

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

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

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

COVER SHEET

1. Institution Name

National-Louis University

2. State

Illinois

3. Date submitted

MM DD YYYY

09 / 13 / 2016

4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:

Sophie Degener

Phone: Ext.

(224) 233-2018

E-mail:

sophie.degener@nl.edu

5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:

Arlene Borthwick

Phone: Ext.

(847) 947-5025

E-mail:

aborthwick@nl.edu

6. Name of institution's program

Reading & Language

7. NCATE Category

Reading Specialist

8. Grade levels⁽¹⁾ for which candidates are being prepared

K-12

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

9. Program Type

- Advanced Teaching
- First Teaching License
- Other School Personnel
- Unspecified

- 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 License

14. Program report status:

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

15. Is your unit seeking

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

16. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:

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

For over one hundred years the National College of Education (NCE) of National-Louis University (NLU) has as its mission excellence in teaching, scholarship, service, and professional development. Recognizing the importance of life-long learning in a diverse, rapidly changing global society, the College is committed to developing and empowering all learners. National-Louis University was a founding member of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher education (NCATE) and also is accredited by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) which has a joint collaboration with NCATE and by the International Literacy Association.

The 36 semester hour graduate Reading Specialist Program, which is situated as an option in the more inclusive Reading Program, meets the ISBE requirements for K-12 Reading Specialist Licensure which requires 1) an initial teaching license in Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary or Special Education; 2) two years or more of successful teaching experience; 3) a Master's or post-master's degree in Reading from an approved program.

In Illinois, Reading Specialist licensure is only conferred through completion of approved graduate programs. Candidates for Reading Specialist Licensure cannot apply individually for this credential. These programs are designated as "entitlement" programs; candidates who successfully complete the programs and undergo a university evaluation of not only university credentials but other state requirements (e.g. initial licensure, prior teaching experience, state testing requirements) are entitled to a license. These meet the requirements of the International Literacy Association for Reading Specialists.

a. The National College of Education Core- 8 sh *

All graduate Master's programs in National College of Education of National-Louis University include core courses for general proficiency required of all Master's degree candidates. For the Reading Specialist, these courses are

ESR505 Educational Inquiry and Instruction - 3 sh

FND511 Social and Cultural Politics of Education -3sh

EPS 541 Cognition and Instruction- 2sh

b. The Reading Core-27 sh

Reading Specialist candidates complete work in their discipline in three strands: Foundational, clinical, and professional. Full course listings and titles can be found in Attachment A.

b1. The Reading Foundational Component: 11 semester hours

These courses develop a research and theory base related to foundations of language, reading and writing for school age students and integrates this knowledge with advanced instructional knowledge. The candidates, who are already certified and, for the most part, practicing teachers, integrate these new practices, theories and research through required teaching cases and other assignments completed in the K-12 regular education classroom

b2. The Clinical Component-10 semester hours of supervised practica (described in #2 below)

b3. The Professional Component- 6 sh

This component deals with professional development and research. The first course engages them in school research relevant to the role of the reading specialist, in developing and critiquing knowledge bases and in professional communication. The second course further develops coaching and leadership skills of the candidates and engages them in practical applications of each as well as other professional responsibilities of the Reading Specialist such as role definition, grant writing, leading literacy teams, communication and advocacy.

Students also have 1 sh of elective course work which is chosen in consultation with their advisor.

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 NLU Reading Specialist program rests on a strong foundation of research, theory, and practice. All coursework in the program includes performance requirements and practical application. The Clinical Component includes 10 semester hours of supervised work with students:

The Clinical Component- 10 semester hours of supervised practica

RLR 510 Diagnostic Techniques for the Reading Specialist (3sh) (10 supervised clinical hours in assessing school age children)

RLR 511 Instructional Strategies for Literacy Interventions (3sh) (10 supervised clinical hours in assessing an older and a younger reader and planning a remediation program)

RLR 592A Literacy Interventions for Elementary Students (2sh) (100 on-site hours of which 40 are supervised clinical teaching hours in assessment, planning, instruction and evaluation of a younger student; includes work with parents and supervisors; also includes participating in student staffings, coaching, videotaping and analysis and resource team problem solving)

