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

NOTE: This form uses the IRA standards approved by NCATE in 2010. Beginning in Fall 2012 all programs must use the 2010 standards.

COVER SHEET

1. Institution Name

   Clarion University of Pennsylvania

2. State

   Pennsylvania

3. Date submitted

MM	DD	YYYY
03	15	2017

4. Report Preparer's Information:

   Name of Preparer:

   Kathleen Murphy

   Phone: (814) 393 -1603   Ext.

   E-mail:

   kmurphy@clarion.edu

5. CAEP Coordinator's Information:

   Name:

   Jesse Haight

   Phone: (814) 393 -2385   Ext.

   E-mail:

   jhaight@clarion.edu

6. Name of institution's program

   Reading Specialist

7. CAEP Category

   Reading Specialist

8. Grade levels[1] for which candidates are being prepared

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

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

    Reading Specialist P-12

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 Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) seeking
    - ○ CAEP accreditation for the first time (initial accreditation)
    - ⦿ Continuing CAEP accreditation

16. State Licensure data requirement on program completers disaggregated by specialty area with sub-area scores:
    CAEP requires programs to provide completer performance data on state licensure examinations for completers who take the examination for the content field, if the state has a licensure testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section IV. 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)

Clarion University of Pennsylvania is located in western Pennsylvania, has 5500 students and includes 27 nationally accredited programs. The reading specialist concentration program, through the Master's Degree Program (M. Ed.), is housed in the School of Education, Department of Education in Stevens Hall.

Pennsylvania certifies reading specialists. The preparation of reading professionals is achieved through the M. Ed. with a reading specialist concentration. Graduate students completing 30 semester hours of the M.Ed. Reading Specialist concentration qualify for Reading Specialist Certification granted by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. The requirements for the program stem from the guidelines established by the Professional Standards and Ethics Committee of the International Literacy Association found in Standards for Reading Professionals: Revised (2010). In addition to the ILA Standards, the program is also aligned with the Pennsylvania Department of Education standards. All state, national, and professional program standards are aligned within the conceptual framework, course syllabi, assignments, assessments, and field experiences.

The master's degree program in education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), which has transitioned to CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation). This program encourages students to view themselves as researchers of teaching and learning and as professionals whose continued growth can best be met through inquiry, reflection, and sustained dialogues with peers. It affords practitioners the opportunity to share effective classroom practices while reading, interpreting, and analyzing current research and professional literature. Students must choose and complete course requirements within a specified concentration area, such as reading specialist.

Students pursuing a M.Ed. with a reading specialist concentration are required to complete a total of 30 semester hours of required courses with a cumulative grade-point average of 3.00/4.00. Twelve semester hours must satisfy core competencies that consist of courses in Research, Reading Pedagogy, Curriculum, and Professional Seminar. Specialization courses (eighteen semester hours) focus on developing specific knowledge of research and practices in literacy processes, literacy coaching, assessment, content reading strategies, reading pedagogy, reading specialist and literacy coaching program organization. The capstone courses, Practicum I: Assessment and Practicum II: Instruction include six semester hours.

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)

Field experiences are built into each core, literacy specialization (24 semester hours) and capstone courses (6 semester hours). The master's degree program in education with a reading specialist concentration develops competencies in pedagogy, curriculum development, research, and

assessment. These competencies are further applied to planning, implementing, and evaluating developmental and remedial reading instruction and assessment for pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade. Since Clarion University's previous NCATE review, the reading specialist concentration program at Clarion University of Pennsylvania has transitioned into literacy coaching.

Field experiences consist of the following:

Planning and implementing a content literacy strategies in-service program with emphasis on the use of literacy coaches in the content classrooms.

Case study profiles focusing on diagnosis, assessment, and instruction for literacy learners

Classroom-based action research project

Job shadowing a reading specialist/literacy coach

Designing and implementing poster sessions for paraprofessional workshops at local school districts

Analysis of classroom and school literacy environments, including interviews with classroom teachers regarding the use of content literacy strategies and observing a good reader and a struggling reader in the classroom.

Collegial sharing and response to literacy research Study Group Leadership project that encourages collaboration and focuses on a specific literacy topic/issue

Interview/Conversation with a literacy professional regarding literacy program, materials, and/or instructional technology evaluations

 Planning, development, and implementation of a professional development initiative that focuses on literacy learning.

