

DEPARTMENT OF LITERACY, ELEMENTARY,
AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

CCSU



Central Connecticut State University

INTERIM ASSESSMENT REPORT
AY 2014-2015

OVERVIEW

Department: Literacy, Elementary, and Early Childhood Education

Report Preparer: Helen R. Abadiano, Professor & Chair

Program Name and Level: Sixth Year Certificate in Reading and Language Arts

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

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 International Literacy Association (ILA) professional standards at the <u>reading specialist</u> and <u>literacy coach</u> level and meet the CSDE <u>Reading and Language Arts Consultant certification</u> requirements. 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)	The department recently reviewed and revised its reading and language arts certification program. Course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics incorporate changes in the International Literacy Association Standards for Reading Professionals and the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) new regulations for Reading and Language Arts Consultant Certification. Target implementation of the revised program is fall 2016. Once implemented, the department will continue to examine the validity and utility of data produced through assessments and 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 understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. They can inform other educators about these major theories of reading and writing processes, components, and development with supporting research evidence, including information about the relationship between the culture and native language of English learners as a support system in their learning to read and write in English.</i>	
5. Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the	Evaluation Paper on Critical Elements in Exemplary Reading

<p>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>Programs. Candidates research on qualities and characteristics of exemplary core and school-wide reading programs—what qualities and characteristics contribute to their success, what research, theories and/or principles support these critical elements in successful reading programs, and how do these critical elements reconcile with their knowledge and understanding of effective reading instruction. They write an evaluation paper that discusses insights gained from research on critical elements in exemplary reading programs and establish connections to their knowledge and understanding of theories and principles of effective reading instruction drawn from research and practice. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate evaluation paper on critical elements in exemplary reading programs.</p> <p>Creating a Rubric for Evaluating Reading and Language Arts Program. Based on candidate knowledge and understanding of critical elements, theories and principles of effective reading programs, and drawing from research and practice, design a rubric for evaluating a core or school-wide reading program. Make sure you include evidence-based rationale for each criteria item you include in the rubric. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate rubric for evaluating reading and language arts program.</p> <p>Diagnostic Portfolio. This provides detailed evidence of candidates’ understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, and their genuine advocacy for change in instructional practices that might be biased or prejudiced against struggling readers and writers, especially English learners and those who struggle with reading and writing. Candidates collaborate with, lead, and provide support to team members in selecting and administering effective diagnostic procedures appropriate for students, especially English learners and students with exceptionalities, as well as model and coach the diagnostic team, teachers, and other support personnel in understanding differentiated instruction, selecting instructional materials that capitalize on diversity, and instructional strategies that provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences by establishing connections between home and community literacy and school literacy. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate diagnostic portfolio. [Note: Specific elements in the assessment and rubrics address this standard.]</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 recently reviewed and revised its reading and language arts certification program. Course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics incorporate changes in the International Literacy Association Standards for Reading Professionals and the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) new regulations for Reading and Language Arts Consultant Certification. Target implementation of the revised program is fall 2016. Once implemented, the department will continue to examine the validity and utility of data produced through assessments and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures.</p>

LO #2: <i>Candidates can support teachers and other personnel in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the reading and writing curriculum for all students, including use of appropriate and varied instructional approaches, and a wide range of texts from traditional print, digital, and online resources.</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.)	Practicum: Leadership Portfolio I & II. This is a multifaceted and comprehensive project designed to demonstrate candidate ability to fulfill the roles of coach and leader, i.e., collaborate in planning, leading, and evaluating professional development activities with individuals or groups of administrators, teachers, other education professionals, and parents; model and coach teachers and other education professionals in school and classroom on best literacy practices; communicate information about theories, historically shared knowledge, and empirical research on areas of curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, diversity, and literate environment to various audiences; actively engage in professional literacy organizations, conferences and/or workshops; and advocate with various groups for instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate leadership portfolio. [Note: Specific elements in the assessment and rubrics address this standard.]
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 #1. The department recently reviewed and revised its reading and language arts certification program. Course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics incorporate changes in the International Literacy Association Standards for Reading Professionals and the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) new regulations for Reading and Language Arts Consultant Certification. Target implementation of the revised program is fall 2016. Once implemented, the department will continue to examine the validity and utility of data produced through assessments and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures.
LO #3: <i>Candidates can collaborate with and provide support to teachers and administrators in administering and interpreting appropriate assessments for students, using multiple data sources to analyze individual readers' and writers' performance, and to use data to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices and students' response to 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.)	Practicum: Leadership Portfolio I & II. This is a multifaceted and comprehensive project designed to demonstrate candidate ability to fulfill the roles of coach and leader, i.e., collaborate in planning, leading, and evaluating professional development activities with individuals or groups of administrators, teachers, other education professionals, and parents; model and coach teachers and other education professionals in school and classroom on best literacy practices; communicate information about theories, historically shared knowledge, and empirical research on areas of curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, diversity, and literate environment to various audiences; actively engage in professional literacy organizations, conferences and/or workshops; and advocate with various groups for instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate leadership portfolio. [Note: Specific elements in the assessment and rubrics address this standard.] Diagnostic Portfolio. This provides detailed evidence of candidates' understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, and their genuine advocacy for change in instructional practices that might be biased or prejudiced against struggling readers and writers, especially English learners and those who