RLR 592B Literacy Interventions for Secondary Students (2sh) (100 on-site hours of which 40 are supervised clinical teaching hours in assessment, planning, instruction and evaluation of an older student; includes work with parents and supervisors; also includes participating in student staffings, coaching, videotaping and analysis and resource team problem solving)

Each of these experiences looks at the research and theory related to assessment, intervention, and the diagnosis and treatment of reading difficulties. This component culminates in an on-site, 5-6 week supervised practicum experience with both early and more advanced readers. The Reading Specialist Practicum requires 40 supervised hours of intensive, individualized and group instruction for elementary and secondary readers. Each candidate works with one younger and one older student and also collaborates with other candidates and their students in group activities. The practicum experience is 100 or more clock hours.

Individually and in teams, candidates create literate environments, use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading instruction, and use a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, and curriculum materials to support reading and writing instruction. The clinical sessions are held on-site and students are recruited from the diverse populations of the metropolitan Chicago Area. Tutors are on site 5 hours a day for 20 instructional days and added set-up and teardown days. Each tutor completes 20 1-hour tutoring sessions with two students requiring remedial reading help.

In the daily instruction and staffings, candidates also engage in literacy coaching and mentoring as well as peer support and collaboration activities. They reflect in order to relate their practice to their foundational knowledge and also to draw implications for applying these understandings to the work of the reading specialist. Each candidate also completes a video analysis of his or her own teaching. Students who receive the instruction represent the ethnic, gender and economic diversity of a large metropolitan city. Through selective scholarships and by locating practica near public transportation, candidates are able to work with a variety of students and the shared staffing engage all candidates in problem solving and instructional planning for a variety of students.

The Clinical Component also involves the candidates in meeting with, interviewing and working with parents and, where permitted, with teachers. Further, the IRA ethical requirements of such work are foregrounded by engaging candidates in the explanation of and permission gathering required by such work with children as well as in the confidentiality requirements of collecting, discussing and storing data.

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 Program of Study.docx

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:		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers ⁽²⁾
2015-2016	83	18
2014-2015	87	24
2013-2014	103	25

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

6. Faculty Information

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

Faculty Member Name	Sophie Degener
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	EdD in Language & Literacy, Harvard University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Faculty
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⁾	Scholarship: Conference Presentations at ILA, LRA, AERA, and IRC; Book on One-on-One Reading & Writing Conferences published by Teachers College Press; Articles in Voices from the Middle and English Leadership Quarterly Service: Reading Program Coordinator; Associate Editor at Illinois Reading Council Journal; Board Member of local council of ILA
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Consultant with numerous local school districts, PD provider, keynote speaker Former classroom teachers, primary grades

Faculty Member Name	Peter Fisher
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	PhD in Reading, SUNY Buffalo
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Faculty
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	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⁾	Scholarship: Co-authored 4 books; Articles in Educational Leadership, Journal of Reading Education, and IRCJ; Chapters in 3 books Service: Three Faculty Senate committees; President of CIRP; Board Member of Volunteer Tutoring Program
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Eight years middle school, one year high school teaching experience

Faculty Member Name	Wendy Gardiner
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ed.D. Curriculum & Social Inquiry, National Louis University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Faculty

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⁾	Salmon, D. & Gardiner, W. (2016). Faculty research residencies: A model for reforming teacher education curriculum. <i>Action in Teacher Education</i> . (38)1, 3-17. Gardiner, W. & Weisling, N. (2015). Mentoring "inside" the action of teaching: Induction coaches' perspectives and practices. <i>Professional Development in Education</i> . DOI: 10.1080/19415257.2015.1084645 Gardiner, W. & Lorch, J. (2015). From "outsider" to "bridge": The changing role of university supervision in an Urban Teacher Residency program. <i>Action in Teacher Education</i> . (37), 172-189. Service NLE: Co-Chair IRB Service Profession: <i>Journal Review, Teaching and Teacher Education and Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice</i>
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	P-12 schools: . School-university liaison_provided K-2 clinical supervision and supported coherence between school & university based portions of a clinically rich teacher preparation model in an urban Chicago Public School . Reading Specialist endorsement

