

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Preparation of Reading Education Professionals (2010 Standards)

National recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the International Reading Association (IRA).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Concord University, WV

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

08 / 01 / 2017

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Reading Specialist

Grade Level⁽¹⁾

PreK-Adult

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

Program Type

Other School Personnel

Award or Degree Level(s)

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

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA decision on national recognition of the program(s):

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation OR Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds SPA benchmarked licensure test data requirement, if applicable:

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

Summary of Strengths:

This assessment documents the alignment of Praxis II with the ILA standards and reports a strong pass rate. Program reviewers document evidence of vigilance for student performance as it relates to need for program adjustments.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

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

- 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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1,2,4,5 and 7 are identified as meeting this standard. In all cases, rubrics are well designed and the assignments are described well. Assessments 2 and 3 are especially strong for meeting this standard.

Standard 2. Curriculum and Instruction. Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.

- 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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1,4,5, 7 and 8 are identified as meeting this standard. Assessments 2 and 4 are especially strong but the standard is met in all cases under the preponderance of evidence. Areas of weakness have been identified and are plans are in place to address these.

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

- 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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1,3,5 and 7 are identified as meeting this standard. Program faculty identify areas of weakness as well as plans to address these areas. The standard is met under the preponderance of evidence across all assessments.

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.

- 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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1,2,4,5 and 8 are identified as meeting this standard. The standard is met.

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.

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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1,4, and 5 provide evidence for meeting this standard.

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.

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.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Comment:

Assessments 1,3,4,5,and 6 are identified as meeting this standard. All components are addressed. The standard is met.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Both the Praxis II (Assessments 1 and 2) and the Research Paper (Assessment 2) provide primary evidence of candidates' mastery of content knowledge. The high rate of passing Praxis II (96.2%) and the strong performance on the research paper substantiate this.

C.2 Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

The Case Study (Assessment 3) and Reading Practicum (Assessment 4) provide primary evidence of candidates' understanding and application of pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Candidates score between Proficient and Distinguished criteria consistently, with one exception of analyzing and interpreting writing assessment and those approach proficiency. Faculty note incorporating additional content to address this.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

Assessment 5, Portrait of a Child, provides primary evidence of candidates' effect on student learning. Faculty note one area of weakness in using a wide range of texts and also provide strong explanation in terms of strict county guidelines and a plan of action to improve candidates' confidence in using other texts.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

Faculty are clearly intentional about reviewing all data systematically and thoroughly. They are to be commended for the direct response to the information supplied by the data. They have a clear sense of what needs to be amended. One specific example of this is provision of support in the area of writing to public school teachers as well as ensuring their faculty are well trained in research based strategies for teaching writing to their candidates. Developing confidence in being able to use a wide range of texts by incorporating this in multiple courses is another example of the faculty's response to assessment results.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

The report provides strong evidence for the institution's program. The assignments and rubrics alike are well designed, clearly articulated. A nice feature of the report was a chart for each assessment identifying the level that was being measured. The faculty are looking toward the 2017 standards. The faculty are also committed to evaluating and responding to the data provided by each assessment.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the CAEP site visitors:

NA

PART G -DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- National Recognition. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the provider's next CAEP accreditation decision in 5-7 years. The Recognition Report will serve as program level evidence for the accreditation cycle it has been initiated. To retain recognition and to gather new evidence for the next accreditation cycle, another program report must be submitted mid-cycle 3 years in advance of the next scheduled accreditation visit. The program will be listed as Nationally Recognized through the semester of the next CAEP accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and CAEP. The institution may designate its program as Nationally Recognized by the SPA, through the semester of the next CAEP accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon CAEP accreditation. Please note that once a program has been Nationally Recognized, it may not submit another report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns cited in the recognition report.

