

# Program Report for the Preparation of Reading Education Professionals International Reading Association (IRA) 2010 Standards Option A

NOTE: This form uses the IRA standards approved by NCATE in 2010. Programs have the option to use either the 2003 or 2010 standards for reports submitted through Spring 2012. Beginning in Fall 2012 ALL programs must use the new standards.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

## COVER SHEET

### 1. Institution Name

Lewis University

### 2. State

Illinois

### 3. Date submitted

MM DD YYYY

09 / 10 / 2012

### 4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:	
<input type="text"/>	
Phone:	Ext.
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
E-mail:	
<input type="text"/>	

### 5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:	
<input type="text"/>	
Phone:	Ext.
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
E-mail:	
<input type="text"/>	

### 6. Name of institution's program

Master of Arts in Education: Reading & Literacy--Reading Specialist Certificate

### 7. NCATE Category

Reading Specialist

### 8. Grade levels<sup>(1)</sup> for which candidates are being prepared

P-12

(1) e.g. K-6, P-12

### 9. Program Type

- Advanced Teaching
- First Teaching License
- Other School Personnel

Unspecified

**10. Degree or award level**

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

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

- Yes
- No

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

Romeoville  
Tinley Park

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

Reading Specialist Type-10

**14. Program report status:**

- Initial Review
- Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required or Recognition with Probation
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions

**15. Is your unit seeking**

- NCATE accreditation for the first time (initial accreditation)
- Continuing NCATE accreditation

**16. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:**

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

- Yes
- No

## SECTION I - CONTEXT

**1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of IRA standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)**

The Lewis University Master of Arts: Reading & Literacy-Reading Specialist Certification Program (MA Reading Specialist) prepares candidates for licensure as reading specialists in the State of Illinois. State requirements dictate that candidates must hold a valid initial teaching license at any level and have at least two years of teaching experience to apply for certification. Candidates must complete a state approved Master's degree program that entitles them to certification and includes practicum experiences and coursework in the following areas: foundations of reading, content area reading, assessment and diagnosis, developmental reading instruction, developmental and remedial reading materials/resources, leadership and supervision, and child/adolescent literature. The Standards of the International Reading Association represent a higher standard of knowledge, skills and dispositions than those of the Illinois State Board of Education and therefore provide an "umbrella" for the state standards.

Institutional policies require that candidates in graduate programs must have received a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution with not less than a 2.75 GPA in the last 60 undergraduate hours, demonstrate a satisfactory completion of the Graduate Entrance Writing Requirement, and submit evidence of a passing grade on the Illinois Certification Basic Skills Test. In addition, candidates applying to advanced certification programs, such as the MA Reading Specialist, must have fulfilled coursework in teaching students with exceptionalities.

The MA Reading Specialist program is currently offered at the main campus in Romeoville and at a satellite campus in Tinley Park, IL. A group at Tinley Park began the program in Spring 2011 and is currently in the midst of their coursework. Therefore, the Tinley Park campus data is reflected only in Assessments 3, 4, and 5 for this report. The Department of Reading & Literacy, in which this program is housed, also offers courses for teachers who do not wish to acquire the advanced certification but are pursuing professional development to augment their practice or fulfill a deficiency for the state. Some of these courses are also part of the MA Reading Specialist program.

Lewis University is a comprehensive, Catholic university founded in 1932. Lewis offers more than 80 undergraduate majors and programs of study, 25 graduate programs, certificates of advanced study, & doctoral programs. Lewis is one of many schools sponsored by the deLaSalle Christian Brothers, an international Roman Catholic teaching order, with more than 320 years of teaching experience in the tradition of John Baptist deLaSalle, Patron Saint of Educators. We aim to instill passion in our educators, including a love for the disenfranchised, a belief in touching hearts, and the desire to pass down a legacy of lifelong learning. We work to develop learning communities that value diverse perspectives, collaborative decision-making and interactive learning experiences. We hold the following outcomes for candidates to become: Knowledgeable Critical Transformative Educators, who possess professional and pedagogical knowledge, integrate technology into teaching, and effectively assess student learning, while approaching education with a critical lens and fostering student transformation; Multicultural Educators, who recognize personal biases, understand cultural issues involved in appropriate learning assessment, and adapt instruction for all students; and Social Justice Advocates, who challenge dominant discourses and institutional inequities, believe that all students can learn, and bring about change.

**2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)**

**Clinical and Field Work Hours**

**Lewis University Reading & Literacy Program**

To prepare each candidate for work as a reading professional, clinical and field work experiences are built into the program coursework. Candidates will be responsible for completing a timesheet and reflection for all clinical and field work experiences. Required and recommended clinical and field work experiences are detailed on course syllabi.

Candidates for the Type 10 Reading Specialist Certificate must complete a minimum of 150 clinical and field work hours with experiences across grades Pre-K to 12. This includes three intensive and extensive practicum experiences in which the candidate participates in assessment, developing case reports, planning and carrying out instruction, and literacy coaching. Other field work experiences in selected courses may include, but are not limited to, the examples listed below.

**Practicum Experiences:**

52-533 25 hours Methods and Strategies for Reading Comprehension, Including Instructional Practicum for the Reading Teacher:

Assessment and supported instruction for a small group of students, including team planning and coaching, a reflective instructional log, work sample, and report to parents. This practicum is most often conducted with a level of student that is familiar to the candidate.

52-529 20 hours Methods and Practicum in Reading Diagnosis: Completion of an elementary and a secondary reading clinic assessment, including the administration and interpretation of informal and formal assessments, coaching others through intensive case seminars, development of two clinical case reports, including recommendations for instruction and intervention for teachers and parents, and communication of results to appropriate audiences.

52-598 60 hours Practicum for the Reading Specialist: Candidates will participate in a reading instructional experience in which they will collaborate with other professionals to provide reading instruction for students and coaching/technical assistance to teachers. This practicum should be with a level of students that expands the experience of the candidate. Candidates will develop a Reading Specialist Work Sample for this practicum.

**Other Field Work Experiences:**

52-524 10 hours Methods of Teaching Reading PreK-3:

- Classroom observation and interview of preschool teacher
- Classroom observation and interview of K-3 teacher
- Administration of running record or other informal assessments to a primary student
- Administration of the Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement to a primary student, including preparation of an analysis and summary of results

52-523 10 hours Methods of Teaching Reading Grades 4-12, Including the Content Areas:

- Classroom observation and interview of an intermediate or middle school teacher
- Classroom observation and interview of a high school teacher
- Administration of an Informal Reading Inventory to a student in grades 4-12, including a summary of results

52-527 10 hours Teaching Reading to the Diverse Learner:

- Classroom observation and interview of a special education teacher
- Classroom observation and interview of an ELL teacher
- Observation or participation in an IEP conference
- Review of student IEP
- Preparation of case studies involving diverse learners
- Critical review of school/district programs/materials for diverse learners

52-538 10 hours Clinical Diagnosis of Reading Problems

- Assessment of a student using appropriate informal and formal instruments
- Development of a case report interpreting and analyzing assessment results and detailing student strengths and areas of need

52-547 15 hours Supervising the PreK-12 Reading Program

- Development and presentation of a staff development presentation for school staff, a graduate conference, or professional conference
- Observation of a classroom teacher followed by development of a literacy coaching plan
- Attendance at a professional conference
- Meeting with a reading supervisor at the building or district level to discuss job responsibilities
- Development of resources to support parents, teachers, or others who work with developing readers

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

See **Attachments** panel below.

**4. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.**

**5. Candidate Information**

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

Program: Master of Arts in Education: Reading & Literacy--Reading Specialist Certificate Romeoville Campus		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers <sup>(2)</sup>
2011-2012	23	█
2010-2011	24	█
2009-2010	21	█

Program: Master of Arts in Education: Reading & Literacy--Reading Specialist Certificate Tinley Park Campus		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers <sup>(2)</sup>
2011-2012	█	█
2010-2011	█	█
2009-2010	13	█

<sup>(2)</sup> NCATE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

**6. Faculty Information**

**Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.**

Faculty Member Name	█
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	█
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	█
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	█
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	█
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	█

Faculty Member Name	█
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	█
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	█

Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> :List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> :List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> :List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> :List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> :List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]
--	------------

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

Faculty Member Name	[REDACTED]
Highest Degree, Field, & University <sup>(3)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member <sup>(4)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Faculty Rank <sup>(5)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Tenure Track	€ YES
Scholarship <sup>(6)</sup> , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service <sup>(7)</sup> : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years <sup>(8)</sup>	[REDACTED]
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools <sup>(9)</sup>	[REDACTED]

(3) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.

(4) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

(5) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

(6) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel. Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

(7) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.

(8) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.

(9) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

## SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the IRA standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

### 1. Please provide following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters each field)

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment <sup>(10)</sup>	Type or Form of Assessment <sup>(11)</sup>	When the Assessment Is Administered <sup>(12)</sup>

Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	Illinois Reading Specialist Test	State Certification Examination	Before 2012, candidates completed the state test at the end of the program. Beginning in 2012, this test must be passed before candidates may enroll in the Practicum for the Reading Specialist.
Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in reading education (required)	Comprehensive Examination	Essay Examination	Candidates must complete the Comprehensive exam within the last two semesters of the program.
Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction (required)	Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample	Work Sample	The assessment is conducted in the course 52-533, Methods and Strategies for Reading Comprehension, Including Instructional Practicum for the Reading Teacher, a required course which is taken in the middle of the program.
Assessment #4: Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience (required)	Practicum for the Reading Specialist	Work Sample, University Supervisor Evaluation, Collaborating Teacher Evaluation	This assessment is conducted in the course 52-598, Practicum for the Reading Specialist, which is taken at the end of the program.
Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning (required)	Practicum for the Reading Specialist: Practicum Work Sample	Work Sample	This assessment is conducted in the course 52-598, Practicum for the Reading Specialist, which is taken at the end of the program.
Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (required)	Diagnostic Practicum	Diagnostic Assessment Clinic and the completion of two Case Reports	This assessment is conducted in the course 52-529, Methods and Practicum in Reading Diagnosis and Remediation, which occurs near the end of the program, after at least 2/3 of the coursework is completed.
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (optional)	Differentiation Portfolio	Project	This assessment is conducted in the course, 52-527, Teaching Reading to the Diverse Learner, a required course which is taken early in the program.
	Literacy Leadership Portfolio	Portfolio	





in reading and writing instruction.									
5.2: Design a social environment that is low-risk, includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write.									
5.3: Use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another; discussions, and peer feedback).	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
5.4: Use a variety of classroom configurations (i.e., whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction.									

**6. Standard 6: Professional Learning and Leadership. Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility.**

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
6.1: Demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning theories and related research about organizational change, professional development, and school culture.								
6.2: Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.	b	b	b	b	b	b	b	b
6.3: Participate in, design, facilitate, lead, and evaluate effective and differentiated professional development programs.								
6.4: Understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions.								

**SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS**

**DIRECTIONS:** The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. Taken as a whole, the assessments must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. The key assessments should be required of all candidates. Assessments and scoring guides and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements [each relating to specific SPA standard(s)], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a cumulative score..

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas to be aligned with the elements in NCATE's unit standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare 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 standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards 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 standards, indicating the specific SPA standards 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). Each attachment should be no larger than 2 mb. 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. Data from licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge. IRA standards addressed in this entry could include Standard 1. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as**

outlined in the directions for Section IV. (Answer required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 1: Illinois State Test for the Reading Specialist Narrative, Documentation, and Data Chart

See **Attachments** panel below.

**2. Assessment of content knowledge in reading education. IRA standards addressed in this entry include Standards 1 and 6. Examples of appropriate assessments include comprehensive examinations, research reports, child studies, action research, portfolio projects,<sup>(13)</sup> and essays. (Answer required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 2: Comprehensive Exam Narrative, Documentation, and Data Chart

See **Attachments** panel below.

(13) For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included are discrete items. In this case, some of the artifacts included in the portfolio may be considered individual assessments.

**3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan reading and literacy instruction, or fulfill other professional responsibilities in reading education. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 2, 3, 4, and 5. Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates' abilities to develop lesson or unit plans or individualized educational plans. (Answer required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Sections III and IV.

Assessment #3: Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample Narrative, Documentation and Data Chart

See **Attachments** panel below.

**4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and/or 6. The assessment instrument used to evaluate internships, practicum, or other clinical experiences should be submitted. (Answer required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 4: Reading Specialist Practicum Narrative, Documentation, and Data Chart

See **Attachments** panel below.

**5. Assessment that demonstrates and evaluates candidate effects on student learning and provision of supportive learning environments for student learning. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and/or 6. Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys. (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 5: Reading Specialist Practicum Analysis of Student Learning Work Sample Narrative, Documentation, and Data Chart

See **Attachments** panel below.

**6. IRA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and/or 6. Examples of appropriate assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, professional study groups, leading a professional development session, research reports, child studies, action research, portfolio tasks, and follow-up studies. (Answer required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 6: Diagnostic Practicum Narrative, Documentation, and Data Chart

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

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

Assessment 7: Differentiation Portfolio Narrative, Documentation and Data Chart

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

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

Assessment 8: Literacy Leadership Portfolio Narrative, Documentation and Data Chart

See **Attachments** panel below.

## SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

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

**(Response limited to 12,000 characters)**

Faculty members in the Lewis MA Reading & Literacy-Reading Specialist Program are committed to program improvement and to seeking optimal candidate performance. We enjoy a positive reputation in area K-12 schools for our program's rigor and the quality of our graduates' work as reading specialists. We therefore regularly discuss our assessment results, program processes, assignments, assessment components, and candidate progress. We make adjustments to the program as we see the need, whether the adjustment needed is a clarification of wording in an assessment, restructuring a course, or adding or changing an assignment or course content. Our key assessments are a strong part of this ongoing improvement. Our program faculty meets annually with an advisory committee comprised of area reading specialists, adjunct faculty, and program alumni, with whom we share our program changes and assessment results and from whom we solicit advice for continuous improvement. Our candidates also feel free to share with us their impressions of the program and we seek their input through conversations at the conclusion of courses. We have noted the following trends and have taken the following steps for improvement.

1. Content Knowledge Candidate content knowledge in the program is measured through Assessment 1: ICTS Reading Specialist Test; and Assessment 2: MA Comprehensive Exam.

Summary of Principal Findings: Our candidates demonstrate success on the state content test and the program comprehensive exam. While most of our candidates demonstrate mastery on these assessments, a few individuals have only demonstrated competence on a variety of subtests or components. However, we do note that they tend to be stronger in the aspects of content knowledge that address IRA Standards 1, 4, and 6, i.e., Foundational Knowledge, Diversity, and Professional Responsibilities, yet there are components of Standards 1 and 4 that show up as areas of challenge in the area of pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, that we notice we need to emphasize.

Interpretation of Findings: Both Assessment 1 and Assessment 2 indicate that our candidates are strong in addressing most of IRA Standard 1. There is variation in their performance on items that address other standards, even though they do meet those standards. Because of the overlap of strengths on Standard 1 in both assessments, we have a clearer indication of where our program is strong. However, the variety in scores makes it difficult to discern a trend in the areas in which candidates are weaker and which we can address programmatically. In addition, we use caution in interpreting these results because of the small number of candidates taking each assessment. Areas we may monitor for future change include candidate understanding of transforming theoretical knowledge into practice.

Changes Made or Planned/Steps Taken: We met in the spring and summer of 2012 to refine our comprehensive exam to further tap into candidate understanding of the intersection of knowledge and practice and explicitly address the impact of systemic barriers within the school system and the reading program on student learning. We also made changes to clarify directions to candidates so that they clearly understood what the examination was asking of them. Furthermore, we plan to increase our emphasis on the knowledge base that addresses characteristics and needs of English language learners in the literacy program, as well as increase our emphasis on fundamental terminology and concepts in foundations and intervention courses. We have already adjusted several course syllabi (assignments, readings, and outcomes) to reflect these emphases. We will continue to monitor our assessments of content knowledge as we make these changes.

2. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions Candidate professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions are measured through Assessments 3: Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample; 4: Reading Specialist Practicum Evaluation; 6: Diagnostic Practicum Evaluation; 7: Differentiation Portfolio; and 8: Literacy Leadership Portfolio.

Summary of Principal Findings: In Assessment 3 (Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample), which occurs mid-program, we noticed that in one of our data sets, our candidates received Acceptable rather than Target ratings in areas addressing Contextual Factors and Assessment. However, data from the Reading Specialist Practicum, Assessment 4, indicate that candidates performed at Target for areas addressing assessment. Some individuals were competent but had not mastered the use of contextual factors for planning and implementing instruction. Assessment 6 (Diagnostic Practicum Evaluation), which occurs toward the end of the program, (after 3 but before 4), provides intensive work with planning, administering, and interpreting assessments. We note that the majority of our candidates have mastered this area at this point in the program, but a few still needed support. Assessment 7 (Differentiation Portfolio), which can be taken at any point in the program, provides intensive focus on understanding preK-12 students and making adaptations for diversity (addressing contextual factors) in the classroom. Data from the most recent administration of Assessment 7 showed increased performance at the target level across all elements of that assessment, including those that address student diversity (contextual factors). The final assessment that evaluates this area is Assessment 8 (Literacy Leadership Portfolio), which occurs near the end of the program. Our candidates achieved target scores on their professional development presentations. They show competence but not full mastery on the elements addressing coaching for professional growth and reflection on practice. We did note that in Assessment 4, which includes a coaching plan element, candidates performed at target levels for the coaching plan, which indicates improvement in this area as compared to Assessment 8. We note that candidates' ability to reflect on their own practice was actually slightly higher in Assessment 8 than Assessment 4.

Interpretation of Findings: Our candidates do well in exhibiting positive dispositions and skill as reading professionals. They take coaching opportunities seriously and do a good job presenting their professional knowledge. They are strong in IRA Standard 2, using varied instruction and materials, Standard 5, designing physical and social environments to support student learning, and Standard 6, exhibiting positive dispositions toward their own and others' learning. Because we have conflicting data about Standards 3 and 4 across our many assessments these are areas that we want to watch closely.

Our multiple practicum assessments reveal that candidates acknowledge student diversity but may need additional support to develop expertise in addressing that diversity in instructional recommendations and practices. We may need to provide more opportunities for critical, reflective, self-evaluation earlier in the program, to better prepare them as reflective, transformative practitioners and leaders.

Changes Made or Planned/Steps Taken: Through our ongoing analysis of our program and assessments, we have identified opportunities to further address diversity, reflective practice, and assessment in our courses. For example, content and assignments in the course, Teaching Reading to the Diverse Learner were made more rigorous in response to our previous data analysis and the 2010 Standards. Since then, we have taken time to explore how we can incorporate content and application of skills and dispositions for working with students for whom English is not their first language in other courses. To address how critical we believe this to be, we have added the WIDA standards to our course syllabi and assignments. In our foundational methods courses, we have increased the instructional time that we spend addressing the needs of diverse students and differing populations. We see these changes as a way to conduct a continuous dialogue about diversity and effective practice across our program, especially in courses where we do not have key assessments. This is particularly important to us in this program because it directly addresses our college unit standards for knowledgeable, critical, transformative educators who have a multicultural perspective and are advocates for social justice.

3. Student Learning. Candidate success with student learning is evaluated specifically through Assessment 5: Reading Specialist Practicum Evaluation (Analysis of Student Learning). Other key assessments that focus on other measures also provide some insight into this area, but we have selected Assessment 5, which occurs during the final clinical experience and asks candidates to explicitly address student learning, as the best indicator of this area.

Summary of Principal Findings: Assessment 5 is a piece of the Reading Specialist practicum evaluation (Assessment 4). Our candidates do very well on measures of their ability to assess and address student learning. However, we have already noted above one area that was a challenge for our candidates: the recognition of student needs and implications of diversity on instructional planning and student learning.

Interpretation of Findings: This is an area of particular concern for us, considering our unit standards (noted above). There is perhaps some opportunity for us to increase candidate comfort with and ability to address diversity in their instruction and assessment of student learning.

Changes Made or Planned: We have already added an opportunity for candidates to better reflect on and plan for addressing diversity in the portfolio assignment added to Teaching Reading to the Diverse Learner. This had been an assignment in our program before it became a key assessment, but we refined the course in which the assessment occurs in order to better target areas of need for diverse students. In addition, the steps that we noted to address professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and disposition, are also designed to help us address diversity and student learning with our candidates. Furthermore, two of our department faculty members participated in a professional development workshop on addressing the needs of English Language Learners in the summer of 2011, in order to bring best practices into our program. We anticipate that this will become a stronger area in the future because of this increased emphasis.

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

**1. For Revised Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Revised Report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/RevisedProgramReports/tabid/453/Default.aspx>**

**2. For Response to Conditions Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the conditions cited in the original recognition report. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions Report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/ResponseToConditionsReport/tabid/454/Default.aspx>**

(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

**Please click "Next"**

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

## **Master of Arts in Education: Reading & Literacy Reading Specialist Certificate**

To obtain a Master of Arts Degree with a Specialization in Reading and Literacy, candidates must satisfactorily complete thirty-nine (39) credit hours of coursework and a comprehensive examination. This program leads to a Type 10 Reading Specialist certificate or Reading Specialist endorsement on a valid certificate.

**Admission Prerequisites:** (\* indicates College of Education form required)

Application\* and fee

2 letters of recommendation\*

A Bachelor's degree from a recognized institution

An Illinois teaching certificate

Two years of successful teaching experience\*

House Bill 150 fulfilled (Exceptional Child)

Graduate Entrance Writing Requirement

Illinois Basic Skills test (if not passed with previous certification)

### **Course Requirements:**

Course no.	Title (credit hours)
52-504	Technology in the Reading and Writing Program (1)
52-509	Child and Adolescent Literature (3)
52-523	Foundations and Methods of Teaching Reading in Grades 4-12, Including the Content Areas (includes field work hours) (3)
52-524	Foundations & Methods of Teaching Reading PreK-3 (10 field work hours) (3)
52-527	Teaching Reading to the Diverse Learner (includes field work hours) (3)
<b>52-529</b>	<b>Methods and Practicum in Reading Diagnosis and Remediation (includes clinical hours) (3)</b>
<b>52-533</b>	<b>Methods and Strategies for Reading Comprehension Instruction including Instructional Practicum for the Reading Teacher (includes clinical hours) (3)</b>
52-534	Teaching Writing in the Literacy Program (2)
52-536	Remediation and Intervention of Reading Problems (3)
52-538	Clinical Diagnosis of Reading Problems (includes field work hours) (3)
52-547	Supervising the PreK-12 Reading Program (includes field work hours) (3)
52-575	Practical Research for Learning Communities (3)
<b>52-598</b>	<b>Practicum for the Reading Specialist (includes clinical hours) (3)</b>
51-548	Educational Organization and Administration (3)

(Above classes in **bold** represent the 9 hours of coursework that are practicum courses.)

### **State Assessment Requirements:**

At the conclusion of the program, candidates seeking a Type 10 Reading Specialist Certificate must pass the Illinois Certification Test for the Reading Specialist, as well as the Assessment of Professional Teaching for grades K-12.

**GRADUATE READING & LITERACY  
READING SPECIALIST  
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS & TRANSITION POINTS**

Initial Advisement contract for \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Transition Point I: Acceptance into Program**

- Transcript confirming a baccalaureate or masters degree from a regionally accredited institution
- Application\* and payment of application fee
- Current Resume\*
- Data input form\* \*Uses Lewis University and Reading & Literacy Department format

---

- Successful completion of ISBE Basic Skills Test
- Minimum 2.75 GPA in last 60 hours of undergraduate work
- Official transcripts from institution awarding highest degree earned
- Two letters of recommendation from supervisors\*
- Successful completion of COE writing requirement\*
- Recommendation of department member
- Acceptance into program by Academic Affairs Committee

**Transition Point II: Professional Practice**

- Maintain a cumulative 3.0 GPA for all coursework
- Unit Assessment Oral Response to Service (following 52-533)
- Review of relevant dispositions by program faculty before enrollment in 5th course and prior to enrollment in practicum course (52-598); all areas at Acceptable or Target level
- Documented successful completion of field work hours required in coursework prior to culminating practicum course
- Successful completion of Reading & Literacy Key Assessments in courses 52-527, 52-533, 52-529 & 52-547

**Transition Point III: Degree Completers**

- Successful completion of culminating practicum course (52-598)
- Review of relevant dispositions by program faculty; all areas at Acceptable or Target
- Successful completion of comprehensive exam
- Unit Final Reflective Essay (with comprehensive exam)
- Professional standards met through requisite coursework completed with minimum cumulative 3.0 GPA and in compliance with all criteria listed in the graduate catalogue

**Transition Point IV: Certification Program Completers**

- Successful completion of ISBE Reading Specialist and APT certification tests\*\*
- Recommended for entitled ISBE certificate or endorsement

\*\*Note, starting July 2012, all candidates must pass the ISBE Reading Specialist Test prior to enrolling in 52-598, *Practicum for the Reading Specialist*. This will move that certification test requirement into transition point II.



## **SPA Assessment #1: Licensure Assessment ICTS Reading Specialist Test**

### **1. Narrative about Assessment #1**

#### **Description of the Assessment and Use in Program**

The Illinois State Board of Education requires a licensure exam for all candidates who seek to obtain the Reading Specialist Certificate. The tests are based on expectations for teachers in Illinois as defined by the Illinois Content Area Standards for Educators. The test for certification was updated during the 2003-2004 academic year and currently addresses four main areas and accompanying subareas.

#### **Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards**

- a. Language, Reading, and Literacy (Corresponds with IRA Standards 1, 4, and 5)
  - 1) Understand the nature, acquisition, and development of language (IRA 1)
  - 2) Understand the development of literacy (IRA 1)
  - 3) Understand the history, theoretical models, and philosophies of reading education (IRA 1)
  - 4) Understand the nature of reading and the language arts (IRA 1)
  - 5) Understand the influence of individual differences and diversity on language development and reading acquisition (IRA 4)
  - 6) Understand elements of the classroom environment that can promote students' interest in reading (IRA 5)
- b. Reading Instruction and Assessment (Corresponds with IRA Standards 2, 3, and 4)
  - 1) Understand strategies for promoting students' word identification, spelling, and vocabulary skills (IRA 2)
  - 2) Understand strategies for promoting students' reading comprehension skills (IRA 2)
  - 3) Understand methods for promoting students' study skills (IRA 2)
  - 4) Understand the characteristics and construction of formal and informal assessments of students' reading (IRA 3 and 4)
  - 5) Understand assessment for the purpose of diagnosing reading difficulties (IRA 3)
  - 6) Understand methods for working with students with special needs who have reading difficulties (IRA 2)
- c. Reading Research and Curriculum Design (Corresponds with IRA Standards, 1, 2 and 6)
  - 1) Understand the characteristics of reading research (IRA 1)
  - 2) Understand appropriate uses of the results of reading research (IRA 1)
  - 3) Understand the essential elements used in curriculum design (IRA 2)
  - 4) Understand strategies for providing leadership in curriculum design and implementation (IRA 6)
  - 5) Understand strategies for managing reading programs (IRA 6)
- d. Professional Responsibilities and Resource Management (Corresponds with IRA Standards 1 and 6)
  - 1) Understand the ongoing process of staff development (IRA 6)
  - 2) Understand strategies for presenting professional development activities (IRA 6)
  - 3) Understand strategies for communicating and collaborating with families, the public, and other professionals (IRA 6)
  - 4) Understand strategies for securing and managing instructional resources (IRA 6)
  - 5) Understand professional conduct for the reading specialist (IRA 1)

### **Summary of the Data**

Lewis University Reading & Literacy Program completers passed the Illinois Certification Testing System (ICTS) subtests (Table A) for the Reading Specialist test. Reading Specialist candidates scored well above the minimum cut score, but slightly below the state mean overall on all but one subtest, on which they scored above the state mean.

Table B ranks the ICTS subtests according to the strength of our candidates' performance on each. Candidates taking the Reading Specialist test, ICTS test 176, during the 2011-2012 school year performed best on the subtest that covered Reading Research & Curriculum Design. This aligns with IRA Standards 1, 2, and 6. Candidates taking the test during the 2012 summer performed best on the subtest that covered Language, Reading, & Literacy, aligning with IRA Standards 1, 4, and 5. This confirms our findings in other program assessments: that our candidates are meeting the IRA Standards. The most challenging ICTS 176 subtest for both groups of candidates was that which covered Reading Instruction & Assessment, which aligns with IRA Standards 2, 3 and 4.

### **Assessment 1 Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards**

With such a small number of students taking the test, we must be careful about over-interpreting the data. Our candidates have generally done better than the state average(s) on the test(s) in the past. In the academic year prior to the test administrations analyzed here, five candidates took and passed the test and two of the five scored at the state average while one scored above the state average. This recent group of scores indicates that we may need to re-examine or realign some of our courses more closely to the state assessment. Both groups of our candidates that took the state test received the same overall mean score, 261. They also found the same subtest (Reading Instruction & Assessment) most challenging, indicating that while they are meeting the standards, they may need more support to master IRA Standards 2, 3 and 4.

The fact that both groups of candidates also scored lower than the state mean on three out of four subtests—and their higher-scoring subtests are not consistent between the two groups—signals that we may need to assess how we can further support our candidates in their preparation for the state content assessment. We do note that candidates may opt to take this test at any point in the program, therefore, we are unsure of the content candidates have been exposed to in the program before they take the test. Nevertheless, we will look for areas in which we may strengthen our program to better address the content measured on the state's standardized test, as well as better meet the requirements of the new IRA standards.

## 2. Directions to Candidates

As per the new (2011) licensing requirements, all applicants seeking a State license must take and pass the content area test before they can be placed in their final practicum field placement. All candidates are advised to register for the content area test and directed to the Illinois Certification Testing System website for directions and sample test items. We also offer to confer with candidates as they prepare to take the test.

## 3. Scoring Rubric

A passing score on the content area test is 240 or above. The score report indicates whether the applicant has passed or not, as well as how they performed on each test subarea. “The passing scores for the Illinois Certification Testing System were established by the Illinois State Board of Education based on recommendations from panels of Illinois educators. The passing score for each content-area test is designed to reflect the level of content knowledge and skills required to perform the job of an educator receiving an initial certificate in Illinois.”

## 4. Data Chart

Table A: Illinois Certification Testing System (ICTS) #176: Reading Specialist—Aggregate Subtest Results

Academic Year	Program Completions N	N Passing	% N Passing	Total Score Mean LU*	Total Score Mean State	Sub 1 Mean LU**	Sub 1 Mean State	Sub 2 Mean LU**	Sub 2 Mean State	Sub 3 Mean LU**	Sub 3 Mean State	Sub 4 Mean LU**	Sub 4 Mean State
2011-2012	█	█	100%	261	269	258	266	257	268	279	254	267	275
Summer 2012	█	█	100%	261	267	275	266	253	266	256	262	259	271

\*Passing Score is 240.