	<p>struggle with reading and writing. Candidates collaborate with, lead, and provide support to team members in selecting and administering effective diagnostic procedures appropriate for students, especially English learners and students with exceptionalities, as well as model and coach the diagnostic team, teachers, and other support personnel in understanding differentiated instruction, selecting instructional materials that capitalize on diversity, and instructional strategies that provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences by establishing connections between home and community literacy and school literacy. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate diagnostic portfolio. [Note: Specific elements in the assessment and rubrics address this standard.]</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 recently reviewed and revised its reading and language arts certification program. Course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics incorporate changes in the International Literacy Association Standards for Reading Professionals and the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) new regulations for Reading and Language Arts Consultant Certification. Target implementation of the revised program is fall 2016. Once implemented, the department will continue to examine the validity and utility of data produced through assessments and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures.</p>
<p>LO #4: <i>Candidates can provide support and leadership to educators, parents and guardians, students, and other members of the community in valuing the contributions of diverse people and traditions to literacy learning.</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>Practicum: Leadership Portfolio I & II. This is a multifaceted and comprehensive project designed to demonstrate candidate ability to fulfill the roles of coach and leader, i.e., collaborate in planning, leading, and evaluating professional development activities with individuals or groups of administrators, teachers, other education professionals, and parents; model and coach teachers and other education professionals in school and classroom on best literacy practices; communicate information about theories, historically shared knowledge, and empirical research on areas of curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, diversity, and literate environment to various audiences; actively engage in professional literacy organizations, conferences and/or workshops; and advocate with various groups for instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate leadership portfolio. [Note: Specific elements in the assessment and rubrics address this standard.]</p> <p>Diagnostic Portfolio. This provides detailed evidence of candidates' understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, and their genuine advocacy for change in instructional practices that might be biased or prejudiced against struggling readers and writers, especially English learners and those who struggle with reading and writing. Candidates collaborate with, lead, and provide support to team members in selecting and administering effective diagnostic procedures appropriate for students, especially English learners and students with exceptionalities, as well as model and coach the diagnostic team, teachers, and other support personnel in understanding differentiated instruction, selecting instructional materials</p>