Please click "Next"

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

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

- Institution Name
- State
- Date submitted
MM DD YYYY
 / /
- Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:	
<input type="text" value="Kathy Hawks"/>	
Phone:	Ext.
<input type="text" value="(304)887-0764"/>	<input type="text"/>
E-mail:	
<input type="text" value="hawksk@concord.edu"/>	
- CAEP Coordinator's Information:

Name:	
<input type="text" value="Kathryn L. Liptak"/>	
Phone:	Ext.
<input type="text" value="(304)384-5155"/>	<input type="text"/>
E-mail:	
<input type="text" value="liptakka@concord.edu"/>	
- Name of institution's program
- CAEP Category
- Grade levels⁽¹⁾ for which candidates are being prepared

PreK-Adult

(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

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

Reading Specialist

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)

The state of West Virginia certifies reading specialists at the PreK-Adult level. A graduate level certification program is required, along with the Master's Degree to be state certified. Concord's reading content specialization is part of the 36-hour M.Ed. program. Upon successful completion of the program and taking Praxis II (Test 5301), graduates will be certified as reading specialists. The Reading Specialist program reflects the IRA's Standards for Reading Professionals (2010) and includes a six-hour practicum. Department of Education faculty, with expertise in reading, are primarily responsible for the 24 hours within the reading content specialization. The graduate reading specialist program is housed in the Department of Education and is designed to prepare candidates, through a focused set of coursework, assessments, standards and clinical experiences, for reading instruction in grades pre-kindergarten through twelve (adult). All students seeking the Master's in Education, Reading Specialist, are required to complete a common core of professional education courses along with the reading specialist cognate.

The offering of the M.Ed. Program is one of the goals in Concord's Institutional Compact and Action Plan. Under Strategic Issue F: Graduate Student Success, Activity 1- states "...provide quality and consistent online/hybrid graduate courses." The compact states, "In an effort to increase graduate enrollment, the University will expand delivery of the graduate programs beyond the boundaries of our traditional service area. Prior to this expansion, Concord will review the quality and consistency of all graduate courses to ensure that each meets or exceeds quality standards of Quality Matters (QM). QM training is a nationally recognized, rigorous peer review process that helps faculty improve student learning in online/hybrid courses. Faculty teaching online/hybrid courses in the graduate programs will be required to attend QM training and ensure that each course meets the QM standards."

Numerous rural counties in West Virginia have a shortfall of reading specialist and are considered high-need areas, making it possible for many of our candidates to receive full or partial tuition reimbursements from their county when working toward their degree.

Concord University is located in Mercer County which is in the southern part of West Virginia. It is situated in an impoverished area where, according to the latest statistics from www.talkpoverty.org, the West Virginia child poverty rate is ranked 44th out of 50, unemployment rate is ranked 49th, and children living apart from parents is also ranked 49th. According to state and federal guidelines, all students in Mercer County, and other surrounding counties, regardless of family income, receive free breakfast and free lunch due to the high poverty which suppresses the area.

While education is the key to breaking the poverty cycle, it is not always viewed as such; thus, creating a more challenging environment for higher education. Residing and working in southern West Virginia presents Concord University with some thought-provoking but stimulating educational opportunities. We continue to seek ways to broaden our service area, making it feasible for our programs to be available to anyone who desires to enroll. While expanding our service region it is critical that we maintain a standard of academic excellence and offer programs that are high-quality which will meet the needs of our population.

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)

The 6-hour practicum is conducted during the graduate summer term (13 weeks) at Concord University and known as the Summer Reading Camp. Graduate students enrolled in the practicum are taught and supervised by full-time faculty at Concord. Since 2008 the summer reading camp has been offered at two primary locations: Wade Community Center in Bluefield, WV and The Golden Rule Montessori School in Princeton, WV. A full-time Concord faculty member is on-site for the entirety of the practicum.

The Wade Center is a community center that reaches into the poverty stricken housing projects of Bluefield, WV in an effort to address the needs of the children in a holistic manner. The demographics of the students attending the Wade Center offer a variety of diverse opportunities for Concord candidates. The average enrollment consists of 85% African-American students and 15% Caucasian. The Wade Center is open year round for children in homeless and/or apparently hopeless situations.