Field experiences are implemented throughout each semester. Candidates spend a minimum of 15 hours (one hour per week) per course working with students and collecting data regarding impact of instruction on student learning. In many courses, for example, when professional development plan or case studies are implemented, hours can exceed 15 hours with students. Our program has two courses (6 semester hours) of supervised clinical experience consisting of the capstone Practicum I: Assessment and Practicum II: Instruction. The culminating practicum that previously consisted of supervised on-site assessment and teaching of Pre-K - grade 8 students with literacy difficulties at local school districts has evolved to a summer reading day camp as of 2006. This has been a concerted attempt to foster an interest and motivation for reading along with transitioning to literacy coaching. In this environment, candidates are required to implement initial assessments, develop instructional goals, and make recommendations. Candidates also create an instructional plan for achieving goals, and implement the plan on an individualized basis or in small groups, forming literacy coaching teams. As literacy coaches, graduate students work with children in small group and one-on-one settings. Ongoing assessment and instruction are integral components of practicum. Information collected through the assessment phase is analyzed and used to inform instruction. Examples for instruction include tutoring, reading response groups, collaborative and shared reading and writing, in

addition to technology.

The formation of literacy coaching teams permits on-site supervisors to provide daily feedback through the use of literacy coaching discussions (de-briefing) and a daily written log. Candidates can provide feedback within their own literacy coaching teams such as focusing on effective literacy strategy instruction and/or making adjustments with administering assessments. The practicum experience has also included working with speech pathologists at the university and reading intervention specialists (through the Special Education Department), which has enhanced the case study background information. Case study profiles are developed by literacy coaching teams in which graduate students synthesize the results, write an extensive case study profile depicting the child's progress throughout the three-week practicum. Candidates provide a formal case study along with a portfolio that includes recommendations for the parents/guardians, classroom teachers and specialized personnel who work with the child. The submission of the case study/portfolio is reviewed by parents/guardians at the Summer Reading Day Camp Open House (practicum). Candidates are provided with the opportunity to present their pre and post assessments, instructional goals, and recommendations directly to parents/guardians. Take home packets of reinforcement activities to maintain progress with the child are given to parents at the conclusion of the open house. A copy of the case study/portfolio is submitted to the practicum instructors.

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.)

CUP Reading Specialist Graduate Course Rotation Sheet

See Attachment 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.

CUP Reading Specialist Course Descriptions

See Attachment panel below.

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: Reading Specialist		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers[2]
2013/2014	27	10
2014/2015	29	7
2015/2016	31	10

6. Faculty Information

Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program. (Please refer to the footnotes for clarification)

Faculty Member Name	Amy Shannonhouse
Highest Degree, Field, & University[3]	Ph.D - Doctor of Philosophy - School of Education(Developmental Movement Studies/ ECH Minor) The University of Pittsburgh
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member [4]	Early Childhood Faculty Member/ Student Teacher Supervisor
Faculty Rank[5]	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	☑ YES
Scholarship[6], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[7]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[8]	Key Note, "Books in Motion", ECH CUP Conference, April 2016 Presenter, IMIL Training (Brain & MVPA workshop), Jefferson-Clarion Head Start, Brookville, Pa. November 2016 Pediatric First Aid/CPR Red Cross Instructor for student groups at CUP (KDP) - Teach classes 2-4 times per year Presenter, Northwest Regional Key Wellness Day, CUP, April 2016
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[9]	Guest presenter for Choosy creative movement/music (IMIL) in Kindergarten, First St. Elementary School, Canonsburg, Pa. December 2016

Faculty Member Name	Deborah A. Ellermeyer
Highest Degree, Field, & University[3]	EdD, Curriculum and Instruction, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member [4]	Teaching faculty, Student teacher supervision
Faculty Rank[5]	Full Professor
Tenure Track	☑ YES
Scholarship[6], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[7]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[8]	1. Ellermeyer, D. (2014). MyEducationLab for textbook, All children read. Boston, MA: Pearson Publishing 2. Ellermeyer, D. and Rowell, J. (submitted). Teaching phonological awareness and early phonics skills with poems, nursery rhymes and read alouds. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited 3. Ellermeyer, D. Laughing and learning about language. (submitted May 2013). Language Arts.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[9]	Supervision of students Certifications - English, Elementary Education

Faculty Member Name	Jonathan R. Brown
Highest Degree, Field, & University[3]	PhD, Pennsylvania State University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member [4]	Teaching faculty

