

**College of Education and Affiliated Programs
Annual Assessment Report
For Reading and Language Art Program**

Note: this report presents and analyzes data from the 2007-08 academic year. During that year, the College of Education and Affiliated Programs engaged in extensive efforts to refine and extend their assessment system. In many cases, data collected starting in Fall 2008 and beyond will look substantially different from the data being presented in this report.

Background

1. Describe your program (enrollment, number of faculty, general goals). Have there been any major changes since your last report?

The Reading Certificate Program, Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program and the Master of Arts in Education Option Reading/Language Arts are based in the Department of Teacher Education in the College of Education. The Program Coordinator serves as the day-to-day administrator of the program and has responsibility for overall coordination of the program.

It is the mission of the graduate reading programs at CSULB to prepare caring, effective, and highly skilled teachers and specialists who will in turn provide appropriate reading and language arts instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students in grades K-12. We provide our candidates with the theoretical and professional knowledge necessary to develop innovative, research-based reading and language arts curricula, and to instill the leadership skills necessary for successful reading program implementation for all students, including English language learners.

Our program goals include the following:

- To develop reading teachers and specialists who have the theoretical and professional knowledge necessary to design and implement innovative, research-based reading and language arts curricula;
- To develop reading teachers and specialists who provide effective reading and language arts instruction for all students, including those who are beginning and developing readers, those with delayed literacy development, and English language learners; and
- To develop reading specialists with expert leadership and supervisory skills in reading and language arts curriculum development, instruction, and intervention.

Our program is designed to “spiral” the students’ content knowledge and pedagogy so that they are able to synthesize and apply their understandings about teaching and learning over time. Currently, there are approximately 70 students enrolled in the program.

Since the program was last approved in Spring 2007, the Student Learning Outcomes have been revised.

Table 1
Program Student Learning Outcomes and Relevant Standards

SLOs	Outcome 1: Provide literacy leadership at the school site or district level.	Outcome 2: Assess and evaluate students' strengths, needs, and achievement in literacy by using a variety of measures	Outcome 3: Design and deliver appropriate instruction in reading/language arts for all students, including diverse learners, based upon assessment results.	Outcome 4: Articulate and apply theoretical foundations in reading/language arts to current theory and research.	Outcome 5: Integrate technology into reading / language arts instruction.	Outcome 6: Communicate information to other professionals in the education community
Signature Assignment(s)	2-year plan	Observation and case study	Observation and case study	Research paper	WebQuest lesson	Culminating learning experience
National Standards	IRA Standard 5	IRA Standard 3	IRA Standard 2, 4	IRA Standard 1	IRA Standard 4	IRA Standard 5
State Standards	CTC Standards 12, 17, 18	CTC Standards 4, 11	CTC Standards 2-5, 7, 9- 11, 15 16, 19, 20	CTC Standards 8, 13, 14	CTC Standards 11, 17, 19	CTC Standards 12, 17
Conceptual Framework	Prepares Leaders	School Improvement	Values Diversity	Research and Evaluation	Promotes Growth	Service and Collaboration
NCATE Elements	Professional Dispositions	Knowledge and Skills- Other	Student Learning- Other	Knowledge and Skills- Other	Knowledge and Skills- Other	Professional Dispositions

Table 2
Collection of Assessment Data and Analysis Schedule

	When Collected	When Analyzed
SLO 1	F 08, F 10 ...	Sp 09, Sp 11 ...
SLO 2	Sp, 08, Sp 10 ...	F 08, F 10 ...
SLO 3	Sp 08, Sp 10 ...	F 08, F 10 ...
SLO 4	Sp 09, Sp 11 ...	F 09, F 11 ...
SLO 5	F 09, F 11 ...	Sp 10, Sp 12 ...
SLO 6	Sp, 08. Sp 09, Sp 10 ...	F 08, F 09, F 10 ...