Faculty Member Name	Susan McMahon
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	PhD. Michigan State University, Literacy Development
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Faculty
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	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⁾	. Published article on writing with Jennifer Berne last winter (2015-16) . Standing Reviewer of the Elva Knight Award for the International Literacy Association . Serve on Review Board for The Reading Teacher
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Teaching and other Professional experience in Schools . Researcher/consultant on Partnership READ (UIC) . Taught grades 6-12 in public and private schools . Provided professional development sessions for teachers in K-8 CPS classrooms (1998-2014)

Faculty Member Name	Ruth Quiroa
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ph.D. Education Curriculum & Instruction: Language & Literacy (ESL-Bilingual Ed.) University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Faculty
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⁾	Naidoo, J. C., & Quiroa, R. E. (2016). Beyond Calaveras and Quinceañeras: Fostering bilingual Latino students' identity development with culturally relevant literature. In E. R. Clark, H. L. Smith, & B. B. Flores (Eds.) <i>Multicultural Literature for Latino Bilingual Children: Their words, their worlds</i> . Rowman Littlefield. Quiroa, R. E. (2016). Filling the gap: The looking glass legacy of Julie Kline and the Americas Book Award. In L. Henderson (Ed.) <i>The Americas Award: Honoring Latino/a children's and young adult literature in the Americas</i> . Lexington Books. Invited member of the Diversity in the ALSC (Association for Library Services to Children) Task Force. Function: To thoroughly examine diversity within all areas of ALSC such as membership, recruitment, award committees, and leadership and to recommend short-term and long-term strategies for developing richer diversity within the association. Spring 2015- present.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Data collection in 2013-2015 for scholarly study titled, "Impact of multicultural literature: How do graduate P12 literature courses affect instructional practice?" Classrooms included: <input type="checkbox"/> A bilingual (Spanish/English) Reading Specialist pullout classroom_Kindergarten and first grade <input type="checkbox"/> Three 7th grade social studies classrooms <input type="checkbox"/> Two high school English Language Arts classrooms_9th, 10th grades

Faculty Member Name	Geri Chesner
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	PhD. Education Urban Education: Curriculum and Instruction, Children's Literature University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Faculty
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⁾	Wen, Xiaoli; Chesner, Geri; Keneman, Ayn; and Borthwick, Arlene, "Impact on P-12 Student Learning: Perspectives from Multiple Stakeholders" (2015). NCE Research Residencies. Paper 3. http://digitalcommons.nl.edu/nce_residencies/3 Chesner, G. A. (2014, November). Expanding Visual and Viewing Abilities of Young Readers at the International Visual Literacy Association (IVLA), Toledo, OH. Chesner, G. A. (2014, September). Understanding and Nurturing the Unique Needs of Foster and Adopted Children in an Early Childhood Setting at the Pathways to Quality Early Childhood Conference and Resource Fair, Milwaukee, WI. Chesner, G. A. (2014, September). Circle Concept of Grief and Loss at the Changing Face of Adoption Conference, Wisconsin Dells, WI.
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	.Teacher - The Art of Writing Conference, November, 2015, Milwaukee Art Museum with 3-12th grade student writers and artists from within the Metro-Milwaukee area (began working with this event annually beginning in 1992) * Hales Corners Elementary School, Wisconsin - First grade classroom - focus on visual

	literacy and picture books.
Faculty Member Name	Mary Hoch
Highest Degree, Field, & University ⁽³⁾	Ed.D., Reading & Language, NLU
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ⁽⁴⁾	Faculty
Faculty Rank ⁽⁵⁾	Assistant 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⁾	Scholarship: 1. Hoch, M., Bernhardt, R., Murphy-Schiller, M., & Fisher, P.J. (2013). Three important words: Students choose vocabulary to build comprehension of informational text. <i>Illinois Reading Council Journal</i> , 41 (3), 3-12. 2. Nagel, C. & Hoch, M. (2014). Understanding power and fear - School integration in the South (1954-1964). <i>Reading.org</i> , Available at http://www.reading.org/general/Publications/bridges/7003 . 3. <i>Illinois Reading Council Journal - Associate Editor & Author, 2013-2014</i> ; Quarterly Professional Development Book Review Column Director of The Reading Center, 2012-Present
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools ⁽⁹⁾	Joliet Public Schools - District 86, Joliet, IL 2007- 2011 Assistant Principal, Lynne Thigpen Elementary School, K-5 Joliet Public Schools - District 86, Joliet, IL 2003 - 2007 Curriculum Specialist, Sator Sanchez Elementary School, K-5 Joliet Public Schools - District 86, Joliet, IL 2002 - 2003 Reading Teacher, Parks School, 3rd Grade Plainfield School District 202, Plainfield, IL 1998 - 2000 Teacher, Wesmere Elementary School, 3rd Grade

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

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

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

(6) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.

Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

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

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

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

SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

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

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

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment ⁽¹⁰⁾	Type or Form of Assessment ⁽¹¹⁾	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁽¹²⁾
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	Illinois State Board of Education Content Test 176	Multiple Choice Assessment	After Program Completion
Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in reading education (required)	Reading Research Inquiry	Literature Review of Literacy-Related Topic	RLR-593
Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction (required)	Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials: Guided Reading Lessons	Report including assessment, planning, instruction, analysis, peer coaching, and reflection	RLR-501
Assessment #4: Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience (required)	Clinical Practice/Field Studies/Case Studies Impact on Students' Learning	Case studies of a beginning reader and an older reader	RLR-511, RLR-592A, & RLR-592B RLR-592A & RLR-592B (clinical practicum courses)

Assessment #5: Assessment of candidate effect on student learning (required)		Observation of instruction, peer coaching, and case study report for parents and teachers	
Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (required)	Assessment of Ability to Provide a Supportive Environment for Student Learning	Analysis of classroom or school library with recommendations for teachers and librarians	RLL-520 or RLL-528
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (optional)	Professional Development Presentation	Conference presentation for practitioner audience based on review of literature and action research project	RLR-518
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards (optional)	Candidate Dispositions	Self-assessment and instructor assessment	Beginning, middle, and end of program

(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).

SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

1. For each IRA standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple IRA 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 should be required of all candidates. Assessments and scoring guides and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements [each relating to specific SPA standard(s)], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a cumulative score..

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

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

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

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare one document that includes the following items:

- (1) A two-page narrative that includes the following:
 - a. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
 - b. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
 - c. A brief analysis of the data findings;
 - d. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording;
 and
- (2) Assessment Documentation
 - e. The assessment tool itself or a rich description of the assessment (often the directions given to candidates);
 - f. The scoring guide for the assessment; and
 - g. Charts that provide candidate data derived from the assessment.

The responses for e, f, and g (above) should be limited to the equivalent of five text pages each, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

Note: As much as possible, combine all of the files for one assessment into a single file. That is, create one file for Assessment #4 that includes the two-page narrative (items a – d above), the assessment itself (item e above), the scoring guide (item f above, and the data chart (item g above). Each attachment should be no larger than 2 mb. Do not include candidate work or syllabi. There is a limit of 20 attachments for the entire report so it is crucial that you combine files as much as possible.

1. Data from licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge. IRA standards addressed in this entry could include Standard 1. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV. (Answer required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Map for ISBE test and ILA standards	ISBE test study guide
ISBE test framework	Q61456_Q61456_Assessment_1_2_page_narrative_and_assessment_data.docx

See **Attachment** panel below.

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

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Q61457_Q61457_Assessment_2_2_page_narrative_and_assessment_data.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 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.

Q61458_Q61458_Assessment_3_2_page_narrative_and_assessment_data (1).docx
--

See **Attachment** panel below.

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

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Q61459_Q61459_Assessment_4_2_page_narrative_and_assessment_data.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 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

Q61460_Q61460_Assessment_5_2_page_narrative_and_assessment_data.docx

See **Attachment** panel below.

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

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Q61461_Q61461_Assessment_6_2_page_narrative_and_assessment_data.docx

See **Attachment** panel below.

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

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Q61462_Q61462_Assessment_7_2_page_narrative_and_assessment_data.docx

See **Attachment** panel below.