Faculty Rank[5]	Full Professor
Tenure Track	▶ YES
Scholarship[6], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[7]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[8]	1. Brown, J.R. and McLaughlin, C.L. (Spring 2015). Jive Talkin', Mandated high-stakes test score statistics: So misunderstood in teacher evaluation wars. PCTM (Pennsylvania Council of Teacher of Mathematics). 2. Brown, J.R. (Summer 2013). Rural Pennsylvania PSSA Mathematics Performance, Dismantling Rural Stereotypes. Pennsylvania Council Teachers of Mathematics (PCTM). 3. Brown, J.R. (2013). Patent education: Estimating assisted hearing costs. Advance: http://audiology.advanceweb.com/SignUp/RegDocFetchFile.aspx?BRID=AD76975906052
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[9]	1. Brookville Area School Districts Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant. Responsibilities include research design, data analysis and interpretation, and annual research report, 2004-2006. 2. Franklin Area School Districts Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant. Responsiblities include research design, data analysis and interpretation, and annual research report, 2004-2007. 3. North Clarion School Districts Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant. Responsibiltiies include research design, data analysis and interpretation, and annual research report, 2005-2007. 4. State System of Higher Education. Northwest Philadelphia Full Service Community Schools Project. Responsibilities include research design, data analysis and interpretation, and research reports, 2006-present. 5. Certifications - Elementary and Secondary Principal, Special Education Supervision, Teacher of the Hearing-Impaired, Teacher of Speech and Language

Faculty Member Name	Kathleen R. Murphy
Highest Degree, Field, & University[3]	D. Ed., Elementary Education: Reading and Language Arts, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2001
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member [4]	Teaching faculty
Faculty Rank[5]	Full Professor
Tenure Track	▶ YES
Scholarship[6], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[7]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[8]	1. Appointed member of ILA Professional Standards and Ethics Committee 2. Reviewer and Lead Program Reviewer for International Reading Association 3. Work in progress A repertoire of motivating middle level reading strategies: Focus on content classrooms, grades 4 - 8. Columbus, OH: Biblio Publishing Inc. 4. K. R. Murphy (2014) Motivation and reading: Focus on content literacy. In G. Goodman (Ed.)., Revised Edition Education psychology reader: The art and science of how people learn (pp. 225-232). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[9]	Consultant and workshop presenter on reading Franklin, Ambridge, and Forest Area School Districts Pre-student teaching supervision Certifications - Communication 7-12, Reading Specialist K-12

Faculty Member Name	Marilyn Howe
Highest Degree, Field, & University[3]	PhD, Curriculum and Supervision, Administration and Policy Studies, University of Pittsburgh
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member	Teaching faculty

(4)	
Faculty Rank[5]	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	�♭ YES
Scholarship[6], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[7]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[8]	The Common Core State Standards and Assessment, Educational Psychology Reader, 2014. The Common Core State Standards for Higher Education, PAC-TE Journal, 2013. "Integration of Technology in the University Classroom," Hand in Hand, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, February 2007.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[9]	University Supervisor of Teacher Candidates/Consultant

Faculty Member Name	Brian Maguire
Highest Degree, Field, & University[3]	PhD, Curriculum and Instruction, Language and Literacy Concentration, Pennsylvania State University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member (4)	Teaching faculty, Student supervision
Faculty Rank[5]	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	�♭ YES
Scholarship[6], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[7]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[8]	1. Keystone State Reading Association, Board of Directors (2006-2008) 2. Seneca Reading Council: Vice President (2005-2006), President (2007-2008) 3. Maguire, B.E. 92007). Rhythm, rhyme, and literacy in Enriching Children's Literacy Skills Through the CREATE Project. A paper presented at the 9th Annual International Conference on Education, Athens, Greece, 2007.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[9]	1. Consultant, Collaborative Literacy Leadership, Curriculum Revision, Franklin School District, (2009-2010) 2. Presenter - Dr. Brian and Friends, "Storytelling, Song Singing, and Book Sharing - Primary, Intermediate, and Faculty Assemblies", Johnsonburg Elementary School, Johnsonburg, PA (2009) 3. Clinical supervision of students Certifications - Elementary Education, Reading Specialist

(3) For example, PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.

