Changes Based on Data

PROGRAM: M. Ed. in Literacy

Name of Assessment	Results/ Data	Changes Made Date	Changes Planned Date	How data is shared with faculty, candidates, and professional community
Assessment #1: Oral Comprehensive Exam of Master's Thesis	Although none of the candidates received Unacceptable on any aspect of the rubric, only 37% of the candidates received Target for element 4 (outcomes and implications) during the spring 2009 semester; the lowest percentage of candidates to achieve Target on any aspect of the rubric in the past 3 years. The number of candidates at Target for Outcomes and Implications fluctuated over the three semesters leading to a slight increase from 37% at Target in spring 2009 to 55% at Target in spring 2010. Although more than half of the candidates achieve Target, declines were evident in elements 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 from 2009 to 2010 and consistent declines across all semesters evident in elements 3 and 5. Candidates' outcomes in assessment 1 suggest they are able to identify, refer to, and synthesize seminal research studies in reading and literacy, craft a research methodology to uses a wide variety of assessments for data collection and analysis of students' literacy outcomes which they use to make recommendations for classroom practice, curriculum, literacy interventions, future research, and professional development for reading professionals. These outcomes suggest candidates demonstrate leadership skills as reading professionals by disseminating their own empirical research to a wider audience and adequately answering questions about their research through the presentations of their thesis which is used for their oral examination. The data also shows that most candidates are unable to meet Target proficiency in their articulation of student outcomes when giving their oral presentation.		Faculty will continue to examine student outcomes in relation to course work that require data collection and analysis (e.g. action research projects, case study) to determine how coursework can be improved to support student outcomes on the thesis.	Data is shared during program meetings. An online forum has been established via Blackboard to facilitate sharing of program reports, information, and resources.
Assessment # 2: Planning and Implementation of a Professional Development Workshop	During the data collection period, all candidates consistently achieved Target in the following indicator elements: 1- organization; 6- opportunity for participants to interact with and share with each other; 10- interaction with participants; 13- materials are appropriate; and 15- spelling, citation, and references; more than 90% met Target. In fall 2009, two indicators with the least number of candidates (62%) meeting Target are element 11 (effectively answered questions) and element14 (usefulness of the materials). Although some fluctuations in the three areas (content, presenter, materials) are evident over the three semesters, the data show all candidates meet Target and Acceptable		We intend to revise the rubric slightly to ensure better alignment with IRA 2010 standards for professional development. This change will help candidates meet Target levels when working with pre-service and in-service teachers in a professional development capacity. The revised rubric	Data is shared during program meetings. An online forum has been established via Blackboard to facilitate sharing of program reports, information, and resources.

	levels in professional learning and leadership standards when presenting their workshops. On average, over 85% of the candidates consistently achieved Target in the Content and Materials used for their workshop, and over 80% average Target in their presentation skills (as measured with the Presenter indicators on the rubric). These outcomes suggest that candidates proficiently demonstrate their knowledge of working with adults; are able to design and implement professional development with appropriate content and resource materials; and can effectively communicate strategies and make recommendations for teachers to support students' reading and literacy development.		will specifically obtain information on the practicality of the resources used and whether insights gained from the workshop is likely to impact classroom practice as well as dispositional information about the candidates' presentation and interaction styles.	
Assessment # 3: Action Research Project: Developmental Portfolio on Teaching and Learning	The data collected and analyzed from spring 2008, fall 2008, spring 2009, and fall 2009 shows that candidates consistently achieve Target in most aspects of the assessment specifically elements 1 (identification of the problem), 2 (description of the context), 3 (research and resources), and 4 (data collection and evidence of student outcomes). Significant increases in the percent of candidates achieving Target are evident in element 5 (teacher reflections) from spring 2008 to fall 2008 (36% to 88%). Similar gains were seen in elements 6 and 7 between fall 2008 and spring 2009 (37% to 87% in both areas). Although a slight decline in the number of candidates at Target for element #1 (identification of the problem) was evident from spring 2009 to fall 2009, 70% are still at the Target level. In the most recent evaluation of candidate performance none of the candidates were rated Unacceptable in any of the elements being measured. With regard to the IRA standards, most candidates demonstrate Target proficiency in this critical assessment.		Faculty are discussing the feasibility and implications of making this assessment # 7	Data is shared during program meetings. An online forum has been established via Blackboard to facilitate sharing of program reports, information, and resources.
Assessment # 4: Diagnosis of Reading Difficulties	Results show there were declines in the percent of candidates achieving Target for element 2 (Required number of tutoring sessions), 4 (Administration of assessments that demonstrates mastering of assessment tools), and 8 (Integration of technology for tutoring sessions) from fall 2009 to fall 2010 with decreases from 100% to 50%, 100 to 58%, and 60% to 0 respectively in these areas. During the same time frame, increases were made in elements 3 (Evaluations of the client's performances and reflection), 5 (Interpretation of assessment results), 6 (Overall reporting of the case study: Summary Report), and 7 (Consultation letter(s) to parents, teachers, or administrators). Although there were slight declines in elements 4 (Administration of assessments that demonstrates mastering of assessment tools), and 8 (Integration of technology for tutoring sessions) from spring 2009 to fall 2010, none of the candidates have received an Unacceptable rating. This data shows that most candidates are able to use a wide range of assessments and instructional materials to diagnose students and communicate results to stakeholders, which are expected knowledge skills and dispositional outcomes candidates should apply in practice.		The technology element on the rubric (element 8) was discussed among faculty members and it was decided that this element be revised to clearly articulate how technology can be used to support teaching and learning. The clinical faculty has already begun to identify ways candidates can integrate technology into the course as an instructional tool.	Data is shared during program meetings. An online forum has been established via Blackboard to facilitate sharing of program reports, information, and resources.