Table 3
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 1		
	Admission to Program		
	Applied	Accepted	Matriculated
	#	#	#
TOTAL	24	24	19

Table 4
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 2
	Advancement to Culminating Experience
	#
Thesis (698) ¹	1
Comps ²	22
Project (695) ³	0
Other (Advanced Credential Programs Only)	0

Table 5
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 3
	Exit
	#
Degree	37
Credential ⁴	33

¹ This is data on students who were enrolled in thesis work during Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. This figure may include students who actually “crossed into” this transition point prior to Fall 2007 and were still making progress on their theses at this time.

² This is data on the number of students who *applied* to take the comprehensive examination in Fall 2007, Spring 2008, or Summer 2008. The data include students who may not have taken or passed the examination(s).

³ This is data on students who were conducting culminating projects during Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. This figure may include students who actually “crossed into” this transition point prior to Fall 2007 and were still making progress on their theses at this time.

⁴ Data for Initial and Advanced Credential Programs reflects students who have filed for their credential with the Credential Office. These data generally include students who have completed the program 1 or more years prior to filing their credential request, particularly related to the advanced credential programs. Data are reported for Summer 2007, Fall 2007, and Spring 2008.

Table 6
Faculty Profile 2007-08

Status	Number
Full-time TT	2
Full-time Lecturer	
Part-time Lecturer	2
Total:	4

2. How many of the total full- and part-time faculty in the program reviewed and discussed the assessment findings described in this document? Please attach minutes and/or completed worksheets/artifacts to document this meeting.

Two out of the three full-time program faculty discussed the data collected from Spring 2008 courses (EDRG 651 and EDRG 695) for SLO 2, SLO 3, and SLO 6. A third full time faculty, the program coordinator, who is currently on sabbatical leave, did not participate in the data discussion. See the completed data discussion worksheet attached to this report.

Data

3. Question 3 is in 2 main parts focused on *primary* data sources related to: student learning and program effectiveness/student experience:
 - a. Candidate Performance Data: Provide *direct* evidence for the student learning outcomes assessed this year and describe how they were assessed (the tools, assignments, etc. used). Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, percentage passing as appropriate for each outcome.

Table 7
Student Learning Outcomes with Correlating Courses and Assessments

SLO	Location and Means by which Data is Collected	Description of the Assessment
2. Candidate can assess and evaluate students' strengths, needs, and achievement in literacy by using a variety of measures.	EDRG 651 Diagnostic Profile and Intervention Plan	Candidates administer a battery of assessments to a child experiencing difficulty with literacy. Based upon assessment results candidates develop an individualized intervention plan.
3. Candidate can design and deliver appropriate instruction in reading/language arts for all students, including diverse	EDRG 651 Case Study Report	Based upon assessment results candidates develop and deliver an individualized intervention plan. Pre-post assessment data are gathered and recommendations for future

learners, based upon assessment results		interventions are provided.
6. Candidate can effectively communicate information to other professionals in the education community	EDRG 695 Culminating Learning Experience	Candidates write a manuscript that is of publishable quality or conduct an individual inquiry project.

The SLOs were assessed using holistic rubrics (A, B, C, D, and F), with results as follows:

Table 8
Student Learning Outcomes Assessed with Holistic Rubrics

	Percentage (%)		
	SLO 2	SLO 3	SLO 6
A (4)	78	100	50
B (3)	21		35
C (2)			15
D (1)			
F (0)			

- b. Program Effectiveness Data: What data were collected to determine program effectiveness and how (e.g., post-program surveys, employer feedback, focus groups, retention data)? This may be indirect evidence of student learning, satisfaction data, or other indicators or program effectiveness. Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, or summarized qualitative data, for each outcome.

End of program surveys are collected from all candidates. These surveys are administered to students during their final semester in the program.