(4) For example, faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

(5) For example, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

(6) Scholarship is defined by CAEP as a 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) For example, 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, in-service 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 ILA 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 (10)	Type or Form of Assessment (11)	When the Assessment Is Administered (12)
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	Reading Specialist	State Licensure Test	Completion of the program
Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in reading education (required)	Comprehensive Examination or Portfolio	Exit assessment options	Completion of program
Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction (required)	Content In-Service Program	Project	ED 567 Secondary, College, and Content Area Reading Instruction - required course
Assessment #4: Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience (required)	Case Study Profile	Case Study	ED 570 Practicum I: Assessment
Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning (required)	Portfolio	Portfolio	ED 571 Practicum II: Instruction
Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses ILA standards (required)	Study Group Leadership	Project	ED 563 Reading Pedagogy - required course
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses ILA standards (optional)	Synthesis of Research Studies	Research	ED 564 Evidence-based Literacy Instruction - required course

Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses ILA standards (optional)	Professional Development Initiative	Project	ED 574 Literacy Leadership Collaboration, Coaching, and Collegial Professional Development - required course

(10) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

(11) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

(12) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

1. For each IRA/ILA standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple IRA/ILA standards.

Standard 1. Foundational Knowledge. Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
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. 1.2: Understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions 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. Standard 2. Curriculum and Instruction. Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
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. 2.3: Use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑

3. Standard 3. Assessment and Evaluation. Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
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. 3.4: Communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences.	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐

4. Standard 4. Diversity. Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
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. Standard 5. Literate Environment. Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
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, 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). 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. 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 and data reported should be required of all candidates. Assessments, scoring guides/rubrics 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 that 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 CAEP's 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/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/rubrics 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/ILA 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 Licensure Test Reading Specialist	Alignment Reading Specialist Praxis to 2010 IRA Standards

    See Attachment panel below.

2. Assessment of content knowledge in reading education. IRA/ILA 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,[13] and essays. (Answer required)

    Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 2 Content Knowledge in Reading Education Graduate Studies

    See Attachment 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/ILA 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 Content In-Service Program Assignment

    See Attachment panel below.

4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. IRA/ILA 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 Case Study Profile

    See Attachment panel below.

5. Assessment that demonstrates and evaluates candidate effects on student learning and provision of supportive learning environments for student learning. IRA/ILA 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 Portfolio

See Attachment panel below.

6. IRA/ILA 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 Study Group Leadership Assignment

See Attachment panel below.

7. Additional assessment that addresses IRA/ILA 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 Synthesis of Research Studies

See Attachment panel below.

8. Additional assessment that addresses IRA/ILA 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 Professional Development Initiative

See Attachment panel below.

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)

Introduction: Changes in the reading specialist concentration program have transpired since the previous NCATE review in 2010. One major transition reflects the shift from the role of the reading specialist to the literacy-coaching framework. Candidates can also select a literacy concentration area, which does not include the reading specialist certification but an emphasis on literacy, embodying key areas such as literacy coaching, professional development and secondary content literacy that can enhance teaching repertoire. The Clarion University Graduate Committee meets monthly to examine contemporary issues that impact coursework at the graduate level. The Reading and Language Arts Committee meets bimonthly. The committees' efforts during the past seven years have focused extensively on incorporating aspects of literacy coaching in the reading specialist coursework through adherence to the IRA 2010 standards. The eight program level assessment scoring rubrics have been revised and the data analysis is used to strengthen the program, focusing on specific coursework and overall candidate performance.

Content Knowledge In assessment one, there is a 100% pass rate on the Reading Specialist Praxis II, indicating candidates have displayed knowledge of IRA Standards 1 - 6. The Reading Specialist Praxis II topics are aligned to the IRA 2010 Standards and graduate courses in the reading specialist concentration program. For each year outlined in this report, there has been 100% pass rate on the comprehensive exam. Efforts are consistently made by the Graduate Committee to examine comprehensive exam prompts in addition to guidelines and scoring criteria for both the comprehensive exam and portfolio on a yearly basis. Current efforts are being made to revise the comprehensive exam rubric.

One area of improvement noted is IRA Standard 1on the comprehensive exam. IRA Standard 1 focuses on Foundational Knowledge. Through the graduate courses, faculty have made attempts to ensure that candidates are familiar with significant research studies where candidates can adequately identify, explain, compare, and contrast the theories and research in the area of language development and learning to read. Candidates are required to provide internal citations through their comprehensive exam responses. An area for consideration is the addition of timely research critiques to further support content knowledge development. The instructor for ED 564 Evidence-based Literacy Instruction has included an assignment in synthesizing peer-reviewed research studies and practitioners' articles. ED 564 is also earlier in

the graduate course rotation sequence for more notable performance results as related to IRA Standard 1.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions Data from the assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate the ability to plan and implement effective reading instruction. Results suggest that candidates can utilize assessment data, recommend instructional strategies to plan and employ developmentally appropriate lessons (assessment 4). Candidates through assessment 3 are provided with the opportunity to integrate technology resources and hands-on activities for the purpose of providing an interactive secondary content in-service program. Literacy coaching activities are embedded throughout the graduate courses. ED 574 is now entitled as "ED 574 Literacy Leadership: Collaboration, Coaching, and Collegial Professional Development." The culminating project for the ED 574 course is the Professional Development Initiative, which emphasizes collaboration as literacy coaches (assessment 8).

