



Program Assessment Report (PAR)

Literacy (LITC) Masters Degree

REPORT PREPARED by: Chai, Hannah H

ACADEMIC YEAR COVERED BY THIS REPORT: 2021-2022

I. PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

The International Literacy Association Standards (ILA, 2017) STANDARD 1 FOUNDATIONAL KNOWLEDGE Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the theoretical, historical, and evidence-based foundations of reading, writing, language, speaking, and listening and the integral role of the reading/literacy specialist in schools. 1.1 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of theoretical, historical, and evidence-based components of reading (e.g., concepts of print, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) development throughout the grades. 1.2 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of theoretical, historical, and evidence-based components of writing (e.g., handwriting, spelling, sentence construction, typing, word processing, conventions) development and the writing process throughout the grades. 1.3 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of theoretical, historical, and evidence-based components of language (e.g., conventions of standard English, knowledge of language, vocabulary acquisition and use), speaking, and listening development throughout the grades. 1.4 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the historical and evidence-based foundations related to the role of the reading/literacy specialist. STANDARD 2 CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION Candidates use foundational knowledge to design literacy curricula that meet needs of learners, especially those with specific literacy needs; design and implement small-group and individual evidence-based literacy instruction for learners with specific literacy needs; collaborate with and coach school-based educators in developing, implementing, and evaluating instructional practices and curriculum. 2.1 Candidates use foundational knowledge to design and evaluate evidence-based literacy curricula that meets the needs of all learners. 2.2 Candidates plan, teach, and evaluate a range of instructional approaches and practices to meet the literacy needs of whole class and groups of students. 2.3 Candidates plan, teach, and evaluate a range of instructional approaches and practices for individual students, especially those with specific literacy needs. 2.4 Candidates collaborate and coach as a means of supporting classroom teachers, special educators, and other education professionals in designing, implementing,

and evaluating literacy instruction. **STANDARD 3 ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION**

Candidates understand, select, and use valid, reliable, fair, and appropriate assessment tools to screen, diagnose, and measure student literacy achievement; inform instruction and evaluate interventions; participate in professional learning experiences; explain assessment results and advocate for appropriate literacy practices to relevant stakeholders. 3.1 Candidates understand the purposes, attributes, formats, strengths/limitations, and influences of various types of tools in a comprehensive literacy and language assessment system (including validity, reliability, inherent language, dialect and/or cultural bias) and apply that knowledge to using assessment tools. 3.2 Candidates collaborate with colleagues to administer, interpret, and use data for decision making about student assessment, instruction, intervention, and evaluation for individual students. 3.3 Candidates participate in and lead professional learning experiences to assist teachers in selecting, administering, analyzing, interpreting, and using results data for instructional decision making for classrooms and schools. 3.4 Candidates, using both written and oral communication, explain assessment results and advocate for appropriate literacy and language practices to a variety of stakeholders, including administrators, teachers, other educators, parents/guardians, and students. **STANDARD 4 DIVERSITY & EQUITY**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of research and relevant theories, pedagogies, and essential concepts of diversity and equity; demonstrate and provide opportunities for understanding all forms of diversity as central to students' identities; create classrooms and schools that are inclusive and affirming; advocate for equity at school, district, and community levels. 4.1 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of foundational theories about diverse learners, equity, and culturally responsive instruction. 4.2 Candidates demonstrate understanding of themselves and others as cultural beings. 4.3 Candidates contribute to and advocate for creation and promotion of inclusive and affirming classroom and school environments. 4.4 Candidates advocate for equity at school, district, and community levels. **STANDARD 5 LEARNERS & THE LITERATE ENVIRONMENT**

developmental needs of all learners and collaborate with school personnel to use a variety of digital and print materials to engage and motivate all learners; integrate digital technologies in appropriate, safe, and effective ways; foster a positive climate that supports a literacy-rich learning environment. 5.1 Candidates, in consultation with families and colleagues, meet the developmental needs of learners, taking into consideration their physical, social, emotional, cultural, and intellectual factors. 5.2 Candidates collaborate with school personnel to implement a variety of digital and print materials to engage and motivate all learners. 5.3 Candidates integrate digital technologies in appropriate, safe, and effective ways and assist colleagues in these efforts. 5.4 Candidates participate in and lead schoolwide efforts to foster a positive climate with families and colleagues that support a literacy-rich learning environment. **STANDARD 6 PROFESSIONAL LEARNING & LEADERSHIP**