Anecdotal data were also collected as they became available:

- 1) A former student was nominated as one of the “Best of the Best” in Los Angeles County public schools.
- 2) A former student received the award of best teacher of the year in Santa Ana Unified School District.
- 3) A former student served as a co-chair for 16th Annual National Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Conference.
- 4) A former student presented a paper at the Arizona Reading Association State Conference, and she did two in-service for her district on high frequency and sight words.
- 5) A current student (who is in the first semester of her program), while taking EDRG 551 and learning more about the relation ship between assessment and instruction, started work with her grade level department team to develop a test-retest/diagnostic-summative assessment for one reading/language arts unit. The

assessment will be used for pre- and post-unit measure of students' knowledge on the unit.

4. **Complementary Data:** You may provide *additional* information (e.g., other data, copies of letters of support from granting agencies or school staff, etc.) about candidate performance, the student experience or program effectiveness used to inform programmatic decision making. This may include quantitative and qualitative data sources.

N/A

Analysis and Actions

5. What do the data for each outcome say regarding candidate performance and program effectiveness? Please note particular areas of strength or areas in need of improvement.

Data, based on holistic rubrics, provide us with information regarding particular SLOs on which students did well and did not do well. In general, all students did well with SLO 3, and a majority of students did well for SLO2. There is 15% of students did not do well for SLO6.

Our students did well with a signature assignment for SLO2 (Diagnostic Profile and Intervention Plan) where they conducted various assessment with a struggling reader and planned a targeted intervention plan based on identified strengths and needs for tutoring sessions. Most students performed at the A level.

For SLO3 (Case Study Report), students wrote about how they addressed needs during the tutoring sessions and what the student has improved. All students performed at the A level.

For SLO 6, students were required to write a publishable piece or conduct an individual inquiry project. The signature assignment has a high expectation from students. The data shows a wide range of student achievement for SLO 6. Some students may not be as skillful at writing as expected from this signature assignment.

6. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings?

The findings from the data are similar to those from past assessment for which holistic rubrics were also used.

7. What steps, if any, will be taken with regard to curriculum, programs, practices, assessment processes, etc. based on these findings in Questions 5 and 6? Please link proposed changes to data discussed in Q5.

There is no evidence to suggest a need for policy or curricular changes, faculty development, additional courses, or extracurricular opportunities. We, however, would like to take the following actions to enhance the effectiveness and quality of our program.

Table 9
Action Items

Objective	Strategies/Tasks/Next Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Due Date
Analytic Rubrics	Revising holistic rubrics to analytic rubrics	Carol Lord Shelley Xu Catherine Lunnis	Oct. 5, 2008 Completed
Peer-Review	Adding to EDRG 540 and EDRG 551 a component of a peer review of the literature reviews and of the case study reports	Carol Lord Shelley Xu	Fall 2008 Completed
Sample Student Products	Providing students with samples of outstanding and good (A and B Levels) quality signature assignment	Joan Theurer	Spring 2009

We already revised the holistic rubrics to analytic rubrics so that we can identify strengths and needs in specific areas of each SLO. In the coming semester, we will use extended, analytic rubrics for all signature assignments. These rubrics would provide us with more specific information regarding the strengths and weaknesses in students' performance on specific SLOs.

To address the issue of writing proficiency, beginning in Fall 2008 all faculty who teach in the program are encouraged to include information in their syllabus regarding the Writers Resource Lab and resources available from the library. The Program Coordinator has included the same information at the Program Orientation. Additionally, EDRG 540 and EDRG 551 are the first two classes candidates take in the program. In EDRG 540, candidates are first exposed to writing a literature review, and in EDRG 551, candidates are expected to write two case study reports based on extensive assessment of two students. Beginning in Fall 2008 the instructors in the courses have added to the respective course a component of a peer review of the literature reviews and of the case study reports. Candidates read one another's penultimate papers and reports and provide written feedback. Candidates then have one week to respond to their peer's feedback before submitting their final paper and report to the course instructors.

During Spring 2009, the instructor for EDRG 695, which addresses SLO 6, will provide students in the class with samples of outstanding and good quality signature assignments so that students have a clearer and better understanding of what is expected.