\*\*Relation of Subtests to International Reading Association Standards:

Subtest 1: Language, Reading, & Literacy	IRA Standards 1, 4, 5; COE Standard 1, 2, 3
Subtest 2: Reading Instruction & Assessment	IRA Standards 2, 3, 4; COE Standards 1, 2, 3
Subtest 3: Reading Research & Curriculum Design	IRA Standards 1, 2, 6; COE Standards 2, 3, 3
Subtest 4: Professional Responsibilities & Resource Management	IRA Standards 1, 6; COE Standards 1, 2, 3

Table B: Relative Strength of Candidate Performance across ICTS #176 Subtests: Reading Specialist  
In what areas are our Candidates performing the strongest? This table ranks each subtest according to candidate scores.

Academic Year	Highest Scoring Subtest (HSS)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Highest Scoring Subtest (2HSS)	3 <sup>rd</sup> Highest Scoring Subtest (3HSS)	4 <sup>th</sup> Highest Scoring Subtest (4HSS)
2011-2012	Reading Research & Curriculum Design	Professional Responsibilities & Resource Management	Language, Reading, & Literacy	Reading Instruction & Assessment
Summer 2012	Language, Reading, & Literacy	Professional Responsibilities & Resource Management	Reading Research & Curriculum Design	Reading Instruction & Assessment

## **SPA Assessment #2: Assessment of Content Knowledge in Reading Education M.A. Comprehensive Exam**

### **1. Narrative about Assessment #2**

#### **Description of the Assessment and Use in the Program**

The Comprehensive Exam represents the culminating assessment for candidates in the Graduate Reading and Literacy Program. Successful completion of this Exam is required in order for a candidate to earn a Master's degree. It is the Program's means of determining whether a candidate has met the requirements for the Program.

The Comprehensive Exam is typically recommended to be taken during one of the last two semesters that a candidate is enrolled in the program. It consists of two questions that must be answered in four hours and one question that is taken home and answered within one week.

1. The first question represents a diagnostic question, in which the candidate is provided with background and assessment data for a group of students—with one student highlighted as a focal student. The candidate is expected to analyze the information, make a diagnostic decision and provide suggested recommendations for instruction and literate environment in a shortened case study format. The question evaluates candidate knowledge of IRA Standard 2-Curriculum, Standard 3-Assessment and Evaluation, Standard 4-Diversity, and Standard 5-Literate Environment.
2. Question two is based on IRA Standard 6-Professional Learning and Leadership, though it also evaluates them on IRA Standard 1-Foundational Knowledge and Standard 4-Diversity. The question asks candidates to help design a literacy professional development for teachers in their district.
3. Question three is a take-home question based on IRA Standard 1-Foundational Knowledge. It also evaluates IRA Standard 2.1. It asks students to describe their approach to literacy instruction—specifically examining areas of theory and research, the historical development of the literacy profession, and the elements that are most relevant and cogent for them.

The candidate must indicate his or her intentions for taking the exam by completing the “Request to Take the Comprehensive Exam” prior to the 15<sup>th</sup> week of the semester preceding the semester in which the candidate wishes to take the examination. The Department Chair will give approval for the examination based on the published requirements in the Graduate Catalog. The Comprehensive Exam is available each semester and is scheduled by the College of Education. Students who require special accommodations for the Comprehensive Exam should discuss this with the Department Chair at the time that the “Request to Take the Comprehensive Exam” is completed.

#### **Assessment 2 Alignment with IRA Standards**

The Comprehensive Exam addresses several 2010 IRA standards through the three questions as follows:

- Question 1 addresses IRA Standards 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 and COE Standards 2, 3.
- Question 2 addresses IRA standards 1.3, 4.1, 4.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 and COE Standards 1, 2, and 3.
- Question 3 addresses IRA Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1 and COE Standard 1.

### **Summary of the Data**

There have been two groups of candidates that have taken the Comprehensive Exam since it has been aligned with the 2010 IRA standards: Spring 2012 (8) and Summer 2012 (1). With the exception of one candidate in the Spring, all candidates received “Acceptable” or “Target” on all 3 questions of the comprehensive exam. This candidate, who has historically been a strong student in the program and was having a particularly challenging morning the day of the exam, received “Unacceptable” on Questions 1 and 2 and was allowed to retake the exam.

### **Assessment 2 Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards**

Overall, the candidates score highest on Question 3, which evaluates “Research-based, Foundational Knowledge of Reading and Writing Processes, Instruction, and Diversity” and is aligned with IRA Standards 1 and 2. This is likely because it is the take-home question and they may use resources that they have acquired throughout the program in their preparation of this question. We are pleased that they do use what has been provided to them and that they are adept at supporting their work with appropriate research and theoretical sources. All of the candidates received “Acceptable” or “Target” on all components of the question. The IRA standard that has the lowest overall mean is 1.3, which requires candidates to reflect on their learning and how their practice has transformed. While candidates can readily discuss how much they have learned in the literacy program, they have some trouble articulating how this learning has transformed their practice over time.

This challenge with examining transformation of practice is echoed in the scores for Questions 1 and 2 as well. As a group, the candidates score higher on Question 1, which evaluates “Assessment & Diagnosis, Addressing Diversity, Instructional Strategies, and Curriculum Methods,” (IRA Standards 2, 3, 4.2, and 5) than Question 2, which evaluates “Professional Development” (IRA Standards 1, 4, and 6). However, for both questions, the IRA standards (4, 2.2, and 6.4) that generate the lowest average scores (Acceptable ratings) are the ones that require candidates to demonstrate their belief in their ability to truly engage with student diversity and act as a locus of change within their buildings and their field.

We discussed this phenomenon at length after the spring 2012 administration. This was the first time we had used the new elaborated exam questions aligned with the 2010 IRA Standards. We believe that one of the contributing factors was the wording of part of Question 1. We request candidates to discuss how they would “minimize institutional barriers and create a literacy-rich environment that addresses diversity.” What we wanted our candidates to address was how they would work to *mitigate* specific barriers or obstacles in the school and advocate for students. However, many candidates chose to talk about student-derived issues that bordered on deficit model thinking. Based upon this, we modified this sub-question for the Summer 2012 administration to more clearly indicate that we were looking for school-derived obstacles. We anticipate being able to analyze the results of these changes after the administration of the exam in the 2012-2013 year. There was only one candidate who wrote to the revised subquestion in the summer of 2012. We have also discussed the need to emphasize more clearly in our coursework the need to advocate for students and to work for change on multiple levels. Our candidates do not struggle with the need to embrace diversity. The next step, though, is to help them work towards creating culturally relevant and critical classrooms where they work as multicultural educators *and* social justice advocates.

## 2. Assessment Documentation

### Directions to Candidates

#### **Graduate Reading and Literacy Program Master of Arts—Reading Specialist Comprehensive Exam International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professionals 2010**

**Question 1:** Assessment & Diagnosis, Addressing Diversity, Instructional Strategies, and Curriculum Materials

Addresses IRA Standards 2, 3, 4, 5; Lewis University COE Standards 2, 3

You are the reading specialist in a school. A teacher has come to you with a variety of assessments that have been gathered for a small group of students and is asking you to assist in interpreting the results and provide support in choosing instructional strategies and curriculum materials to enhance literacy learning for the students. Use the provided student/group assessment profile to prepare your response to this teacher.

- a. First describe the assessments that were conducted and discuss their purposes as used in this profile. Note what additional means of assessment you would suggest the teacher now use and describe how they would add to your understanding of the students' literacy learning (do not create results for these, just comment on what additional information would be helpful and how the teacher could assess that information). (IRA Standards 3.1, 3.2)
- b. Use the assessment results provided to decide at what functional reading levels the identified student in this group is currently performing. Describe the meaning of the different reading levels so that the teacher will understand how they apply to the student in the context of classroom instruction. Discuss whether the identified student is functioning at an appropriate level and explain your reasoning. (IRA Standards 3.2)
- c. Describe the strengths and needs of the identified student as presented in the assessment profile. Discuss also the instructional needs and strengths of the group. Include potential institutional barriers that the students in the group might face, considering language, culture, background, and other developmental or sociological factors. Support your interpretation with information from the profile. (IRA Standards 3.2 & 3.4; COE Standard 3)
- d. Discuss ways to transform the environment (classroom structure, routines, school culture, grouping practices, etc.) of the school to address institutional barriers and create a literacy-rich environment that addresses diversity. How would you, as a literacy leader in the school, work with this teacher to bring about the changes you suggest? (IRA Standards 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3; COE Standard 2)
- e. Within the literacy-rich context that you have described, make specific recommendations for instruction/intervention that will build on the strengths and address the needs of the students in this group. This should include a minimum of four instructional approaches that have been discussed in this program. For each approach you recommend, you must explain why you recommend it for this group and how the teacher will implement it. (IRA Standards 2.2, 3.3, 5.4)

- f. Explain to the teacher the criteria you would use for selecting texts and materials to meet the students' needs. Your explanation should help the teacher critically evaluate and select appropriate materials to optimize literacy learning through the use of traditional print and new technological resources. Then, recommend specific examples of texts and materials that have been discussed in this program and meet these criteria. Discuss how access to these resources would impact student literacy learning for this group. (IRA Standards 2.3)

**Question 2: Professional Development**

Addresses IRA Standards 1, 4, and 6; Lewis University COE Standards 1, 2, 3

This represents an IRA Level 3 Coaching simulation.

As a literacy leader in a school/district, you have been asked to help facilitate the literacy professional development for teachers in the setting. There are no limitations in time or resources to develop this plan. Describe the following key considerations as you develop a plan that moves the whole district toward more effective literacy instruction and meets the needs of individual teachers and paraprofessionals.

- a. Discuss the importance and need for professional development in literacy for teachers to assist in becoming more knowledgeable, critical and transformative in your practice. Be sure to include the impact of teacher attitude and dispositions on the literacy learning of *all* students. (IRA Standards 1.3, 6.2, 6.3, COE Standard 1)
- b. Discuss the sources of information that will guide you and other literacy leaders in development of a plan of professional development. Include discussion about how adult learning, organizational change and school culture can impact planning. (IRA Standards 1.3, 6.1, 6.2; COE Standards 1, 3)
- c. Describe options for professional development with individuals and groups in the school/district setting. Discuss how you will determine the types of goals, activities and resources you might incorporate to bring about positive change over time. In addition to moving the school/district toward more effective and inclusive literacy instruction for all students, how you work with teachers and paraprofessionals in their progress toward individual professional goals? Don't forget that in addition to advocating for best practices in literacy, you want to include the importance of multicultural literacy and social advocacy. (IRA Standards 1.3, 4.1, 4.3, 6.3; COE Standards 2, 3)
- d. Discuss the measures you will use to evaluate the success of the overall plan and provide feedback to participants. How will you know the overall plan is successful? How can you help teachers evaluate and improve their individual literacy practices? How will you reflect on and improve your own growth as a literacy leader? (IRA Standard 6.3; COE Standard 1)
- e. A school/district professional development plan impacts literacy instruction at a local level. Discuss ways that you may empower yourself, teachers, or others to understand and influence community, state, or national policy decisions related to literacy. How you can make a difference outside of your school district in advocating for best practices in literacy as well as access and equity for all learners? (IRA Standards 6.4; COE Standards 1, 3)

**TAKE-HOME COMPONENT: Submit response via LiveText for review to LewisRandL account, within one week of the in-person exam date. See attached directions for creating and submitting the document.**

**Question 3:** Research-based, Foundational Knowledge of Reading and Writing Processes, Instruction, and Diversity  
Addresses IRA Standards 1 and 2; Lewis University College of Education Standard 1

Describe your approach to literacy instruction addressing the areas below. Reflect on your learning and the work you have done in this program, considering the IRA Standards and the COE Standards. To help you frame your response, you may refer to a specific grade level or situation, describe examples of work you have done in the program or in your school, or describe excellent examples of practice that you have observed. Provide a list in APA format of all references you cite.

- a. First, describe the theoretical and/or research foundations on which your knowledge is based. Make reference to specific and multiple sources from across the program and discuss how these theories or studies help us understand the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural factors that are involved in how students become fully literate individuals. How have these theoretical/research foundations helped you transform your own practice? (IRA Standards 1.1, 1.3; COE Standard 1)
- b. Next, comment on the historical development of knowledge in the literacy profession, noting major ways that the perceptions of reading and writing have changed over time. Discuss the enduring aspects of this history that align with your theoretical perspective. (IRA Standards 1.2; COE Standard 1)
- c. Based on your theoretical and foundational knowledge, discuss the elements that are essential to include in an integrated, comprehensive, balanced literacy curriculum for the grade level of your choice. (IRA Standards 1.1, 1.3, 2.1; COE Standard 1)



## Scoring Rubric

Comprehensive Exams are evaluated by 2-3 instructors from the Reading and Literacy program. The Comprehensive Exam Rubric for the Graduate Programs in the College of Education is used for evaluation purposes.

### Question 1 Rubric

Standard (IRA 2010 or COE)	Unacceptable (0)	Developing/Acceptable (1)	Target (2)
3.1 Candidates understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.	Provides no discussion about the assessment tools used to assess the student or offers inaccurate or inappropriate descriptions or uses for the assessment tools.	Demonstrates understanding of assessments used.	Describes the assessment tools used to assess the student and describes their use for assessing the performance of the reader. Notes appropriate additional assessments.
3.2 Candidates select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes.	Does not appropriately interpret assessment results. Does not identify additional assessments or suggests inappropriate assessments.	Interprets results adequately to identify student needs or strengths. Notes additional assessments to be used.	Appropriately and thoroughly interprets assessments in the profile. Identifies additional assessments that would be effective.
3.3 Candidates use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.	Recommendations do not logically flow from information provided.	Recommendations fit the given profile.	Recommendations are clearly appropriate and fit with a logical interpretation of the provided information.
3.4 Candidates communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences.	Written response is difficult to follow and does not assume a teacher audience.	Written response is clear. Results/implications reported are consistent with the given profile.	Written response is clear and is clearly geared for a teacher to follow. Results/implications are appropriate for the profile.
4.2 Candidates use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.	Diversity of the group and context is not considered.	Diversity is considered in the written response.	Written response positively incorporates diversity in appropriate practices and discussion.
5.1 Candidates design the physical environment to optimize students' use of traditional print, digital, and online resources in reading and writing instruction.	Transformation of the literate environment is superficially considered as a matter of adding materials or is minimally or	Discusses the transformation of the environment through appropriate use of resources, choice, support, routines, and varied configurations to support student learning. Considers a variety of resources in the instructional recommendations. Addresses issues of justice in	Provides suggestions for coaching a teacher in the transformation of the environment through appropriate use of resources, choice, support, routines, and varied configurations to
5.2 Candidates design a social environment that is low risk			

and includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write.	inappropriately addressed.	suggestions for transforming the environment and/or the instructional recommendations. Provides appropriate guidance for a teacher.	create an optimal environment for literacy learning. Considers a variety of resources in the instructional recommendations. Addresses issues of justice in suggestions for transforming the environment and/or the instructional recommendations.	
5.3 Candidates use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another, discussions, and peer feedback).				
5.4 Candidates use a variety of classroom configurations (i.e., whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction.				
2.2 Candidates use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections.	Recommended approaches are inappropriate for the identified profile or are not varied in number or type.	Recommended approaches are appropriate for the profile and are described sufficiently for a teacher to implement.	Recommended approaches thoroughly address the profile and represent effective ways to transform practice for the identified students. Provides appropriate guidance for a teacher.	
2.3 Candidates use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.	Texts suggested are limited or inappropriate.	Texts suggested incorporate different resources and types, and are appropriate for the profile.	Texts suggested are well considered for the profile, and represent a wide range of resources and types.	
<b>Multicultural Educator - culturally responsive pedagogy</b>	Refutes the value of the cultural context and/or its implications.	Does not identify the cultural context and/or its implications.	Recognizes the cultural context of classroom and community; provides examples of educational decisions that support culturally responsive pedagogy.	Critically analyzes and evaluates the implementation of educational decisions that are responsive to the cultural context. Provides examples to support his/her response.
<b>Social Justice Advocate - knowledge and commitment</b>	Unwilling to acknowledge and advocate for social justice issues.	Uninformed about the importance of social justice issues in his/her role as an educator.	Acknowledges social justice issues and gives examples of social justice advocacy.	Demonstrates knowledge of social justice issues and identifies relevant communities to bring about change.

## Question 2 Rubric

Standard (IRA 2010 or COE)	Unacceptable (0)	Developing/Acceptable (1)		Target (2)
1.3 Candidates understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.	Does not consider the impact of the teacher on student literacy learning.	Considers the impact of teacher on student literacy learning.		Addresses appropriate impact of teacher on literacy learning.
6.1 Candidates demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning theories and related research about organizational change, professional development, and school culture.	Written response provides little or no evidence that candidate understands concepts of adult learning and/or change.	Written response acknowledges concepts of adult learning and change.		Response demonstrates understanding of adult learning and related research/theories.
6.2 Candidates display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.	Little evidence of the consideration of the impact of teacher dispositions on literacy teaching and learning is evident in response.	Response acknowledges the role and impact of a teacher's dispositions on student literacy learning and notes the importance of the pursuit of professional development.		Understanding of the impact of one's own and other teachers' dispositions on literacy learning and the importance of literacy professional development is evident in response.
6.3 Candidates participate in, design, facilitate, lead, and evaluate effective and differentiated professional development programs.	Described plan is inappropriate or unrealistic or lacks components that would make it effective in practice.	Described plan addresses appropriate goals, activities, resources, and evaluation.		Described plan incorporates components that would make it effective in bringing about positive change.
4.1 Candidates recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write.	Diversity and social justice advocacy is not considered or is inappropriately or stereotypically addressed.	Diversity and social justice advocacy is considered in the overall plan.		Diversity and social justice advocacy are well incorporated into the plan.
4.3 Candidates develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity.				
6.4 Candidates understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions.	Little or no attempt is made to address how one would influence others for policy change; suggestions made are inappropriate.	Considers appropriate ways to influence others.		Thoughtfully and appropriately discusses ways to influence outside of one's own local sphere.
<b>Critical Transformative Educator - demonstrates the belief that</b>	Denies the need to create critical, equitable	Does not recognize the need to create critical, equitable	Begins to create critical, equitable educational	Creates critical, equitable educational

<b>each student can learn</b>	educational opportunities and experiences.	educational opportunities and experiences. Is unaware of critical pedagogy or its relevance in 21 <sup>st</sup> century classrooms.	opportunities and experiences for staff or students through instructional design and delivery and/or professional development and supervision of staff. Supports critical instructional design and implementation in order to provide a culturally relevant education that is meaningful for all students.	opportunities and experiences for staff or students through culturally relevant instructional design and delivery and/or professional development and supervision of staff. Advocates for critical education and implementation in order to provide a culturally relevant education that is meaningful for all students.
<b>Reflective Practice</b>	Unable to accept constructive criticism and feedback; unwilling to engage in critical reflection for personal professional growth and development.	Unable to utilize reflection for personal professional growth and development.	Begins to engage in critical reflection in order to determine areas of needed personal and professional growth, and begins to accept constructive criticism and feedback.	Engages in on-going critical reflection in order to determine areas of personal and professional needed growth; seeks constructive feedback and dialogue regarding personal development and professional practice.
<b>Multicultural Educator - culturally responsive pedagogy</b>	Refutes the value of the cultural context and/or its implications.	Does not identify the cultural context and/or its implications.	Recognizes the cultural context of classroom and community; provides examples of educational decisions that support culturally responsive pedagogy.	Critically analyzes and evaluates the implementation of educational decisions that are responsive to the cultural context. Provides examples to support his/her response.
<b>Social Justice Advocate - knowledge and commitment</b>	Unwilling to acknowledge and advocate for social justice issues.	Uninformed about the importance of social justice issues in his/her role as an educator.	Acknowledges social justice issues and gives examples of social justice advocacy.	Demonstrates knowledge of social justice issues and identifies relevant communities to bring about change.

### Question 3 Rubric

Standard (IRA 2010 or COE)	Unacceptable (0)	Developing/Acceptable (1)	Target (2)
1.1 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.	Does not cite or provide references for theories/research. Misinterprets or misrepresents theories and/or research that are mentioned. Mentions unfounded or untenable studies or theories. Fails to connect to cognitive, linguistic, motivational, or sociocultural factors.	Provides references for theories/research. Mentions appropriate theories and/or research. Attempts to connect to cognitive, linguistic, motivational, or sociocultural factors	Provides references for theories/research. Describes theories and/or research. Studies or theories are well grounded and connected to cognitive, linguistic, motivational, or sociocultural factors
1.2 Candidates understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components.	Misrepresents or fails to note history of literacy knowledge. Does not connect history with theory/research.	Notes key ideas/movements in the historical development of literacy. Attempts to link aspects of this history with the theory/research that is noted above.	Explains key ideas/movements in the historical development of knowledge in the literacy profession, notes ways perceptions of literacy have changed and links history to theory/research.
2.1 Candidates use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.	No apparent connection between theory and practice. Fails to note practices or mentions ways to address word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, or reading–writing connections that are not sound or reasonable for the identified level.	Attempts to link theory to practice. Notes appropriate ways to address or emphasize word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections for the identified level.	Links theory to practice and notes effective ways to address or emphasize word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections within that theoretical perspective.
1.3 Candidates understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students’ reading	Notes a few things that were learned but does not describe how knowledge gained has impacted one’s own practice	Describes new learning and notes ways that knowledge gained has been implemented in one’s practice to impact students’ reading.	Reflects on learning and describes ways that knowledge gained has transformed or































development and achievement.	as a literacy professional in a transformational way.			will transform one's own practice as a literacy professional.
<b>COE 1: Research Based Pedagogical Practices</b>	Contradicts the value of research based practices and educational theory.	Does not reference or inaccurately represents research based practices.	Discusses application of research that supports developmental and pedagogical practices; includes multiple references and specific examples.	Discusses application and evaluates research that supports developmental and pedagogical practices; includes multiple references and specific examples.

**Data Results-SPA Assessment #2: Comprehensive Examination**

<b>Question 1: Assessment &amp; Diagnosis, Addressing Diversity, Instructional Strategies, and Curriculum Materials</b>		Spring, 2012 n=			Summer, 2012 n=		
		T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 1</b>	<p>IRA 2010: 3.1 Candidates understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.</p> <p>Describes the assessment tools used to assess the student and describes their use for assessing the performance of the reader. Notes appropriate additional assessments.</p>	75%	25%	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 2</b>	<p>IRA 2010: 3.2 Candidates select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes.</p> <p>Appropriately and thoroughly interprets assessments in the profile. Identifies additional assessments that would be effective.</p>	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 3</b>	<p>IRA 2010: 3.3 Candidates use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.</p> <p>Recommendations are clearly appropriate and fit with a logical interpretation of the provided information.</p>	75%	0%	25%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 4</b>	<p>IRA 2010: 3.4 Candidates communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences. Written response is clear and is clearly geared for a teacher to follow. Results/implications are appropriate for the profile.</p>	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 5</b>	<p>IRA 2010: 4.2 Candidates use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.</p> <p>Written response positively incorporates diversity in appropriate practices and discussion.</p>	75%	0%	25%	0%	100%	0%

<p><b>Rubric Item 6</b></p>	<p><b>IRA 2010: 5</b> Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, use of instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.</p> <p>Provides suggestions for coaching a teacher in the transformation of the environment through appropriate use of resources, choice, support, routines, and varied configurations to create an optimal environment for literacy learning. Considers a variety of resources in the instructional recommendations.</p> <p>Addresses issues of justice in suggestions for transforming the environment and/or the instructional recommendations.</p>	<p> 50%</p>	<p> 25%</p>	<p> 25%</p>	<p> 100%</p>	<p> 0%</p>	<p> 0%</p>
<p><b>Rubric Item 7</b></p>	<p><b>IRA 2010: 2.2</b> Candidates use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections.</p> <p>Recommended approaches thoroughly address the profile and represent effective ways to transform practice for the identified students.</p> <p>Provides appropriate guidance for a teacher.</p>	<p> 25%</p>	<p> 50%</p>	<p> 25%</p>	<p> 0%</p>	<p> 100%</p>	<p> 0%</p>
<p><b>Rubric Item 8</b></p>	<p><b>IRA 2010: 2.3</b> Candidates use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.</p> <p>Texts suggested are well considered for the profile, and represent a wide range of resources and types.</p>	<p> 25%</p>	<p> 50%</p>	<p> 25%</p>	<p> 0%</p>	<p> 100%</p>	<p> 0%</p>



Question 2: Professional Development		Spring, 2012 n=			Summer, 2012 n=		
		T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 9</b>	IRA 2010: 1.3 Candidates understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement. Addresses appropriate impact of teacher on literacy learning.	 75%	 25%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 10</b>	IRA 2010: 6.1 Candidates demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning theories and related research about organizational change, professional development, and school culture. Response demonstrates understanding of adult learning and related research/theories	 50%	 25%	 25%	 0%	 100%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 11</b>	IRA 2010: 6.2 Candidates display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors. Understanding of the impact of one's own and other teachers' dispositions on literacy learning and the importance of literacy professional development is evident in response.	 75%	 0%	 25%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 12</b>	IRA 2010: 6.3 Candidates participate in, design, facilitate, lead, and evaluate effective and differentiated professional development programs. Described plan incorporates components that would make it effective in bringing about positive change.	 50%	 50%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 13</b>	IRA 2010: 4.1 Candidates recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. 4.3 Candidates develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity. Diversity and social justice	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%

	advocacy are well incorporated into the plan.						
<b>Rubric Item 14</b>	<b>IRA 2010: 6.4</b> Candidates understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions. Thoughtfully and appropriately discusses ways to influence outside of one's own local sphere.	25%	50%	25%	0%	100%	0%
<b>Question 3: Research-based, Foundational Knowledge of Reading and Writing Processes, Instruction, and Diversity</b>							
		Spring, 2012 n			Summer, 2012 n		
		<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>Rubric Item 15</b>	<b>IRA 2010: 1.1</b> 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.  Provides references for theories/research. Describes theories and/or research. Studies or theories are well grounded and connected to cognitive, linguistic, motivational, or sociocultural factors	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 16</b>	<b>IRA 2010: 1.2</b> Candidates understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components.  Explains key ideas/movements in the historical development of knowledge in the literacy profession, notes ways perceptions of literacy have changed and links history to theory/research.	75%	25%	0%	0%	100%	0%

<p><b>Rubric Item 17</b></p>	<p><b>IRA 2010: 2.1</b> Candidates use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.</p> <p>Links theory to practice and notes effective ways to address or emphasize word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections within that theoretical perspective.</p>	<p> 75%</p>	<p> 25%</p>	<p> 0%</p>	<p> 0%</p>	<p> 100%</p>	<p> 0%</p>
<p><b>Rubric Item 18</b></p>	<p><b>IRA 2010: 1.3</b> Candidates understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.</p> <p>Reflects on learning and describes ways that knowledge gained has transformed or will transform one's own practice as a literacy professional.</p>	<p> 50%</p>	<p> 50%</p>	<p> 0%</p>	<p> 0%</p>	<p> 100%</p>	<p> 0%</p>

## **Unit/SPA Assessment #3: Evidence of Effective Practice Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample**

### **1. Narrative about Assessment #3**

#### **Description of the Assessment and Use in Program**

The Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample is completed in 52-533 *Methods and Strategies for Reading Comprehension Instruction, Including Instructional Practicum for the Reading Teacher*, which is one of the three courses designed to provide field experience for our candidates in the MA Reading Specialist program. This course is one that is typically taken about half way through the program. Candidates pre-assess student needs, develop tutoring plans, conduct tutoring sessions, evaluate student progress at the conclusion of the tutoring process and make recommendations to parents and teachers for continued support. This Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample, adapted from the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Work Sample, was developed because it provides a comprehensive performance assessment of candidate ability to provide effective reading instruction for students. This assessment evaluates candidates' ability to meet one of the key roles of a Reading Specialist as described in the IRA Standards 2010, "Specialist may have primary responsibility for working with struggling readers." Candidates on the Romeoville campus have an opportunity to work with students in an after school program at a partner school district. Candidates at the Tinley Park campus work with a student of their choice. Faculty provide supervision in both settings.

As indicated in the data chart, the criteria for the Design for Instruction task changed between the 2010 administration of the assessment and the 2011 administration. As we migrated the assessment to the 2010 standards, we also decided to expand the lesson and unit design component to highlight the importance of gradual release, language objectives, variety of instructional activities, and technology, since the previous criteria seemed to be lumped together and did not allow us to discriminate between success in the variety of elements that are important for instruction. In addition, a new section, Considering Diversity, was added with the 2010 Standards in order to encourage candidates to reflect on their need to consider student diversity when providing effective reading instruction for students.

#### **Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards**

The comprehensive Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample addresses a number of IRA Standards throughout the numerous tasks that exemplify the decision making that Reading Specialists must make in order to facilitate learning, reflect on their practice and inform others of student progress. The tasks of the Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample include: consideration of *Contextual Factors*, setting *Learning Goals*, development of an *Assessment Plan*, creation of a *Design for Instruction*, reflection on *Instructional Decision-Making*, *Analysis of Student Learning*, *Reflection and Self-Evaluation*, *Consideration of Diversity*, and *Tutoring Summary*. The tasks provide prompts with examples and recommended length of response. The tasks are general enough to be used in a variety of instructional contexts. In completing these tasks, the candidates demonstrate their ability to meet the IRA Standards listed with each task: Contextual Factors (IRA 1.3,

2.1, 4.1); Learning Goals (IRA 2.1.); Assessment Plan (IRA 3.2, 3.3, 3.4); Design for Instruction (IRA 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4); Instructional Decision-Making (IRA 2.1, 3.3, 4.2, 6.2); Analysis of Student Learning (IRA 1.3, 3.3); Reflection and Self-Evaluation (IRA 6.2); Consideration of Diversity (IRA 4.1, 4.2, 4.3); and Tutoring Summary (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 3.4, 6.2).

### **Summary of the Data**

The data chart includes scores from three applications of the assessment in two different semesters. Of the 32 candidates that completed this assessment during that time frame, all candidates received an Acceptable or Target rating in each task except for one candidate from the Tinley Park campus, who received unacceptable scores in Assessment Plan, Instructional Decision-Making, Analysis of Student Learning, Reflection and Self-Evaluation, Considering Diversity and Tutoring Summary. After an attempt to provide further mentoring with the candidate's work with the tutoring and the work sample, the candidate was counseled out of the program. We note that overall, our candidates received more Acceptable ratings than Target ratings in the areas of Contextual Factors – Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment – Technical Soundness and Adaptations in Fall, 2010. More instructional emphasis was placed on these areas and subsequently, candidate scores improved during the Fall, 2011 administrations.