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

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Q61463_Q61463_Assessment_8_2_page_narrative_and_assessment_data.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)

Section V: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program

This report is being written only two years after our last Response to Conditions report. At that time, we went through major changes to our assessments, paring them back to only eight key assessments. In our Response to Conditions, we detailed those changes. The data contained within this report reflects those new assessments. These assessments more directly address the 2010 IRA (now ILA) Standards for Reading Professionals, allowing us to see more clearly our programs' strengths and needs. It is important to note that the language of our rubrics has changed so that, for most of our assessments, our candidates are either seen as demonstrating proficient understanding or basic understanding. For all but one assessment (Assessment 6), we no longer differentiate between "distinguished" and "proficient" understanding. Assessment 6 retained that wording for the 2014-15 data only but was changed in 2015-16. For this report, basic and proficient understanding both indicate that candidates have met the ILA standards, though of course we strive for all of our candidates to be "proficient."

For the most part, our candidates have shown improvement from the first year of our new assessments to the second year. We believe this is due to instructor familiarity with the assessments and because of fine tuning done to clarify instructions and evaluation rubrics for the assessments from 2014-15 to 2015-16. At this time, the language included in our rubrics is clear and consistent, and we are better able to distinguish our candidates across categories.

Content Learning

From a content area perspective, our candidates have demonstrated success on the Illinois State Board of Education Reading Specialist tests,

and we interpret that as a broad indicator of content learning. Examination of scores on each of the sub-tests indicates a solid understanding of content across the board. However, we know that success on a standardized test provides only a partial picture of our candidates and what they have learned, and we believe the candidates' efforts on the other assessments provide much more information.

We have been pleased to see steady improvement from one cohort to the next with regard to the understanding of literacy theory and research. Reading specialist candidates have been effective in reading seminal and current research, synthesizing what they learn, and sharing that information with their classmates and the university community. In past years, our candidates did not always demonstrate a solid understanding of theoretical frameworks for literacy development, and we see that improving over the past two years.

Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions

Pedagogically, our candidates have historically tended to be strong, and we have noted that our current assessments continue to demonstrate that pedagogical strength. Candidates in the program develop professional knowledge through administering, scoring, and interpreting several assessments of students' literacy. This is typified early in the program through the guided reading assignment and later, in the case studies undertaken during their practicum. Based on assessments, candidates show their pedagogical knowledge by 1) planning and teaching a guided reading group that is differentiated for each student in the group; and 2) designing an intervention that addresses the students' needs, including print skills, comprehension, studying, and writing. Our candidates showed a good understanding of how literacy difficulties occur, and appropriate literacy instruction for addressing such difficulties in relation to print skills, comprehension, and studying. Two areas where our candidates are not as strong is in planning effective literacy work for the rest of the class during guided reading and addressing writing instruction for an individual student. They seem comfortable with various approaches to classroom instruction in writing, but less comfortable with intervening when difficulties occur.

Student Learning

Candidates observe and develop student learning as they work with them in the intervention program highlighted in Assessment 5. The faculty believes that individual tutoring provides an opportunity for candidates to understand the importance of the Zone of Proximal Development in relation to literacy instruction. Candidates address students' needs, and measure their learning through formative assessments. The gradual release of responsibility to the students is stressed, so that students begin to take responsibility for their own learning. Our candidates understand various ways in which students learn, and are aware of ways in which literacy develops. In addition to applying the pedagogical knowledge learned in other classes, candidates learn from each other as they explore various methods of addressing the development of literacy.

While they can describe appropriate instruction for students at different grade levels and can observe the impact on student learning, they are less comfortable reporting on the impact of that instruction on student learning in a formal report. We would like to see candidates demonstrate better understanding of how to communicate with parents/guardians and other stakeholders.

Changes to the Program

There are several ways that we believe our program could improve. Some changes have already occurred while other changes are being considered in light of our analysis of the data.

Changes already made. Two years ago, we rewrote all of our courses in order to reflect the 2010 Standards for Reading Professionals as well as changes in the field (including Common Core State Standards and the resulting focus on information texts, higher order skills/strategies, and writing across genres). As we rewrote all courses simultaneously and collaboratively, we were better able to plan the courses in a logical sequence and without unnecessary redundancies. We were also able to consider the learning trajectory of a typical student so that the earlier courses create the necessary foundation in literacy content and pedagogy while the later courses build on that foundation.