Appendix A

Reading/Language Arts Program

Data Retreat Discussion Guide

Overview

This discussion guide is a tool for program faculty to use as they sit together to review data on student learning outcomes. The questions below are prompts to begin discussion of the data on *each outcome*. You may also use the tool to guide note-taking so that you can easily transfer your findings/next steps into your annual CED or CTC Biennial report.

To optimize the discussion, it is helpful to have on hand:

- Summarized data on student performance in the form of tables and graphs
- Copies, for each SLO being discussed, of signature assignment samples (with names removed) for a range of scores (e.g., high, medium, low)
- Copies of the annual CED or CTC Biennial report template
- Copies of the data discussion questions

In general, consider a discussion flow as follows:

1. Identify the SLO to be discussed

SLO 2 Candidates can assess and evaluate students' strengths, needs, and achievement in literacy by using a variety of measures.

SLO 3 Candidates can design and deliver appropriate instruction in reading/language arts for all students, including diverse learners, based upon assessment results.

SLO 6 Candidates can effectively communicate information to other professionals in the education community.

2. Review the data on the overall scores and subscores

Data are based on holistic rubrics, which have A-F rating.

3. Determine areas of strength and weakness

Most of students performed at A levels (78%) for Diagnostic Profile and Intervention Plan, For the case study report assignments (100%), all students performed at the A levels. For Culminating Learning Project, 50% students performed at A, 35% at B, and 15% at C level.

Strengths: Case study report and Diagnostic Profile and Intervention Plan

There is a high level expectation, and the data shows a wide range of student achievement for SLO 6

Weakness: There is no apparent weakness.

4. Consider the utility of the signature assignment/rubric

Because this is a holistic rubric, it did not lead itself to a detailed analysis of student achievement. The rubric did show holistically that most students achieved at a higher level. Signature assignments are used to assess specific SLOs, the goals of the program.

5. Make final determinations and consider next steps

In the coming semester, we will use extended, analytic rubrics for signature assignment. These rubrics would provide us with more specific information regarding the strengths and weaknesses in students' performance on specific SLOs.

Data Analysis and Interpretation Discussion

Student Learning

- How satisfied are you with the overall performance of students on the signature assignment?

Majority of students performed well on SLOs 2 and 3. 50% performed very well, and 35% at B level. We are satisfied with students' performance, but we hope that a higher percentage of students would perform at A level.

- On what criteria or sub-skills do students seem to be doing *particularly well*?

Final case study report, and also diagnostic profile and intervention plan.

- On what criteria or sub-skills do students seem to be *struggling*?

15% students did not perform well on SLO6, but the holistic rubric did not inform us which specific sub-skills the students did not do well. The projects students did satisfied SLO 6. They showed varied levels of abilities of communicating with other educators in the field.

- What about the results was surprising?

Not surprising since there are a range of ability levels among students.

- What are the areas of particular concern where you would like to see student performance improve?

No. No students performed inadequately (level D) for any of the SLOs.

Instrument Utility

- Did the signature assignment and/or rubric you used give you the information you were seeking?

Yes, but we would like to have more specific information regarding students' performance on the SLOs. Analytic rubrics would provide this type of information. We will use the revised, analytic rubrics for all signature assignments for courses offered in Fall 2008.

- Do you want to make any revisions to the signature assignment and/or rubric, or the assessment process?

No. The rubrics have been expanded, and revised to more closely reflect students' strengths and weaknesses.

Programs, Courses, and Practices

- What actions (e.g., policy or curricular changes, faculty development, additional courses or extracurricular opportunities, changes in processes, etc.) might you take to improve student learning?

We already revised the holistic rubrics to analytic rubrics so that we can identify strengths and needs in specific areas of each SLO. There is no evidence to suggest a need for policy or curricular changes, faculty development, additional courses or extracurricular opportunities, changes in processes.

We can provide students with examples of signature assignment for SLO6 so that they would know the expectations.

- Who else needs to know about these findings and next steps?

N/A