### **Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards**

This assessment is so comprehensive that it requires candidates to demonstrate understanding and application of at least one element of each of the 2010 IRA Standards. We believe that the work sample format pushes already practicing educators to consciously move through the steps of effective reading instruction to meet the diverse needs of students. The data from Contextual Factors and Design for Instruction show that candidates meet Standard 1 (1.1, 1.3) understanding major theories and understanding the role of professional judgment as they plan instruction and consider the impact of student contexts on instruction. In addition the data from Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Design for Instruction, Instructional Decision-Making and Tutoring Summary show that candidates meet Standard 2 (2.1, 2.2, 2.3) by using foundational knowledge, appropriate and varied instructional approaches and a wide variety of texts after determining student contextual factors, designing instruction for the students, adapting instruction and developing a summary for parents. Candidate data from Assessment Plan, Instructional Decision-Making, Analysis of Student Learning and Tutoring Summary show that candidates meet Standard 3 (3.2, 3.3, 3.4) by being able to select and administer assessment, use the information to plan and evaluate instruction and communicate results to audiences. Candidate data from Contextual Factors, Design for Instruction, Instructional Decision-Making, and Consideration of Diversity demonstrate candidate proficiency with Standard 4 (4.1, 4.2, 4.3) by understanding and valuing forms of diversity, use of a literacy curriculum and instructional practices that impact student engagement with diversity and develop strategies to advocate for equity. Also, candidate data from Design for Instruction demonstrates candidate success with Standard 5 (5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4) by their ability to design the physical and social environment, using routines and using a variety of classroom configurations. Finally, candidate data from Instructional Decision-Making, Reflection and Self-Evaluation and Tutoring Summary show candidate success with Standard 6 (6.2) because of their positive dispositions and their reflection on personal professional development.

## 2. Complete Assessment Description

Lewis University College of Education  
Department of Reading and Literacy  
**Unit Assessment #3 (Evidence of effective practice)**  
**READING TEACHER**  
**TUTORING WORK SAMPLE**  
**52-533**

**Addresses IRA 2010 Standards for Reading Professionals**

The Reading Teacher Practicum in 52-533 includes 25 hours in which the candidate will complete field work (instructional practicum) that allows the candidate an opportunity to assess, develop instructional plans, and provide supportive instruction for a student. The Reading Teacher Work Sample provides the means for the candidate to document, report, and reflect on the entire field work experience.

The prompts and rubrics contained in this document were adapted from those developed by representatives of the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality. Director: Roger Pankratz [rogerapankratz@wku.edu](mailto:rogerapankratz@wku.edu)

### **Overview of the Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample (RTTWS)**

#### **The Vision**

Successful reading teacher candidates support learning by designing individualized instruction that includes a range of strategies and builds on each student's strengths, needs, and prior experiences. Through this performance assessment, reading teacher candidates provide credible evidence of the candidate's ability to facilitate learning by meeting the following work sample standards:

- The reading teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment. (IRA 1, 2, 4; LU COE 1, 2; ISBE 27.120.1; NETS 1)

- The reading teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals. (IRA 2; LU COE 1; ISBE 27.120.1)
- The reading teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during and after instruction. (IRA 3; LU COE 1; ISBE 27.120.2; NETS 1)
- The reading teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts. (IRA 1, 2, 4, 5; LU COE 1, 2; ISBE 27.120.1, 7; NETS 1)
- The reading teacher uses regular and systematic observation and evaluation of student learning to make instructional decisions. (IRA 2, 3, 4, 6; LU COE 1; ISBE 27.120.1, 2)
- The reading teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement. (IRA 1, 3; LU COE 1; ISBE 27.120.2)
- The reading teacher reflects on his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice. (IRA 6; LU COE 1, 3; ISBE 27.120.8)
- The reading teacher reflects on, values, and supports diversity in student experience and learning. (IRA 4; LU COE 2; ISBE 27.120.1)
- The reading teacher communicates tutoring goals, strategy instruction, learning progress and future recommendations with parents. (IRA 2, 3, 6; LU COE 1; ISBE 27.120.1, 2)

### **Your Assignment**

The following assignment description contains teaching processes identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning. The Prompts help you document the extent to which you have met each standard. The Standards and Rubrics will be used to evaluate your Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample.

You are required to tutor for 25 hours during this practicum. At the conclusion of tutoring, you will turn in a Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample that describes the contextual factors impacting your student, identifies learning goals based on standards and student strengths and needs, and describes an assessment plan for student learning and a plan for instruction. The Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample will also analyze student learning and require you to reflect upon and evaluate your teaching as related to student learning, as well as consider diversity in all aspects of the work sample tasks. Following completion of the RTTWS, you will also complete a brief summary suitable for sharing with parents.

### **RTTWS Format**

1. Complete a cover page that includes: your name, date, pseudonym and grade level of your student, university, course number and title.
2. Complete a table of contents that lists the sections and attachments in your RTTWS document with page numbers.
3. Charts, graphs and assessment instruments will be included in the RTTWS document. The tutoring instructional log and plans will also be included. Other attachments may include student work that provides evidence of your performance and your students' learning progress. Do not include any actual student or teacher names or identification in any part of the RTTWS.
4. A suggested page length for the narrative is given at the end of each component section. The narrative sections should not exceed twenty-five word processed pages, double-spaced in 12-point font, with 1-inch margins.
5. References and credits should be cited in a separate section at the end of your narrative and written in APA style.

### **RTTWS Task 1: Contextual Factors**

*The reading teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set leaning goals and plan instruction and assessment.*

*(IRA 1, 2, 4; LU COE 1, 2; ISBE 27.120.1; NETS 1)*

IRA 1.3: Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.

- Model fair-mindedness, empathy and ethical behavior in teaching students and in working with other professionals.
- Communicate the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy and ethical behavior in literacy instruction and professional behavior

IRA 2.1: Use foundational knowledge to design and/or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.

- Develop and implement the curriculum to meet the specific needs of readers who struggle with reading.

IRA 4.1: Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write.

- Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which certain qualities of diversity influence the reading and writing development of student who struggle with reading and writing.
- 

Discuss relevant factors and how they may affect the teaching-learning process. Include any supports and challenges that affect instruction and student learning.

#### **Prompt**

In your discussion include:

- **Community, district, school, or classroom factors.** Address the characteristics of the student's background, community, school, or classroom that may affect learning. You may want to consider geographic location, community and school population, socio-economic



profile and race/ethnicity. You might also address such things as stability of community, political climate, community support for education, class size and resources, and other environmental factors.

- **Student characteristics.** Address student characteristics you must consider as you design instruction and assess learning. Include factors such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, special needs, achievement/developmental levels, culture, language, interests, learning skills and prior learning that may influence the development of your learning goals, instruction and assessment. Include discussion of pertinent psychological, sociological and linguistic foundations of reading. Avoid discussing student characteristics from a deficit point of view.
- **Instructional implications.** Address how contextual characteristics for this student have implications for instructional planning and assessment. Consider the main components of reading instruction in your planning. Include specific instructional implications for at least two characteristics and any other factors that will influence how you plan and implement instruction for this student.

**Suggested Page Length:** 1-2

---

## **RTTWS Task 2: Learning Goals**

*The reading teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals. (IRA 2; LU COE 1; ISBE 27.120.1)*

IRA 2.1: Use foundational knowledge to design and/or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.

- Develop and implement the curriculum to meet the specific needs of readers who struggle with reading.
- 

### **Task 2 Prompt**

Provide and justify the learning goals for the tutoring sessions.

- **List the learning goals** (not the activities) that will guide the planning, delivery and assessment of your tutoring sessions. These goals should define what you expect the student to know and be able to do at the end of the tutoring. The goals should be significant (reflect the big ideas or structure of the discipline) challenging, varied and appropriate. Number or code each learning goal so you can reference it later.
- **Show how the goals are aligned with local, state, or national standards** (identify the source of the standards). **Be sure to include reading comprehension, motivation, and other aspects of student's reading, based on identified strengths and needs.**
- **Describe the types and levels of your learning goals.**

- **In order to design your tutoring to meet the specific needs of the readers with whom you are working, discuss why your learning goals are appropriate in terms of development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills; and other student needs.**

**Suggested Page Length:** 1-2

---

### **RTTWS Task 3: Assessment Plan**

*The reading teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during and after instruction. (IRA 3; LU COE 1; ISBE 27.120.2; NETS 1)*

IRA 3.2: Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes.

- Administer and interpret appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.

IRA 3.3: Use assessment information to plan and to evaluate instruction.

- Analyze and use multiple data sources to analyze individual reader's performance and to plan instruction and/or intervention.
- Analyze and use assessment data to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices and students' responses to instruction.

IRA 3.4: Communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences

- Analyze and report assessment results to a variety of appropriate audiences for relevant implications, instructional purposes, and accountability.
  - Demonstrate the ability to communicate results of assessments to various audiences.
- 

#### **Task 3 Prompt**

Design an assessment plan to monitor student progress toward the learning goals. Use a range assessment tools and approaches, appropriate for assessing reading comprehension, attitude, and motivation. Plan to assess student learning before, during and after instruction. These assessments should authentically measure student learning and may include performance-based tasks, paper-and-pencil tasks, or personal communication. Describe why your assessments are appropriate for measuring learning.

- **Provide an overview of the assessment plan.** For each learning goal include: assessments used to judge student performance, format of each assessment, and adaptations of the assessments for the individual needs of the student, based on pre-assessment and contextual factors. The purpose of this overview is to depict the alignment between learning goals and assessments and to show adaptations to meet the individual needs of students or contextual factors. You may use a visual organizer such as a table, outline, or other means to make your plan clear.

- **Describe the assessments that are aligned with your learning goals and will help you determine student progress.** Clearly explain any pre- and post-assessments and describe the assessments you plan to use to check on student progress throughout the tutoring. Comment on how you will use the information to inform instruction for this student. Although formative assessment may change as you are teaching, your task here is to predict at what points in your teaching it will be important to assess student progress toward learning goals. Be careful not to describe an assessment plan that takes more time and importance than the instruction it is supposed to support. Discuss how directions and procedures will be made clear to the student and the criteria you will use to determine if the student's performance meets the learning goals. Include copies of assessments, prompts, and/or student directions.

**Suggested Page Length:** 1+ assessment instruments, scoring rubrics/keys or directions.

---

### **RTTWS Task 4: Design for Instruction**

*The reading teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts. (IRA 1, 2, 4, 5; LU COE 1, 2; ISBE 27.120.1, 7; NETS 1)*

IRA 1.1: 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.

- Analyze classroom environment quality for fostering individual motivation to read and write (e.g., access to print, choice, challenge and interests).

IRA 2.1: Use foundational knowledge to design and/or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.

- Develop and implement the curriculum to meet the specific needs of readers who struggle with reading.

IRA 2.2: Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading/writing connections.

- Use instructional approaches that are supported by literature and research.
- Provide appropriate in-depth instruction for all readers and writers and especially for those who struggle with reading and writing.
- Support classroom teachers and/or education support personnel to implement instructional approaches for all students.

IRA 2.3: Use a wide range of texts [narrative, expository, poetry, etc.] and traditional print and online resources.

- Support classroom teachers in building and using a quality accessible, classroom library and materials collection that meets the specific needs and abilities of all learners.

IRA 4.1: Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write.

- Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.

IRA 4.2: Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.

- Provide differentiated instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online resources, that capitalize on diversity.

IRA 5.1: Design the physical environment to optimize students' use of traditional print and online resources in reading and writing instruction.

- Arrange instructional areas to provide easy access to books and other materials for a variety of individual, small group and whole class activities and support teachers in doing the same.
- Modify the arrangement to accommodate students' changing needs.

IRA 5.2: Design a social environment that is low-risk, includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write.

- Create a supportive social environment for all students, especially those who struggle with reading.
- Support teachers and/or other professionals in doing the same for all readers.

IRA 5.3: Use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another; conducting discussions, giving peer feedback).

- Understand the role of routines in creating and maintaining positive learning environments for reading and writing instruction using traditional print and online resources.
- Create effective routines for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.
- Support teachers in doing the same for all readers.

IRA 5.4: Use a variety of classroom configurations (whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction.

- Use evidenced-based grouping practices to meet the needs of all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.

---

#### **Task 4 Prompt**

Describe how you will design your instruction related to learning goals, the student characteristics and needs, and the specific learning context. Include all session plans and notes (tutoring log) in this section.

- **Accurate Representation of Content: Comprehension Strategies.** Describe at least two reading comprehension strategies that you will teach and explain a variety of instructional techniques that you will use to teach the student these strategies. The strategies and instructional techniques you choose should be supported by current literature and research in reading. Your tutoring plans/log should show when and how you implemented the techniques you describe.
- **Grouping and Professional Collaboration.** Describe the grouping strategies that you recommend to best address the learning goals and provide meaningful strategy instruction for students. Be sure to include a variety of grouping options. If you are working with a single student, describe what you would recommend for grouping for this student in the classroom. Discuss how you would collaborate with the teacher or other professionals to implement instruction.
- **Lesson Design and Gradual Release of Responsibility:** Outline an overall plan for the tutoring sessions. Use a visual organizer such as a block plan or outline to make your overall plan clear. Following this overview, discuss how you have built into your planning an approach to Gradual Release of Responsibility, and how this was accomplished in your instruction (give examples of the modeling, guided, and independent practice that you used). Also discuss the language objectives that you incorporated into your planning, where appropriate, and how these are designed to support English Language Learners as well as striving readers. As you progress, add copies of each of the tutoring instructional session plans, including your reflections on prior sessions and relevant assessment data, so that all session plans are included. In the overall plan and in each of the instructional plans include the following:
  - **Alignment of Learning Goals:** Be sure to indicate the goal or goals (coded from your Learning Goals section) that you are addressing in each activity. Make sure that every goal is addressed by at least one activity and that every activity relates to at least one goal.
  - **Language Objectives:** If the student(s) you are working with are identified as such, or if required for your situation, include language objectives appropriate for English language learners. Consider these language objectives in your reflections.
  - **Variety of Instructional Approaches:** Use a wide range of instructional strategies and materials to support reading comprehension and motivation, other aspects of reading as appropriate to the student, and techniques to promote a literate environment.
- **Materials.** Describe the selection of curriculum materials, resources, books, and other items that you plan to use. Provide a rationale for the use of the selected materials that considers appropriateness for instruction, level, interest, and cultural and linguistic factors.
- **Technology.** Describe how you will use technology in your planning and/or instruction. If you do not plan to use any form of technology, provide your clear rationale for its omission.

**Suggested Page Length:** 3+ tutoring log entries

## **RTTWS Task 5: Instructional Decision-Making**

*The reading teacher uses regular and systematic observation and evaluation of student learning to make instructional decisions. (IRA 2, 3, 4, 6; LU COE 1; ISBE 27.120.1, 2)*

IRA 2.1: Use foundational knowledge to design and/or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.

- Develop and implement the curriculum to meet the specific needs of readers who struggle with reading.

IRA 3.3: Use assessment information to plan and to evaluate instruction.

- Analyze and use multiple data sources to analyze individual reader's performance and to plan instruction and/or intervention.
- Analyze and use assessment data to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices and students' responses to instruction.

IRA 4.2: Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.

- Provide differentiated instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online resources, that capitalize on diversity.

IRA 6.2: Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.

- Promote the value of reading and writing in and out of school by modeling a positive attitude toward reading and writing with students, colleagues, administrators, and parents and guardians.
  - Demonstrate effective use of technology for improving student learning.
- 

### **Task 5 Prompt**

Provide examples of instructional decision-making based on students' learning or responses.

- Using the reflections from individual tutoring sessions, explain one specific instructional decision that you made during tutoring. Cite specific evidence to support your answers to the following:
  - Describe the student's learning or response that caused you to rethink your plans. The student's learning or response may come from a planned formative assessment or another source (not the pre-assessment).
  - Describe what you did next and explain why you thought this would improve student progress toward the learning goal.
- Using the reflections from individual tutoring sessions, explain how you adjusted instruction to meet student needs throughout the duration of the tutoring. Focus on your evaluation of the student's learning, particularly concerning effective reading comprehension and motivation. Consider the modifications you made to the instructional strategies used to teach reading comprehension or promote motivation or attitude. Did you make changes in the modeling or dispositions exhibited in attempting to motivate the student to be a reader or writer?
- Describe the decisions you made to select and adapt materials for the student reading level, interest, background, or for other needs.
- Discuss the ways you collaborated with other educators to evaluate and revise the instructional decisions you made.

**Suggested Page Length:** 2-4

---

## **RTTWS Task 6: Analysis of Student Learning**

*The reading teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement. (IRA 1, 3; LU COE 1; ISBE 27.120.2)*

IRA 1.3: Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.

- Model fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior when teaching students and working with other professionals.

IRA 3.3: Use assessment information to plan and to evaluate instruction.

- Analyze and use multiple data sources to analyze individual reader's performance and to plan instruction and/or intervention.
- 

### **Task 6 Prompt**

Analyze your assessment data, including pre-post assessments and formative assessments to determine the student's progress related to the learning goals over the course of the tutoring. Focus on student learning and the evidence gathered during tutoring sessions. Recommend specific suggestions for ongoing instruction.

Note: Conclusions about your own teaching effectiveness drawn from this analysis should be provided in the "Reflections and Self-Evaluation" section. You will reflect on reasons why the student did or did not learn in that section.

In this section, you will analyze data to explain progress and achievement toward learning goals demonstrated by the individual student.

- Select one specific learning goal for which the student demonstrated growth. Use pre-, formative, and post-assessment data with examples of the student's work to draw conclusions about the extent to which this student attained the learning goal.

- Consider the tutoring sessions overall or another specific learning goal. Discuss the student’s learning, supporting your discussion with pre-, formative, and post-assessment data and examples of the student’s work. Discuss how the tutoring sessions have apparently impacted the student’s learning.
- Describe at least two specific recommendations for ongoing instruction that a parent, teacher, or the student may implement.

**Suggested Page Length: 3-4+ charts and student work examples**

---

### **RTTWS Task 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation**

*The reading teacher reflects on his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice. (IRA 6; LU COE 1, 3; ISBE 27.120.8)*

IRA 6.2: Display positive dispositions related to one’s own reading and writing and the teaching or reading and writing and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.

- Promote the value of reading and writing in school and out of school by modeling a positive attitude towards reading and writing with students, colleagues, administrators, and parents.
- Demonstrate effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership skills.

---

#### **Task 7 Prompt**

Reflect on your performance as a teacher and link your performance to student learning results. Evaluate your performance and identify future actions for improved practice and professional growth. Also, consider your own learning as a reading professional.

- Select the learning goal for which you student was most successful. Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors under your control.
- Select the learning goal for which your student was least successful. Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors under your control. Discuss what you could do differently or better in the future to improve your student’s learning.
- Discuss your own learning about reading instruction and your own practice as a reading teacher. Reflect on possibilities for your own professional development. Describe at least two professional learning goals that emerged from your insights and experiences in the tutoring practicum. Identify two specific steps you will take to grow as a reading professional in the critical area(s) you identified.



**Suggested Page Length: 2**

---

**RTTWS Task 8:  
Considering Diversity**

*The reading teacher reflects on, values, and supports diversity in student experience and learning. (IRA 4; LU COE 2; ISBE 27.120.1)*

IRA 4.1: Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write.

- Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which certain qualities of diversity influence the reading and writing development of student who struggle with reading and writing.

IRA 4.2: Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs and engagement with the features of diversity.

- Use curriculum materials and instructional practices that are sensitive to the needs of all students and that represent an array of diversity.

IRA 4.3: Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity.

- Provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link their communities with the school.
  - Collaborate with teachers, parents and guardians, and administrators to implement policies and instructional practices that promote equity and draw connections between home and community literacy and school literacy.
- 

Reflect on each of the sections of this work sample and note how diversity is addressed in each.

**Task 8 Prompt**

- Tasks 1-2: Consider the contextual factors and comment on how the diversity evident in the setting influences the reading and writing development of the students with whom you worked. Discuss how this influenced the development of your learning goals.
- Tasks 3-4: Describe the ways in which your assessment plan and design for instruction were responsive to diversity in the setting. Note the ways in which the instruction, materials, and other resources you used capitalized on diversity.
- Tasks 5-6: Discuss the ways you considered diversity in your instructional decision-making and analysis of student learning. Note the decisions and practices that were particularly responsive to diversity.
- Task 7: Discuss how you worked to recognize your own culture and to teach in ways that were responsive to students' diverse backgrounds. Note how you would work to advocate for diversity if you were to continue in the setting in the coming year.

- Task 8: Note the ways you would make changes in the future to provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link their communities to the school. Comment also on ways you could help students value differences and understand and respect others, particularly the contributions of diverse people and traditions to literacy learning.

**Suggested Page Length: 2-4**

## **RTTWS: Tutoring Summary**

*The reading teacher communicates tutoring goals, strategy instruction, learning progress and future recommendations with parents. (IRA 2, 3, 6; LU COE 1; ISBE 27.120.1, 2)*

IRA 2.1: Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated comprehensive and balanced curriculum.

- Develop and implement the curriculum to meet the specific needs of students who struggle with reading.
- Support teachers and other personnel in the design, implementation and evaluation of the reading and writing curriculum for all students.

IRA 2.2: Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections.

- Use instructional approaches supported by literature and research for the following areas: concepts of print, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, critical thinking, motivation, and writing.
- Support classroom teachers and education support personnel to implement instructional approaches for all students.

IRA 3.4: Communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences:

- Analyze and report assessment results to a variety of appropriate audience for relevant implications, instructional purposes, and accountability.
- Demonstrate the ability to communicate results of assessments to various audiences.

Lewis University College of Education  
Department of Reading and Literacy

Tutoring Summary and Recommendations—Fall 2011

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Grade \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_

Tutor \_\_\_\_\_ Number of Sessions \_\_\_\_\_ Total Tutoring Hours \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Assessment Information at Start of Tutoring:**

Briefly provide names of assessments and overall results. For example,

The December 2007 DRA score provided by the teacher indicates that Jamil is reading at a 3<sup>rd</sup> grade level.

Running Records with 3<sup>rd</sup> grade level text showed that Jamil reads rapidly, he guesses at vocabulary words he does not know, and he does not attend to punctuation while reading. He did identify most basic sight words quickly and automatically.

The Burke Interview revealed that Jamil relies on the teacher to help him identify unknown words and that he reads quickly to get to the end of the book.

---

**Instructional Goals:**

1. Name the tutoring goals and provide rationale.

2. For example,

3. Jamil will monitor his reading for comprehension. He needs to see reading as a process of creating meaning rather than as a race to get to the end of the book.

---

**Description of Reading Instruction:**

1. For each instructional goal, briefly describe the reading comprehension strategy that you taught and the methods you used to help the student learn.

2. Keep this section brief and clear. For example,

3. To meet the goal that Jamil will monitor his reading, the tutor introduced the Visualizing strategy. The tutor and Jamil discussed the idea that Visualizing is like making a movie of what you read in your head. The tutor used think-alouds, pausing while reading to describe what she was thinking, to model how a reader creates images in the mind while reading. The tutor then had Jamil try pausing while reading to think aloud. After several practice sessions, Jamil was able to describe the images he was creating while reading.

---

**Student Performance at Conclusion of Tutoring:**

Provide assessment information and an overall statement of performance for each goal. Be brief and clear.

---

---

**Recommendations:**

Provide two or three recommendations that can easily be done at home to support continued learning. For example,

To help Jamil continue to monitor his reading, have Jamil pause at least once on each page and tell a family member or friend what he is thinking about what he is reading. He can also pause after each chapter to draw what he visualizes.

### 3. Scoring Rubric

## R&L UA/IRA 3: Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample 2010 Standards Rubric

### Contextual Factors Rubric

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Knowledge of Community, School, and Classroom Factors (1, 25%)</b> IL-ISBE-RS.1F IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.2.1 IRA-2010.2.1.5.b NETS-T-2008.1	Describes the characteristics of the student(s) background, community, school, or classroom that may affect learning.	Includes some of the characteristics of the student(s) background, community, school or classroom that may affect learning.	Displays minimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the characteristics of the student(s) background, community, school, and/or classroom
<b>Knowledge of Characteristics of Students (1, 25%)</b> IL-ISBE-RS.1F IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IRA-2010.2.1.5.b	Discusses characteristics of student(s) (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) related to the foundations of reading and writing that may affect learning. Includes, where relevant, any psychological or linguistic background information.	Mentions general student characteristics related to the foundations of reading and writing (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.	Displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge of student characteristics (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities, disabilities). Characteristics mentioned are not relevant to foundations of reading and writing.
<b>Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills and Prior Learning (1, 25%)</b> IL-ISBE-RS.1F IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IRA-	Notes student's learning experiences/approaches, language development and reading acquisition, including factors in student's skills and prior learning that may affect learning. Includes where appropriate any relevant variations in student's learning experiences related to cultural and linguistic diversity.	Mentions student's learning and reading acquisition, identifies student's skills and prior learning that may affect learning. Includes where appropriate any relevant variations in student's learning experiences related to cultural and linguistic diversity.	Displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge about the student's learning or skills. No knowledge of the diversity of language development and reading acquisition is evident.

<b>2010.2.1.5.b</b>			
<b>Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment (1, 25%) IL-ISBE-RS.1I IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IRA-2010.1.3 IRA-2010.4.1.5.a</b>	Provides specific implications for instruction and assessment based on knowledge of the major components of reading, student characteristics and community, school and classroom factors, in order to design instruction that meets specific needs of students.	Provides general implications for instruction and assessment based on knowledge of reading, identified student characteristics, and community, school, and classroom factors.	Does not provide implications for instruction and assessment based on the major components of reading, student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics OR provides inappropriate implications.

### Learning Goals Rubric

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Significance, Challenge, and Variety (1, 33%) IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL-ISBE-RS.1G IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IRA-2010.2.1 IRA-2010.2.1.5.b</b>	Specifies learning goals for reading comprehension, motivation, and other aspects of student's reading, based on identified strengths and needs. Goals are significant and appropriately challenging for the student.	Specifies learning goals for reading comprehension, motivation, and other aspects of student's reading. Goals are appropriately challenging for the student.	Goals are lacking in variety or do not address specific aspects of reading. Goals do not present a challenge.
<b>Appropriateness for Students (1, 33%) IL-ISBE-RS.1G IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee IRA-2010.2.1.5.b</b>	Goals are appropriate for the student's current development, considering prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences, and other student needs. Where appropriate, goals include consideration of differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	Some goals are appropriate for the student, considering prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences, and other student needs, including student's cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	Goals are not appropriate for the student's development, prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences, or other student needs or cultural and linguistics backgrounds.
<b>Alignment with Standards (1, 33%) IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IRA-2010.2.1</b>	Goals are explicitly aligned with national, state or local standards for student reading development.	Some goals are aligned with national, state or local standards.	Goals are not aligned with national, state, or local standards and do not reflect the major components of reading.

## Assessment Plan Rubric

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction (1, 33%)</b> <b>IL-ISBE-RS.2 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IRA-2010.3 IRA-2010.3.3</b>	<p>Outlines or describes plan for assessing each of the learning goals.</p> <p>Describes use of assessments to plan instruction.</p>	<p>Outlines plan for assessing some of the learning goals. Mentions how results of assessments will be used.</p>	<p>A specific assessment plan is not clearly identified, or assessments are not clearly linked with learning goals or instruction.</p>
<b>Modes and Approaches (1, 33%)</b> <b>IL-ISBE-RS.2 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.3 NETS-T-2008.1</b>	<p>The assessment plan includes a variety of assessment tools and practices appropriate to inform reading comprehension instruction.</p> <p>Student performance is assessed throughout the instructional sequence; assessments will be used to plan and evaluate instruction but assessment does not take precedence over instruction.</p>	<p>The assessment plan includes tools and practices appropriate to inform reading comprehension instruction.</p> <p>Student performance is assessed throughout the instructional sequence.</p>	<p>The assessment plan includes only one assessment and does not assess students before, during, and after instruction.</p> <p>Assessments are not appropriate to inform reading instruction.</p>
<b>Technical Soundness and Adaptations (1, 33%)</b> <b>IL-ISBE-RS.2 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.3.2 IRA-2010.3.4 NETS-T-2008.1</b>	<p>Discusses how assessment directions and procedures will be made clear to the student. If appropriate, indicates adaptations to assessments to meet the individual needs of the student, considering student development, cultural or linguistic background.</p>	<p>Discusses assessment directions and procedures. If appropriate, indicates adaptations to assessments to meet the individual needs of the student, considering student development, cultural or linguistic background.</p>	<p>Directions and procedures are not considered or are apparently confusing to students.</p> <p>Assessments are not appropriate for the development, cultural, or linguistic background of the student.</p>

## Design for Instruction Rubric

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Accurate Representation of Content (1, 14%)</b> <b>IL-ISBE-RS.1 IRA-2010.2.1 IRA-2010.2.2 IRA-2010.2.2.5.a</b>	Discusses at least two comprehension strategies. Instructional plans and discussion of strategies demonstrate an understanding of reading instruction, including an in-depth understanding of comprehension strategy instruction that is supported by literature and research.	Discusses two comprehension strategies. Instructional plans and discussion of strategies demonstrate an understanding of reading instruction, in general, and are accepted in current literature and/or research.	Discussion of comprehension strategies is limited. Instructional plans indicate inaccuracies in understanding of reading theory and practice. Reading comprehension appears to be viewed primarily as a result of practice with isolated skills.
<b>Grouping and Collaboration (1, 14%)</b> <b>IRA-2010.5.4 IRA-2010.5.4.5.a</b>	A variety of classroom configurations and evidence-based grouping practices are described that meet the needs of and provide meaningful strategy instruction for students. A variety of grouping options are addressed. Where the reading teacher is working with an individual student, suggestions are made for appropriate grouping during reading instruction outside of the tutoring session. Ideas for collaboration with the teacher or other professionals are appropriate.	Grouping strategies are described. Ideas for collaboration with the teacher or other professionals are appropriate.	Grouping strategies are limited or absent, or are inappropriate for instruction or the students. Ideas for collaboration are minimal or inappropriate.
<b>Lesson Design &amp; Gradual Release: Alignment with Learning Goals (1, 14%)</b> <b>IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IRA-2010.2.1</b>	All lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. All learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. All learning goals are covered in the design across the span of tutoring plans.	Most lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Most learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Most learning goals are covered in the design.	Few lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Few learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Not all learning goals are covered in the design.
<b>Lesson Design &amp; Gradual Release: Language</b>	Tutoring plans indicate that the activities, materials, and language	Tutoring plans indicate that the activities, materials, and language	Little or no consideration of language proficiency or literacy