Similarly, in rewriting classes, we were able to consider the areas where we felt we needed improvement and make some changes. For example, we knew from our previous SPA report that providing our candidates with opportunities for coaching should happen earlier in our courses. We added coaching elements to two of our beginning courses so that candidates can begin to build their capacity for coaching earlier in the program and fine tune their coaching skills during the later courses.

In addition, we realized that some of our candidates came to their reading research class without a strong foundation in reading theory. In rewriting our course outlines, we made sure to emphasize the theoretical and research foundations pertinent within each course (e.g., emergent literacy, comprehension, writing, assessment, etc.).

Proposed changes. We have several ideas we are hoping to implement during the upcoming academic year.

Improved collaboration among faculty. We have multiple faculty members teaching each of our reading specialist courses, including adjunct faculty. In looking at our assessment data, we realize that we could be much clearer in communicating expectations for our assessments to our adjunct faculty, who have not always been part of our ongoing discussions about program assessments. As fulltime faculty, we can do a much better job meeting with our adjunct faculty to explain and clarify course and assessment requirements.

Online students. Our online candidates didn't fare as well on key assessments (in particular Assessment 3) as did our face to face candidates. We plan to improve communication of expectations as well as procedures for peer coaching for our online students.

Tracking student growth. We are impressed with our candidates and their learning, but we do not believe we have in place a sufficient means of tracking growth from the initial classes to program completion.

Because we worked to streamline our assessments, we now have three courses that are not included in our key assessments, and we would like to explore options for demonstrating the growth that candidates experience in those classes. For example, we have added a coaching component to multiple classes in order to address ILA standards, but we have yet to include this data in our SPA report. We would like to create a signature assessment that tracks our candidates' coaching capacity across classes.

Similarly, while we believe that we have done a good job integrating aspects of diversity into each of our classes, we do not believe that our signature assessments necessarily reflect this. We would like to consider how one assessment could, potentially, demonstrate candidates' understanding of diversity and learning across classes.

Changes specific to content knowledge. Candidates in their final year of the reading specialist program have to write a literature review synthesizing research and theory on a literacy-related topic of their choosing. Candidates begin this class with vastly different experiences utilizing library resources in order to conduct searches of the literature, find books and articles, and cite sources correctly and appropriately. One thing we have already done to address these varying experiences is to ensure that students read theory and research in each of their reading specialist courses. We have also worked together as faculty to consider supports we can put into place for students who are less experienced reading and writing about research. We now provide "writing workshop" time for students during the research class that is dedicated to teaching about and providing time to work on different facets of a literature review.

Changes specific to professional and pedagogical knowledge. Based on assessment data, we perceive some of our candidates' capacity for communicating literacy knowledge to various stakeholders to be a weakness. We need to do a better job in each of our classes in providing improved instructions and opportunities to practice communicating literacy knowledge to different audiences. In the coming year, we plan to be deliberate in helping students navigate those opportunities more successfully. We plan to use videotaped examples of coaching interactions and PD presentations as well as exemplars of case study reports to better scaffold candidate work in this area.

Changes specific to student learning. We have noted that our candidates are more reflective about student learning when they have opportunities to work one-on-one with students or in small groups. This becomes clear as we examine the data from our practicum assessments. In order to encourage this kind of reflection earlier in our program, we plan to amend our assessments in the earlier courses to ensure that candidates not only assess and plan instruction but also reflect on and find evidence for student learning.

In analyzing two years of assessment data, we see that we have much to be proud of with regard to candidate learning in our program. We are gratified when our candidates communicate how much their thinking and teaching has changed as a result of their time in the program. So many of our candidates start the reading specialist program because they want to be better teachers within their own classrooms, and that is a worthy goal. However, by the time many of them complete the program, they have already become leaders within their buildings, and they aspire to continue in these leadership roles, helping to shape not only the literacy learning of students, but also the literacy teaching of their colleagues. By implementing the above changes we hope to continue to make their experiences relevant in a changing educational environment.

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

1. For Revised Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Revised Report are available on the NCATE web site at

<http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/RevisedProgramReports/tabid/453/Default.aspx>

2. For Response to Conditions Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the conditions cited in the original recognition report. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions Report are available on the NCATE web site at

<http://www.ncate.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReportSubmission/ResponseToConditionsReport/tabid/454/Default.aspx>

(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

Please click "Next"

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