p>Faculty</p>
<p>7. Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Based on assessment data, 100 percent of candidates meet LO #2. The department will begin to examine the validity and utility of data produced through the assessments.</p>

LO #3: <i>Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.</i>	
5. Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)	<p>Assessments and Rubrics</p> <p>Diagnostic & Remedial Case Portfolio demonstrates candidates' ability to meet LO #3 particularly at the interventionist and coaching levels. It is a multifaceted and comprehensive project designed to document candidates' planning, implementation and evaluation of diagnostic and corrective processes that place students on a learning continuum.</p> <p>Remedial Reading & Language Arts Case Portfolio provides evidence of candidates' understanding of the research and literature related to types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations, including tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and measuring outcomes and ability to fulfill the role of interventionist by being able to appropriately select, and effectively administer, score, and interpret assessment of selected primary and elementary students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing, in order to identify individual proficiencies and difficulties, and place them along a developmental continuum; use assessment information to plan and evaluate individual instruction for primary and elementary students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing; and clearly communicate assessment results to students, teachers, parents, and colleagues.</p>
6. Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, administrative assistant, etc.) If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	Faculty
7. Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Based on assessment data, 100 percent of candidates meet LO #3. The department will begin to examine the validity and utility of data produced through the assessments.
LO #4: <i>Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.</i>	
5. Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)	<p>Assessments and Rubrics</p> <p>Diagnostic & Remedial Case Portfolio demonstrates candidates' ability to meet LO #4 particularly at the interventionist and coaching levels. It is a multifaceted and comprehensive project designed to document candidates' planning, implementation and evaluation of diagnostic and corrective processes that place students on a learning continuum and create and engage students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences.</p> <p>Remedial Reading & Language Arts Case Portfolio provides evidence of candidates' understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of primary and elementary students, especially English learners and those who struggle with reading and writing. Lesson plans and materials reveal candidates' ability to develop reading and writing instruction that capitalizes on students' diverse backgrounds, prior knowledge and experiences, language, and cultural values; engage students in learning opportunities that positively impact their knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with their diverse backgrounds, prior knowledge and experiences, language, and cultural values; and provide differentiated instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online</p>

	resources to primary or elementary students, especially English learners and those who struggle with reading and writing.
6. Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, administrative assistant, etc.) If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	Faculty
7. Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Based on assessment data, 100 percent of candidates meet LO #4. The department will begin to examine the validity and utility of data produced through the assessments.
LO #5: <i>Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.</i>	
5. Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)	<u>Assessments and Rubrics</u> Remedial Reading & Language Arts Case Portfolio provides evidence of candidates' understanding of and ability to fulfill the role of an interventionist by ensuring that primary and elementary students, especially English learners and those who struggle with reading and writing, have easy access to a variety of books and other instructional materials, including digital and online resources, to support their individual needs and interests; are immersed in a supportive social environment, motivated, provided scaffold, and multiple opportunities for learning to read and write; and are provided with effective routines such as time allocation, read aloud, journal writing, and transitions from one activity to another, in order to motivate, scaffold, and provide them with multiple opportunities for learning to read and write. Lesson plans and materials reveal candidates' ability to accommodate students' changing needs with special emphasis on encouraging and giving many opportunities for English learners to use English.
6. Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, administrative assistant, etc.) If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	Faculty
7. Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Based on assessment data, 100 percent of candidates meet LO #5. The department will begin to examine the validity and utility of data produced through the assessments.

DATA TABLE by LEARNING OBJECTIVES
Fall 2013-Spring 2014

T = TARGET (3)

A = ACCEPTABLE (2)

U = UNACCEPTABLE (0-1)

MS = MEAN SCORE

N = PARTICIPANTS

LEARNING OBJECTIVES	T	A	U	MS	N
LO #1: <i>Candidates understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections.</i>	93.55%	6.45%	0%	2.94	31
LO #2: <i>Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.</i>	41.67%	58.33%	0%	2.42	60
LO #3: <i>Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.</i>	41.67%	58.33%	0%	2.42	60
LO #4: <i>Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.</i>	41.67%	58.33%	0%	2.42	60
LO #5: <i>Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.</i>	41.67%	58.33%	0%	2.42	60