<p><b>Objectives (1, 14%)</b>  <b>IL-ISBE-RS.1F IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IRA-2010.1.1 IRA-2010.1.1.5.e IRA-2010.4.2 IRA-2010.4.2.5.a WIDA.ELP.K-2.1 WIDA.ELP.K-2.2</b></p>	<p>used are well considered for the literacy and language proficiency of the student(s). Language objectives are included if appropriate for the context. All objectives are sound, well written, and fitting for student needs and growth.</p>	<p>used are appropriate for the literacy and language proficiency of the student(s). Language objectives are noted where appropriate. All objectives are achievable and well written.</p>	<p>level of the student is evident in the plans. If language objectives are included, they are not appropriate for the situation. Some objectives are ill suited to the student, context, or are poorly written.</p>
<p><b>Lesson Design &amp; Gradual Release: Variety of Instructional Approaches (1, 14%)</b>  <b>IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.2.1.5.b IRA-2010.2.2 IRA-2010.2.2.5.a IRA-2010.5.1 IRA-2010.5.2 IRA-2010.5.3 IRA-2010.5.3.5.b NETS-T-2008.1</b></p>	<p>All lessons are logically organized using routines and appear to be useful in moving the student(s) toward achieving the learning goals. Instructional sessions include optimal use of resources and specific modeling of reading and writing as valued lifelong activities. A wide range of instructional practices are included in instructional plans. Instructional approaches are supported by current research or literature. Instructional practices are appropriate for the learner's stage of development, cultural background, and language proficiency needs.</p>	<p>Lessons have some logical organization (routine is evident) and appear to be appropriate for achieving the learning goals. Some modeling of reading and writing as lifelong practices is included in the plans. Instructional practices are varied and appropriate. Some consideration of learners' literacy development and language proficiency needs is evident.</p>	<p>Lessons are not logically organized (e.g., lack of routine is evident). Few or no modeling or motivational activities are used. Instructional practices are limited in variety and/or are unsupported or inappropriate for the learners.</p>
<p><b>Use of a Variety of Texts, Resources and Technology (1, 14%)</b>  <b>IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL-ISBE-RS.7 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1dd IL-LEWIS-COE-</b></p>	<p>A wide range of texts and materials are included in instructional plans. Texts and materials are appropriate for the learner's stage of development, cultural background, and language proficiency needs. Traditional print, digital, and online resources used will</p>	<p>Some variety in texts and materials is included in instructional plans. Texts and materials are appropriate for the learner's stage of development or cultural and linguistic backgrounds, or language proficiency needs. Diversity is</p>	<p>Little variety of resources is evident. Heavy reliance on textbook or single resource (e.g., work sheets). No technology or diversity is mentioned, even if these are actually addressed during sessions. Resources are</p>

<p><b>2008.1ee IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IRA-2010.2.3 IRA-2010.4.1 NETS-T-2008.1</b></p>	<p>positively impact students' engagement with diversity. Where applicable, incorporates appropriate technology in a meaningful way to support learning. Discusses the use of technology to support learning.</p>	<p>considered in selection of traditional print, digital, and/or online resources. Where applicable, incorporates technology.</p>	<p>inappropriate for the students or negatively impact engagement with diversity.</p>
<p><b>Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources (1, 14%)</b> <b>IL-ISBE-RS.1 IRA-2010.2 IRA-2010.2.1.5.b</b></p>	<p>Provided lesson planning format is used, with assessment data, contextual information, and reflections on previous instruction included. It is clearly evident that the curriculum/plans implemented are appropriate and meet the needs of the students in the sessions, especially those struggling with reading. Most instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and assessment data.</p>	<p>Provided lesson planning format is used, with some assessment data, and contextual factors considered. Most elements of the plans appear to be productive and appropriate for the students' needs as struggling readers.</p>	<p>Provided lesson planning format is not used or plans are incomplete. Instruction has not been designed with reference to contextual factors and assessment data. Materials, activities and assignments do not appear productive and appropriate for the student.</p>

### Instructional Decision-making Rubric

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<p><b>Sound Professional Practice (1, 25%)</b> <b>IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL-ISBE-RS.1I IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.2.1 IRA-2010.2.1.5.a</b></p>	<p>Using the reflections from individual tutoring sessions, the tutor explains the instructional decisions that were made throughout the duration of the tutoring. Focus of discussion is on student learning, particularly concerning effective reading comprehension and motivation. (Teacher disposition for supporting student learning is evident in this focus.)</p>	<p>The tutor explains some instructional decisions made during tutoring sessions and considers student learning and motivation.</p>	<p>Instructional decisions as described are inappropriate and not necessarily related to promoting effective reading comprehension or motivation to read and learn. Disposition for supporting student learning is not clearly evident.</p>
<p><b>Modifications Based on</b></p>	<p>Modifications of the instructional plan to</p>	<p>Modifications of the instructional</p>	<p>Tutor does not make</p>

<p><b>Analysis of Student Learning and Learning Goals (1, 25%)</b>  <b>IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL-ISBE-RS.1I IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.3.3 IRA-2010.3.3.5.a IRA-2010.3.3.5.b</b></p>	<p>address the individual student needs and create a literate environment are informed by the analysis of student learning and an understanding of effective reading instruction, given the student's contextual factors.  Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals.</p>	<p>plan are made to address individual student needs, but these are loosely based on analysis of student learning or the tutor's understanding of effective reading instruction.  Modifications in instruction are somewhat congruent with learning goals.</p>	<p>modifications to the instructional plan or does not provide an explanation of how the changes that were made relate to analysis of student learning or an understanding of effective reading instruction.  Modifications in instruction lack congruence with learning goals.</p>
<p><b>Modifications for Diversity and Variety of Materials and Resources (1, 25%)</b>  <b>IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL-ISBE-RS.1H IL-ISBE-RS.1I IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IRA-2010.4.2 NETS-T-2008.1 WIDA.ELP.K-2.1</b></p>	<p>Modifications to the selection of materials and resources used are described and are appropriate to identified student needs and characteristics, particularly regarding diversity. The variety of materials/resources is considered, including books, other print materials, technologies, published research-based curricula, and teacher- and student-created materials. Materials and/or</p>	<p>Modifications to the selection of materials and resources used are described. A variety of materials/resources is evident.</p>	<p>Modifications to materials and resources used are described and are appropriate to identified student needs and characteristics.</p>
<p><b>Collaboration for Decision Making (1, 25%)</b>  <b>IL-ISBE-RS.6 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.6.2.5.d</b></p>	<p>Describes ways the tutor collaborated with other educators to evaluate and revise instructional decisions.</p>	<p>Mentions communicating with others about instructional decisions.</p>	<p>Does not address communication or collaboration with others about the decisions made.</p>

**Analysis of Student Learning Rubric**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<p><b>Alignment with Learning Goals (1, 20%)</b>  <b>IL-ISBE-RS.2 IL-</b></p>	<p>Student learning over the course of tutoring is discussed. Analysis of assessment data is fully aligned with learning goals.</p>	<p>Student learning over the course of tutoring is discussed. Analysis is somewhat aligned with learning goals.</p>	<p>Student learning is not considered over the course of the tutoring, or analysis of student learning is not aligned with learning goals</p>

<b>LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.3.3.5.b</b>			
<b>Interpretation of Data (2, 40%) IL-ISBE-RS.2 IL- LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE- 2008.2dd IRA-2010.1.3 IRA-2010.3.3</b>	Analysis of assessment data and interpretation of student learning is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data.	Discussion of student learning is limited to reporting of data or conclusions are not fully supported by data.	Interpretation/discussion is inaccurate, and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.
<b>Evidence of Impact on Student Learning (2, 40%) IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL-ISBE-RS.1G IL-ISBE-RS.2H IL-LEWIS-COE- 2008.1bb IRA- 2010.3.3.5.b</b>	Analysis of student learning includes discussion of the effectiveness of intervention and student responses to intervention. Provides relevant recommendations for ongoing instruction.	Analysis of student learning considers participation in tutoring sessions as a factor in the student's learning and provides recommendations for future instruction.	Analysis of student learning fails to include discussion of the tutoring sessions' impact on student learning and relevant recommendations for future instruction.

### Reflection & Self-evaluation Rubric

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Interpretation of Student Learning (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL- ISBE-RS.8 IL-LEWIS- COE-2008.1ff IL- LEWIS-COE-2008.3 IRA-2010.6.2</b>	Uses evidence to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. Explores hypotheses related to their own teaching of and/or dispositions for reading and writing, for why the student(s) did or did not meet learning goals.	Provides evidence but only simplistic or superficial reasons or hypotheses to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. Limited consideration of one's own teaching or dispositions related to reading and writing.	No evidence or reasons provided to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section
<b>Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.1 IL-</b>	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of	Provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others. Does not comment on the impact

<b>ISBE-RS.8 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ff IRA-2010.6.2</b>	thereof. Thoughtfully considers the impact of the tutor's own practice, dispositions, and modeling on the student's learning.	theory or research). Mentions impact of the tutor on student learning.	of the tutor on student learning.
<b>Alignment Among Goals, Instruction and Assessment (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.2L IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IRA-2010.6.2.5.d</b>	Logically connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.	Considers learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.	Does not connect learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction and/or the connections are irrelevant or inaccurate.
<b>Implications for Future Teaching (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.1I IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ff IRA-2010.6.2</b>	Discusses one's own learning about reading instruction and your own practice. Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, or assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning.	Mentions one's own learning as a reading teacher. Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment but no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.	Does not consider one's own learning as a reading teacher. Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment.
<b>Implications for Professional Development (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.2L IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.6.2</b>	Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals.	Presents professional learning goals that are related to the insights and experiences described in this section and provides a general plan for meeting the goals.	Provides no professional learning goals or presents goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section. No plan for meeting these goals is provided.

### Considering Diversity Rubric

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Tasks 1-2 (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.1F IL-ISBE-RS.8B IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd IRA-2010.4 IRA-</b>	Thoughtfully considers how the diversity evident in the setting influences the reading and writing development of the students and makes a clear connection to the development of learning goals	Notes how the diversity evident in the setting influences the reading and writing development of the students in the setting. Connects appropriately to the development of learning goals.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for how diversity is evident in the setting and influences learning goals.

<b>2010.4.1 WIDA.ELP.K-2.1</b>			
<b>Tasks 3-4 (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.1F IL-ISBE-RS.8B IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2 IRA-2010.4 IRA-2010.4.2 WIDA.ELP.K-2.1</b>	Describes how the assessment plan and design for instruction were responsive to diversity in the setting. Includes how the instruction, materials, and other resources used capitalized on diversity.	Describes diversity in the assessment plan and design for instruction Mentions diversity of instruction, materials, and other resources.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for how diversity was used to plan assessment and instruction.
<b>Tasks 5-6 (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.1F IL-ISBE-RS.8B IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2 IRA-2010.4 IRA-2010.4.2</b>	Discusses how diversity influenced instructional decision-making and analysis of student learning. Notes the decisions and practices that were particularly responsive to diversity.	Mentions considering diversity in the instructional decision-making and analysis of student learning.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas regarding the consideration of diversity in instructional decision-making or student learning.
<b>Task 7 (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.1F IL-ISBE-RS.8 IL-ISBE-RS.8A IL-ISBE-RS.8B IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2aa IRA-2010.4 IRA-2010.4.1</b>	Discusses the acknowledgement of the tutor's own culture and efforts made to teach in ways that were responsive to students' diverse backgrounds. Notes appropriate suggestions for advocating for diversity in this setting in the future.	Discusses one's own culture and mentions teaching in ways that were responsive to students' diverse backgrounds OR notes struggles experienced in acknowledging or incorporating diversity.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for cultural awareness or culturally responsive teaching.
<b>Task 8 (1, 20%) IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ff IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3 IRA-2010.4 IRA-2010.4.3 WIDA.ELP.K-2.1 WIDA.ELP.K-2.2</b>	Notes changes for their own practice that would provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link their communities to the school. Comments on how to help students value differences and understand and respect others, related to literacy learning.	Notes changes that would provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that reflect their diversity. Comments on how to help students value differences and understand and respect others.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for how to make effective change or advocate for diversity.

### Tutoring Summary

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Format (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.6 IL-LEWIS-COE-</b>	Provided format is used for the two-page summary of tutoring goals, strategy	Provided format is used. Clear and appropriate	Provided format is not used or language is excessively

<b>2008.1bb IRA-2010.6.2.5.d</b>	instruction, learning progress, and recommendations. Clear language that is appropriate for communication with parents is used; terms are explained. Demonstrates effective communication skills.	language is used. Demonstrates ability to use effective communication skills.	technical, inappropriate, or not clear.
<b>Goals and Instruction (2, 40%) IL-ISBE-RS.6 IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.2.2.5.c</b>	Goals are outlined along with a brief explanation of how the goals were determined for this student. Comprehension strategies taught are explained briefly. Specific methods that were most effective for this student are described in a way that will support parents and education personnel in understanding and implementing the methods.	Goals are outlined. Comprehension strategies are explained briefly. Methods that were used are mentioned.	Goals are not clear or are inappropriate. Strategies are mentioned but not explained. Methods used are not mentioned.
<b>Student Learning (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.2 IL-ISBE-RS.2H IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.3.4</b>	Student learning is discussed briefly with a focus on strengths or new insights, in a way that assists parents and others to understand the results and implications.	Student learning is discussed.	Assessment data are noted but student learning is not mentioned.
<b>Recommendations (1, 20%) IL-ISBE-RS.1I IL-ISBE-RS.6 IL-ISBE-RS.6H IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3 IRA-2010.2.1.5.c IRA-2010.2.2.5.c WIDA.ELP.K-2.1 WIDA.ELP.K-2.2</b>	Suggests ways the parent or teacher may continue to assist the student to apply the strategies taught. Describes recommendations in a way that will support parents and education personnel in implementing the recommended instructional approaches.	Suggests ways the parent or teacher may work with the student.	Does not explain recommendations or suggests activities that are new to the student or are not appropriate for home.

## 4. DATA CHART

### Data Results-SPA Assessment #3: Reading Teacher Tutoring Work Sample

		Fall, 2010 n=14 Romeoville Campus			Fall, 2011 n=11 Romeoville Campus			Fall, 2011 n=11 Tinley Park Campus		
		T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Contextual Factors</b>	Knowledge of Community, School, and Classroom Factors IRA 2.1	12 86%	2 14%	0 0%	11 100%	0 0%	0 0%	11 100%	0 0%	0 0%
	Knowledge of Characteristics of Students IRA 2.1	12 86%	2 14%	0 0%	11 100%	0 0%	0 0%	11 100%	0 0%	0 0%
	Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills and Prior Learning IRA 2.1	12 86%	2 14%	0 0%	11 100%	0 0%	0 0%	9 85%	2 14%	0 0%
	Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment IRA 1.3, 4.1	6 43%	8 57%	0 0%	11 100%	0 0%	0 0%	9 85%	2 14%	0 0%
<b>Learning Goals</b>	Significance, Challenge and Variety IRA 2.1	12 86%	2 14%	0 0%	11 100%	0 0%	0 0%	9 85%	2 14%	0 0%
	Appropriateness for Students IRA 2.1	13 93%	1 7%	0 0%	10 90%	1 9%	0 0%	9 85%	2 14%	0 0%
	Alignment with Standards IRA 2.1	13 93%	1 7%	0 0%	11 100%	0 0%	0 0%	11 100%	0 0%	0 0%
<b>Assessment</b>	Alignment with Learning	9	5	0	10	1	0	11	0	0



<b>Plan</b>	Goals and Instruction IRA 3.3	<b>64%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>14%</b>
	Modes and Approaches IRA 3.3	<b>10</b> <b>71%</b>	<b>4</b> <b>29%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>9</b> <b>81%</b>	<b>2</b> <b>18%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>14%</b>
	Technical Soundness and Adaptations IRA 3.2, 3.4	<b>6</b> <b>43%</b>	<b>8</b> <b>57%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>10</b> <b>90%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>9%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Design for Instruction</b>	Alignment with Learning Goals IRA (2003) 2.2, 2.3	<b>12</b> <b>86%</b>	<b>2</b> <b>14%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
	Lesson Design and Gradual Release: Alignment with Learning Goals IRA 2.1	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	Accurate Representation of Content IRA 2.1, 2.2	<b>13</b> <b>93%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>10</b> <b>90%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>9%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	Grouping and Collaboration IRA 5.4	<b>13</b> <b>93%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	Lesson Design and Gradual Release: Language Objectives IRA 1.1, 4.2	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	Lesson and Unit Structure IRA (2003) 4.2, 4.3	<b>13</b> <b>93%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
	Lesson Design & Gradual Release: Variety of Instructional Approaches IRA 2.1, 2.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments, Resources and/or Technology IRA (2003) 2.1, 2.2, 2.3	<b>13</b> <b>93%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
	Use of a Variety of Texts,	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>			

	Resources and Technology IRA 2.3, 4.1				<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources IRA 2.1	<b>13</b> <b>93%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Instructional Decision Making</b>	Sound Professional Practice IRA 2.1	<b>13</b> <b>93%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning and Learning Goals IRA 3.3	<b>12</b> <b>86%</b>	<b>2</b> <b>14%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>14%</b>
	Modifications for Diversity and Variety of Materials and Resources IRA 4.2	<b>8</b> <b>57%</b>	<b>5</b> <b>36%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>14%</b>
	Collaboration for Decision Making IRA 6.2	<b>8</b> <b>57%</b>	<b>5</b> <b>36%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>Analysis of Student Learning</b>	Alignment with Learning Goals IRA 3.3	<b>13</b> <b>93%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>10</b> <b>90%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>9%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>14%</b>
	Interpretation of Data IRA 1.3, 3.3	<b>13</b> <b>93%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>10</b> <b>90%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>9%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>14%</b>
	Evidence of Impact on Student Learning IRA 3.3	<b>13</b> <b>93%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>Reflection and Self-Evaluation</b>	Interpretation of Student Learning IRA 6.2	<b>14</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment IRA 6.2	<b>12</b> <b>86%</b>	<b>2</b> <b>14%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0%</b>

	Alignment Among Goals, Instruction and Assessment IRA 6.2	<b>12</b> <b>86%</b>	<b>2</b> <b>14%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	57%	28%	14%
	Implications for Future Teaching IRA 6.2	<b>14</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%
	Implications for Professional Development IRA 6.2	<b>11</b> <b>79%</b>	<b>2</b> <b>14%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>10</b> <b>90%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>9%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%
<b>Considering Diversity</b>	Tasks 1-2 IRA 4.1	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%
	Tasks 3-4 IRA 4.2	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>10</b> <b>90%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>9%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%
	Tasks 5-6 IRA 4.2	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>10</b> <b>90%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>9%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%
	Task 7 IRA 4.1	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%
	Task 8 IRA 4.3	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%
<b>Tutoring Summary</b>	Format IRA 6.2	<b>12</b> <b>86%</b>	<b>2</b> <b>14%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>11</b> <b>100%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%
	Goals and Instruction IRA 2.2	<b>11</b> <b>79%</b>	<b>3</b> <b>21%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>10</b> <b>90%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>9%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%
	Student Learning IRA 3.4	<b>13</b> <b>93%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>7%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>10</b> <b>90%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>9%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%
	Recommendations IRA 2.1, 2.2	<b>12</b> <b>86%</b>	<b>2</b> <b>14%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	<b>10</b> <b>90%</b>	<b>1</b> <b>4%</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0%</b>	85%	0%	14%

## **Practicum for the Reading Specialist (52-598)**

### **Key Assessment #4: Reading Specialist Practicum Evaluation (Clinical Practice)**

#### **1. Narrative about Assessment #4**

##### **Description of the Assessment and Use in the Program**

The Reading Specialist Practicum Evaluation is conducted in the course 52-598, *Practicum for the Reading Specialist*, the culminating practicum experience that occurs at or near the end of a candidate's coursework in the program. This is a level 3 coaching opportunity for candidates. The candidate is placed in a practicum setting with one or more teachers in which he/she will collaborate to provide effective reading instruction to students. There are three components to this assessment.

**Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards** This practicum addresses several 2010 IRA Standards through the various components as follows:

##### **Reading Specialist Work Sample Elements** (Based on the Renaissance Partnership Work Sample)

1. The Contextual Factors element addresses 2.1, Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum; and 4.1, Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write.
2. The Learning Goals element addresses 2.1, noted above; 2.2, Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections; 4.2, Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity; and 5, 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.
3. The Assessment Plan element addresses 3.1, Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations; 3.2, select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes; 3.3, use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction; and 3.4, communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences.
4. The Design for Instruction element addresses 2.1, 2.2, 4.1, and 4.2, as well as 2.3, Use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources; 5.1, Design the physical environment to optimize students' use of traditional print, digital, and online resources in reading and writing instruction; 5.3, Use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another, discussions, and peer feedback); and 5.4 Use a variety of classroom configurations (i.e., whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction.
5. The Instructional Decision-Making element addresses 2.1, 2.2, 3.4, 4.2, 5, 5.3, and 5.4, as well as 1.3, Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.
6. The Analysis of Student Learning element addresses 1.3, 3.3, and 3.4.
7. The Reflection and Self Evaluation element addresses 1.3 and 2.2, as well as 6.2, Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.
8. The Coaching Plan element addresses 2.2, 3.1, 4.2, and 6.2, as well as 6.1, Demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning theories and related research about organizational change, professional development, and school culture; and 6.3, Participate in, design, facilitate, lead, and evaluate effective and differentiated professional development programs.

9. The Considering Diversity element addresses 4.1, and 4.2, as well as 4.3, Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity. Although addressing diversity is integrated across the work sample, we ask candidates to reflect again more specifically to consider what more could be addressed in their practicum setting.

Collaborating Professional Assessment The Collaborating Professional, who is the point person for the school district of the practicum setting, and is likely to be considered in the coaching plan created by the candidate, is also asked to evaluate whether the candidate demonstrates the following elements:

1. Candidate has knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction and is able to use that knowledge in collaborating with a teacher to develop a program. (Standards 1 and 2)
2. Candidate uses a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, and curriculum materials to support teachers in reading and writing instruction (Standard 2)
3. Candidate uses a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading instruction. (Standard 3)
4. Candidate creates a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, use of instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments. (Standard 5)
5. Candidate views professional development as a career-long effort and responsibility and in so doing works to promote growth in themselves and others. (Standard 6)

University Supervisor Assessment The University Supervisor evaluates the elements in the Work Sample, as well as the engagement and learning of the candidate in the Practicum setting and the evidence of the candidate's professional dispositions. This verifies that the standards addressed in the work sample are evident in the candidate's observed practice as well as in the written document.

### **Summary of the Data**

Overall, the candidates demonstrated effectiveness in the role of reading specialist in the practicum assessment of clinical practice. Our candidates demonstrate success on all tasks in the work sample. Individual candidates varied in which elements presented greater challenge for them, but overall candidates seem to find more challenge in meeting IRA standards 1, 4, and 6, as they address self-evaluation, leading change, and flexibility to adapt instruction meet diverse student needs within the practicum setting.

### **Assessment 4 Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards**

We place candidates in very diverse settings for practicum, so we expect some will find the new setting and adapting to working with new colleagues in the accelerated pace of summer school to be a challenge. We are pleased that the majority of our candidates are evaluated at Target levels in their abilities to implement effective reading assessment and practices (IRA Standards 2, 3, 5) and to assist teachers to do the same in their practicum settings (Standard 1.3, 6.2). Over time, we have noticed that our candidates struggle to find ways to act as coaches and transformative educators within the parameters of a pre-set literacy curriculum, in those practicum settings where such a curriculum is in place. We will continue to place candidates in diverse settings and will work to identify in advance those who may be particularly challenged by the flexibility required in the practicum setting. We will continue to monitor candidates' ability to meet student needs to see whether there is additional action needed, but we have already added an additional opportunity to focus on this in great detail in a portfolio assignment that we added to our course, Teaching Reading to the Diverse Learner. We expect that this assignment will help us more explicitly address candidate competence in recognizing and meeting the literacy needs of diverse learners and also help us identify those who may require

more help in this area before they reach the reading specialist practicum course in the program.

## **2. Directions to Candidates:**

The candidate will be expected to not only plan and provide instruction to students, but to provide coaching to the classroom teacher on the use of instructional approaches and materials appropriate for student levels, interests and cultural and linguistic backgrounds, assessment options and their application in the setting, communication of student performance, the use of literacy practices that respect and value differences, promoting a literate environment, promoting diversity, and promoting positive dispositions for better student achievement. The candidate is expected to fulfill the attendance, planning and work expectations of the particular site. Some sites have specific goals, assessment, instructional expectations and materials required for their reading programs. Other sites have greater opportunities for candidates to make educational decisions. In either situation, the candidate is expected to be involved in the instruction of students and the professional dialogue and coaching that assists other professionals in instructional decisions and professional growth now or for the future.

*Reading Specialist Work Sample* – The candidate is to complete a reflective written piece called the Reading Specialist Work Sample, patterned after the Teacher Work Sample from The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality. The Work Sample requires a candidate to reflect on the effectiveness of their teaching on student performance by examining the Contextual Factors of the school, by setting Learning Goals, by developing an Assessment Plan, by Designing Instruction based on the above information, by analyzing student learning to make Instructional Decisions, by examining student progress through Analysis of Student Learning, and by Reflection and Self-Evaluation. In addition, as part of the RSWS, the Reading Specialist Candidate is required to consider the opportunities for coaching in this particular practicum placement and develop a coaching plan. This comprehensive document is 16-20 pages in length. Each section has specific requirements, including graphics created with technology and student samples. The Reading Specialist Work Sample will be evaluated by the University Supervisor. (See the complete description of each segment following this assignment description.)

*Observations* – The University Supervisor for the placement will work with the candidate and the collaborating teacher to review the expectations of the practicum at the beginning of the placement. The University Supervisor will then visit the practicum setting at least two additional times to talk with the collaborating teacher and candidate about the work being done. These observations of the practicum will note the diversity of the setting, student work that is observed, coaching opportunities, as well as the use of technology.

*Collaborating Teacher Evaluation* – The Collaborating Teacher, located on-site at the practicum placement will communicate with the University Supervisor as needed and complete an evaluation form at the conclusion of the practicum, reflecting on the candidate's performance on the International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professionals.

*University Supervisor Evaluation* – The University Supervisor will complete a final evaluation document based on data from the Observations, the Reading Specialist Work Sample and the Collaborating Teacher Evaluation. This final comprehensive evaluation document will determine a candidate's grade in the class.

**READING SPECIALIST PRACTICUM  
WORK SAMPLE  
52-598**

**Addresses IRA Standards for Reading Professionals 2010**

The following pages contain the information needed to complete the assignment for the practicum. The culminating project, called a Teacher Work Sample, allows the candidate to share a comprehensive look at the practicum experience.

The prompts and rubrics contained in this document were adapted from the Teacher Work Sample developed by representatives of the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality. Director: Roger Pankratz [rogerapankratz@wku.edu](mailto:rogerapankratz@wku.edu)



## **Overview of the Reading Specialist Work Sample (RSWS)**

### **The Vision**

Successful reading specialist candidates support learning by designing a Reading Specialist work Sample that includes a range of strategies and builds on each student's strengths, needs, and prior experiences. Through this performance assessment, specialist candidates provide credible evidence of the candidate's ability to facilitate learning by meeting the following standards:

- \*The reading specialist uses information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment. (IRA 2.1, 4.1; LU COE 1, 2)
- \*The reading specialist sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals. (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 4.2, 5; LU COE 1, 2)
- \*The reading specialist uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during and after instruction. (IRA 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4; LU COE 1, 2)
- \*The reading specialist designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts. (IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4; LU COE 1, 2)
- \*The reading specialist uses on-going analysis of student learning to help teachers make instructional decisions. (IRA 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.4, 4.2, 5, 5.3, 5.4; LU COE 1)
- \*The reading specialist uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement. (IRA 1.3, 3.3, 3.4; LU COE 1)
- \*The reading specialist reflects on his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice. (IRA 1.3, 2.2, 6.2; LU COE 1, 2)
- \*The reading specialist reflects on coaching opportunities to promote professional development of paraprofessionals and teachers. (IRA 2.2, 3.1, 4.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3; LU COE 1, 3)
- \*The reading specialist creates and engages students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society. (IRA 4.1, 4.2, 4.3; LU COE 2)

### **Your Assignment**

The following assignment description contains seven teaching processes identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning. In addition, candidates are expected to develop a coaching plan for paraprofessionals or teachers within the practicum and to engage in practices that value diversity. The Prompts help you document the extent to which you have met each standard. The Standards and Rubrics will be used to evaluate your Reading Specialist Work Sample.

You are required to engage in literacy instructional/coaching activities for approximately 50 hours during your practicum. At the conclusion of your practicum, you will need to turn in a Reading Specialist Work Sample that describes the contextual factors of your practicum, identifies learning goals based on state or district standards, describes an assessment plan for student learning, and includes a plan for instruction. The Reading Specialists Work Sample will also analyze student learning, require you to reflect upon and evaluate your teaching as related to diversity and student

learning, and require you to develop a coaching plan to extend the professional development for paraprofessionals or teachers in the practicum.

### **Format**

1. Complete a cover page that includes: your name, date, grade level of Practicum, university, course number and title.
  2. Complete a table of contents that lists the sections and attachments in your RSWS document with page numbers.
  3. Charts, graphs and assessment instruments are required as part of the RSWS document. Other attachments may include student work that provides evidence of your performance and your students' learning progress. Do not include any student or teacher names or identification in any part of the RSWS.
  4. A suggested page length for the narrative is given at the end of each component section. The narrative sections should not exceed twenty word processed pages, double-spaced in 12-point font, with 1-inch margins.
  5. References and credits should be cited in a separate section at the end of your narrative and written in APA style.
- 

## **Contextual Factors**

**(IRA 2.1, 4.1; LU COE 1, 2)**

*The reading specialist uses information about the learning-teacher context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment.*

### **Task 1**

Discuss relevant factors and how they may affect the teaching-learning process. Include any supports and challenges that affect instruction and student learning.

### **Prompt**

In your discussion include:

- **Community, district and school factors.** Address geographic location, community and school population, socio-economic profile and race/ethnicity. You might also address such things as stability of community, political climate, community support for education, and other environmental factors.
- **Classroom factors.** Address physical features, availability of technology equipment and resources and the extent of parental involvement. You might also discuss other relevant factors such as classroom rules and routines, grouping patterns, scheduling and classroom arrangement.
- **Student characteristics.** Address student characteristics you must consider as you design instruction and assess learning. Include factors such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, special needs, achievement/developmental levels, culture, language, interests, learning skills and prior learning that may influence the development of your learning goals, instruction and assessment. Include discussion of the psychological, sociological and linguistic foundations of reading.
- **Instructional implications.** Address how contextual characteristics of the community, classroom and students have implications for instructional planning and assessment. Consider the main

components of reading instruction in your planning. Include specific instructional implications for at least two characteristics and any other factors that will influence how you plan and implement your unit.

**Suggested Page Length:** 1-2

---

## Learning Goals

**(IRA 2.1, 2.2, 4.2, 5; LU COE 1, 2)**

*The reading specialist sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals.*

### Task 2

Provide and justify the learning goals for the unit.

### Prompt

- **List the learning goals** (not the activities) that will guide the planning, delivery and assessment of your unit. These goals should define what you expect students to know and be able to do at the end of the unit. The goals should be significant (reflect the big ideas or structure of the discipline) challenging, varied and appropriate. Number or code each learning goal so you can reference it later.
- **Show how the goals are aligned with local, state, or national standards.** (identify the source of the standards). **Be sure to include the main components of reading instruction and plans to promote a literate environment.**
- **Describe the types and levels of your learning goals.**
- **Discuss why your learning goals are appropriate in terms of development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills; and other student needs.**

**Suggested Page Length:** 1-2

---

## Assessment Plan

(IRA 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4; LU COE 1, 2)

*The reading specialist uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during and after instruction.*

### Task 3

Work with teachers to design an assessment plan to monitor student progress toward learning goal(s). Use a wide range assessment tools and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during and after instruction. These assessments should authentically measure student learning and may include performance-based tasks, paper-and-pencil tasks, or personal communication. Describe why your assessments are appropriate for measuring learning.