Assessment # 5: Remediation of Reading Difficulties	From spring 2009 to fall 2010, the data for element # 6 (Overall organization) shows twice as many candidates achieved Target over the two semesters reviewed with an increase from 50% achieving Target in spring 2009 to 100% achieving Target in fall 2010 on this critical assessment. In fall 2010, 100% of the candidates achieve Target in all areas: elements 1 (Resources), 2 (Development of Materials), 3 (Consultation), 4 (Lesson Plan), and 6 (Overall Organization). This data suggests candidates are able to support student learning in authentic learning environments.		Faculty members are discussing the feasibility and implications of making this assessment # 3. The technology element on the rubric (element 8) was discussed among faculty members and it was decided that this element be revised to clearly articulate how technology can be used to support teaching and learning. The clinical faculty has already begun to review the rubric and identify ways candidates can integrate technology into the course as an instructional tool.	Data is shared during program meetings. An online forum has been established via Blackboard to facilitate sharing of program reports, information, and resources.
Assessment # 6: Critical Issues Research Project	Data shows an overall increase in the number of candidates at Target in each aspect of the rubric. In spring 2009, 100% of the candidates achieved Target on this assessment, a 29% increase in all areas since the spring 2008 semester. Candidates complete an online project and demonstrate leadership. This data suggests that most candidates demonstrate leadership in online discussions about critical literacy issues, as advocates of critical issues. There has been a gradual increase in all candidates achieving Target on the critical assessment. Over the three semesters presented, candidates at Target increased from 71% to 100% in their ability to present and demonstrate knowledge of a critical issue, as well as in their reflective essay. The data examined for assessment 6 suggests candidates have a vast knowledge of reading and literacy theory, research, assessment, curriculum, instruction, and issues such as the impact of technology on teaching and learning, and meeting the needs of diverse learners in 21st century classrooms. The data also shows candidates are able to share information with peers in the course by facilitating discussions about critical issues and how to address them with instructional and curricular decisions while reflecting on their own practice.			Data is shared during program meetings. An online forum has been established via Blackboard to facilitate sharing of program reports, information, and resources.

Master of Education in Literacy
International Reading Association SPA Report
SECTION V – Use of Assessment Results to improve program

(1) Content Knowledge
The content knowledge of candidates in the Master's in Literacy program at William Paterson University is assessed through assessment 1, Oral Comprehensive Exam of Master's Thesis and assessment 2, Planning and Implementation of a Professional Development Workshop. In addition, GPA and grades are monitored to ensure that candidates have sufficient content knowledge to be effective reading professionals.

Principal Findings and Interpretation of the Findings
Outcomes from assessment 1 demonstrate that the majority of the candidates (above 50%) consistently achieve Target in areas that evaluate their knowledge. Most candidates are able to share knowledge of reading and literacy theory. Similar evidence from assessment 2 shows more than 60% of candidates achieve Target in relation to IRA standards and demonstrate their ability to share knowledge with a wider audience through their professional development workshops. This suggests that reading candidates proficiently demonstrate their knowledge of working with adults; designing and implementing professional development; and identify and sharing resources and materials with colleagues.

Data collected revealed 37% of candidates that achieved Target on element 4 (outcomes and implications) in spring 2009. This was the lowest percent of candidates with this outcome in the data collected. Similarly fluctuations were evident in element 6 (question and answer). This suggests that candidates need more help and experience examining data, drawing conclusions about the data, and discussing or articulating the implications of the outcomes that emerge from the data. Furthermore, the 31% decline in the number of candidates at Target for articulating their research methods during the oral examination of their thesis suggests that candidates need more background in research methods.

Program Changes Based on the Findings
The data shows that candidates are able to demonstrate their knowledge of reading, literacy and learning, through assessment 2: Planning and Implementation of a Professional Development Workshop. We intend to revise the rubric slightly to ensure better alignment with IRA 2010 standards for professional development. This change will help candidates meet Target levels when working with pre-service and in-service teachers in a professional development capacity. The revised rubric will specifically obtain information on the practicality of the resources used and whether insights gained from the workshop is likely to impact classroom practice as well as dispositional information about the candidates' presentation and interaction styles.