The Golden Rule Montessori School (GRMS), like the Wade Center is centrally located in a poverty stricken area. While the Wade Center affords opportunities for students in Bluefield, the GRMS offers opportunities for students in Princeton, WV. Both locations allow CU candidates to assess, motivate, and instruct students in meaningful, alternative, and authentic methods of teaching reading without the stringent guidelines that govern county schools. The partnerships that have emerged from the practicum being housed in these two facilities have resulted in a stronger community connection with Concord.

During the practicum, candidates are paired together for a co-teaching experience. Each co-teaching team is assigned a small group of students who will be under their guidance and supervision during the practicum or summer reading camp. Each co-teaching pair of candidates is also provided an area in the designated facility where they are required to create a literate environment to support student learning in a motivational and intentional fashion. Creativity embedded in effective instructional plans while implemented in thematically designed areas, targeting individual student needs in reading and writing, has proven effective in reaching students at their point of need. Candidates collaborate and plan effectively to meet the student's needs at their cognitive

level, social level, and motivational level. A Concord faculty member is at the site monitoring, collaborating, assisting, and supporting candidates during the camps entirety.

Additionally during the practicum, reading specialist candidates are responsible for mentoring, coaching, and evaluating Concord undergraduate pre-service teachers who assist them during the instructional time at the Wade Center or GRMS, in order to fulfill the requirements of an undergraduate reading course. University professors document the field practicum through observation forms and evaluation forms.

In addition to the practicum, reading specialist candidates are engaged in on-going, embedded field studies as they complete Assessments 3, 5, 7, and 8. These comprehensive assessments allow candidates to address multiple ILA Standards by using an integrated approach that includes assessment instruction, critical reflection, coaching, and professional development. These embedded field studies take place in area schools. The embedded field work focuses on assessing and teaching P-12 students and working with and supporting colleagues, teachers, paraprofessionals, and other support personnel in the school. University faculty oversee school-based fieldwork.

Assessment Three- candidates are required to complete an early field placement on three P-12 students as they administer numerous screening and diagnostic reading and writing assessments, submit assessments results, interpret assessment data accurately, and develop instructional plans driven by the assessment results. This information will be submitted in the form of a case study. This study is performed in the public school with a university faculty member overseeing it.

Assessment Five- candidates are required to complete an early field experience with one child who has been identified by assessment data as an intensive or strategic reader. The candidate will tutor the child one-on-one for a minimum of 10 hours. The early field experience is completed in the public school or in an alternative venue if approved ahead of time by the instructor. The professor oversees the process and project.

Assessment Seven- candidates are required to complete an action research project in their schools/classrooms as a field study. The project must be approved by the instructor and include a proposal, program description, literature review, data collection, and results. The project is supervised by the instructor.

Assessment Eight- candidates are required to participate in an online field study. This project is a Web Buddy Project and allows our candidates to interact with high school students from an inner-city school, very different from our rural farming and mining communities where most of our candidates call home. The project utilizes literacy as its springboard and is overseen by the

professor.

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.)

Reading Specialist PreK-Adult Progression Sheet and Catalog Description of Courses.doc

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.
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-		
*Our candidates do not progress through our program in cohorts. They complete the program at their own pace. Therefore, the number of program completers is not equivalent to the number of candidates enrolled.		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers ⁽²⁾
2013-2014	42	5
2014-2015	47	12
2015-2016	48	19

(2) CAEP 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. (Please refer to the footnotes for clarification)

Faculty Member Name	Hawks, Kathy J.
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ed. D., Higher Education Leadership, Nova Southeastern University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Undergraduate and graduate faculty, supervision of student teachers
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Professor of Education
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ :List up to 3 major contributions in the	Faculty Advisor, Reading Council, Concord University; Concord University Professional Development School Initiative Director; ILA SPA Coordinator for Reading Specialist program; Presenter, ITQ Grant, Mercer County, WV, Summer 2013 and 2014

past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Teacher, Glenwood School, Grades 2, 3, and 5, Mercer County, WV (21 years) Part-time Title I Reading Specialist, Straley Elementary School, Mercer County, WV 2004-2005 (1 year)