### Prompt

- **Provide an overview of the assessment plan.** For each learning goal include: assessments used to judge student performance, format of each assessment, and adaptations of the assessments for the individual needs of students based on pre-assessment and contextual factors. The purpose of this overview is to depict the alignment between learning goals and assessments and to show adaptations to meet the individual needs of students or contextual factors. You may use a visual organizer such as a table, outline, or other means to make your plan clear.
- **Describe the pre- and post-assessments that are aligned with your learning goals.** Clearly explain how you will evaluate or score pre- and post-assessments, including criteria you will use to determine if the students' performance meets the learning goals. Include copies of assessments, prompts, and/or student directions and criteria for judging student performance (e.g., scoring rubrics, observation checklist, rating scales, item weights, test blueprint, answer key).
- **Discuss your plan for formative assessment that will help you determine student progress during the unit.** Describe the assessments you plan to use to check on student progress and comment on the importance of collecting that particular evidence. Although formative assessment may change as you are teaching the unit, your task here is to predict at what points in your teaching it will be important to assess students' progress toward learning goals.

**Suggested Page Length:** 2+ pre- and post-assessment instruments, scoring rubrics/keys, and assessment plan table.

---

## Design for Instruction

(IRA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4; LU COE 1, 2)

*The reading specialist designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.*

### Task 4

Describe how you will work with the teacher to design your unit instruction related to unit goals, students' characteristics and needs, and the specific learning context.

### Prompt

- **Results of pre-assessment.** After administering the pre-assessment, analyze student performance *relative to the learning goals*. Depict the results of the pre-assessment in a format that allows you to find patterns of student performance relative to each learning goal. You may use a table, graph, or chart. Describe the pattern you find that will guide your instruction or modification of the learning goals.
- **Unit overview.** Provide an overview of your unit. Use a visual organizer such as a block plan or outline to make your unit plan clear. Include the topic or activity you are planning for each day/period. Also indicate the goal or goals (coded from your Learning Goals section) that you are addressing in each activity. Make sure that every goal is addressed by at least one activity and that every activity relates to at least one goal. Use a wide range of instructional strategies and materials to support the main components of reading and to promote a literate environment.
- **Activities.** Describe at least three unit activities that reflect a variety of instructional strategies/techniques and explain why you are planning those specific activities. In your explanation for each activity, include:
  - how the content relates to your instructional goal(s),
  - how the activity stems from your pre-assessment information and contextual factors,
  - what materials/technology you will need to implement the activity, and
  - how you plan to assess student learning during and/or following the activity (i.e., formative assessment)
- **Technology.** Describe how you will use technology in your planning and/or instruction. If you do not plan to use any form of technology, provide your clear rationale for its omission.

**Suggested Page Length:** 3+ visual organizer

---

## Instructional Decision-Making

(IRA 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.4, 4.2, 5, 5.3, 5.4; LU COE 1)

*The reading specialist uses on-going analysis of student learning to help teachers make instructional decisions.*

### Task 5

Provide two examples of instructional decision-making based on students' learning or responses.

### Prompt

- Think of a time during your unit when a student's learning or response caused you and the teacher to modify your original design for instruction. Consider the modifications you made to the instructional strategies or materials used to teach the main components of reading. Also, consider the changes that might have occurred to better match students to materials at their level or for other diverse needs. Did you make changes in the modeling or dispositions exhibited in attempting to motivate students to be readers or writers? (The resulting modification may affect other students as well.) Cite specific evidence to support your answers to the following:
  - Describe the student's learning or response that caused you to rethink your plans. The student's learning or response may come from a planned formative assessment or another source (not the pre-assessment).
  - Describe what you did next and explain why you thought this would improve student progress toward the learning goal.
- Now, think of one more time during your unit when another student's learning or response caused you to modify a different portion of your original design for instruction. (The resulting modification may affect other students as well.) Cite specific evidence to support your answers to the following:
  - Describe the student's learning or response that caused you to rethink your plans. The student's learning or response may come from a planned formative assessment or another source (not the pre-assessment).
  - Describe what you did next and explain why you thought this would improve student progress toward the learning goal.

**Suggested Page Length:** 3-4

---

## Analysis of Student Learning

**(IRA 1.3, 3.3, 3.4; LU COE 1)**

*The reading specialist uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.*

### Task 6

Analyze your assessment data, including pre-post assessments and formative assessments to determine student's progress related to the unit learning goals. Use visual representations and narrative to communicate the performance of the whole class, subgroups, and two individual students. Conclusions drawn from this analysis should be provided in the "Reflections and Self-Evaluation" section.

### Prompt

In this section, you will analyze data to explain progress and achievement toward learning goals demonstrated by subgroups of students or individual students.

- **Subgroups.** Select a group characteristic (e.g., gender, performance level, socio-economic status, language proficiency) to analyze in terms of **one learning goal**. Provide a rationale for your selection of this characteristic to form subgroups (e.g., girls vs. boys; high- vs. middle- vs. low-performers). Create a graphic representation that compares pre- and post-assessment results for the subgroups on this learning goal. Summarize what these data show about student learning.
- **Individuals.** Select two students that demonstrated different levels of performance. Explain why it is important to understand the learning of these particular students. Use pre-, formative, and post-assessment data with examples of the students' work to draw conclusions about the extent to which these students attained the two learning goals. Graphic representations are not necessary for this subsection.

*Note: You will provide possible reasons for why your students learned (or did not learn) in the next section, "Reflection and Self-Evaluation."*

**Suggested Page Length:** 4+ charts and student work examples

---

## Reflection and Self-Evaluation

**(IRA 1.3, 2.2, 6.2; LU COE 1, 2)**

*The reading specialist analyzes the relationship between his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.*

### Task 7

Reflect on your performance as a teacher and link your performance to student learning results. Evaluate your performance and identify future actions for improved practice and professional growth.

### Prompt

- Select the learning goal where you students were most successful. Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors under your control.
- Select the learning goal where you students were least successful. Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors under your control. Discuss what you could do differently or better in the future to improve your students' performance.

**Reflection on possibilities for professional development.** Describe at least two professional learning goals that emerged from your insights and experiences with the RSWS. Identify two specific steps you will take to improve your performance in the critical area(s) you identified.

**Suggested Page Length: 2**

---

## Coaching Plan

**(IRA 2.2, 3.1, 4.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3; LU COE 1, 3)**

*The reading specialist reflects on coaching opportunities to promote professional development of paraprofessionals and teachers.*

### Task 8

Reflect on your interactions with paraprofessionals and other teachers in your practicum. Consider their performance and identify a coaching plan for professional growth.

### Prompt

- Select an individual with whom you have collaborated during this practicum. Choose at least two different areas related to the reading instruction or reading environment of this practicum and develop a coaching plan for this individual.
- Be sure and consider multiple options for professional development in considering the two areas to be developed.
- Be sure to indicate which plans you are able to carry out during your practicum.

**Suggested Page Length: 2**

---



## Consideration of Diversity

**(IRA 4.1, 4.2: LU COE 2)**

*The reading specialist creates and engages students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.*

### Task 9

Reflect on each of the sections of this work sample and note how diversity is addressed in each.

### Prompt

- Tasks 1-2: Consider the contextual factors and comment on how the diversity evident in the setting influences the reading and writing development of the students with whom you worked. Discuss how this influenced the development of your learning goals.
- Tasks 3-4: Describe the ways in which your assessment plan and design for instruction were responsive to diversity in the setting. Note the ways in which the instruction, materials, and other resources you used capitalized on diversity.
- Tasks 5-6: Discuss the ways you considered diversity in your instructional decision-making and analysis of student learning. Note the decisions and practices that were particularly responsive to diversity.
- Tasks 7-8: Discuss how you worked with your teaching collaborator in the setting to recognize your own cultures and to teach in ways that were responsive to students' diverse backgrounds. If the collaborating professional in the setting was resistant to this, note how you would work to advocate for diversity if you were to continue in the setting in the coming year.
- Task 9: Note the ways you would make changes in the future to provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link their communities to the school. Comment also on ways you could help students value differences and understand and respect others, particularly the contributions of diverse people and traditions to literacy learning.

**Suggested Page Length: 2-3**

**R&L UA/IRA 4 and 5: 598 Reading & Literacy MA Specialist Practicum (rev 2011)**

**Contextual Factors Rubric**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Knowledge of Community, School, and Classroom Factors IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IRA-2010.4.1</b>	Specialist displays a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.	Specialist displays some of the knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school and classroom that may affect learning.	Specialist displays minimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom
<b>Knowledge of Characteristics of Students IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2bb IRA-2010.4.1</b>	Specialist displays general and specific understanding of student differences (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning. Specialist demonstrates knowledge of psychological, and linguistic foundations of reading and writing.	Specialist displays general knowledge of student differences (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning. Specialist displays some knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing.	Specialist displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge of student differences (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities, disabilities). Specialist does not appear to understand the foundations of reading and writing.
<b>Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3dd IRA-2010.2.1</b>	Specialist displays general and specific understanding of the different ways students learn (e.g. learning styles, learning modalities) that may affect learning, including specific knowledge of language development and reading acquisition and variations related to cultural and linguistic diversity.	Specialist displays general knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g. learning styles, learning modalities), including some knowledge of language development and reading acquisition and variations related to cultural and linguistic diversity.	Specialist displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g. learning styles, learning modalities). No knowledge of the diversity of language development and reading acquisition is evident.
<b>Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3dd</b>	Specialist displays general and specific understanding of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	Specialist displays general knowledge of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	Specialist displays little or irrelevant knowledge of students' skills and prior learning.
<b>Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee IRA-2010.2.1</b>	Specialist provides specific implications for instruction and assessment based on knowledge of the major components of reading, student individual differences and community, school and classroom characteristics.	Specialist provides general implications for instruction and assessment based on some aspects of the major components of reading, student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	Specialist does not provide implications for instruction and assessment based on the major components of reading, student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics OR provides inappropriate implications.

## Learning Goals Rubric

	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
<b>Significance, Challenge, and Variety IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.2.2 IRA-2010.4.2 IRA-2010.5</b>	Goals reflect several types or levels of learning and are significant and challenging and reflect the major components of reading and promote a literate environment.	Goals reflect several types or levels of learning but lack significance or challenge and reflect only some of the major components of reading and include impact on creating a literate environment.	Goals reflect only one type or level of learning and do not focus on the major components of reading nor create a literate environment.
<b>Clarity IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.2.2</b>	Most of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	Some of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	Goals are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes.
<b>Appropriateness for Students IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee IRA-2010.2.2 IRA-2010.4.2</b>	Most goals are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs. Select appropriate options for differing stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	Some goals are appropriate for the development; prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs. Some consideration is given to students in differing stages and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	Goals are not appropriate for the development; prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences; or other student needs. No consideration is given to students in differing stages or cultural and linguistic backgrounds.
<b>Alignment with Standards IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IRA-2010.2.1</b>	Most of the goals are explicitly aligned with national, state or local standards for student reading development in the major components of reading.	Some goals are aligned with national, state or local standards and reflect some components of reading.	Goals are not aligned with national, state, or local standards and do not reflect the major components of reading.

## Assessment Plan Rubric

	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
<b>Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd IRA-2010.3.2 IRA-2010.3.3</b>	Each of the learning goals is assessed through the assessment plan; assessments are congruent with the learning goals in content and cognitive complexity. Specialist guides teachers in using appropriate assessments and reporting the results to appropriate audiences.	Some of the learning goals are assessed through the assessment plan, but many are not congruent with learning goals in content and cognitive complexity. Specialist assists in use of assessments or reporting of results to appropriate audiences.	Content and methods of assessment lack congruence with learning goals or lack cognitive complexity. Specialist does not assist in assessment.
<b>Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IRA-2010.3.1 IRA-2010.3.3</b>	Assessment criteria are clear and are explicitly linked to the learning goals. Individual assessment is extended by the specialist.	Assessment criteria have been developed, but they are not clear or are not explicitly linked to the learning goals. Little extension is done by the specialist.	The assessments contain no clear criteria for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals.
<b>Multiple Modes and Approaches IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd IRA-2010.3.2</b>	The assessment plan includes a wide range of assessment tools (including performance assessments, lab reports, research projects, etc.) and practices that range from individual to group assessment. Student performance is assessed throughout the instructional sequence.	The assessment plan includes multiple modes but all are either pencil/paper based (i.e. they are not performance assessments) and/or assess only one group of individuals.	The assessment plan includes only one assessment mode and does not assess students before, during, and after instruction.

<b>Technical Soundness IL-LEWIS-COE- 2008.1bb IRA-2010.3.2</b>	Specialist assists teachers in selecting assessments that appear to be valid; scoring procedures are explained; most items or prompts are clearly written; directions and procedures are clear to students.	Specialist assists teachers in selecting assessments that appear to have some validity. Some scoring procedures are explained; some items or prompts are clearly written; some directions and procedures are clear to students.	Assessments are not valid; scoring procedures are absent or inaccurate; items or prompts are poorly written; directions and procedures are confusing to students.
<b>Adaptations Based on the Individual Needs of Students IL-LEWIS-COE- 2008.2dd IRA-2010.3.3 IRA-2010.3.4</b>	Specialist makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of students with at different developmental stages and from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.	Specialist makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of some students at different developmental stages and backgrounds.	Specialist does not adapt assessments to meet the individual needs of students or these assessments are inappropriate.

### **Design for Instruction Rubric**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Alignment with Learning Goals IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.2.2</b>	All lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. All learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. All learning goals are covered in the design, which uses a wide range of instructional practices and materials to meet the needs of diverse learners.	Most lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Most learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Most learning goals are covered in the design which uses a wide range of instructional practices and materials to meet most diverse learner needs.	Few lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Few learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Not all learning goals are covered in the design or instruction and materials are not designed for diverse learners.
<b>Accurate Representation of Content IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IRA-2010.2.1 IRA-2010.5.3</b>	Specialist's use of content appears to be accurate. Focus of the content with the major components of reading.	Specialist's use of content appears to be mostly accurate. Shows some awareness of the major components of reading.	Specialist's use of content appears to contain numerous inaccuracies. Content seems to be viewed more as isolated skills and facts rather than as part of a larger conceptual framework.
<b>Lesson and Unit Structure IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.5.3</b>	All lessons within the unit are logically organized and appear to be useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals. Specialist assists others in selecting a large supply of materials that match readers' needs. Reading and writing are modeled daily as valued lifelong activities and methods are used to motivate learners.	The lessons within the unit have some logical organization and appear to be somewhat useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals. Some materials are used that match reader needs. Some modeling of reading/writing occurs, as well as some motivational activities.	The lessons within the unit are not logically organized organization (e.g., sequenced). Materials are not matched to reader Needs. No modeling or motivational activities are used.

<p><b>Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee IRA-2010.2.2 IRA-2010.2.3 IRA-2010.4.2 IRA-2010.5.4</b></p>	<p>Specialist uses instructional grouping options, wide range of instructional practices and wide range of materials for learners at different stages of development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>Some variety in instruction, activities, assignments, or resources but with limited contribution to learning.</p>	<p>Little variety of instruction, activities, assignments, and resources. Heavy reliance on textbook or single resource (e.g., work sheets).</p>
<p><b>Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.4.1 IRA-2010.4.2 IRA-2010.4.3</b></p>	<p>Most instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Most activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student.</p>	<p>Some instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Some activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student.</p>	<p>Instruction has not been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Activities and assignments do not appear productive and appropriate for each student.</p>
<p><b>Use of Technology IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1dd IRA-2010.2.3 IRA-2010.5.1</b></p>	<p>Specialist integrates appropriate technology that makes a significant contribution to teaching and learning OR provides a strong rationale for not using technology.</p>	<p>Specialist uses technology but it does not make a significant contribution to teaching and learning OR specialist provides limited rationale for not using technology.</p>	<p>Technology is inappropriately used OR specialist does not use technology, and no (or inappropriate) rationale is provided.</p>

### **Instructional Decision-making Rubric**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<p><b>Sound Professional Practice IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.1.3 IRA-2010.3.4 IRA-2010.4.2 IRA-2010.5</b></p>	<p>Specialist encourages instructional decisions that are pedagogically sound (i.e., they are likely to lead to student learning) and based on the major components of reading, wide range of instructional practices and elements of creating a literate environment. Specialist articulates importance of teaching disposition on student achievement.</p>	<p>Instructional decisions are mostly appropriate, but some decisions are not based on the major components of reading, some variety of instructional practices or creating a literate environment. Specialist mentions teacher disposition on student achievement.</p>	<p>Many instructional decisions are inappropriate and not based on major components of reading or elements of creating a literate environment. Specialist makes no mention of teaching disposition on student achievement.</p>

<b>Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee</b> <b>IRA-2010.2.2</b> <b>IRA-2010.2.3</b> <b>IRA-2010.3.4</b> <b>IRA-2010.4.2</b> <b>IRA-2010.5.3</b> <b>IRA-2010.5.4</b>	Specialist encourages appropriate modifications of the instructional plan to address individual student needs. These modifications are informed by the analysis of student learning/performance, understanding of the major components of reading instruction, including developing a literate environment and contextual factors. Include explanation of why the modifications would improve student progress.	Some modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs, but these are minimally based on analysis of student learning, understanding of the major components of reading instruction, including developing a literate environment, or contextual factors. Some variety in instructional practices is present.	Specialist treats class as "one plan fits all" with no modifications and no relationship to major components of reading or creating a literate environment. No variety of instructional practices is evident.
<b>Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b> <b>IRA-2010.2.1</b>	Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals.	Modifications in instruction are somewhat congruent with learning goals.	Modifications in instruction lack congruence with learning goals.

### Analysis of Student Learning Rubric

	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
<b>Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b> <b>IRA-2010.3.4</b>	Presentation is easy to understand and contains no errors of representation.	Presentation is understandable and contains few errors.	Presentation is not clear and accurate; it does not accurately reflect the data.
<b>Alignment with Learning Goals</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b> <b>IRA-2010.3.3</b>	Analysis is fully aligned with learning goals and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	Analysis of student learning is partially aligned with learning goals and/or fails to provide a comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the goals for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	Analysis of student learning is not aligned with learning goals.
<b>Interpretation of Data</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd</b> <b>IRA-2010.3.4</b>	Interpretation is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data.	Interpretation is technically accurate, but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data.	Interpretation is inaccurate, and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.
<b>Evidence of Impact on Student Learning</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee</b> <b>IRA-2010.1.3</b> <b>IRA-2010.3.3</b>	Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal.	Analysis of student learning includes incomplete evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.	Analysis of student learning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.

### Reflection & Self-evaluation Rubric

	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
--	--------	------------	--------------

<b>Interpretation of Student Learning</b> IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd IRA-2010.1.3	Uses evidence to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet learning goals.	Provides evidence but no (or simplistic, superficial) reasons or hypotheses to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section.	No evidence or reasons provided to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section.
<b>Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment</b> IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ff IRA-2010.1.3 IRA-2010.6.2	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof.	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of theory or research).	Provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others.
<b>Alignment Among Goals, Instruction and Assessment</b> IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb	Logically connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.	Connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction, but misunderstandings or conceptual gaps are present.	Does not connect learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction and/or the connections are irrelevant or inaccurate.
<b>Implications for Future Teaching</b> IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ff IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1gg IRA-2010.2.2 IRA-2010.6.2	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment.
<b>Implications for Professional Development</b> IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3bb IRA-2010.6.2	Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals.	Presents professional learning goals that are not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section and/or provides a vague plan for meeting the goals.	Provides no professional learning goals or goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section.

### Coaching Plan Rubric

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Reflection on Instructional Needs</b> IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ff IRA-2010.2.2 IRA-2010.3.1 IRA-2010.4.2	Provides evaluation of teacher or paraprofessional teaching practices for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment.
<b>Implications for Professional Development</b> IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ff IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1gg IRA-2010.6.3	Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section.	Presents professional learning goals that are not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section.	Provides no professional learning goals or goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section.

<b>Coaching Plan for Professional Development</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1gg</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3bb</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3dd</b> <b>IRA-2010.6.1</b> <b>IRA-2010.6.2</b> <b>IRA-2010.6.3</b>	Describes specific steps to meet these goals with a wide range of activities.	Provides a general plan or for meeting these goals or with few activities.	No clear plan for coaching is presented.
--	---	--	--

## Considering Diversity

	Target (3 pts)	Acceptable (2 pts)	Unacceptable (1 pt)
<b>Tasks 1-2 (1, 20%)</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2</b> <b>IRA-2010.4.1</b>	Thoughtfully considers how the diversity evident in the setting influences the reading and writing development of the students and makes a clear connection to the development of learning goals	Notes how the diversity evident in the setting influences the reading and writing development of the students in the setting. Connects appropriately to the development of learning goals.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for how diversity is evident in the setting and influences learning goals.
<b>Tasks 3-4 (1, 20%)</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2</b> <b>IRA-2010.4.2</b>	Describes how the assessment plan and design for instruction were responsive to diversity in the setting. Includes how the instruction, materials, and other resources used capitalized on diversity.	Describes diversity in the assessment plan and design for instruction Mentions diversity of instruction, materials, and other resources.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for how diversity was used to plan assessment and instruction.
<b>Tasks 5-6 (1, 20%)</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2</b> <b>IRA-2010.4.2</b>	Discusses how diversity influenced instructional decision-making and analysis of student learning. Notes the decisions and practices that were particularly responsive to diversity.	Mentions considering diversity in the instructional decision-making and analysis of student learning.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas regarding the consideration of diversity in instructional decision-making or student learning.
<b>Tasks 7-8 (1, 20%)</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2</b> <b>IRA-2010.4.2</b>	Discusses working with the teaching collaborator to acknowledge their own cultures and to teach in ways that were responsive to students' diverse backgrounds, and/or discusses a plan for advocating for diversity with this professional in the future.	Discusses working with the teaching collaborator to acknowledge their own cultures and to teach in ways that were responsive to students' diverse backgrounds OR notes that there was resistance to acknowledging or incorporating diversity.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for cultural awareness or culturally responsive teaching.
<b>Task 9 (1, 20%)</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2</b> <b>IRA-2010.4.2</b>	Notes changes that would provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link their communities to the school. Comments on how to help students value differences and understand and respect others, related to literacy learning.	Notes changes that would provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that reflect their diversity. Comments on how to help students value differences and understand and respect others.	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for how to make effective change or advocate for diversity.



## **Collaborating Teacher Assessment**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Candidate has knowledge of the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction and is able to use that knowledge in collaborating with a teacher to develop a program IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.1</b>	Shows professional ease in ability to collaborate with teacher to make instructional programs and modifications that support all students.	Supports teacher in providing reading instruction; Knows if reading components are being integrated and can assess appropriately.	Unable to plan a program of instruction, provide instruction or evaluate a program.
<b>Candidate uses a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, materials, and an integrative, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.2</b>	Shows initiative in searching out techniques that improve instruction for all students.	Tries new techniques learned in program or from collaborating teacher.	Chooses to use only methods that he or she currently employs or are at hand, whether or nor they are effective in supporting student learning.
<b>Candidate uses a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading instruction IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd IRA-2010.3</b>	Helps to design an assessment approach that monitors student progress and informs teacher instruction.	Works with the teacher in assessing student needs and promoting the use of that information for instruction.	Does not possess the skill to assess student progress in any manner.
<b>Candidate creates a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, use of instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments. IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee IRA-2010.5</b>	Creates new materials or settings for the classroom and/or creates a positive learning environment.	Brings in materials to support instruction and the environment, and/or assists in creating a positive learning environment.	Does not participate in obtaining materials and creating a positive literate environment
<b>Candidate views professional development as a career-long effort and responsibility and in so doing works to promote growth in themselves and others IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ff IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3bb IRA-2010.6</b>	Reflects on the practicum and takes leadership for changes when warranted.	Reflects on the practicum and his or her own performance as a reading professional; Promotes new ideas.	Candidate provides instruction, but does not promote new ideas with others or self-reflection for him or herself.
<b>Meets obligations-quality and timeliness IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.1.3 IRA-2010.6.2</b>	Regularly demonstrates professional responsibilities by meeting obligations and deadlines and designing high quality work	Begins to demonstrate professional responsibilities by meeting obligations and deadlines and designing high quality work	Does not demonstrate professional responsibilities by meeting obligations and deadlines and designing high quality work
<b>Professional behaviors IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.1.3 IRA-2010.6.2</b>	Regularly exhibits professional behaviors in working with students, peers, and superordinates	Begins to exhibit professional behaviors in working with students, peers, and superordinates	Does not exhibit professional behaviors in working with students, peers, and superordinates

<b>Recognition of different student needs: Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee IRA-2010.4</b>	Regularly recognizes the different needs of students	Begins to recognize the different needs of students	Does not recognize the different needs of students
<b>Demonstrates belief that all students can learn IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3dd IRA-2010.2.2 IRA-2010.4.3</b>	Regularly demonstrates the belief that all students can learn	Begins to demonstrate the belief that all students can learn	Does not demonstrate the belief that all students can learn

### **University Supervisor Assessment**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Uses contextual and student information to create a literate environment that fosters literacy learning IRA-2010.5</b>	Log, discussions, and actions demonstrate sensitivity to the impact of the learning context and individual differences on learning. Candidate regularly uses information about the learning/teaching context and student individual differences to assist teachers with setting learning goals, planning instruction and assessing learning.	Log, discussions, and actions show evidence of some awareness of the influence of the learning/teaching context and student individual differences.	Little consideration for the learning/teaching context or student individual differences is evident in interactions, discussions, actions, or log. Candidate does not address context or student factors with classroom teacher.
<b>Assists classroom teacher in setting learning goals that are appropriate for the need and characteristics of students and support literacy learning IRA-2010.2</b>	Log, actions, and seminar discussions evidence the ways the candidate assists the classroom teacher in setting significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals. If the learning goals are predetermined, the candidate considers the merit of these goals in discussions or written work.	Log, actions, and seminar discussions reveal some discussion of the variation, significance, challenge, and/or appropriateness of learning goals. Candidate can articulate how learning goals were determined.	Candidate takes little or no initiative to discuss the appropriateness of learning goals or assist the teacher in considering learning goals. Learning goals that are influenced by the candidate are not appropriate for the student or in the context.
<b>Assist teacher in using assessments to plan and evaluate effective literacy instruction IRA-2010.3</b>	Log, actions, and seminar discussions evidence the ways the candidate assists the teacher in using a wide range of assessments to assess student learning before, during and after instruction. If assessment system is predetermined, the candidate considers the appropriateness of the assessments.	Log, actions, and seminar discussions reveal some consideration of the appropriateness of assessments. Candidate can articulate how assessments are used.	Candidate does not assist in the use of assessments or does not consider the appropriateness of the assessments used.











































<p><b>Design Instruction for specific goals and contexts that supports student literacy learning. IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2</b></p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions evidence the ways the candidate considers learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts when designing instruction. Candidate provides evidence of instructional design and planning when observed by the university supervisor, in log, and during seminar discussions.</p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions indicate occasional consideration of learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts in candidate designs for instruction. Candidate provides evidence of planning when observed by the university supervisor, in log, and during seminar discussions.</p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions evidence little or no consideration of learning goals, student characteristics and needs, or learning contexts in instruction. Candidate provides no evidence of instructional design or planning when observed by the university supervisor, in log, and during seminar discussions.</p>
<p><b>Work with the teacher to make appropriate instructional decisions, based on foundational knowledge, ethical professional judgment, and analysis of student literacy learning. IRA-2010.1 IRA-2010.3</b></p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate works with the teacher in thoughtful analysis of student learning to support instructional decision-making.</p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate and the teacher discuss student learning and instructional decisions.</p>	<p>Candidate resists working with the teacher in instructional decision-making. Decision-making is not clearly based on analysis of student learning.</p>
<p><b>Assist teacher in using assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective literacy learning and student achievement. IRA-2010.3</b></p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate assists the teacher in using assessment data in student profiles and/or to communicate student progress and achievement.</p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate assists the teacher in using assessment data to keep track of student progress or achievement.</p>	<p>Candidate does not work with the teacher to document or discuss assessment data.</p>
<p><b>Analyze relationship between instruction and learning, particularly considering one's dispositions and role as a model for student literacy achievement. IRA-2010.1.3 IRA-2010.6.2</b></p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate considers the impact of his or her own instruction on student learning in the practicum setting.</p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions indicate that the candidate is aware that his or her instruction is one factor in student learning, but thoughtful analysis of that relationship is not clearly evident.</p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide little or no evidence that the candidate considers his or her own instruction as a factor in student learning in the practicum setting.</p>
<p><b>Reflect on coaching opportunities. IRA-2010.6</b></p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate identifies and reflects on coaching opportunities in the practicum setting. The candidate clearly conveys that the focus of coaching is to promote professional development of teachers and/or paraprofessionals in the setting.</p>	<p>Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate identifies coaching opportunities for teachers and/or paraprofessionals in the setting.</p>	<p>Candidate does not identify coaching opportunities, or focuses on personal biases or preferences when discussing the professional development of others in the setting.</p>
<p><b>Meets obligations - quality and timeliness IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.1.3 IRA-2010.6.2</b></p>	<p>Regularly demonstrates responsibilities by meeting obligations and deadlines</p>	<p>Begins to demonstrate responsibilities by meeting obligations and deadlines</p>	<p>Does not demonstrate responsibilities by meeting obligations and deadlines</p>








































<b>Professional behaviors</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-</b> <b>2008.1bb</b> <b>IRA-2010.1.3</b> <b>IRA-2010.6.2</b>	Regularly exhibits professional behaviors in working with students, peers, and superordinates	Begins to exhibit professional behaviors in working with students, peers, and superordinates	Does not exhibit professional behaviors in working with students, peers, and superordinates
<b>Recognition of different student needs and engaging students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society. IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee</b> <b>IRA-2010.4</b>	Regularly recognizes the different needs of students	Begins to recognize the different needs of students	Does not recognize the different needs of students
<b>Demonstrates belief that all students can learn IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3dd</b> <b>IRA-2010.2.2</b> <b>IRA-2010.6.2</b>	Regularly demonstrates the belief that all students can learn	Begins to demonstrate the belief that all students can learn	Does not demonstrate the belief that all students can learn