	that capitalize on diversity, and instructional strategies that provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences by establishing connections between home and community literacy and school literacy. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate diagnostic portfolio. [Note: Specific elements in the assessment and rubrics address this standard.]
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 #1. The department recently reviewed and revised its reading and language arts certification program. Course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics incorporate changes in the International Literacy Association Standards for Reading Professionals and the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) new regulations for Reading and Language Arts Consultant Certification. Target implementation of the revised program is fall 2016. Once implemented, the department will continue to examine the validity and utility of data produced through assessments and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures.
LO #5: <i>Candidates can model and support teachers and other professionals in creating a literate environment that fosters reading and writing for all students.</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>Practicum: Leadership Portfolio I & II. This is a multifaceted and comprehensive project designed to demonstrate candidate ability to fulfill the roles of coach and leader, i.e., collaborate in planning, leading, and evaluating professional development activities with individuals or groups of administrators, teachers, other education professionals, and parents; model and coach teachers and other education professionals in school and classroom on best literacy practices; communicate information about theories, historically shared knowledge, and empirical research on areas of curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, diversity, and literate environment to various audiences; actively engage in professional literacy organizations, conferences and/or workshops; and advocate with various groups for instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate leadership portfolio. [Note: Specific elements in the assessment and rubrics address this standard.]</p> <p>Diagnostic Portfolio. This provides detailed evidence of candidates' understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, and their genuine advocacy for change in instructional practices that might be biased or prejudiced against struggling readers and writers, especially English learners and those who struggle with reading and writing. Candidates collaborate with, lead, and provide support to team members in selecting and administering effective diagnostic procedures appropriate for students, especially English learners and students with exceptionalities, as well as model and coach the diagnostic team, teachers, and other support personnel in understanding differentiated instruction, selecting instructional materials that capitalize on diversity, and instructional strategies that provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences by establishing connections between home and community literacy and school literacy. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate diagnostic portfolio. [Note: Specific elements in the assessment and rubrics address this standard.]</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 recently reviewed and revised its reading and language arts certification program. Course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics incorporate changes in the International Literacy Association Standards for Reading Professionals and the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) new regulations for Reading and Language Arts Consultant Certification. Target implementation of the revised program is fall 2016. Once implemented, the department will continue to examine the validity and utility of data produced through assessments and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures.</p>
<p>LO #6: <i>Candidates can collaborate with and support teachers and administrators in planning, leading, and evaluating professional development activities for individuals and groups of teachers, including assisting in writing grant proposals and advocating with various groups for needed organizational and instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction.</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>Practicum: Leadership Portfolio I & II. This is a multifaceted and comprehensive project designed to demonstrate candidate ability to fulfill the roles of coach and leader, i.e., collaborate in planning, leading, and evaluating professional development activities with individuals or groups of administrators, teachers, other education professionals, and parents; model and coach teachers and other education professionals in school and classroom on best literacy practices; communicate information about theories, historically shared knowledge, and empirical research on areas of curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, diversity, and literate environment to various audiences; actively engage in professional literacy organizations, conferences and/or workshops; and advocate with various groups for instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate leadership portfolio. [Note: Specific elements in the assessment and rubrics address this standard.]</p> <p>Diagnostic Portfolio. This provides detailed evidence of candidates' understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, and their genuine advocacy for change in instructional practices that might be biased or prejudiced against struggling readers and writers, especially English learners and those who struggle with reading and writing. Candidates collaborate with, lead, and provide support to team members in selecting and administering effective diagnostic procedures appropriate for students, especially English learners and students with exceptionalities, as well as model and coach the diagnostic team, teachers, and other support personnel in understanding differentiated instruction, selecting instructional materials that capitalize on diversity, and instructional strategies that provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences by establishing connections between home and community literacy and school literacy. Scoring rubric is used to evaluate candidate diagnostic portfolio. [Note: Specific elements in the assessment and rubrics address this standard.]</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</p>	<p>Based on assessment data, 100 percent of candidates meet LO #6. The department recently reviewed and revised its reading and language</p>

<p>data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>arts certification program. Course syllabi, assessments and scoring rubrics incorporate changes in the International Literacy Association Standards for Reading Professionals and the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) new regulations for Reading and Language Arts Consultant Certification. Target implementation of the revised program is fall 2016. Once implemented, the department will continue to examine the validity and utility of data produced through assessments and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures.</p>
---	---

DATA TABLE by LEARNING OBJECTIVES
Fall 2014-Spring 2015

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 the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. They can inform other educators about these major theories of reading and writing processes, components, and development with supporting research evidence, including information about the relationship between the culture and native language of English learners as a support system in their learning to read and write in English.</i>	91.67%	8.33%	0%	2.92	24
LO #2: <i>Candidates can support teachers and other personnel in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the reading and writing curriculum for all students, including use of appropriate and varied instructional approaches, and a wide range of texts from traditional print, digital, and online resources.</i>	100%	0%	0%	3.00	36
LO #3: <i>Candidates can collaborate with and provide support to teachers and administrators in administering and interpreting appropriate assessments for students, using multiple data sources to analyze individual readers' and writers' performance, and to use data to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices and students' response to instruction.</i>	68.18%	31.82%	0%	2.68	44
LO #4: <i>Candidates can provide support and leadership to educators, parents and guardians, students, and other members of the community in valuing the contributions of diverse people and traditions to literacy learning.</i>	41%	59%	0%	2.41	44
LO #5: <i>Candidates can model and support teachers and other professionals in creating a literate environment that fosters reading and writing for all students.</i>	100%	0%	0%	3.0	44
LO #6: <i>Candidates can collaborate with and support teachers and administrators in planning, leading, and evaluating professional development activities for individuals and groups of teachers, including assisting in writing grant proposals and advocating with various groups for needed organizational and instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction.</i>	34%	66%	0%	2.34	44