Faculty Member Name	Williams, William P.
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ph. D., Curriculum and Instruction - English Education/Literacy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Undergraduate and graduate faculty, student teacher supervisor
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
Scholarship ⁽⁶⁾ , Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service ⁽⁷⁾ : List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ⁽⁸⁾	Williams, William. Opening Up Dialogue to Help Close Down Stereotypes. Part of the Commission on the Teaching and Research on Young Adult Literature at the National Council of Teachers of English National Conference. Atlanta, GA. November 2016. Williams, William; Williams, Angela; and Jenkins, Dale. Engaging Students and Inspiring Success: Approaches to Ensure Success in K-18 Education. Virginia Association of Teachers of English Annual Conference. Hampton, VA. October 2016. Williams, William; Williams, Angela; and Roth, Elizabeth. Buddying with Books and Budding Teachers: Building Professional Relationships Utilizing PDS Connections to Develop 21st Century Professionals. National Association for Professional Development Schools Conference. Washington D.C. March 2106.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Secondary English/Language Arts Teacher, Chief Ivan Blunka School, New Stuyahok, AK, 1996-1997 (1 year); Secondary English Teacher, Gordon County School District, GA, 1994-1996 (2 years); Educational Director, Brookhaven Boys and Girls Club, GA 1991-1992 (1 year)

(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)	Praxis II- Reading Specialist Exam (5301)	State Licensure Exam	Completed at the end of the program
Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in reading education (required)	Research Paper	The candidate will demonstrate an understanding and knowledge of language development, cultural and social processes, linguistic diversity, physical factors, motivational factors, and the integration of strategies, related to reading and writing.	Completed in RDNG 510
Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction (required)	Case Study	The Case Study requires the candidate to select, develop, administer, and interpret a variety of reading and writing assessments and then plan effective literacy instruction. The candidate assesses and plans instruction for student's point of need.	Completed in RDNG 530

<p>Assessment #4: Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience (required)</p>	<p>Reading Practicum/Internship</p>	<p>A six-week practicum experience which requires assessing, creating a literate and motivational environment, planning instruction, diagnosing and evaluating, and professional development.</p>	<p>Completed in RDNG 570</p>
<p>Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning (required)</p>	<p>Portrait of a Child</p>	<p>The candidate selects an intensive or struggling reader to tutor one-on-one for a minimum of 10 hours. Based on the interpretation of assessment results, the candidate plans and implements effective instructional strategies for the child.</p>	<p>Completed in RDNG 550</p>
<p>Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses ILA standards (required)</p>	<p>Professional Leadership Portfolio</p>	<p>The Professional Leadership Portfolio allows candidates the opportunity to showcase their professional learning and leadership experiences as well as to plan for future professional growth.</p>	<p>Completed in RDNG 520</p>
<p>Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses ILA standards (optional)</p>	<p>Action Research Project</p>	<p>The Action Research Project provides the candidate an opportunity to identify a problem within his/her classroom, career, or other professional setting that he/she would like to attempt to improve.</p>	<p>Completed in RDNG 560</p>

<p>Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses ILA standards (optional)</p>	<p>Web Buddy Project</p>	<p>The Web Buddy Project provides the candidate an authentic opportunity to interact and discuss literature and literacy with high school students in a diverse setting in another region of the country.</p>	<p>Completed in RDNG 525</p>
---	--------------------------	---	----------------------------------

(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).

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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 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 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 One.docx

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 Two.docx

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 Three.docx

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 Four.docx

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 Five.docx

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 Six.docx

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 Seven.docx

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 Eight.docx

See Attachment 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)

The Master's in Education which leads to the Reading Specialist certification at Concord University has, since its beginning, prepared candidates to meet standards identified by the International Literacy Association (ILA) for Reading Professionals. First, the standards for 2003 and then the standards for 2010 drove our program's content, assessments, and programmatic changes. Concord is now positioned at a transition point, as we prepare to address the revised ILA Standards for Literacy Professionals 2017.