#### 4. Data Chart-SPA Assessment #4: Reading Specialist Practicum Evaluation (Clinical Practice)

Reading Specialist Work Sample: Contextual Factors		Site	Summer, 2011 n=█			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n=█ Tinley Park n=█		
			T	A	U	T	A	U
			<b>Rubric Item 1</b>	<b>Knowledge of Community, School, and Classroom Factors: IRA-2010.4.1</b> Specialist displays a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 2</b>	<b>Knowledge of Characteristics of Students: IRA-2010.4.1</b> Specialist displays general and specific understanding of student differences (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning; Specialist demonstrates knowledge of psychological, and linguistic foundations of reading and writing.	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 67%	█ 33%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning: IRA-2010.2.1</b> Specialist displays general and specific understanding of the different ways students learn (e.g. learning styles, learning modalities) that may affect learning, including specific knowledge of language development and reading acquisition and variations related to cultural and linguistic diversity	Romeoville	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%	█ 50%	█ 50%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 4</b>	<b>Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning : IRA-2010 4.1</b> Specialist displays general and specific understanding of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	Romeoville	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 5</b>	<b>Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment: IRA-2010.2.1</b> Specialist provides specific implications for instruction and assessment based on	Romeoville	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%	█ 67%	█ 33%	█ 0%

	knowledge of the major components or reading, student individual differences and community, school and classroom characteristics.	Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Reading Specialist Work Sample: Learning Goals</b>		Site	Summer, 2011 n=			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n=		
			T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 6</b>	<b>Significance, Challenge, and Variety IRA-2010.2.2, 4.2, 5</b> Goals reflect several types or levels of learning and are significant and challenging and reflect the major components of reading and promote a literate environment	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 7</b>	<b>Clarity: IRA-2010.2.2</b> Most of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 8</b>	<b>Appropriateness for Students IRA-2010.2.2, 4.2</b> Most goals are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs. Select appropriate options for differing stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 9</b>	<b>Alignment with Standards IRA-2010.2.1</b> Most of the goals are explicitly aligned with national, state or local standards for student reading development in the major components of reading.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Reading Specialist Work Sample:</b>		Site	Summer, 2011 n=			Summer, 2012		

Assessment Plan						Romeoville n	Tinley Park n	
			T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 10</b>	<b>Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction: IRA-2010.3.2, 3.3</b> Each of the learning goals is assess through the assessment plan; assessments are congruent with the learning goals in content and cognitive complexity. Specialist guides teachers in using appropriate assessments and reporting the results to appropriate audiences	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 67%	 33%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 11</b>	<b>Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance IRA-2010.3.1, 3.3</b> Assessment criteria are clear and are explicitly linked to the learning goals. Individual assessment is extended by the specialist.	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 67%	 16%	 16%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 12</b>	<b>Multiple Modes and Approaches IRA-2010.3.2</b> The assessment plan includes a wide range of assessment tools (including performance assessments, lab reports, research projects, etc.) and practices that range from individual to group assessment. Student performance is assess throughout the instructional sequence.	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 84%	 16%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 13</b>	<b>Technical Soundness: IRA-2010.3.2</b> Specialist assists teachers in selecting assessments that appear to be valid; scoring procedures are explained; most items or prompts are clearly written; directions and procedures are clear to students.	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 50%	 33%	 16%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 14</b>	<b>Adaptations Based on the Individual Needs of Students IRA-2010.3.3, 3.4</b>	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 67%	 33%	 0%





































	Specialist makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of students with at different developmental stages and from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.	Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
			Summer, 2011 n= 			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n=  Tinley Park n= 		
<b>Reading Specialist Work Sample: Design for Instruction</b>		Site	T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 15</b>	<b>Alignment with Learning Goals IRA-2010.2.2</b> All lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. All learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. All learning goals are covered in the design, which uses a wide range of instructional practices and materials to meet the needs of diverse learners.	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 84%	 16%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 16</b>	<b>Accurate Representation of Content IRA-2010.2.1, 5.3</b> Specialist's use of content appears to be accurate. Focus of the content with the major components of reading.	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 84%	 16%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 17</b>	<b>Lesson and Unit Structure IRA-2010.5.3</b> All lessons within the unit are logically organized and appear to be useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals. Specialist assists others in selecting a large supply of materials that match readers' needs. Reading and writing are modeled daily as valued lifelong activities and methods are used to motivate learners.	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 84%	 16%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 18</b>	<b>Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources IRA-2010.2.2, 2.3, 4.2, 5.4</b> Specialist uses instructional grouping	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 84%	 16%	 0%



	options, wide range of instructional practices and wide range of materials for learners at different stages of development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds	Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 19</b>	<b>Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources: IRA-2010.4.1, 4.2, 4.3</b> Most instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Most activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 20</b>	<b>Use of Technology: IRA-2010.2.3, 5.1</b> Specialist integrates appropriate technology that makes a significant contribution to teaching and learning OR provides a strong rationale for not using technology.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Reading Specialist Work Sample: Instructional Decision-making</b>		Site	Summer, 2011 n=			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n=		
			T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 21</b>	<b>Sound Professional Practice IRA-2010.1.3, 3.4, 4.2, 5</b> Specialist encourages instructional decisions that are pedagogically sound (i.e., they are likely to lead to student learning) and based on the major components of reading, wide range of instructional practices and elements of creating a literate environment. Specialist articulates importance of teaching disposition on student achievement.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 22</b>	<b>Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning IRA-2010 2.2, 2.3, 3.4, 4.2, 5.3, 5.4</b> Specialist encourages appropriate modifications of the instructional plan to address individual student needs. These modifications are informed by the analysis	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%








































	of student learning/performance, understanding of the major components of reading instruction, including developing a literate environment and contextual factors. Include explanation of why the modifications would improve student progress.	Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 23</b>	<b>Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals: IRA-2010.2.1</b> Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Reading Specialist Work Sample: Analysis of Student Learning</b>		Site	Summer, 2011 n=			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n=		
			T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 24</b>	<b>Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation IRA-2010.3.4</b> Presentation is easy to understand and contains no errors of representation.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 25</b>	<b>Alignment with Learning Goals IRA-2010.3.3</b> Analysis is fully aligned with learning goals and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 26</b>	<b>Interpretation of Data: IRA-2010.3.4</b> Interpretation is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data.	Romeoville	84%	16%	0%	50%	50%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%

<b>Rubric Item 27</b>	<b>Evidence of Impact on Student Learning: IRA-2010.1.3, 3.3</b> Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	67%	16%	16%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Reading Specialist Work Sample: Reflection &amp; Self-evaluation</b>		Site	Summer, 2011 n=			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n= Tinley Park n=		
			T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 28</b>	<b>Interpretation of Student Learning IRA-2010.1.3</b> Uses evidence to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet learning goals	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	0%	16%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 29</b>	<b>Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment: IRA-2010.1.3, 6.2</b> Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof.	Romeoville	84%	16%	0%	50%	50%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 30</b>	<b>Alignment Among Goals, Instruction and Assessment: IRA-2010. 2.2, 3.3</b> Logically connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 31</b>	<b>Implications for Future Teaching: IRA-2010. 2.2, 6.2</b> Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	67%	16%	16%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%

<b>Rubric Item 32</b>	<b>Implications for Professional Development: IRA-2010.6.2</b> Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals.	Romeoville	 84%	 16%	 0%	 67%	 33%	 0%	
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%	
<b>Reading Specialist Work Sample: Coaching Plan</b>		Site	Summer, 2011 n=			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n=			Tinley Park n=
			T	A	U	T	A	U	
<b>Rubric Item 33</b>	<b>Reflection on Instructional Needs IRA-2010 2.2, 3.1, 4.2</b> Provides evaluation of teacher or paraprofessional teaching practices for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning.	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 50%	 50%	 0%	
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%	
<b>Rubric Item 34</b>	<b>Implications for Professional Development: IRA-2010.6.3</b> Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section.	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 67%	 33%	 0%	
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%	
<b>Rubric Item 35</b>	<b>Coaching Plan for Professional Development: IRA-2010.6.1, 6.2, 6.3</b> Describes specific steps to meet these goals with a wide range of activities.	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 67%	 33%	 0%	
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%	

















































Reading Specialist Work Sample: Considering Diversity		Site	Summer, 2011 n=█			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n=█ Tinley Park n=█		
			T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 36</b>	<b>Tasks 1-2: IRA-2010.4.1</b> Thoughtfully considers how the diversity evident in the setting influences the reading and writing development of the students and makes a clear connection to the development of learning goals	Romeoville	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%	█ 33%	█ 67%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 37</b>	<b>Tasks 3-4: IRA-2010.4.2</b> Describes how the assessment plan and design for instruction were responsive to diversity in the setting. Includes how the instruction, materials, and other resources used capitalized on diversity.	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 67%	█ 33%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 38</b>	<b>Tasks 5-6: IRA-2010.4.2</b> Discusses how diversity influenced instructional decision-making and analysis of student learning. Notes the decisions and practices that were particularly responsive to diversity.	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 67%	█ 33%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 39</b>	<b>Tasks 7-8: IRA-2010.4.2</b> Discusses working with the teaching collaborator to acknowledge their own cultures and to teach in ways that were responsive to students' diverse backgrounds, and/or discusses a plan for advocating for diversity with this professional in the future	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 50%	█ 50%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 40</b>	<b>Task 9: IRA-2010.4.2</b> Notes changes that would provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link their communities to the school. Comments on how to help students value differences and understand and respect others, related to literacy learning.	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 50%	█ 50%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%

Collaborating Professional Assessment		Site	Summer, 2011 n █			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n █ Tinley Park n █		
			T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 41</b>	<p>Candidate has knowledge of the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction and is able to use that knowledge in collaborating with a teacher to develop a program <b>IRA-2010.1</b></p> <p>Shows professional ease in ability to collaborate with teacher to make instructional programs and modifications that support all students.</p>	Romeoville	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%	█ 67%	█ 33%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 42</b>	<p>Candidate uses a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, materials, and an integrative, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing <b>IRA-2010.2</b></p> <p>Shows initiative in searching out techniques that improve instruction for all students</p>	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 50%	█ 50%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 43</b>	<p>Candidate uses a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading instruction <b>IRA-2010.3</b></p> <p>Helps to design an assessment approach that monitors student progress and informs teacher instruction.</p>	Romeoville	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%	█ 50%	█ 50%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 44</b>	<p>Candidate creates a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, use of instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments. <b>IRA-2010.5</b></p> <p>Creates new materials or settings for the classroom and/or creates a positive learning environment.</p>	Romeoville	█ 67%	█ 33%	█ 0%	█ 33%	█ 67%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 45</b>	<p>Candidate views professional development as a career-long effort and responsibility and in so doing works to promote growth in themselves and others <b>IRA-2010.6</b></p> <p>Reflects on the practicum and takes leadership for</p>	Romeoville	█ 84%	█ 0%	█ 16%	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%

	changes when warranted.	Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 46</b>	<b>Meets obligations-quality and timeliness</b> IRA-2010.1.3; 6.2 Regularly demonstrates professional responsibilities by meeting obligations and deadlines and designing high quality work	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 47</b>	<b>Professional behaviors</b> IRA-2010.1.3 Regularly exhibits professional behaviors in working with students, peers, and superordinates	Romeoville	 84%	 16%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 48</b>	<b>Recognition of different student needs: Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society</b> IRA-2010.4 Regularly recognizes the different needs of students	Romeoville	 67%	 33%	 0%	 84%	 16%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 49</b>	<b>Demonstrates belief that all students can learn</b> IRA-2010.2.2; 4.3 Regularly demonstrates the belief that all students can learn	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 84%	 16%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%

University Supervisor Assessment		Site	Summer, 2011 n=			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n= Tinley Park n=		
			T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 50</b>	<b>Uses contextual and student information to create a literate environment that fosters literacy learning IRA-2010.5</b> Log, discussions, and actions demonstrate sensitivity to the impact of the learning context and individual differences on learning. Candidate regularly uses information about the learning/teaching context and student individual differences to assist teachers with setting learning goals, planning instruction and assessing learning.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 51</b>	<b>Assists classroom teacher in setting learning goals that are appropriate for the need and characteristics of students and support literacy learning IRA-2010.2</b> Log, actions, and seminar discussions evidence the ways the candidate assists the classroom teacher in setting significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals. If the learning goals are predetermined, the candidate considers the merit of these goals in discussions or written work.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 52</b>	<b>Assist teacher in using assessments to plan and evaluate effective literacy instruction IRA-2010.3</b> Log, actions, and seminar discussions evidence the ways the candidate assists the teacher in using a wide range of assessments to assess student learning before, during and after instruction. If assessment system is predetermined, the candidate considers the appropriateness of the assessments.	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 53</b>	<b>Design instruction for specific goals and contexts that supports student literacy learning.</b> Log, actions, and seminar discussions evidence the ways the candidate considers learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts when designing instruction. Candidate provides evidence of instructional design and planning when observed by the university supervisor, in log, and during seminar discussions.	Romeoville	84%	16%	0%	100%	0%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 54</b>	<b>Work with the teacher to make appropriate instructional decisions, based on foundational knowledge, ethical professional judgment, and analysis of student literacy learning. IRA-2010.1; 3</b>	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%



	Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate works with the teacher in thoughtful analysis of student learning to support instructional decision-making.	Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 55</b>	<b>Assist teacher in using assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective literacy learning and student achievement.</b> <b>IRA-2010.3</b> Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate assists the teacher in using assessment data in student profiles and/or to communicate student progress and achievement.	Romeoville	 84%	 16%	 0%	 84%	 16%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 56</b>	<b>Analyze relationship between instruction and learning, particularly considering one's dispositions and role as a model for student literacy achievement.</b> <b>IRA-2010.1.3; 6.2</b> Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate considers the impact of his or her own instruction on student learning in the practicum setting.	Romeoville	 67%	 33%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 57</b>	<b>Reflect on coaching opportunities.</b> <b>IRA-2010.6</b> Log, actions, and seminar discussions provide evidence that the candidate identifies and reflects on coaching opportunities in the practicum setting. The candidate clearly conveys that the focus of coaching is to promote professional development of teachers and/or paraprofessionals in the setting.	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 84%	 16%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 58</b>	<b>Meets obligations - quality and timeliness</b> <b>IRA-2010.1.3; 6.2</b> Regularly demonstrates responsibilities by meeting obligations and deadlines	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 84%	 16%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 59</b>	<b>Professional behaviors</b> <b>IRA-2010.1.3; 6.2</b> Regularly exhibits professional behaviors in working with students, peers, and superordinates	Romeoville	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	 100%	 0%	 0%

<b>Rubric Item 60</b>	<p><b>Recognition of different student needs and engaging students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.</b>  <b>IRA-2010.4</b></p> <p>Regularly recognizes the different needs of students</p>	Romeoville	84%	16%	0%	100%	0%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%
<b>Rubric Item 61</b>	<p><b>Demonstrates the belief that all students can learn.</b>  <b>IRA-2010.2.2, 6.2</b></p> <p>Regularly demonstrates the belief that all students can learn.</p>	Romeoville	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	100%	0%	0%

## **Practicum for the Reading Specialist (52-598)**

### **Assessment #5: Reading Specialist Practicum Evaluation (Analysis of Student Learning)**

#### **1. Narrative about Assessment**

##### **Description of the Assessment and Use in Program**

The Reading Specialist Practicum Evaluation is conducted in the course 52-598, *Practicum for the Reading Specialist*, the culminating practicum experience that occurs at or near the end of a candidate's coursework in the program. This is a level 3 coaching opportunity for candidates. This Practicum is also one of two key assessments in which the Impact on Student Learning is demonstrated. The candidate is placed in a practicum setting with one or more teachers in which he/she will collaborate to provide effective reading instruction to students. The candidate then prepares a Reading Specialist Work Sample, of which two elements directly address Student Learning.

**Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards** The Reading Specialist Practicum Analysis of Student Learning Components of the RSWS address several 2010 IRA Standards as follows:  
**Reading Specialist Work Sample Elements addressing Student Learning**

1. The Instructional Decision-Making element addresses 1.3, Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement; 2.1, Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum; 2.2, Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections; 3.4, communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences; 4.2, Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity; 5, 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; 5.3, Use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another, discussions, and peer feedback); and 5.4, Use a variety of classroom configurations (i.e., whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction.
2. The Analysis of Student Learning element addresses 1.3, 3.4, and 3.3, use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.

##### **Summary of the Data**

Student learning is addressed in elements of the work sample that address IRA Standards 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 5, 5.3, and 5.4. All candidates in 2011 scored at Target on these elements. One candidate in 2012 scored at Acceptable on elements addressing these standards, and one scored at Unacceptable on one element addressing standards 1.3 and 3.3.

##### **Assessment 5 Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards**

While our candidates, including those in the satellite location, are successful overall on the work sample, we note that the elements addressing IRA Standard 4, the recognition of student needs and reflecting on implications of diversity in instructional planning and student learning presented a challenge for about 1/3 of our candidates at the main campus in 2012 and about 1/6 of our candidates in 2011. We will continue to monitor candidates' ability to meet student needs

to see whether there is additional action needed, but we have already added an additional opportunity to focus on this in great detail in a portfolio assignment that we added this year to our course, Teaching Reading to the Diverse Learner. We expect that this assignment will help us more explicitly address candidate competence in recognizing and meeting the literacy needs of diverse learners and also help us identify those who may require more help in this area before they reach the practicum course in the program.

## 2. Assessment Documentation

### Directions to Candidates:

*Reading Specialist Work Sample* – The candidate is to complete a reflective written piece called the Reading Specialist Work Sample, patterned after the Teacher Work Sample from The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality. The Work Sample requires a candidate to reflect on the effectiveness of their teaching on student performance by examining the Contextual Factors of the school, by setting Learning Goals, by developing an Assessment Plan, by Designing Instruction based on the above information, ***by analyzing student learning to make Instructional Decisions, by examining student progress through Analysis of Student Learning***, and by Reflection and Self-Evaluation. In addition, as part of the RSWS, the Reading Specialist Candidate is required to consider the opportunities for coaching in this particular practicum placement and develop a coaching plan. This comprehensive document is 16-20 pages in length. Each section has specific requirements, including graphics created with technology and student samples. The Reading Specialist Work Sample will be evaluated by the University Supervisor. (See the complete description of each segment following this assignment description.)

**READING SPECIALIST PRACTICUM  
WORK SAMPLE  
52-598**

**Addresses IRA Standards for Reading Professionals 2010**

The following pages contain the information needed to complete the assignment for the practicum. The culminating project, called a Teacher Work Sample, allows the candidate to share a comprehensive look at the practicum experience.

The prompts and rubrics contained in this document were adapted from the Teacher Work Sample developed by representatives of the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality. Director: Roger Pankratz [rogerapankratz@wku.edu](mailto:rogerapankratz@wku.edu)

Sections pertaining to the analysis of student learning are excerpted here.

## **Instructional Decision-Making**

**(IRA 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.4, 4.2, 5, 5.3, 5.4; LU COE 1)**

*The reading specialist uses on-going analysis of student learning to help teachers make instructional decisions.*

### **Task 5**

Provide two examples of instructional decision-making based on students' learning or responses.

#### **Prompt**

- Think of a time during your unit when a student's learning or response caused you and the teacher to modify your original design for instruction. Consider the modifications you made to the instructional strategies or materials used to teach the main components of reading. Also, consider the changes that might have occurred to better match students to materials at their level or for other diverse needs. Did you make changes in the modeling or dispositions exhibited in attempting to motivate students to be readers or writers? (The resulting modification may affect other students as well.) Cite specific evidence to support your answers to the following:
  - Describe the student's learning or response that caused you to rethink your plans. The student's learning or response may come from a planned formative assessment or another source (not the pre-assessment).
  - Describe what you did next and explain why you thought this would improve student progress toward the learning goal.
- Now, think of one more time during your unit when another student's learning or response caused you to modify a different portion of your original design for instruction. (The resulting modification may affect other students as well.) Cite specific evidence to support your answers to the following:
  - Describe the student's learning or response that caused you to rethink your plans. The student's learning or response may come from a planned formative assessment or another source (not the pre-assessment).
  - Describe what you did next and explain why you thought this would improve student progress toward the learning goal.

**Suggested Page Length:** 3-4

---

## Analysis of Student Learning

**(IRA 1.3, 3.3, 3.4; LU COE 1)**

*The reading specialist uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.*

### Task 6

Analyze your assessment data, including pre-post assessments and formative assessments to determine student's progress related to the unit learning goals. Use visual representations and narrative to communicate the performance of the whole class, subgroups, and two individual students. Conclusions drawn from this analysis should be provided in the "Reflections and Self-Evaluation" section.

### Prompt

In this section, you will analyze data to explain progress and achievement toward learning goals demonstrated by subgroups of students or individual students.

- **Subgroups.** Select a group characteristic (e.g., gender, performance level, socio-economic status, language proficiency) to analyze in terms of **one learning goal**. Provide a rationale for your selection of this characteristic to form subgroups (e.g., girls vs. boys; high- vs. middle- vs. low-performers). Create a graphic representation that compares pre- and post-assessment results for the subgroups on this learning goal. Summarize what these data show about student learning.
- **Individuals.** Select two students that demonstrated different levels of performance. Explain why it is important to understand the learning of these particular students. Use pre-, formative, and post-assessment data with examples of the students' work to draw conclusions about the extent to which these students attained the two learning goals. Graphic representations are not necessary for this subsection.

*Note: You will provide possible reasons for why your students learned (or did not learn) in the next section, "Reflection and Self-Evaluation."*

**Suggested Page Length:** 4+ charts and student work examples

---



**R&L UA/IRA 4 and 5: 598 Reading & Literacy MA Specialist Practicum (rev 2011)**

**Instructional Decision-making Rubric**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<p><b>Sound Professional Practice IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.1.3 IRA-2010.3.4 IRA-2010.4.2 IRA-2010.5</b></p>	<p>Specialist encourages instructional decisions that are pedagogically sound (i.e., they are likely to lead to student learning) and based on the major components of reading, wide range of instructional practices and elements of creating a literate environment. Specialist articulates importance of teaching disposition on student achievement.</p>	<p>Instructional decisions are mostly appropriate, but some decisions are not based on the major components of reading, some variety of instructional practices or creating a literate environment. Specialist mentions teacher disposition on student achievement.</p>	<p>Many instructional decisions are inappropriate and not based on major components of reading or elements of creating a literate environment. Specialist makes no mention of teaching disposition on student achievement.</p>
<p><b>Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee IRA-2010.2.2 IRA-2010.2.3 IRA-2010.3.4 IRA-2010.4.2 IRA-2010.5.3 IRA-2010.5.4</b></p>	<p>Specialist encourages appropriate modifications of the instructional plan to address individual student needs. These modifications are informed by the analysis of student learning/performance, understanding of the major components of reading instruction, including developing a literate environment and contextual factors. Include explanation of why the modifications would improve student progress.</p>	<p>Some modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs, but these are minimally based on analysis of student learning, understanding of the major components of reading instruction, including developing a literate environment, or contextual factors. Some variety in instructional practices is present.</p>	<p>Specialist treats class as "one plan fits all" with no modifications and no relationship to major components of reading or creating a literate environment. No variety of instructional practices is evident.</p>
<p><b>Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.2.1</b></p>	<p>Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals.</p>	<p>Modifications in instruction are somewhat congruent with learning goals.</p>	<p>Modifications in instruction lack congruence with learning goals.</p>

## Analysis of Student Learning Rubric

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.3.4</b>	Presentation is easy to understand and contains no errors of representation.	Presentation is understandable and contains few errors.	Presentation is not clear and accurate; it does not accurately reflect the data.
<b>Alignment with Learning Goals IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IRA-2010.3.3</b>	Analysis is fully aligned with learning goals and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	Analysis of student learning is partially aligned with learning goals and/or fails to provide a comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the goals for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	Analysis of student learning is not aligned with learning goals.
<b>Interpretation of Data IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd IRA-2010.3.4</b>	Interpretation is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data.	Interpretation is technically accurate, but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data.	Interpretation is inaccurate, and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.
<b>Evidence of Impact on Student Learning IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee IRA-2010.1.3 IRA-2010.3.3</b>	Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal.	Analysis of student learning includes incomplete evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.	Analysis of student learning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.

4. Data Chart

**Data Results-SPA Assessments #4 and #5: Practicum for the Reading Specialist**

Reading Specialist Work Sample: Instructional Decision-making		Site	Summer, 2011 n=█			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n=█ Tinley Park n=█		
			T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 21</b>	<b>Sound Professional Practice IRA-2010.1.3, 3.4, 4.2, 5</b> Specialist encourages instructional decisions that are pedagogically sound (i.e., they are likely to lead to student learning) and based on the major components of reading, wide range of instructional practices and elements of creating a literate environment. Specialist articulates importance of teaching disposition on student achievement.	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 22</b>	<b>Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning IRA-2010 2.2, 2.3, 3.4, 4.2, 5.3, 5.4</b> Specialist encourages appropriate modifications of the instructional plan to address individual student needs. These modifications are informed by the analysis of student learning/performance, understanding of the major components of reading instruction, including developing a literate environment and contextual factors. Include explanation of why the modifications would improve student progress.	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 23</b>	<b>Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals: IRA-2010.2.1</b> Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%

Reading Specialist Work Sample: Analysis of Student Learning		Site	Summer, 2011 n=█			Summer, 2012 Romeoville n █ Tinley Park n █		
			T	A	U	T	A	U
			<b>Rubric Item 24</b>	<b>Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation IRA-2010.3.4</b> Presentation is easy to understand and contains no errors of representation.	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 25</b>	<b>Alignment with Learning Goals IRA-2010.3.3</b> Analysis is fully aligned with learning goals and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 26</b>	<b>Interpretation of Data: IRA-2010.3.4</b> Interpretation is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data.	Romeoville	█ 84%	█ 16%	█ 0%	█ 50%	█ 50%	█ 0%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%
<b>Rubric Item 27</b>	<b>Evidence of Impact on Student Learning: IRA-2010.1.3, 3.3</b> Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal.	Romeoville	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%	█ 67%	█ 16%	█ 16%
		Tinley Park	NA	NA	NA	█ 100%	█ 0%	█ 0%

## **Methods and Practicum in Reading Diagnosis and Remediation (52-529)**

### **Assessment #6: Diagnostic Practicum Evaluation**

#### **1. Narrative about Assessment #6**

##### **Description of the Assessment and Use in Program**

The Diagnostic Practicum Evaluation is conducted in the course 52-592, *Methods and Practicum in Reading Diagnosis and Remediation*. The diagnostic practicum provides a Level 2 coaching opportunity for candidates. In this Practicum, the candidate must assess and diagnose two students representing different grade levels. For each case, the candidate is evaluated on the following three components.

1. *Scheduled Diagnostic Sessions* – The candidate will successfully complete the reading assessment and diagnosis of a minimum of two students representing different educational levels. These sessions will also include diagnostic instruction.
2. *Collaborative Seminar Sessions* – Each candidate will be required conduct a formal summative presentation of the client to classmates, in which they discuss their assessment work with the student client, providing copies of key assessments and findings to support their presentation. All candidates are required to not only present their own clients, but to participate in the inquiry and discussion of all candidates' clients. This represents a Level 2 coaching opportunity.
3. *Complete Professional Case Reports* – Each candidate will demonstrate the ability to synthesize assessment data and write a report of diagnostic findings that includes recommendations for instruction, intervention, and/or a remediation plan. Two thoroughly developed, word-processed case reports must be written to communicate the results of the assessment to parents and teachers. These case reports will be prepared in consultation with the course instructor and will involve multiple revisions.

In addition, embedded in each component is an evaluation of *Professional Dispositions* – Each candidate is expected to display the highest professional dispositions during their work with children, parents, teachers, other reading professionals, and instructors.

##### **Assessment 6 Alignment with IRA Standards**

The Diagnostic Practicum Evaluation addresses 2010 IRA Standards through various components as follows:

*Scheduled Diagnostic Sessions* consist of preparation for assessment sessions, professional disposition in the conduct the sessions, and administration of assessments. These address 1.3, Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement; 3.1, Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations; 3.2, Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and online, for specific purposes; 3.4, Communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences; and 6.2, Display positive dispositions related to one's own reading and writing and the teaching or reading and writing and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.

*Collaborative Seminar Sessions* consist of the preparation of evidence, presentation of the case, and participation in providing recommendations to peers. These address 1.3, 3.1, 3.4, and 6.2, all noted above, as well as 4.1, Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write.

*Complete Professional Case Reports* consist of sections that address the student background, general observations, assessment results, analysis of reading performance, recommendations. In addition, report format, conventions, and professional dispositions are assessed. The Professional Case Reports address 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, and 6.2, as noted above. In addition, they address 2.2, Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading/writing connections; 2.3, Use a wide range of texts [narrative, expository, poetry, etc.] and traditional print and online resources; and 3.3 Use assessment information to plan and to evaluate instruction.

## **Summary of the Data and Interpretation of Data Findings with Evidence of Meeting IRA Standards**

The course in which the Diagnostic Practicum is conducted is offered each spring, so we have data using the 2010 standards from spring 2011 and spring 2012. There were 4 candidates who completed 2 case reports each in spring 2011, for a total of 8 reports evaluated, and 3 candidates in spring 2012 completed a total of 6 reports. In both years, all candidates achieved Target for both case reports on rubric items 2, 5, and 13, all of which pertain to professional dispositions and address IRA Standard 6.2. Also in both years, only one case report earned an Acceptable rating, with all the others earning Target, on rubric items 1, 6, 7, 8, and 12. These address IRA standards 1.3, 3.4, 4.1, and 6.2 and tell us that our candidates do an excellent job in their preparation for assessment including selection of appropriate assessments, understanding of professional knowledge, recognition of diversity, and professional dispositions in both assessment and coaching situations.

Rubric items 3, 4, 9, 10, and 11 were more challenging for some of our candidates, but candidates did meet the IRA Standards by achieving at least at the Acceptable level on each item. Item 3 addresses IRA standards 3.2 and 3.4, pertaining to the administration and interpretation of assessment results and communicating those results, and is assessed via the observation of the candidates' conduct of assessments with students. In 2011, candidates scored at Target for 75% of the cases assessed, and Acceptable for 25% of the cases, while in 2012 candidates scored at Target for 50% and Acceptable for 50% of the cases. This indicates that candidates made occasional errors in their administration or scoring of assessments during the assessment sessions for one of the two cases they conducted. Similarly, a few candidates in 2011 made minor errors on Item 4, which assesses their preparation and documentation for the seminar session in which they presented their student's case, with 37% of candidates scoring at Acceptable and 63% at Target. In 2012, 100% of candidates scored at Target on this element, which addresses IRA standards 3.1, 3.4, and 4.1. This indicates that our candidates for the most part interpret assessments correctly, communicate results of assessments effectively, and address diversity in their interpretation of assessments, although a few candidates needed additional support in these areas last year. Items 9, 10, and 11 addresses IRA standards 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4, and is evaluated through candidates' ability to describe assessment results effectively in a formal written report for parent and teacher audiences, the written analysis of assessment information, and recommendations for instruction. The majority of candidates in both years earned Target on these elements, but some (ranging from 16% to 50%) scored at Acceptable. This indicates that our candidates seem to be improving but some still need support in their interpretation of the meaning of assessment results, and the selection and description of instructional practices and communicating this to a variety of audiences.

Overall, our candidates do a very good job in their preparation for assessment, professional dispositions in the conduct of the diagnostic practicum elements, and coaching in the seminar sessions. However, a few of our candidates appear to need additional support to excel in their administration of assessments, analysis of assessment results and making appropriate recommendation for instruction based on those results. This practicum experience is a culmination and synthesis of the coursework candidates have completed prior to this practicum experience, but it is not the final practicum for candidates. We will continue to monitor candidate ability to administer assessments and will examine the previous assessment assignments and courses to identify opportunities to further emphasize assessment for optimal results and student learning. We will also monitor candidate performance in this course and explore opportunities to improve practice with these essential literacy coach skills in other assignments and courses in our program. While our candidates are performing adequately in using a variety of appropriate instructional approaches and materials, we see an opportunity to further strengthen our candidates' knowledge of these in their preparation in this course and others in the program. We include assignments that require candidates to write and present instructional recommendations in each of our courses, so we will continue to do this and explore ways to augment these assignments in the future.

