

DEPARTMENT OF LITERACY, ELEMENTARY,
AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

CCSU



Central Connecticut State University

INTERIM ASSESSMENT REPORT
AY 2016-2017

OVERVIEW

Department: Literacy, Elementary, and Early Childhood Education

Report Preparer: Lynda M. Valerie, Associate Professor

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.ccsu.edu/literacy/MSdegree.html
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 International Literacy Association (ILA) professional standards at the <u>reading specialist</u> and <u>literacy coach</u> levels, and meet the CSDE <u>Reading Specialist</u> certification requirements. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments before program completion. Faculty are involved in the design and implementation of assessments and rubrics. Data is regularly examined and 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)	The department continues to examine the validity and utility of data produced through its key assessments to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures.
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 articulate their understandings of the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and 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.)	Comprehensive Examination demonstrates candidates' understanding of major theories and empirical research supporting the diagnostic and corrective processes that place students on a learning continuum.
6. Interpretation: Who interprets the	Faculty

evidence? (e.g., faculty, administrative assistant, etc.) If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	
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, 97.06% (33/34) of candidates meet LO #1. The department has reviewed its comprehensive exam questions and the revised exam will be used in the next scheduled exam.
LO #2: <i>Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.</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>Diagnostic Case Study (RDG 594) demonstrates candidates' ability to select appropriate assessment tool for middle and secondary readers, English language learners and/or students with exceptionalities. Candidates administer, analyze and interpret data of individual students, and provide recommendations with evidence-based rationale to address students' areas for improvement.</p> <p>Diagnostic & Remedial Case Portfolio (RDG 595) 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 (RDG 596) 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>
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% of candidates meet LO #2. The department recently revised its reading and language arts certification program at the master's level to incorporate the 097 certification requirements. Hence, the course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics reflect these changes effective fall 2017.
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,	Diagnostic Case Study (RDG 594) demonstrates candidates' ability to select appropriate assessment tool for middle and secondary readers, English language learners and/or students with exceptionalities. Candidates administer, analyze and interpret data of individual students, and provide

<p>portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>recommendations with evidence-based rationale to address students’ areas for improvement.</p> <p>Diagnostic & Remedial Case Portfolio (RDG 595) 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 (RDG 596) 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>
<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% of candidates meet LO #2. The department recently revised its reading and language arts certification program at the master’s level to incorporate the 097 certification requirements. Hence, the course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics reflect these changes effective fall 2017.</p>
<p>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></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>Diagnostic & Remedial Case Portfolio (RDG 595) 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 (RDG 596) 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 resources to primary or elementary students, especially English learners and 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% of candidates meet LO #2. The department recently revised its reading and language arts certification program at the master's level to incorporate the 097 certification requirements. Hence, the course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics reflect these changes effective fall 2017.</p>
<p>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></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>Remedial Reading & Language Arts Case Portfolio (RDG 596) 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.</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% of candidates meet LO #2. The department recently revised its reading and language arts certification program at the master's level to incorporate the 097 certification requirements. Hence, the course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics reflect these changes effective fall 2017.</p>

DATA TABLE by LEARNING OBJECTIVES
Fall 2016-Spring 2017

T = TARGET (3)

A = ACCEPTABLE (2)

U = UNACCEPTABLE (0-1)

MS = MEAN SCORE

N = PARTICIPANTS

LEARNING OBJECTIVES	ASSESSMENTS	N	T = 3	A = 2	U = 0	MS	Mean Average
LO #1: <i>Candidates articulate their understandings of theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.</i>	Comprehensive Examination	34	0%	97.06%	2.94%	1.94	1.94
LO #2: <i>Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.</i>	Diagnostic Case Study	18	50%	50%	0%	2.5	2.73
	Diagnostic & Remedial Case Portfolio	14	14.28%	85.71%	0%	2.14	
	Remedial Reading & Language Arts Case Portfolio	26	73.07%	26.92%	0%	3.54	
LO #3: <i>Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.</i>	Diagnostic Case Study	18	66.67%	33.33%	0%	2.67	2.6
	Diagnostic & Remedial Case Portfolio	14	35.71%	64.29%	0%	2.36	
	Remedial Reading & Language Arts Case Portfolio	26	76.92%	23.07%	0%	2.77	
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>	Diagnostic & Remedial Case Portfolio	14	71.43%	28.57%	0%	2.71	2.61
	Remedial Reading & Language Arts Case Portfolio	26	50%	50%	0%	2.5	
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>	Remedial Reading & Language Arts Case Portfolio	26	84.62%	15.38%	0%	2.85	2.85