As was the case with the 2010 Standards, the 2017 Standards are performance based and delineate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions upon which we will assess the Reading/Literacy Specialist candidate. The 2017 standards identify the clinical experience as a separate standard, making seven standards instead of six. The new standards appear to address all three roles of reading/literacy specialist in a more comprehensive manner than previous standards.

Two immediate revisions emerge: 1) continue to emphasize the unique role of Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach/Interventionist as leader of effective reading and writing programs, but with a stronger emphasis as the role of coordinator; and 2) evaluate our reading practicum to ensure that it remains a strength of our program while meeting the new criteria in the 2017 Standards.

In continuing with Concord's commitment to offer an effective and excellent program, we have diligently worked to meet the goals and make the changes identified in our 2011 SPA report. Two of the most prominent changes were: a new course, RDNG 525-Literacy Research and Instruction for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students was developed and added to our program as a required class. The objective of this course was to address the changing needs of a diverse population. Additionally, we have incorporated extensive content into, and redesigned RDNG 510, to include an emphasis on communication skills and coaching techniques as candidates explore the contemporary roles, as well as the historic roles of the reading/literacy specialist. Since 2011 we have continuously reviewed and analyzed our assessment data, we have determined definite strengths, as well as areas for improvement. The following sections will identify how the new standards and the principle findings of our analysis of the data from our eight assessments will strengthen and advance our program.

Content Knowledge

Multiple assessments within the program address candidates' foundational knowledge. Assessment One is the State Licensure exam required for certification as a reading specialist in West Virginia. The Praxis II Reading Specialist Exam (5301) covers both knowledge of relevant facts and the ability to analyze problems and apply principles to reading literacy instruction. The test content covers: assessment and diagnostic teaching, reading and writing development, leadership skills and specialized knowledge of pedagogical principles and instructional practices, professional learning and leadership, and an analysis of an individual student case study. Candidates who have taken the Praxis II exam have performed exceptionally well. Data for this report indicate that Concord has a 96.2% pass rate. Only one candidate of those who attempted the test did not pass.

Content knowledge is also addressed in the candidates' completion of a research paper in Assessment Two. Completed during RDNG 510-Foundations of Reading, the candidates must apply their knowledge by demonstrating an understanding of psychological, sociological, and linguistic foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. The data from this assessment along with the successful results of candidates taking the Praxis II content exam indicate that our candidates possess strong content knowledge.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge

A review of cumulative data provides positive findings regarding the successful attainment of our candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge. Candidates have multiple opportunities to demonstrate effective use of assessment tools and the analysis of diagnostic measures. Candidates use assessment data to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction. (ILA 3) Data for Assessment Three overwhelmingly demonstrates that candidates are strong in administering and interpreting assessments in reading. However, earlier findings identified a weakness in assessing and teaching writing.

To address this deficit, a faculty member was provided the opportunity to receive specialized training in assessing and teaching writing at a professional development training on The 6+1 Traits of Writing. Since that time we have seen a steady increase in candidates' ability to teach and assess writing in Assessment Three. Specifically, data collected in fall 2016 was evidence of a substantial increase in this area. After faculty discussion, we arrived at the conclusion that the difference in candidates' scores on Assessment Three was partially attributed to the extensive training of the faculty. Concord will continue to support professional development for faculty in areas that will strengthen our program. Faculty continuously monitor assessment data for trends which demonstrate the need for specialized training.

While Concord faculty are confident that our program supports the candidate

as a professional leader (ILA 6), one weakness that we detected was that our candidates were not afforded many opportunities to fulfill the role of coordinator. While Assessment Two addresses the roles of reading/literacy specialist, and Assessment Six defines the professional commitment of the candidate, neither offer the practical application in the role of reading coordinator. The 2017 Standards clearly articulate the role of reading/literacy specialist as coordinator. Concord faculty welcome the opportunity to enhance our program by including an assessment, or redesigning a current assessment, which will allow our candidates to have practical experiences serving as a reading coordinator at both the county and school levels. In planning for this future assessment, conversations with county coordinators have already occurred, whereby, establishing a partnership between county coordinators and Concord faculty for tutelage and building experiences for our candidates as coordinators.