We are pleased that our candidates take this practicum and the coaching opportunity it presents seriously and demonstrate effective practice in coaching and professional conduct. We will continue to emphasize these elements in all courses in our program.

## 2. Directions to Candidates:

All candidates for the MA in Reading and Literacy - Reading Specialist, must complete a successful Diagnostic Practicum. In this Practicum, the candidate must assess and diagnose two students representing different grade levels. Assessment and evaluation of candidate progress in 52-529 is conducted through three components: Conduct of the Scheduled Diagnostic Sessions, Collaborative Seminar Sessions, and Complete Professional Case Reports. Professional Dispositions are reflected throughout these three rubrics. The rubrics for all three components are contained in this assessment document.

A. The Scheduled Diagnostic Session is a key component of the clinical hours in this course. The candidate will be expected to demonstrate professional knowledge in selecting appropriate assessments. The candidate will then be expected to correctly and effectively use those assessment tools. The candidate is expected to display positive dispositions when working with all populations. The candidate will be responsible to successfully complete the reading assessment and diagnosis of a minimum of two students representing different educational levels. These sessions will also include diagnostic instruction.

B. The Collaborative Seminar Session is a key component of professional experiences in this course. Candidates must present their students through use of key artifacts and analysis from the diagnostic session. In addition, all candidates must participate in the inquiry and discussion of the other students presented. The seminars are an opportunity to extend the learning of all candidates and to provide coaching on each other's practice in a positive and collegial manner. Each candidate will be required to discuss his or her formative assessment work with clients and conduct a formal summative presentation of the client to classmates, providing copies of key assessments and findings. All candidates are required to not only present their own client, but to participate in the inquiry and discussion of all students. This provides a Level-2 coaching opportunity for candidates

C. The Complete Professional Case Report is one means for reading professionals to communicate results and implications of reading assessment to parents and other educators. Each candidate will demonstrate the ability to synthesize assessment data and prepare a report of diagnostic findings that includes recommendations for instruction, intervention, and/or a remediation plan. Two thoroughly developed, professionally formatted case reports must be written to communicate the results of the assessment to parents and teachers. These case reports will be prepared in consultation with the course instructor and will involve multiple revisions.

D. Each candidate is expected to display the highest professional dispositions during their work with children, parents, teachers, other reading professionals, and instructors. Dispositions evident in professional conduct, participation, discussions, and collaboration, are considered according to criteria outlined in the Illinois Teaching Standards and the International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professionals. Candidates are expected to use the professional vocabulary of reading and literacy theory and research, to discuss issues with respectful, professional language, treat student information with the highest confidentiality, and to engage in collaborative, supportive behavior that demonstrates understanding of the effect that an individual teacher's attitude and behavior can have on student and peer learning. This is key to the role of coach for a reading professional.

The final grade will be assigned based on the completion of the practicum experience, which will include the completion of two successful case reports following thorough assessment sessions with designated students and seminar participation, including peer coaching. The above four components (Scheduled Diagnostic Sessions, Collaborative Seminar Sessions, Complete Professional Case Reports, Professional Dispositions) are evaluated in the case report/practicum rubrics posted in College LiveText.

Each Case Report will be due multiple times as they are read, evaluated, and revised. Each revision is read carefully and any corrections needed must be completed and the report resubmitted in a timely manner. The final version of each report will be sent to the student's home and school, so the final versions must be perfect. The candidate should apply what was learned in the completion of the first report and demonstrate growth in the preparation of the subsequent report.

Candidates are expected to perform at "Acceptable" level or better on each evaluation component. Multiple ratings of "Unacceptable" on elements in any of the evaluation component rubrics will result in review by the University Supervisor and the Department Chair and will be discussed with the candidate to determine whether remediation or other action is needed. Completion of all practicum/case report responsibilities is necessary to earn a grade in the course. Final grades will be determined based on the balance of Target, Acceptable, and Unacceptable ratings across both case reports, with ratings on the second considered more heavily than the first.



## FULL CASE REPORTS-GENERAL FORMAT

Note—write section titles in full caps and identify each section with roman numerals, as on this page. The bulleted points here are for your assistance and should not appear in the body of your report. The report is to be double-spaced with a double space between sections. Follow the Report Preparation and Style Guidelines when preparing your report. *Do not include the words in italics in your report.*

The case report cover sheet will precede the first page of your report.

### I. BACKGROUND *(This section reports information gained prior to the assessment day)*

- student's age, grade, health, gender, etc.
- family and relationship
- medical history
- educational background
- information from the classroom teacher, reading teacher, or others as pertinent
- parent information (as reported in the Parent Form)
- student's interests
- attitudes reported by the parent & teacher

### II. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS *(This section reports information gained the assessment day)*

- assessment site and conditions
- time frame
- student attitudes and behavior
- other general interview results
- statement of validity

### III. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- Burke Interview description and results
- QRI description and definition of levels
- QRI results (report student's levels)
- other informal reading assessments administered this session, including descriptions and results of each
- standardized reading tests—descriptions and results
- writing sample description and results
- overall statement of performance

### IV. ANALYSIS OF READING PERFORMANCE

#### A. Word Recognition, Decoding, and Fluency

1. sight words
2. word recognition (decoding), isolated and in context
3. self-corrections
4. fluency

*(Continued on next page.)*

#### B. Comprehension and Vocabulary

1. oral and silent comprehension

2. retellings
3. sequencing
4. narrative and expository comprehension
5. vocabulary
6. other strategies

C. Writing and Motivation

1. writing
2. attitudes, self-perceptions

D. Overall Strengths and Areas of Need

- summarize areas of strength and need

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

(Be detailed about strategic activities and make solid connections between strengths or needs and activities.)

- school
- home
- student
- concluding statement

VI. APPENDIX

- booklist
- select strategy explanations

## Rubrics

### Scheduled Diagnostic Sessions

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<p><b>Preparation (1, 33%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3dd</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 1.3, 3.1, 6.2</b></p>	<p>---Made provisions for successful audio taping of the session</p> <p>---Has all needed materials for key assessments</p> <p>---Assessment materials are well organized for ease of administration</p> <p>---Brings additional materials/supplies that may be needed</p> <p>---Has made provision for student comfort and rapport</p> <p>---Demonstrates understanding of psychological, sociological and linguistic foundations of reading as well as knowledge of language development related to cultural and linguistic diversity when choosing assessments</p> <p>---Uses a wide range of assessments</p>	<p>---Meets the majority of criteria for excellent preparation</p> <p>---Some difficulty in choosing assessments appropriate to the foundations of reading and cultural or linguistic needs of the student</p> <p>Further assessment may have been appropriate</p>	<p>---Is missing needed materials</p> <p>---Materials are not well organized</p> <p>---Is not prepared for audio taping or has no back-up materials to address taping difficulties</p> <p>---(batteries, second tape, etc.)</p> <p>---Has made little or no provision for student comfort and rapport</p> <p>---Choice of assessments does not indicate knowledge of foundations of reading or language development related to cultural and linguistic diversity</p> <p>---Does not use a wide variety of assessments</p>
<p><b>Professional Disposition (1, 33%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 6.2</b></p>	<p>---Appearance and dress are professional and appropriate</p> <p>---Proceeds with calm demeanor and professional attitude</p> <p>---Maintains confidentiality of session and dignity of student</p> <p>---Presents self to parents/school personnel in a manner that well represents the Lewis University Reading and Literacy Program</p> <p>---Understands the connection between teacher dispositions and student success</p>	<p>---Appearance and dress are acceptable</p> <p>---Moments where demeanor or attitude slip are rare and self-corrected</p> <p>Presentation to parents/school and student are acceptable</p> <p>---Treats students with respect</p>	<p>---Is inappropriate in dress and personal appearance</p> <p>---Does not maintain confidentiality of session or dignity of student</p> <p>---Conversations with parents or colleagues are inappropriate for the setting</p> <p>---Presents cause for concern in an area of professional conduct or attitude during the session</p> <p>---Does not appear to understand the connection between teacher disposition and student success</p>

<p><b>Administration Procedures (1, 33%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 3.2, 3.4</b></p>	<p>---Completes formal assessments as designed</p> <p>---Administers IRI appropriately and efficiently</p> <p>---Uses informal assessments in a manner that will deliver the best information about the student</p> <p>---Encourages ongoing progress without indicating correctness of answers</p> <p>---Does not provide leading prompts or supply answers</p> <p>---Able to identify student proficiencies and difficulties</p>	<p>---Uses acceptable procedures to administer assessments</p> <p>---Recovers from errors in a way that does not compromise assessment results</p> <p>---Encourages without leading student</p> <p>---Able to place students on a developmental continuum</p>	<p>---Uncertainty about administration procedures is disruptive to the session</p> <p>---Use of materials clearly indicates unfamiliarity with procedures</p> <p>---Makes significant errors in administration of one or more assessments</p> <p>---Provides leading prompts or answers</p> <p>---Praise or comments indicate student performance</p> <p>---Unable to identify student proficiencies and difficulties in assessment</p>
---	--	---	---

**Collaborative Seminar Sessions**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<p><b>Paperwork: Handouts &amp; Evidence (1, 33%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 3.1, 3.4, 4.1</b></p>	<p>---Candidate is appropriately prepared with assessment results, analysis and recommendation charts to communicate results to instructor and peers</p> <p>---All results are calculated correctly and documented</p> <p>---Student is placed along a developmental continuum</p> <p>---Assessment results are used to plan instruction that meets the diverse needs of students and takes student interest, abilities and backgrounds into consideration</p>	<p>---Candidate provides too much or too little information about the student when communicating to peers</p> <p>---Some minor errors in calculations or analysis may occur</p> <p>---Information is mostly well-organized</p> <p>---Assessment results may not be clearly connected to the plan of instruction</p>	<p>---Candidate does not show clear evidence of organization or careful preparation</p> <p>---Pieces of assessment information may be missing or calculations may be incorrect</p> <p>---Instructional recommendations are missing or do not fit assessment results</p> <p>---Does not take student interest, abilities or background into consideration when planning instruction</p>

<p><b>Presentation: Use of time, Professionalism, Dispositions (1, 33%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 3.4, 6.2</b></p>	<p>---Candidate represents the student well and with professional language  ---Presentation time is used efficiently, organized and logical  ---Candidate is able to communicate a synthesis of assessment information</p>	<p>---Candidate uses appropriate language when discussing student  ---May go overtime or demonstrate some disorganization when presenting  ---Treats student information seriously</p>	<p>---Uses inappropriate language or shows disrespect when discussing the student  ---Uses too little time to present the student well or uses too much time, rambles or searches for information  ---Candidate is unable to communicate a synthesis of assessment information</p>
<p><b>Participation: Disposition, Support, Feedback, Recommendations (1, 33%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ff</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3bb</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 1.3, 6.2</b></p>	<p>---Candidate makes connections between theory and practice, and among cases presented  ---Peer suggestions show understanding of principles of effective reading diagnosis and instruction and how the major components of reading are integrated  ---Consistently provides supportive feedback to peers  ---Suggests appropriate recommendations</p>	<p>---Candidate makes connections among cases  ---Peer suggestions show understanding of theory and principles of effective reading diagnosis and instruction, but may demonstrate some confusions  ---Provides supportive feedback to peers  ---Candidate suggests thoughtful recommendations</p>	<p>---Candidate is not participatory or  ---exhibits unprofessional demeanor  ---Provides inappropriate or counterproductive feedback or recommendations to peers  ---Unable to demonstrate an understanding of the major components of reading and how they are integrated</p>

### Complete Professional Case Reports

	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
<p><b>Background (1, 8%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 3.4, 4.1</b></p>	<p>---Candidate demonstrates knowledge of psychological, sociological, and linguistic foundations of reading in the selection of important background information in communicating results to teachers and parents</p>	<p>---Candidate may choose too little or too much information when choosing background information for the report to teachers and parents</p>	<p>---The candidate does not demonstrate an understanding of the foundations of reading when selecting background information for the report of results to teachers and parents</p>
<p><b>General Observations (1, 8%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 3.4, 4.1</b></p>	<p>---Candidate demonstrates knowledge of psychological, sociological, and linguistic foundations of reading in noting student behavior and performance when communicating results to teachers and parents</p>	<p>---Candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge of the foundations of reading when noting student behavior and performance, though some elements may be missing when communicating results to teachers and parents</p>	<p>---Candidate does not demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of the foundations of reading when noting student behavior and performance in communicating results to teachers and parents</p>

<p><b>Assessment Results (2, 16%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 3.1, 3.2, 3.4</b></p>	<p>---Candidate is able to describe the use of a wide range of assessments and to place the student along a continuum of proficiencies and difficulties  ---Communicates results of assessments to teachers and parents</p>	<p>---Candidate is generally able to describe the use of assessments and to indicate the student's proficiencies and difficulties  ---Communicates results of assessments to teachers and parents</p>	<p>---Candidate is unable to describe the use of assessments and to determine the student's placement on a continuum of development  ---Unable to communicate results of assessments to teachers and parents</p>
<p><b>Analysis of Reading Performance (4, 33%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2dd</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 3.2, 3.4</b></p>	<p>---Candidate demonstrates knowledge of the major components of reading while analyzing the wide range of assessments used in the diagnosis  ---Places student along a developmental continuum, while identifying strengths and needs  ---Communicates analysis of assessments to teachers and parents</p>	<p>---Candidate may omit a reading component or a student strength or need in the process of analyzing the wide range of assessments  ---Communicates analysis of assessments to teachers and parents</p>	<p>---Candidate is unable to demonstrate knowledge of the major components of reading or to analyze assessments  ---Unable to communicate results of assessments to teachers and parents</p>
<p><b>Recommendations (2, 16%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1aa</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ee</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2ee</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3bb</b> <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3dd</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1</b></p>	<p>---Candidate recommends a wide range of instructional practices and materials to teachers, including grouping options to support the reading needs of diverse students  ---Recommends multiple materials that match the levels, interests and cultural and linguistic background of student  ---Materials are chosen to motivate student  ---Encourages modeling of reading and writing as a valued lifelong activity</p>	<p>---Candidate recommends some instructional practices and materials to teachers, including grouping options to support the reading needs of diverse students  ---Recommends some materials that match the levels, interests and cultural and linguistic background of student  ---Materials are chosen to motivate student  ---Encourages modeling of reading and writing as a valued lifelong activity</p>	<p>---Candidate is unable to recommend instructional practices and materials to teachers, ignores grouping options to support the reading needs of diverse students  ---Recommended materials do not match the levels, interests and cultural and linguistic background of student nor do they provide motivation  ---Does not encourage modeling of reading and writing as a valued lifelong activity</p>

























<p><b>Report Format and Conventions (1, 8%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 6.2</b></p>	<p>---Report is free of mechanical, typographical, grammatical, or other errors  ---Conventions of English are used appropriately  ---Guidelines for preparing professional reports are followed</p>	<p>---Report contains few or insignificant mechanical, typographical, grammatical, or other errors.  ---Conventions of English are used appropriately with few deviations  ---Guidelines for preparing professional reports are followed with few deviations</p>	<p>---Report contains significant or several mechanical, typographical, grammatical, or other errors  ---Several misuses of conventions of English are evident  ---Guidelines for preparing professional reports are not well followed</p>
<p><b>Professional Dispositions (1, 8%)</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1bb IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.1ff</b>  <b>IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.2cc IL-LEWIS-COE-2008.3bb</b></p> <p><b>IRA 2010: 1.3, 6.2</b></p>	<p>---Candidate completes all materials in a timely manner, incorporates feedback and takes responsibility for revisions that keep the report cohesive  ---Engages in professional dialogue with instructor, displaying positive dispositions about literacy and reflecting on one's own work</p>	<p>---Candidate completes materials in timely manner, incorporates feedback and revises most areas of the report  ---Engages in dialogue with the instructor and follows suggestions, keeping positive dispositions toward the instructor and literacy  ---Begins to reflect on work</p>	<p>---Candidate does not complete materials in a timely manner, and is not attentive to revisions  ---Does not engage in dialogue, but wishes to be told what to do  ---Displays negative attitudes toward the instructor and literacy  ---Does not demonstrate reflection</p>



















**Data Results-SPA Assessment #6: Diagnostic Practicum**

Scheduled Diagnostic Sessions		Spring, 2011 n= [REDACTED]			Spring, 2012 n= [REDACTED]		
		T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 1</b>	<p><b>Preparation</b>  <b>IRA 2010: 1.3, 3.1, 6.2</b>                      Made provisions for successful audio taping and conduct of the session; Has all needed materials; well organized; Has made provision for student comfort and rapport; Demonstrates understanding of psychological, sociological and linguistic foundations of reading as well as knowledge of language development related to cultural and linguistic diversity when choosing assessments; Uses a wide range of assessments</p>	<p>88%</p>	<p>12%</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>0%</p>
<b>Rubric Item 2</b>	<p><b>Professional Disposition: IRA 2010: 6.2</b>                      Appearance and dress are professional and appropriate ; Proceeds with calm demeanor and professional attitude ; Maintains confidentiality of session and dignity of student ; Presents self to parents/school personnel in a manner that well represents the Lewis University Reading and Literacy Program ; Understands the connection between teacher dispositions and student success</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>0%</p>
<b>Rubric Item 3</b>	<p><b>Administration Procedures</b>  <b>IRA 2010: 3.2, 3.4</b>                      Completes formal assessments as designed ; Administers IRI appropriately and efficiently ; Uses informal assessments in a manner that will deliver the best information about the student ; Encourages ongoing progress without indicating correctness of answers ; Does not provide leading prompts or supply answers ; Able to identify student proficiencies and difficulties</p>	<p>75%</p>	<p>25%</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>0%</p>



		Spring, 2011			Spring, 2012		
		T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Collaborative Seminar Sessions</b>							
<b>Rubric Item 4</b>	<p><b>Paperwork: Handouts &amp; Evidence</b>  <b>IRA 2010: 3.1, 3.4, 4.1</b></p> <p>Candidate is appropriately prepared with assessment results, analysis and recommendation charts to communicate results to instructor and peers; All results are calculated correctly and documented ; Student is placed along a developmental continuum; Assessment results are used to plan instruction that meets the diverse needs of students and takes student interest, abilities and backgrounds into consideration</p>	 63%	 37%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 5</b>	<p><b>Presentation: Use of time, Professionalism, Dispositions</b>  <b>IRA 2010: 3.4, 6.2</b></p> <p>Candidate represents the student well and with professional language; Presentation time is used efficiently, organized and logical; Candidate is able to communicate a synthesis of assessment information</p>	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 6</b>	<p><b>Participation: Disposition, Support, Feedback, Recommendations</b>  <b>IRA 2010: 1.3, 6.2</b></p> <p>Candidate makes connections between theory and practice, and among cases presented; Peer suggestions show understanding of principles of effective reading diagnosis and instruction and how the major components of reading are integrated; Consistently provides supportive feedback to peers; Suggests appropriate recommendations</p>	 100%	 0%	 0%	 83%	 16%	 0%

		Spring, 2011 n= [REDACTED]			Spring, 2012 n= [REDACTED]		
		T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Complete Professional Case Reports</b>							
<b>Rubric Item 7</b>	<b>Background: IRA 2010: 3.4, 4.1</b> Candidate demonstrates knowledge of psychological, sociological, and linguistic foundations of reading in the selection of important background information in communicating results to teachers and parents	 88%	 12%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 8</b>	<b>General Observations</b> <b>IRA 2010: 3.4, 4.1</b> Candidate demonstrates knowledge of psychological, sociological, and linguistic foundations of reading in noting student behavior and performance when communicating results to teachers and parents	 88%	 12%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 9</b>	<b>Assessment Results</b> <b>IRA 2010: 3.1, 3.2, 3.4</b> Candidate is able to describe the use of a wide range of assessments and to place the student along a continuum of proficiencies and difficulties; Communicates results of assessments to teachers and parents	 27%	 72%	 0%	 83%	 16%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 10</b>	<b>Analysis of Reading Performance</b> <b>IRA 2010: 3.2, 3.4</b> Candidate demonstrates knowledge of the major components of reading while analyzing the wide range of assessments used in the diagnosis; Places student along a developmental continuum, while identifying strengths and needs; Communicates analysis of assessments to teachers and parents	 50%	 50%	 0%	 67%	 33%	 0%

<b>Rubric Item 11</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Recommendations</b>  <b>IRA 2010: 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1</b></p> <p>Candidate recommends a wide range of instructional practices and materials to teachers, including grouping options to support the reading needs of diverse students; Recommends multiple materials that match the levels, interests and cultural and linguistic background of student; Materials are chosen to motivate student; Encourages modeling of reading and writing as a valued lifelong activity</p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>50%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>50%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>67%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>33%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0%</b></p>
<b>Rubric Item 12</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Report Format and Conventions</b>  <b>IRA 2010: 6.2</b></p> <p>Report is free of mechanical, typographical, grammatical, or other errors; Conventions of English are used appropriately; Guidelines for preparing professional reports are followed</p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>100%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>84%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0%</b></p>
<b>Rubric Item 13</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment-IRA 3.2, 3.3</b></p> <p>Candidate completes all materials in a timely manner, incorporates feedback and takes responsibility for revisions that keep the report cohesive; Engages in professional dialogue with instructor, displaying positive dispositions about literacy and reflecting on one's own work</p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>100%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>100%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0%</b></p>	 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0%</b></p>

# **SPA Assessment #7: Additional Assessment That Addresses IRA Standards Differentiation Portfolio**

## **1. Narrative about Assessment #7**

### **Description of the Assessment and Use in Program**

The Differentiation Portfolio is completed in 52-527 Teaching Reading to the Diverse Learner, a course that typically occurs during the beginning to middle of a candidate's program. It is a comprehensive collection of information in which candidates demonstrate how they might apply knowledge of working with diverse students at a beginning level of coaching – by gathering information that can be shared with other educators. The Differentiation Portfolio contains multiple sections in which the candidate discusses key information about working with diverse learners, including a narrative about diversity, disposition and critical literacy; assessment options, learning environment development; instructional strategy options, and potential print, digital and online intervention materials. Though the course is required in the Reading Specialist program, it is an elective in a program in another department. The data charts for this assessment only include the scores of individuals in the Reading Specialist program. Though the program had a similar assignment in this course prior to the adoption of the 2010 IRA Standards, the Department decided to make some revisions to the activity and adopt this as a key assessment for our program.

### **Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards**

The Differentiation Portfolio addresses several 2010 IRA Standards through the five sections as follows:

- The narrative in the Diversity, Disposition and Critical Literacy section addresses 4.1 Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write; and 4.3 Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity.
- The Assessment section addresses 3.2 Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes and 3.3 Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.
- The Learning Environment section addresses 5.1 Design the physical environment to optimize students' use of traditional print, digital, and online resources in reading and writing instruction and 5.2 Design a social environment that is low risk and includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write.
- The Instructional Strategies and Intervention Materials sections address 2.2 Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections and 4.2 Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.

### **Summary of the Data**

The data chart includes scores from 17 individuals who were assessed in two different semesters. For the first three items in the rubric, Diversity, Disposition and Critical Literacy; Assessment; and Learning Environment; all candidates received Target or Acceptable ratings. Those assessed during Summer, 2011, demonstrated more Acceptable than Target ratings for the first three items. Those assessed during Spring, 2012, demonstrated more Target than Acceptable ratings. For the last two items on the rubric, 63% of candidates from the Summer 2011 administration received Target or Acceptable for Instructional Strategies while 36% received Unacceptable. In addition, 81% from that administration received Target or Acceptable for Intervention Materials, while 18% received Unacceptable. All candidates from the Spring, 2012 administration received Target for Instructional Strategies and Intervention Materials. Overall, candidate performance improved between the Summer, 2011 administration and the Spring, 2012 administration.

### **Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards**

This assessment provides evidence for the ability of candidates to meeting the IRA Standards aligned to the assessment, but it also indicates a beginning level of coaching, in which candidates gather information about working with diverse students that can be shared with other educators. All Reading Specialist candidates on the data chart received an Acceptable or Target rating for the first three rubric items. This indicates that candidates from both administrations recognize, understand and value forms of diversity and develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity (IRA 4.1, 4.3); they are able to select, develop, administer and interpret assessment and use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction (IRA 3.2, 3.3); and they can design the physical environment to optimize student use of resources and design a social environment that is low-risk, include choice, motivation and scaffolded support (IRA 5.1, 5.2). Though only 63% of Summer, 2011 candidates scored at Target or Acceptable for Instructional Strategies, 100% of Spring, 2012 candidates demonstrated the ability to select appropriate and varied instructional strategies and to use a literacy curriculum and instructional practices that positively impact diversity (IRA 2.2, 4.2). The 36% of candidates who scored at Unacceptable, received that score because they did not follow directions correctly. Primarily, they did not describe two strategies in each of the 5 core reading elements because they misread directions. For the final rubric item, 81% of candidates in the Summer, 2011 administration and 100% of Spring, 2012 candidates demonstrated the ability to select appropriate and varied instructional strategies and to use a literacy curriculum and instructional practices that positively impact diversity (IRA 2.2, 4.2). The 18% from the Summer, 2011 administration who scored at Unacceptable, received that score because they did not follow directions. Primarily, those two candidates did not draw from the intervention materials that were examined as part of the course, which was a requirement of the assessment. We believe that candidates in the second administration in Spring, 2012 scored more Target ratings and no Unacceptable ratings because an effort was made to make sure that candidates clearly understood the directions for the assessment.

## 2. Directions to Candidates

### Reading and Literacy Program Assessment #7 Differentiation Portfolio 52-527 Teaching Reading to the Diverse Learner

All candidates for the MA in Reading and Literacy-Reading Specialist must complete this portfolio to demonstrate how they might apply knowledge of working with diverse students at a beginning level of coaching – by gathering information that can be shared with other educators.

#### Directions to the Candidate:

Applying knowledge from this course, develop a portfolio of information that can be used to assist other educators as they work with the diverse learners in today's classrooms. The portfolio contents should be divided into five different sections. These include:

- Diversity, Disposition and Critical Literacy**  
Describe the different types of diversity that might be found in today's classrooms. Discuss your understanding of the ways in which diversity influences the reading and writing development of all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing, as well as English language learners. Why is teacher attitude important in teaching diverse students? Why should teachers maintain a critical literacy perspective? How can issues of inequity and opportunities for social justice be incorporated into the literacy curriculum? What might teachers do to help link the school and community?  
IRA 4.1; 4.3; ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 2, 6; COE 1c; 1e; 1f; 1g; 2b; 2c; 2d; 2e; 3a; 3b; 3c; 3d
- Assessment**  
Describe the information an educator needs to know about a student to help him or her succeed with reading and writing. How can an educator be sure to provide instruction in the zone of proximal development? How does the diversity in today's classrooms impact what information is gathered or how it is gathered? Provide a description at least 5 reading or writing assessments discussed in class and describe how the information from the assessment can inform instruction for diverse learners, including English language learners.  
IRA 3.2; 3.3; ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 2; COE 1a; 1b; 1c; 2d; 3a
- Learning Environment**  
Discuss the importance of creating a safe physical and social learning environment for diverse learners. Discuss the impact of choice, motivation, risk and scaffolded support for individuals who have diverse learning needs, including the need to support the language development English language learners. Please include a discussion of the use of print, digital and online resources. IRA 5.1; 5.2; WIDA ELPS 1, 2; ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 2; COE 1c; 1e; 2a; 2b; 2c; 2e; 3a; 3c; 3d
- Instructional Strategies**  
Briefly describe at least two instructional strategies for each of the five elements of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension) that were

examined in this course as potential literacy support for diverse learners. Be sure to describe traditional print as well as online resources. Include a statement of how this strategy might benefit the literacy needs of an individual, including English language learners. IRA 2.2; 4.2; WIDA ELPS 2; ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 2, 4; COE 1a; 1b; 1d; 2a; 2b; 2c; 3a; 3d; NETS Standard 1 & 2

### 5. Intervention Materials

Briefly describe at least 5 traditional print, digital or online resources examined in this course that can be recommended to use as interventions to support students with diverse literacy needs, including English language learners. Be sure to indicate how these materials would benefit the literacy needs of diverse learners. IRA

2.2; 4.2; ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 2, 4, 7; COE 1a; 1b; 1d; 2a; 2b; 2c; 3a; 3d; NETS Standard 2

This assignment supports 2010 IRA Standards 2.2 Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections; 3.2 Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes; 3.3 Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction; 4.1 Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write; 4.2 Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity; 4.3 Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity; 5.1 Design the physical environment to optimize students' use of traditional print, digital, and online resources in reading and writing instruction; 5.2 Design a social environment that is low risk and includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write.

This assignment supports WIDA ELP Standard 1: English language learners communicate for Social and Instructional purposes within the school setting; Standard 2: English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of Language Arts.

This assignment supports NETS Standard 1: Facilitate and Inspire Student Learning and Creativity; Standard 2: Design and Develop Digital-Age Learning Experiences and Assessments.

This assignment supports ISBE Reading Specialist Section 27.120 Standards 1: The competent reading specialist has a deep understanding of reading and reading instruction; 2. The competent reading specialist understands how to diagnose reading disabilities and how to teach and support the education of students with reading disabilities; 4. The competent reading specialist provides leadership in curriculum design and implementation; 6. The competent reading specialist communicates and works with the public and other professionals; 7. The competent reading specialist secures and manages instruction resources.

This assignment supports the COE Unit Standards: 1. **Knowledgeable Critical Transformative Educators:** a. Demonstrates in-depth knowledge of subject matter; b. Demonstrates professional knowledge and skills; c. Implements a robust knowledge of critical pedagogical content; d. Integrates technology in practices; e. Creates positive environments for student learning; f. Reflects on professional experiences; g. Acts on professional convictions; 2. **Multicultural Educators:** a. Articulates personal prejudices and biases and knows their impact on teaching and learning; b. Demonstrates knowledge of schools and classrooms as non-neutral cultural space and the implications for teaching and learning; c. Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures; d. Demonstrates a thorough understanding of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessment student learning; e. Creates positive environments for all students, including students with exceptionalities; 3. **Social Justice Advocates:** a. Articulates institutional inequities and their impact on teaching and learning; b. Engages relevant communities to bring about change; c. Challenges dominant discourses; d. Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn.