Candidates are self-aware, lifelong learners who collaboratively design, align, and assess instructional practices and interventions that support students and professional colleagues; develop, refine, and demonstrate leadership skills; engage in collaborative decision making with and advocate on behalf of teachers, students, families, and communities. 6.1 Candidates become self-aware, lifelong learners. 6.2 Candidates engage in collaborative decision making with colleagues to design, align, and assess instructional practices and interventions within and across classrooms. 6.3 Candidates develop, refine, and

demonstrate leadership skills through effective interpersonal and written communication. 6.4 Candidates advocate on behalf of teachers, students, families, and communities for effective literacy practices and policies. STANDARD 7 PRACTICUM/CLINICAL EXPERIENCES Candidates in traditional, hybrid, and online programs complete a minimum of two supervised, integrated, extended practica/clinical experiences one focused on intervention with students and the other on novice coaching. Candidates are supervised by highly qualified literacy professionals in practica/clinical experiences equivalent to a six-hour course. 7.1 Candidates work with individual and small groups of students at various grade levels in a supervised practicum experience to assess students' literacy strengths and needs, develop literacy intervention plans, implement instructional plans, and assess impact on student learning. 7.2 Candidates develop, reflect on, and study their own teaching practices through ongoing and cyclical collaborative and novice coaching experiences with peers and experienced colleagues. 7.3 Candidates have opportunities for authentic, school-based experiences that are supervised by qualified literacy professionals. *Supervisors of practica/clinical supervisors are highly qualified they understand literacy processes, have literacy content knowledge, understand literacy assessment with evidence-based instructional strategies, and have experience as reading specialists.

II. PROCEDURES USED FOR ASSESSMENT

A. Direct Assessment

All candidates in the Reading Endorsement & Master of Literacy Program are graduate students and hold an active Ohio teaching license. All Reading Endorsement and Master of Literacy candidates are required to complete the KAs that are embedded in the various courses throughout the program. Coursework for the Reading Endorsement program includes KAs in all 5 courses in the Reading Endorsement program. Coursework for the Master of Literacy program includes the 5 KAs from the Reading Endorsement coursework and 2 additional KAs. The Key Assessments have been built into each of the courses listed below, and all candidates are required to complete the Key Assessment assignments as a part of the course completion requirements. Data were collected from the following courses ED 7060, ED 7450, ED 7500, ED 7560, ED 7650, ED 7810, ED 7220, and the Reading OAE assessment (038/039). Candidates who do not successfully complete the KAs are not permitted to 'pass' the course. Any unsuccessful candidates receive remediation and one-on-one support from the instructor and/or co-program directors. Key Assessment Assessment #1 Reading Ohio Assessment for Educators Name & Type of Assessment Passing the Reading Ohio Assessment for Educators Subtest I (038) & Subtest II (039) 2017 ILA Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 Learning Outcomes Candidates are required, by the Ohio Department of Education, to take and pass the Pearson Reading OAE (038/039) in order to obtain a Reading Endorsement certificate. Candidates must successfully pass both Subtest I and II. The Reading OAE enables the candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding gained. Course and Description Reading OAE Subtest I & II. Candidates must receive a passing score of 220 on both Part I and Part II of the Reading OAE in order to obtain a Reading

Endorsement as granted by the Ohio Department of Education.

<https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Early-Learning/Third-Grade-Reading-Guarantee/Third-Grade-Reading-Guarantee-Teacher-Resources/Reading-Endorsement-Guidance-Document.pdf.aspx>

Key Assessment #2 Assessment of content knowledge in reading education
Name & Type of Assessment Synthesis Project - Electronic Presentation
(+Indirect Assessment Candidate Disposition Inventory Self-Assessment) 2017 ILA Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 4.1, 4.2, 6.1, 6.3 Learning Outcomes The Synthesis Project is the culmination of literacy theories and research for ED 7060 Theoretical Foundations in Literacy. The goal of the Synthesis Project is to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, application, and analysis of the information learned by synthesizing all the parts into one. This summative assessment should demonstrate an understanding of the literacy theories that impact literacy decisions that may lead to positive instructional and curricular designs. Course and Description ED 7060 Theoretical Foundations in Literacy. Development of an understanding regarding the historical, linguistical, sociological, and psychological/cognitive theories related to effective literacy instruction and education.