ILA Standard Four relates to diversity. According to Merriam-Webster, diversity by definition refers to a person's gender, race, age, religious beliefs, or socio-economic status, just to name a few. Given Concord's location in southern West Virginia and with regard to the socio-economic status of our area as a whole, we are by definition extremely diverse in the area of poverty.

Diversity is embedded throughout our program and is evidenced in numerous assessments; however, Assessment Eight targets the standard of diversity almost exclusively. Assessment Eight is a Web Buddy Project completed in our most recently added diversity course (RDNG 525). It affords candidates a unique opportunity to share a literacy experience with high school students in regions vastly different from ours through use of technology tools. Data collected from Assessment Eight reflects the positive impact this assessment is having on candidates. However, in reviewing the data, faculty realized that we do not have a tool which measures the impact this project is having on the participating high school students. Future changes to this assessment include the development of an evaluation instrument to be used with the high school students. Our goal is for Concord faculty to continue seeking innovative methods of exposing our candidates to diversity in a variety of venues.

Concord faculty value the importance of professional and pedagogical knowledge. Faculty continue to be active in attending ILA conferences, West Virginia Reading Association (WVRA) conferences, and other professional developments which support literacy. Faculty also encourage our candidates to participate, submit proposals, and present at conferences. Numerous candidates have presented at the WVRA and local literacy workshops. It is our goal to have all candidates present at a literacy conference before completing our program. We continue to work on ways to support them with this endeavor.

Student Learning

A review of the data provided positive findings regarding the successful

attainment of our candidates' use of instructional approaches and integrating a comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing. (ILA 2) Candidates have met requirements for all standards associated with the use of a variety of instructional strategies, approaches, and methods to support reading and writing.

Assessments Four and Five specifically target and address curriculum and instruction. (ILA 2). These two assessments measure the candidate's effect on student learning, including creating a literate environment which fosters reading and writing. (ILA 5)

Assessment Four, the reading practicum, also known as the Summer Reading Camp, speaks to these standards in a more observable measure. The practicum is held at a site where each candidate is provided his/her own space. Every candidate creates and designs their own area to support motivation, creates a social environment that is low-risk and supports choice, and provides the opportunity for students to learn to read and write. (ILA 5) Since the course professor is onsite for the entire practicum and all candidates are in the same facility, it allows for collaboration among the candidates and instructor. Creativity is evident in the arrangements of the areas, in the grouping configurations, and instructional strategies implemented. The data for Assessment Four reveals that our candidates are more successful on this assessment than any other. The pre and post assessment data results, reflections, and interviews suggest that the practicum impacts student learning and supports motivation that our candidates need to thrive in a co-teaching experience as well as the freedom to develop and create an arrangement that accommodates students' needs. Motivation has emerged as a driving force for our practicum.

Although there is strong evidence that our practicum is extremely effective, when the 2017 Standards are approved, faculty will unpack the standards, giving special attention to the newest standard, Standard Seven. We will explore programmatic changes necessary for our reading practicum to meet the requirements at the highest level identified by the new standards.

While the results from Assessment Five were consistently positive and the evidence of student learning was supported by diagnostic assessments including pre and post assessments, there was however, one piece of stark evidence that emerged; our candidates need to be afforded an opportunity to teach outside the stringent county guidelines. Candidates were hesitant and lacked confidence in using a "wide range of texts". (ILA 2) They leaned toward a strong reliance on the basal reader. Similar data continued for several years. In an effort to address this concern, faculty from Concord wrote and were awarded a state grant entitled Improving Teacher Quality (ITQ Grant). The funding from the grant was utilized to hold week-long trainings in the summer which focused on project-based learning and implementing instructional strategies using a wide variety of texts, not affiliated with the basal reader. The

participants included, but were not exclusively, candidates in our Reading Specialist Program. It is our goal to be proactive in seeking alternatives to the basal reader and exposing candidates to a wide array of texts.

As Concord faculty, we stand at the juncture of the introduction of new standards; we appreciate the opportunity to improve our reading specialist program as new standards are introduced.

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.