## 3. Scoring Rubric

Reading and Literacy Program Assessment #7			
Differentiation Portfolio Rubric			
52-527 Teaching Reading to the Diverse Learner			
	Target (90-100%)	Acceptable (70-80%)	Unacceptable (<70%)
Diversity, Disposition	Candidate describes the range of diversity found in a classroom	Candidate describes only a few type of diversity found in the	Candidate describes only one type of diversity found in a

<p><b>and Critical Literacy</b> IRA 4.1; 4.3 ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 2, 6 COE 1cc; 1ee; 1ff; 1gg; 2bb; 2cc; 2dd; 2ee; 3aa; 3bb; 3cc; 3dd</p>	<p>and how the types of diversity can influence the reading and writing development of students. Candidate describes the importance of teacher attitude and critical perspective. Response includes a discussion of social justice and the school/community connection.</p>	<p>classroom and gives a limited description of how diversity can influence student reading and writing development. Candidate describes the importance of teacher attitude or critical perspective, but not both. Response discusses social justice or the school/community connection.</p>	<p>classroom or does not discuss how diversity can influence the reading and writing development of students. Candidate does not discuss the importance of teacher attitude and critical perspective or include a discussion of social justice and the school/community connection.</p>
<p><b>Assessment</b> IRA 3.2; 3.3 ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 2 COE 1aa; 1bb; 1cc; 2dd; 3aa</p>	<p>Candidate describes the types of student information that teachers to collect in order to design appropriate instruction, provides a complete description of how diversity impacts the type and manner in which information is gathered, and provides 5 appropriate assessment examples.</p>	<p>Candidate provides a limited description of student information needed to plan instruction, provides a limited description of how diversity impacts the type and manner in which information is gathered, and names only a few assessments for gathering information.</p>	<p>Candidate is unable to discuss the student data needed to plan instruction, or is unable to provide a description of how diversity impacts the type and manner in which information is gathered, or is unable to name specific assessments.</p>
<p><b>Learning Environment</b> IRA 5.1; 5.2 ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 2 COE 1cc; 1ee; 2aa; 2bb; 2cc; 2ee; 3aa; 3cc; 3dd WIDA ELPS: 1, 2</p>	<p>Candidate describes the importance of establishing a safe and supportive learning environment for diverse learners, including the impact of choice, motivation, risk and scaffolded support for individuals who have diverse learning needs. Candidate includes discussion of language development for English language learners, as well as the use of print, digital and online resources.</p>	<p>Candidate provides a limited description of the importance of establishing a safe and supportive learning environment for students who struggle with reading, and gives a limited description of the impact of choice, motivation, risk and scaffolded support for individuals who have diverse learning needs. Candidate includes discussion of language development for English language learners, as well as either print, digital or online resources.</p>	<p>Candidate is unable to provide a description of the importance of establishing a safe and supportive learning environment for students who struggle with reading or does not provide a description of the impact of choice, motivation, risk and scaffolded support for diverse learners, or language development for English language learners. Candidate is unable to discuss the need for print, digital or online resources.</p>
<p><b>Instructional Strategies</b> IRA 2.2; 4.2 ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 2, 4 COE 1aa; 1bb; 1dd; 2aa; 2bb; 2cc; 3aa; 3dd WIDA ELPS: 2 NETS Standard 1 &amp; 2</p>	<p>Candidate provides a complete description of two instructional strategies in each of the 5 areas of reading instruction that might provide intervention for diverse learners, as well as a statement of how the strategy benefits students, including English language learners.</p>	<p>Candidate provides a limited description of two instructional strategies in each of the 5 areas of reading instruction that might provide intervention for diverse learners, as well as a statement of how the strategy benefits the students, including English language learners.</p>	<p>Candidate may only name strategies or provide description for fewer than two strategies in each of the 5 areas of reading instruction that might provide intervention for diverse learners, or does not provide a statement of how the strategy benefits the students, including English language learners.</p>
<p><b>Intervention Materials</b> IRA 2.2; 4.2 ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 2, 4, 7 COE 1aa; 1bb; 1dd; 2aa; 2bb; 2cc; 3aa; 3dd NETS Standard 2</p>	<p>Candidate describes 5 print, digital or online resources used as interventions to support diverse learners, including English language learners, and indicates the benefit for these learners.</p>	<p>Candidate describes only 5 print resources as interventions to support diverse learners, including English language learners, and indicates the benefit for these learners.</p>	<p>Candidate describes fewer than 5 resources as interventions to support diverse learners, including English language learners or does not indicate the benefit for these learners.</p>

This assignment supports 2010 IRA Standards 2.2 Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections; 3.2 Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes; 3.3 Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction; 4.1 Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write; 4.2 Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity; 4.3 Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity; 5.1 Design the physical environment to optimize students' use of traditional print, digital, and online resources in reading and writing instruction; 5.2 Design a social environment that is low risk and includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write.





















This assignment supports NETS Standard 1: Facilitate and Inspire Student Learning and Creativity; Standard 2: Design and Develop Digital-Age Learning Experiences and Assessments.













This assignment promotes WIDA Standard 1: English language learners communicate for Social and Instructional purposes within the school setting and Standard 2: English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of Language Arts.

This assignment supports ISBE Reading Specialist Section 27.120 Standards 1: The competent reading specialist has a deep understanding of reading and reading instruction; 2. The competent reading specialist understands how to diagnose reading disabilities and how to teach and support the education of students with reading disabilities; 4. The competent reading specialist provides leadership in curriculum design and implementation; 6. The competent reading specialist communicates and works with the public and other professionals; 7. The competent reading specialist secures and manages instruction resources.

This assignment supports the COE Unit Standards: 1. **Knowledgeable Critical Transformative Educators:** aa. Demonstrates in-depth knowledge of subject matter; bb. Demonstrates professional knowledge and skills; cc. Implements a robust knowledge of critical pedagogical content; dd. Integrates technology in practices; ee. Creates positive environments for student learning; ff. Reflects on professional experiences; gg. Acts on professional convictions; 2. **Multicultural Educators:** aa. Articulates personal prejudices and biases and knows their impact on teaching and learning; bb. Demonstrates knowledge of schools and classrooms as non-neutral cultural space and the implications for teaching and learning; cc. Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures; dd. Demonstrates a thorough understanding of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessment student learning; ee. Creates positive environments for all students, including students with exceptionalities; 3. **Social Justice Advocates:** aa. Articulates institutional inequities and their impact on teaching and learning; bb. Engages relevant communities to bring about change; cc. Challenges dominant discourses; dd. Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn.

#### 4. Data Results-SPA Assessment #7: Differentiation Portfolio

		Summer, 2011 n=			Spring, 2012 n=		
		T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Rubric Item 1</b>	<b>Diversity, Disposition and Critical Literacy-IRA 4.1, 4.3</b> Description of range of diversity can influence reading and writing development; teacher attitude and critical perspective; social justice and the community connection	 45%	 54%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 2</b>	<b>Assessment-IRA 3.2, 3.3</b> Description of types of information to collect for designing instruction; how diversity impacts the type and manner of gathering information; 5 examples of assessments	 27%	 72%	 0%	 83%	 16%	 0%
<b>Rubric Item 3</b>	<b>Learning Environment-IRA 5.1, 5.2</b> Description of establishing safe and supportive learning environment including the impact of choice, motivation, risk, and scaffolded support; language development for ELL's; and use of print, digital and online resource	 27%	 72%	 0%	 83%	 16%	 0%

<b>Rubric Item 4</b>	<b>Instructional Strategies-IRA 2.2, 4.2</b> Description of two instructional strategies for each of the 5 core areas of reading instruction to benefit diverse learners	 <b>27%</b>	 <b>36%</b>	 <b>36%</b>	 <b>100%</b>	 <b>0%</b>	 <b>0%</b>
<b>Rubric Item 5</b>	<b>Intervention Materials-IRA 2.2, 4.2</b> Description of 5 print, digital or online resources as interventions to support diverse learners	 <b>45%</b>	 <b>36%</b>	 <b>18%</b>	 <b>100%</b>	 <b>0%</b>	 <b>0%</b>

# **SPA Assessment #8: Additional Assessment That Addresses IRA Standards Literacy Leadership Portfolio**

## **1. Narrative about Assessment #8:**

### **Description of the Assessment and Use in Program**

The Literacy Leadership Portfolio is completed in 52-547 Supervising the P-12 Reading Program, a required course that typically occurs near the end of a candidate's program. It is a portfolio of activities that allows the candidate to demonstrate literacy leadership and coaching at Level 2 and Level 3 intensity. The three activities include the development of a Professional Development Presentation that is rehearsed in class, but delivered to members of a local reading council or to the candidate's colleagues at school; a Literacy Observation and Coaching Plan that is conducted with a candidate's colleague in a school district; and an Analysis of a School Wide Literacy Program with Action Plan for Improvement, which is completed in the candidate's or a colleague's district. The Professional Development Presentation and Literacy Observation and Coaching Plan were individual assessments in the previous iteration of the Program Report. A Curriculum Review was an assignment in this course that was not a key assessment. With the advent of the 2010 IRA Standards, the Curriculum Review was modified to include an analysis and action plan based on an IRA Sample Assessment, and all three activities were combined to form a Literacy Leadership Portfolio.

### **Assessment Alignment with IRA Standards**

Part I, the Professional Development Presentation, is aligned with several IRA 2010 Standards. Choosing a topic that focuses on a key aspect of reading, connects to audience needs, is supported with relevant historical and current research and involves the audience aligns with the Standards related to foundational knowledge, curriculum and instruction, diversity, literate environment, and professional learning and leadership IRA 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1 and 6.3. Providing a handout and an evaluation sheet for the presentation aligns with Standards related to professional learning IRA 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3.

In Part II, the Literacy Observation and Coaching Plan, the candidate needs to consider the impact of faculty member's background on student learning and the colleague's professional growth which aligns with the Standards related to foundational knowledge and professional learning IRA 1.3 and 6.1. The planning process and lesson presentation aligns with Standards related to foundational knowledge, assessment and evaluation, diversity, and literate environment IRA 1.1, 3.3, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4. Consideration of professional development suggestions aligns with the Standards for professional learning and leadership IRA 6.1 and 6.3. The candidate reflection on personal learning aligns with Standards for foundational knowledge and professional learning and leadership IRA 1.1, 1.3, 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3.

In Part III, the Analysis of a School Wide Literacy Program with Action Plan for Improvement, the candidate needs to interview stakeholders to determine strengths and weaknesses of the school literacy program and then create a chart and narrative

that displays that information, which aligns with the curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, and diversity Standards, IRA 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 4.2, 4.3. The candidate then needs to develop an action plan for one initiative to impact the school literacy program, which aligns with the curriculum and instruction and professional learning and leadership Standards, IRA 2.1, 6.1, 6.3, and 6.4.

### **Summary of the Data**

The data chart contains information from 12 candidates from the Romeoville campus who were assessed during two semesters over two years. All candidates received a Target for all the rubric elements in Part I Professional Development Presentation.

For Part II, Literacy Observation and Coaching Plan, all candidates received either a Target or Acceptable for all the rubric elements. For the Spring, 2011 administration, all candidates received Target for all the rubric elements. For the Spring, 2012 administration, 57% of candidates received an Acceptable in the area of Suggestions for Further Professional Growth, while 42% received a Target in that category. The same group had 14% of candidates who received an Acceptable and 85% received Target in Coaching Reflection.

In Part III, Analysis of a School Wide Literacy Program with Action Plan for Improvement, candidates scored at Target in all rubric elements except for one. The Spring, 2011 group of candidates had 40% scoring at Acceptable and 60% at Target on the Narrative component of the interview information.

### **Interpretation of Data Findings and Evidence for Meeting IRA Standards**

Lewis Reading Specialist candidates have demonstrated a high level of performance with the entire Literacy Leadership Portfolio, scoring Target on most criteria and Acceptable on a few. It appears that they have displayed evidence of meeting the IRA Standards.

All candidates received Target on the elements of the Part I Professional Development Presentation. The course has targeted the content that candidates need to produce a quality presentation, but also, the Department has a close relationship with the local reading council at which the candidates present. These candidates have previously observed the presentations of other candidates, so they have had great opportunities to view quality presentations.

The greater number of Acceptable than Target ratings under the category of Suggestions for Further Professional Growth in the Spring, 12 assessment suggests that this content needs to be further emphasized with candidates to ensure that they are familiar with a variety professional growth options and are ready to tailor suggestions to the needs of an educator.

An additional consideration is the Narrative section of the Analysis of a School Wide Literacy Program with Action Plan for Improvement. In the Spring, 2011 assessment, 40% of candidates scored at Acceptable for the Narrative section of the analysis. Because of this, the Spring, 2012 group were required to have a draft of their analysis submitted for feedback. They apparently benefitted from the feedback before moving into a final product, since all candidates in Spring, 2012 achieved Target.

## **2. Directions to Candidates:**

### **Reading and Literacy Program Assessment #8 Literacy Leadership Portfolio 52-547 Supervising the P-12 Reading Program**

This assessment contains three activities that allow the candidate to demonstrate literacy leadership and coaching at Level 2 and Level 3 intensity. The three activities include creation of a Professional Development Presentation; a Literacy Observation and Coaching Plan with a colleague; and an Analysis of a School Wide Literacy Program with Action Plan for Improvement.

#### **Part 1: Professional Development Presentation**

Each candidate will develop a 25-30 minute presentation on some aspect of reading that you can present to educators to help develop their knowledge of literacy. The presentation must be delivered to an audience for which it is intended. You will have an opportunity to deliver your presentation to our class for practice. You are expected to use technology in your presentation, actively engage the audience, provide handouts that complement the topic and an evaluation so that you may receive feedback.

1. First you should choose a topic of interest to you. Be sure that what you select matches the needs of your audience and is developed with their knowledge base in mind. Are they seasoned professionals, paraprofessionals or pre-service teachers? Remember that since your presentation is only 25-30 minutes, you need to narrow it to something that is manageable. Provide theoretical content and practical activities.
2. Examine the literature that supports your topic. You need to discuss the current theories or research studies that help to define the importance of your topic. You need to share these key ideas with the audience so that they understand the research and historical perspective of this topic in the field of literacy.
3. Develop your presentation:
  - Use technology to create your presentation.
  - Develop a handout for your audience that will benefit recipients during and after the session.
  - Make sure that your presentation actively engages the audience by providing an activity.
  - Prepare a feedback/evaluation sheet for the audience that will give you information that will help you improve your presentation for the future.

## Part II: Literacy Observation and Coaching Plan

For this activity you will model literacy instruction and then observe a colleague teach or you may work with a colleague to co-teach literacy lessons. The purpose of this assessment is to develop your communication and collaboration skills during coaching.

- Collaborate with a colleague who will support this literacy coaching activity.
- Meet to identify a focus for instruction. Co-plan your lesson. Review the Teacher Literacy Observation Form to target one or more areas for focus.
- Arrange for the colleague to observe you teaching a lesson . . .or co-teach a lesson with your class.
- Conduct the lesson. Complete a post-lesson conference with your colleague to provide feedback and discuss follow-up. Use the Teacher Literacy Observation Form as a guide for conversation.
- Repeat the process by collaboratively planning a literacy lesson for you to observe your colleague . . .or co-teach a second lesson in your colleague's classroom.
- Complete a post-lesson conference with your colleague to provide feedback and discuss a follow-up.
- At the conclusion of your experience, write a critical reflection about your experiences that includes the following sections:

### 1. **Background**

Provide a description of your colleague and the teaching context. In order to retain confidentiality, please create a pseudonym for your colleague. Tell about the grade level and type of classes. Give some background about the teacher – is this a new teacher, a seasoned teacher or someone mid-career? Can you provide any information about the teacher's background, training or professional development? (1 page)

### 2. **Lessons**

Describe the planning process and lesson presentations. (1-2 pages)

### 3. **Suggestions for Further Professional Growth**

Discuss a plan of coaching or professional support you might suggest in working with this teacher. What might that support look like? What resources would you suggest? Are there book or study groups that would be beneficial? Is there further modeling or collaborative teaching? What are some realistic choices that you could offer to a colleague? (1-2 pages)

### 4. **Reflection**

In this last section write a critical reflection on what you learned as a literacy specialist regarding effective coaching. Focus on the process of coaching.

What worked well in this process? What would you change in future coaching situations?

### **Part III: Analysis of a School Wide Literacy Program with Action Plan for Improvement**

Each candidate will conduct an audit of their school's literacy program, noting strengths and areas of need. Following the audit, each candidate will create an action plan for improvement by identifying one initiative that could increase the effectiveness of the school's literacy program. The audit will include:

- **Interview** multiple persons to gain a variety of perspectives about the strengths and weaknesses of your school's literacy program. A minimum of four types of individuals should be selected.
  - Principal or Asst. Principal
  - District curriculum administrator
  - Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach
  - Experienced classroom teacher
  - Paraprofessional that works with literacy
  - Active parent
  - Student
- **Analyze** your findings from the interviews based on the elements of a curriculum audit that have been provided for you. You may also wish to examine the IRA Standards for an Exemplary Reading Program as well.
- **Using technology, create a chart or table** of your analysis that identifies the literacy program strengths and weaknesses.
- **Write a narrative** that synthesizes the findings presented in the table or chart, including multiple perspectives that were obtained through interviews.
- **Create an Action Plan for Improvement** by identifying one initiative that you can lead that you believe will increase the effectiveness of the school's literacy program. Provide specific details regarding your process for implementing your plan and following through on your initiative. After the course instructor has examined your plan, you will share your report with a building administrator.

### 3. Scoring Rubric

Reading and Literacy Program Assessment #8			
Literacy Leadership Portfolio – Part I			
Professional Development Presentation Rubric			
52-547 Supervising the P-12 Reading Program			
	Target (90-100%)	Acceptable (70-80%)	Unacceptable (<70%)
<b>Topic</b> IRA 2.2; 4.3; 5.1; 5.2; 5.3; 5.4 ISBE 27.120: Standard 1 COE 1aa; 1bb; 1cc; 2aa; 2bb, 2cc, 2dd; 3aa; 3dd	Candidate has chosen a reading topic which focuses on a key component of reading, such as instructional materials, strategies, assessment or creating a literate environment.	Candidate has chosen a topic that is only related to reading and focusing on a key component of reading, such as instructional materials, strategies, assessment or creating a literate environment.	Candidate has chosen a topic that is not related to reading instruction.
<b>Connection to Audience Needs</b> IRA 6.1; 6.3 ISBE 27.120: Standard 5, 6	Candidate choice of topic is targeted for the audience.	Candidate choice is appropriate for an audience interested in reading, but not particularly for this audience.	Candidate choice of topic is inappropriate for the audience.
<b>Research</b> IRA 1.1, 1.2 ISBE 27.120: Standard 3 COE 1aa; 1bb; 1cc NETS Standard 3	Candidate supports topic with relevant historical and current research.	Candidate supports topic with research that is not directly related to topic.	Candidate does not support the topic with research.
<b>Audience Involvement</b> IRA 6.1; 6.3	Candidate involves the audience with a meaningful task that promotes understanding of the content.	Candidate gets feedback from the audience during the presentation.	Candidate does not involve the audience in the presentation.
<b>Use of Technology</b> COE 1dd NETS Standard 1	Candidate uses technology to support the presentation, including a video clip or podcast in presentational software.	Candidate uses technology for presentation to such an extent that it would stand alone without the candidate. Presentation must include a video clip or podcast in presentational software.	No technology is used in the presentation.
<b>Handouts</b> IRA 6.1; 6.3 NETS Standards 2, 5	Handouts provide key ideas and resources that allow the audience to review and use them at a later date.	Handouts contain only the presentation that the audience watched.	No handouts are provided or handouts contain to original content.
<b>Feedback/Evaluation Sheet</b> IRA 6.1; 6.2; 6.3 ISBE 27.120: Standards 7 COE 1ff NETS Standards 2, 5	Candidate provides an opportunity for audience to provide comments and suggestions on the feedback sheet.	Feedback sheet is Likert scale with little opportunity for narrative feedback.	No feedback sheet is provided.



Literacy Leadership Portfolio – Part II			
Literacy Observation and Coaching Plan Rubric			
52-547 Supervising the P-12 Reading Program			
	Target (90-100%)	Acceptable (70-80%)	Unacceptable (<70%)
<b>Background</b> IRA Standards 1.3; 6.1	Candidate provides complete background on the colleague and the teaching context. While retaining confidentiality through the use of a pseudonym, the candidate describes the colleague's experience level, background, and professional development, as well as the professional relationship with the candidate. Candidate indicates how this knowledge may impact student learning and colleague's professional growth.	Candidate provides some information about the colleague and the teaching context or provides limited discussion of impact on student learning and professional growth.	Candidate provides limited information about the colleague and the teaching context or does not discuss potential impact on student learning and professional growth.
<b>Lessons</b> IRA Standards 1.1; 3.3; 4.2; 4.3; 5.1; 5.2; 5.3; 5.4 ISBE 27.120: Standard 1 COE 1aa; 1bb; 1cc; 1dd; 2aa; 2bb; 2cc; 2dd; 2ee; 3aa; 3bb; 3cc; 3dd NETS Standard 2	Candidate completely describes the planning process used with the colleague and the experiences with the presentation of the lessons. Candidate should reflect on the foundations and components of reading/writing development, assessment, curriculum and instructional practices, equity, literacy environment, materials, routines, and grouping.	Candidate provides some discussion of the planning process and presentation experiences. Candidate may omit reflection on one aspect of literacy instruction: foundations and components of reading/writing, assessment, curriculum and instruction, equity, literacy environment, materials, routines and grouping.	Candidate provides a limited discussion of the planning process and presentation. Few aspects of literacy instruction (foundations and components of reading/writing, assessment, curriculum and instruction, equity, literacy environment, materials, routines, and grouping).
<b>Suggestions for Further Professional Growth</b> IRA Standards 6.1; 6.3 ISBE 27.120: Standard 5, 6 COE 1aa; 1bb; 1cc; 1ee; 1gg; 2aa; 2bb; 2dd; 2ee; 3bb; 3dd NETS Standard 2, 3	Candidate discusses a plan of coaching or professional support for this colleague, including resources and formats. Multiple options are presented for the colleague's growth. Suggestions should include print and nonprint options. Plan indicates comprehensive candidate knowledge of adult learning and professional development. Candidates are encouraged to use online databases, Refworks, ERIC and YouTube to gather information.	Candidate discusses a plan of coaching or professional support that for this colleague, including resources and formats. Limited options are presented for the colleague's growth. Plan indicates some knowledge of adult learning and professional development.	Candidate discusses a limited plan of coaching or professional support that does not provide choice. Plan does not demonstrate candidate knowledge of adult learning and professional development.
<b>Coaching Reflection</b> IRA Standards 1.1; 1.3; 6.1; 6.2; 6.3 ISBE Standard: 8 COE 1ff NETS Standard 5	Candidate provides a well-developed reflection on what was learned as a literacy specialist engaged in the process of coaching. Reflection should include a discussion of what techniques worked well in the process and what should be changed in future coaching situations. Candidate should consider the foundations of reading and writing development, the role of professional judgment, as well as	Candidate provides a basic reflection of the coaching experiences or shows only limited knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing development, the role of professional development, or theories of adult learning and professional development.	Candidate reflection is limited and does not demonstrate knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing development, the role of professional development, or theories of adult learning and professional development.

	theories of adult learning and professional development.		
--	--	--	--

Literacy Leadership Portfolio – Part III			
Analysis of a School Wide Literacy Program with Action Plan for Improvement Rubric			
52-547 Supervising the P-12 Reading Program			
	Target (90-100%)	Acceptable (70-80%)	Unacceptable (<70%)
<b>Interviews</b> IRA Standards 2.2; 2.3; 3.1; 4.2; 4.3. ISBE 27.120: Standard 6 COE 3bb	Candidate interviews at least 4 key categories of school stakeholders to gain a variety of perspectives about the strengths and weaknesses of the school literacy program. Questions inquire about critical elements of a school-wide program such as instruction, materials, assessment, existing curriculum, and equitable access for all students. Stakeholder roles are identified and their responses are summarized.	Candidate interviews only 3 key categories of school stakeholders to gain a variety of perspectives about the strengths and weaknesses of the school literacy program or interview questions may omit a critical element of a school-wide program, such as instruction, materials, assessment, existing curriculum or equitable access for all students. All stakeholder roles may not be identified or all responses may not be summarized.	Candidate interviews less than 3 key categories of school stakeholders to gain a variety of perspectives about the strengths and weaknesses of the school literacy program, omits more than one critical element or a school-wide program, such as instruction materials, assessment, existing curriculum or equitable access for all students. Stakeholder roles are not identified or stakeholder responses are not summarized.
<b>Chart/Table</b> IRA Standards 2.2; 2.3; 3.1; 4.2; 4.3 ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 4, 5 COE 1dd NETS Standard 3, 5	Candidate assembles the information gathered from interviews into a graphic organizer indicating strengths and weaknesses of the school-wide program in comparison to best practices in reading curriculum and instruction from an identified source.	Candidate assembles the information into a graphic organizer, but may not separate strengths and weaknesses. Best practices are listed, but source may not be identified.	Candidate does not assemble the information into a graphic organizer, does not indicate strengths and weaknesses, or does not compare to any best practices.
<b>Narrative</b> IRA Standards 2.2; 2.3; 3.1; 4.2; 4.3 ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 3, 4, 5 COE 1dd	Candidate synthesizes the responses of the stakeholders into a narrative that provides a holistic perspective of the literacy program, indicating strengths and weaknesses of the school-wide program in comparison to best practices.	Candidate organizes stakeholder responses into a narrative that is a listing of stakeholder responses, rather than a synthesis of perspectives.	Candidate does not include all stakeholder responses in the narrative or does not compare to any best practices.
<b>Action Plan</b> IRA Standards 2.1; 6.1; 6.3; 6.4 ISBE 27.120: Standard 1, 4, 5, 6 COE 1aa, 1bb, 1cc, 1ee, 1gg, 2bb, 2dd, 2ee, 3bb, 3cc, 3dd	Candidate identifies one initiative from the identified areas of weakness and provides specific details regarding the process for implementing the plan. The initiative supports the implementation of an integrated curriculum and focuses on instruction, materials, assessment, development of a curriculum or equitable access for all students. Candidate includes a postscript of the meeting with the administrator to share the plan after faculty approval of the action plan.	Candidate identifies an initiative from the identified areas, but it may be an area of strength rather than weakness or some details for implementing the plan are not included.	Candidate does not identify an initiative from the analysis of the program. Details for implementation of the plan may be omitted. Postscript of the administrator meeting is missing.

This Literacy Leadership Portfolio supports 2010 IRA Standards 1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivation and socio-cultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components (including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading/writing connections); 1.2: Understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perception of reading and writing development, processes, and components;

1.3: Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement; 2.1: Use foundational knowledge to design and/or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum; 2.2: Use appropriate and varied instruction approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading/writing connections; 2.3: Use a wide range of texts (narrative, expository, poetry, etc.) and traditional print and online resources; 3.1: Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations; 3.3: Use assessment information to plan and to evaluate instruction; 4.2: Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices; 4.3: Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity; 5.1: Design the physical environment to optimize students' use of traditional print and online resources in reading and writing instruction; 5.2: Design a social environment that is low-risk, includes choice, motivation, scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write; 5.3 Use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another; conducting discussions, giving peer feedback); 5.4: Use a variety of classroom configurations (whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction; 6.1: Demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning theories and related research about organizational change, professional development and school culture; 6.2: Display positive dispositions related to one's own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing and pursue the developments of individual professional knowledge and behaviors; 6.3: Participate in, design, facilitate, lead and evaluate effective and differentiated professional development programs; 6.4: Understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions.











































This Literacy Leadership Portfolio supports NETS Standards 1. Facilitate and Inspire Student Learning and Creativity; Standard 2: Design and Develop Digital-Age Learning Experiences and Assessments; 3. Model Digital-Age Work and Learning; 5 Engage in Professional Growth and Leadership.































This assignment supports ISBE Reading Specialist Section 27.120 Standards: 1. The competent reading specialist has a deep understanding of reading and reading instruction. 3. The competent reading specialist understands how to interpret and use reading research. 4. The competent reading specialist provides leadership in curriculum design and implementation. 5. The competent reading specialist provides leadership in staff development. 6. The competent reading specialist communicates and works with the public and other professionals. 8. The competent reading specialist has high professional standards.

The assignment supports COE Unit Standards: 1. **Knowledgeable Critical Transformative Educators:** aa. Demonstrates in-depth knowledge of subject matter; bb. Demonstrates professional knowledge and skills; cc. Implements a robust knowledge of critical pedagogical content; dd. Integrates technology in practices; ee. Creates positive environments for student learning; ff. Reflects on professional experiences; gg. Acts on professional convictions; 2. **Multicultural Educators:** aa. Articulates personal prejudices and biases and knows their impact on teaching and learning; bb. Demonstrates knowledge of schools and classrooms as non-neutral cultural space and the implications for teaching and learning; cc. Demonstrates behavior necessary to work with students, families and communities of various cultures; dd. Demonstrates a thorough understanding of cultural issues involved in appropriately assessment student learning; ee. Creates positive environments for all students, including students with exceptionalities; 3. **Social Justice Advocates:** aa. Articulates institutional inequities and their impact on teaching and learning; bb. Engages relevant communities to bring about change; cc. Challenges dominant discourses; dd. Demonstrates fairness and belief all students can learn.

#### 4. Data Results-SPA Assessment #8: Literacy Leadership Portfolio

Part I		Spring, 2011 n=			Spring, 2012 n=		
Professional Development Presentation		T	A	U	T	A	U
<b>Topic</b>	Candidate chooses a topic that focuses on key component of reading IRA 2.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Connection to Audience Needs</b>	Candidate choice of topic is targeted to the audience IRA 6.1, 6.3	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
<b>Research</b>	Candidate supports topic with relevant historical and current research	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%

	IRA 1.1, 1.2						
<b>Audience Involvement</b>	Candidate involves the audience with a meaningful task that promotes understanding of the content IRA 6.1, 6.3	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Use of Technology</b>	(College and State Standards)	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Handouts</b>	Handouts provide key ideas and resources that allow the audience to review and use them at a later date IRA 6.1, 6.3	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Feedback/Evaluation Sheet</b>	Candidate provides an opportunity for audience to provide comments and suggestions on the feedback sheet IRA 6.1, 6.2, 6.3	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Part II</b>		<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>Literacy Observation and Coaching Plan</b>							
<b>Background</b>	Candidate provides complete background on the colleague and the teaching context, indicating what impact this information might have on student learning and colleague's professional growth IRA 1.3, 6.1	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Lessons</b>	Candidate completely describes the planning process used with the colleague and the experiences with the presentation of the lessons IRA 1.1, 3.3, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Suggestions for Further</b>	Candidate discusses a plan of coaching or professional support for this colleague,	 100%	 0%	 0%	 42%	 57%	 0%

<b>Professional Growth</b>	including resources and formats IRA 6.1, 6.3						
<b>Coaching Reflection</b>	Candidate provides a well-developed reflection on what was learned as a literacy specialist engaged in the process of coaching IRA 1.1, 1.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3	 100%	 0%	 0%	 85%	 14%	 0%
<b>Part III</b>		<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>Analysis of a School Wide Literacy Program with Action Plan for Improvement</b>							
<b>Interviews</b>	Candidate interviews stakeholders to gain a variety of perspectives about the strengths and weaknesses of the school literacy program. IRA 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 4.2, 4.3	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Chart/Table</b>	Candidate assembles the information gathered from interviews into a graphic organizer indicating strengths and weaknesses of the school-wide program IRA 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 4.2, 4.3	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Narrative</b>	Candidate synthesizes the responses of the stakeholders into a narrative that provides a holistic perspective of the literacy program IRA 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 4.2, 4.3	 60%	 40%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%
<b>Action Plan</b>	Candidate identifies one initiative from the identified areas of weakness and provides specific details regarding the process for implementing the plan. IRA 2.1, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4	 100%	 0%	 0%	 100%	 0%	 0%