Key Assessment #3 Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction
Name & Type of Assessment Literacy Handbook Project and Professional Leadership - Unit Plan 2017 ILA Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2 Learning Outcomes The Literacy Handbook Project is a key assessment for ED 7450 Content Literacies K-12. The Literacy Handbook is a compilation of teaching strategies and materials designed around a specific content area, grade level, and topic of study. Careful thought and consideration is required in the selection process of materials and strategies to enrich content area learning, to engage and motivate all learners, and to articulate the support of the materials and strategies selected for this project. Strategies and activities should reflect recognition of advocating for the equity of all students and strive to impact students' knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity. Course and Description ED 7450 Content Literacies K-12. Exploration of content area learning with an emphasis on effective literacy strategies including vocabulary/concept development, comprehension, writing, technology, and resources to enhance literacy learning for diverse learners in grades K-12.

Key Assessment #4 Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience
Name & Type of Assessment Instructional Portfolio & Case Study on an At-Risk Reader/Writer Professional Leadership - Assessment & Intervention Project. (+Candidate Disposition Inventory Assessment by the Instructor) 2017 ILA Standards 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 7.1, 7.2 Learning Outcomes The Instructional Portfolio/Case Study on an At-Risk Reader/Writer is a key assessment for ED 7560 Diagnosis and Intervention for At-Risk Readers and Writers Practicum I. The Instructional Portfolio/Case Study is a compilation of assessment data, objectives, and lesson plans focused on meeting the needs of an at-risk learner. Careful thought and consideration is required to determine the tutoring objectives based on assessment data, resulting in lesson plans targeted to the individual learning needs of the student. Wrapped in rich data, the Instructional Portfolio/Case Study becomes a holistic case study on an at-risk learner. Candidates will share their professional knowledge and insights gained regarding the at-risk reader/writer in the Professional Leadership Assessment and Intervention Project with other professional educators. Course and Description ED 7560 Diagnosis and Intervention for At-Risk Readers and Writers

Practicum. Supervised tutoring of a K-12 student identified as at-risk or struggling reader/writer. Involves individual reading/writing assessments, developing learning objectives, implementing lesson plans to meet a student's learning goals, and making recommendations for future instruction. Key Assessment #5 Assessment of the candidate effect on student learning

Name & Type of Assessment Literacy Assessment Portfolio & Case Study 2017 ILA Standards 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 6.1, 6.2, 7.1 Learning Outcomes Literacy Assessment Portfolio & Case Study is a key assessment for ED 7500 Literacy Assessment and Evaluation. The Literacy Assessment Portfolio involves a compilation of a literacy assessment tool kit of assessments appropriate for each of the three Ohio grade bands K-3, 4-9, and 7-12. The Literacy Assessment Portfolio has one interest/attitude surveys/questionnaire related to reading & writing for each grade band (3 total) and three reading/writing assessments for each grade band (9 total). The Case Study involves administering appropriate literacy assessments to a K-3 grade student, a 4-9 grade student, and a 7-12 grade student. Candidates will assess, collect data, analyze the data, and make instructional recommendations for each of the three students, thereby completing three Case Studies for this key assessment assignment. Course and Description ED 7500 Literacy Assessment and Evaluation. Explore various literacy assessments to administer, analyze, and interpret the results of the assessment tools to enhance specific and targeted reading and writing instruction for K-12 learners.

Key Assessment #6 Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards

Name & Type of Assessment Professional Development Project and Coaching Project. (+Candidate Disposition Inventory Assessment by the Instructor) 2017 ILA Standards 2.4, 3.3, 4.4, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.2, 7.3 Learning Outcomes Two key assessment assignments, the Professional Development (PD) Project and the Coaching Project, are required in ED 7650 Professional Learning and Leadership in Literacy Practicum II. The candidates will first complete the PD project, which requires careful thought and consideration in meeting the professional needs of teachers in their grade level(s) and/or building. The goal of this PD project is to support fellow teachers by surveying teacher needs, researching a specific topic based on the data results, preparing and presenting a PD session that is research based or supported by research. This PD session will be supervised by an assigned highly qualified external evaluator. The Coaching project will require the candidate to follow up on the PD session by working with a selected colleague in a professional setting. The goal of the Coaching project is to serve as a novice literacy coach by coaching a fellow teacher as they work towards implementing the strategies/ ideas/tools from the PD session. Observations, analysis, suggestions, and recommendations will be made by the candidate. Course and Description ED 7650 Professional Learning and Leadership in Literacy Practicum II. Working as a literacy leader to plan, develop, and present a supervised professional development on a literacy topic. Coaching and mentoring of an adult professional. This course involves a supervised practicum by a highly qualified external evaluator. Key Assessment #7