Perhaps the most noteworthy reading program changes have been the practicum courses (ED 570 Practicum I: Assessment and ED 571 Practicum II: Instruction), which previously reflected the role of the reading specialist, now encompassing literacy coaching. An area for improvement, which is continually refined, is the role of candidates functioning in the capacity as literacy coaches on teams. Graduate students as literacy coaches make decisions regarding the use of informal and formal assessments, instructional strategies, and recommendations. The practicum case studies and portfolio are completed collaboratively as literacy coaches (assessments 4 and 5). On-site practicum supervisors function as literacy coaches, working directly with each team providing input on instruction and assessment decisions.

Another area of improvement includes communication with various stakeholders. Candidates are provided with the opportunity to collaborate with speech pathologists on-site, which enhances background information for their case studies. Just this past summer 2016, literacy coaches worked with reading intervention specialists from the Special Education Department. Input was provided with the case studies from the reading intervention specialists. Candidates communicate directly with parents/guardians as well as classroom teachers through conferences and an open house venue in the practicum setting. Recommendations for continued progress are shared in the form of take home parent packets. Culminating activities by literacy coaching teams with children have included reader's theater as well as incorporation of technology (songs and choral readings on CD) as part of their portfolio presentation (assessment 5). We have added brain-based activities and utilized books with movement the past two summers (2015 and 2016). With the success of the transition from a traditional reading specialist role to literacy coaching for practicum is the concern with the onslaught of web-based teaching. Suggestions and inquiries have been made as to whether practicum will become web-based at some point.

Through analysis, data findings suggest that candidates in the reading specialist concentration program display professional and pedagogical

knowledge, skills, and dispositions as literacy leaders. Candidates adeptly apply previous course knowledge to the practicum experiences as graduate students conduct a variety of informal and formal assessment tools, plan and implement instructional strategies and provide support firsthand to other literacy coaches on their respective teams, in addition to enhancing communication efforts with various stakeholders such as parents, speech pathologists, and reading intervention specialists.

Through the field-based experiences and practicum courses, our candidates can enthusiastically and quite effectively support classroom teachers as literacy leaders in their attempts to interpret assessments, provide high quality instruction for students in Pre K - grade 8 in most need of reading assistance. Student Learning Data findings suggest that reading specialist concentration candidates demonstrate the ability to effectively plan and implement informal and formal assessments that impact students' learning and literacy development. Candidates for assessment 4, the case study profile, utilize pre and post assessments to document students' progress in, i.e. word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. The impact on student learning is further substantiated with the portfolio (assessment 5). Examples provided by the candidates include pre and post assessments and instructional strategies during a three-week practicum time frame. Revisions to both the case study profile and portfolio reflect literacy coaching teamwork. Candidates are required to provide a daily log of their work as literacy coaches in addition to collaboration activities reflecting assessment and instruction. On-site practicum supervisors provide a written team observation, focusing on candidates functioning in the role of literacy coaches. Through this formal observation, we can see firsthand the effect on student learning.

During practicum, literacy coaches are interacting with children, diagnosing and remediating reading difficulties and/or implementing use of instructional teaching strategies to a group of students at varying ability levels. Candidates complete the case study profile and portfolio with exemplary scores (assessments 4 and 5).

For assessment 6, candidates identify a study topic that is appropriate for literacy educators and offer a rationale for their selection of the study topic. Candidates plan and develop a series of learning opportunities for their peers in ED 563, or for another appropriate real-world audience of participants, then serve as the leader of this study group, which supports candidate effect on student learning.

With the change from the College of Education and Human Services to a School of Education as part of the College of Arts, Education, and Sciences, this has made a significant impact on faculty staffing. In spring 2015, my colleague, Dr. Brian Maguire retired and passed away on September 7, 2015. A part-time temporary instructor has filled his position. Another area for noted improvement is Standard 4: Diversity. Last summer, I initiated conversation with the director of international programs. He expressed interest in further discussions with the goal of having the international students participate in the

summer practicum classes. This can greatly enhance our efforts with improving diversity standards, most noteworthy - additional experience working with English Language Learner students.

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 CAEP website at http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur

   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 CAEP website at http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur

   (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

Please click "Next"

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