Over the past few years, program faculty members have identified course-based assignments and critical assessments to provide candidates with opportunities to demonstrate their ability to collect and analyze data on student performance. The action research project (assessment 3) which is completed in one of the foundation courses requires that candidates collect and analyze data and reflect on the impact of a literacy-based intervention on students' literacy development. Midway in the program candidates complete a year-long case study where they administer a

range of assessments and remediate K-12 students' literacy needs while tutoring in the reading clinic. Throughout the case study, candidates use assessment data to make instructional decisions, create targeted lesson plans, and provide feedback to parents and teachers on the K-12 student's progress.

In spring 2009, to examine the inter-reliability of candidates' outcomes we piloted a new assessment protocol for assessment 1 – using three evaluators for each candidate's oral exam. Results were fairly consistent with previous semesters. Additionally, few faculty schedules allowed them to participate in the pilot, which made recruitment of three evaluators from across the College of Education, for each of the candidates a difficult process to manage in an ongoing basis each spring. Our self-study also led us to focus our efforts on validating the rubric and ensuring inter-rater reliability through the evaluation instrument. In fall 2010 three program faculty members reviewed program critical assessments. The review included examination of three (3) student work samples from each of the six program assessments, description of assignments, and the rubric used to evaluate the student outcome. The assessment was examined through an independent review by two faculty members who used the rubric to evaluate the three samples. Faculty did not review assessments from courses they taught. After independent review, the group held a discussion to share their evaluations and insights about student outcomes and assignments in relation to program outcomes. This protocol was already in place for assessment 1: candidates are evaluated by 2 faculty members (except for spring 2009 when it was 3 faculty members) neither of which are their thesis advisor. For the inter-rater reliability check for assessment 1we re-examined the rubrics completed in previous semesters by evaluators. With regard to scores on assessment 1, the inter-rater reliability check yielded a mean rating of 97% agreement between raters. As a result we have decided to continue using the rubric and 2 faculty evaluators (who are not the candidate's advisor) for assessment 1.

(2) Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
The pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions of candidates in the Master of Education in Literacy program are evaluated through assessment 3 (Action Research Project: Developmental Portfolio on Teaching and Learning), and assessment 4 (Diagnosis of Reading Difficulties).

Principal Findings and Interpretation of the Findings
Candidates' consistently demonstrate proficient pedagogical knowledge in literacy research and literacy education and their ability to apply their knowledge in authentic, field-based experiences with students. Overall most candidates in the last three years (over 80%) achieve Target on assessment 3, Action Research Project: Developmental Portfolio on Teaching and Learning. All candidates are able to use a wide range of assessments and instructional materials to diagnose students and communicate results to stakeholders, which are expected knowledge skills and dispositional outcomes candidates should apply in practice, as demonstrated on assessments 3, and 4. There was a decline in the number of candidates achieving Target in element 8 (integration of technology) for assessment 4, Diagnosis of Reading Difficulties.

Program Changes Based on the Findings
Additional data is needed to further examine candidates' experiences in the clinic when completing the case study for assessments 4 (Diagnosis of Reading Difficulties) and 5 (Remediation of Reading Difficulties). The technology element on the rubric (element 8) was

discussed among faculty members and it was decided that this element be revised to clearly articulate how technology can be used to support teaching and learning. The clinical faculty has already begun to identify ways candidates can integrate technology into the course as an instructional tool.

(3) Student learning
Impact of the Master's in Literacy candidates on student learning is assessed through a variety of critical assessments in the program: assessment 3 (Action Research Project: Developmental Portfolio on Teaching and Learning), assessment 4 (Diagnosis of Reading Difficulties), and assessment 5 (Remediation of Reading Difficulties). All of these assessments provide evidence that candidates are able to impact student learning. The data specifically collected and analyzed from assessment 5 (Remediation of Reading Difficulties) shows that all candidates collect and examine data on student outcomes, and plan instruction based on assessments and student needs.

Principal Findings and Interpretation of the Findings
Due to recent program and faculty changes, data from this assessment point to the need for more candidate work on classroom assessment and reflection. Additional data collection and analysis will provide more insight on candidate performance with regard to their impact on student learning.

Program Changes Based on the Findings
The program will continue to collect data on student learning to develop a better understanding of how candidates are impacting student learning. To obtain a more comprehensive view of the impact of candidates on student learning, faculty have discussed using assessment 5 (Remediation of Reading Difficulties) for critical assessment 3 and 5. In addition, clinical faculty members are currently reviewing the rubric used for assessment 5 to determine the most effective ways to examine and evaluate the impact of teaching on learning. With this change, it's likely that assessment 3 will become assessment 7 in the program, but more discussion among the faculty members is warranted to finalize changes.

The WPU Master of Education in Literacy program has used and will continue to utilize assessment results to improve candidate performance as well as enhance program quality as demonstrated above. Faculty members in the program are committed to using a variety of meaningful and valid assessments to meet IRA standards.