Additional assessment that addresses IRA standards Name & Type of Assessment Literacy Research Project and Paper. (+Candidate Disposition Inventory Assessment by the Instructor) 2017 ILA Standards 1.1,1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 3.4, 4.2, 6.1, 7.1, 7.3 Learning Outcomes A Literacy Research Project and Paper is required for the final capstone course, ED7810 Literacy Research Project Seminar. The key assessment, a Literacy Research Project and Paper, is the culmination and implementation of the planning and preparation process completed

in the pre-requisite course, ED7800 Research in Reading. Candidates will conduct the designed research project, implement, analyze the data, write up, and present their findings. The Literacy Research Project is a supervised field practicum overseen by the faculty instructor and a highly qualified external literacy professional for the course. Course and Description ED 7810 Literacy Research Project Seminar Practicum III. Candidates will complete the following components data collection, transcription, analysis, dissemination, limitations, and implications for the master's Research Project. This course involves supervision by a highly qualified external literacy professional. Key Assessment Assessment #8 Assessment of candidate effect on student learning Name & Type of Assessment Case Study of a Struggling Writer 2017 ILA Standards 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.2, 5.1, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.1, 7.2 Learning Outcomes Case Study on a Struggling Writer is a key assessment for ED 7220 Teaching Writing K-12. The Case Study requires the candidates to work with a struggling writer. Based on recommendations and need for additional instruction, the student will be provided the struggling writer with extra instruction and support. Course and Description ED 7220 Teaching Writing K-12. Study of writing methodologies and the processes of teaching writing in grades K-12. Includes research into the theories regarding writing, writing instruction, and the reciprocity between writing and reading. Key Assessment Indirect Assessment Name & Type of Assessment CEHS Survey of Graduating Students Learning Outcomes Candidates were asked to complete the CEHS Survey of Graduating Students. Course and Description CEHS Survey of Graduating Students asked the candidates to respond to questions regarding the level of satisfaction with the quality of the program, quality of the courses, quality of instruction, relevance, strengths & weaknesses of the program, and their willingness to recommend the program to others. See the Appendix Literacy Crosswalk Matrix for alignment to the ILA Reading Standards, IDA Standards, Reading OAE Domains & Competencies, and the 2018 Ohio Reading Standards.

B. Scoring of Student Work

All Reading Endorsement and Master of Literacy candidates are required to complete the KAs that are embedded in the various courses throughout the program. There is a rubric tied to each KA that assesses the student learning outcomes based on the ILA 2017 Standards. Data was collected from the following courses ED 7060, ED 7450, ED 7500, ED 7560, ED 7650, ED 7810, ED 7220, and the Reading OAE assessment (038/039). The instructor within each course is responsible for assessing students' learning based on the KA assignment. All candidates are required to complete the Key Assessment assignments as a part of the course completion requirements. Candidates who do not complete the KAs are not permitted to 'pass' the course. The Reading Endorsement/Literacy Committee annually examines the KA data and rubric to ensure validity and reliability of the KA rubric and data. • Key Assessment #1 OAE Subtest I and II (038/039) – Required passing score of 220 in order to add a Reading Endorsement to a teaching license – Externally Scored by Pearson • Key Assessment #2 Synthesis Project - Electronic Presentation (ED 7060) – Rubric scored by course instructor • Key Assessment #3 Literacy Handbook Project and Professional Leadership - Unit

Plan (ED 7450) – Rubric scored by course instructor • Key Assessment #4 Instructional Portfolio & Case Study on an At-Risk Reader/Writer and Professional Leadership - Assessment & Intervention Project (ED 7560) – Rubric scored by course instructor • Key Assessment #5 Literacy Assessment Portfolio & Case Study (ED 7500) – Rubric scored by course instructor • Key Assessment #6 Professional Development Project and Coaching Project (ED 7650) – Rubric scored by course instructor and a highly qualified external literacy professional. • Key Assessment #7 Literacy Research Project and Paper (ED 7810) – Rubric scored by course instructor • Key Assessment #8 Case Study on a Struggling Writer (ED 7220) – Rubric scored by course instructor

C. Indirect Assessment

- CHEH Graduated Student Surveys – See Appendix • Faculty ratings of candidate professional dispositions using CEHS Candidates Dispositions Inventory (CDI) • Diversity matrix – collected in ED 7650 (end of the Reading Endorsement program) and ED 7810 (end of the Literacy M.Ed. program)

III. ASSESSMENT RESULTS/INFORMATION:

KA1 OAE Subtest I and II (038/039) – Required passing score of 220 in order to add a Reading Endorsement to a teaching license – Externally Scored by Pearson
KA2 Synthesis Project - Electronic Presentation (ED 7060) – Rubric scored by course instructor
KA3 Literacy Handbook Project and Professional Leadership - Unit Plan (ED 7450) – Rubric scored by course instructor
KA4 Instructional Portfolio & Case Study on an At-Risk Reader/Writer and Professional Leadership - Assessment & Intervention Project (ED 7560) – Rubric scored by course instructor
KA5 Literacy Assessment Portfolio & Case Study (ED 7500) – Rubric scored by course instructor
KA6 Professional Development Project and Coaching Project (ED 7650) – Rubric scored by course instructor and a highly qualified external literacy professional.
KA7 Literacy Research Project and Paper (ED 7810) – Rubric scored by course instructor
KA8 Case Study on a Struggling Writer (ED 7220) – Rubric scored by course instructor
Indirect Assessment CEHS Survey of Graduated Students – completed at the end of the program

Key Assessment #1 OAE Subtest I and II (038/039) – Required passing score of 220 in order to add a Reading Endorsement to an active teaching license – Externally Scored by Pearson
KA1 Data Results Subtest I (038) All candidates (n=7) passed Subtest I 100% pass rate. Above the State Mean for Domains 01, 02, and 03. Below the State Mean by -0.1 for Domain 04. The average score was 272.1 and the average Domain score was 3.82. All candidates score above the State % Correct for all Competencies (.3-13.3%), except Domain 04-0001 Constructed Response-Reading Assessment (-12%)
Subtest II (039) All candidates (n=7) passed Subtest II 100% pass rate. At or above the State Mean for all Domains. The average score was 269 and the average Domain score was 3.75. All candidates

score above the State % Correct for all Competencies (1.2-19.4%), except Domain 01-0012 Methods, techniques for comprehension strategies (-5.8%) and Domain 2-0015 Evidence & main ideas for interpretation (-3.3). Analysis in Relation to Learning Outcome Subtest I (038) Candidates demonstrated an overall understanding of the Domains and Competencies in Subtest I. For Domain 04-0001 Constructed Response-Reading Assessment, the candidates were below the state mean (-12%), however all 100% of candidates passed Subtest I. Subtest II (039) Candidates demonstrated an overall understanding of the Domains and Competencies in Subtest II. For Domain 01-0012 Methods, techniques for comprehension strategies, the candidates were below the state mean (-5.8%) and Domain 2-0015 Evidence & main ideas for interpretation, below the state mean (-3.3), however all 100% of candidates passed Subtest II. Key Assessment #2 Synthesis Project - Electronic Presentation (ED 7060) – Rubric scored by course instructor KA2 Data Results KA2 (n=16) showed that all candidates met or exceeded all standards except for Standard 6.2. Two candidates were deemed as not meeting the standard regarding positive dispositions and professional knowledge regarding the impact of theories and research on the teaching of reading and writing. Analysis in Relation to Learning Outcome All candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the four major theoretical frameworks ((Historical, Linguistic, Sociological, and Psychological/Cognitive), and evidence-based components of reading, writing, language, speaking, and listening development throughout the K-12 grades. They were also able to demonstrate an understanding of the impact of educational theory in supporting a comprehensive and well-balanced literacy curriculum. Candidates were able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how theories and research connect to literacy learning to support organizational change, professional development, and school culture. Two candidates were deemed as not meeting Standard 6.2 regarding positive dispositions and professional knowledge regarding the impact of theories and research on the teaching of reading and writing. Both candidates received remediation regarding this standard. Key Assessment #3 Literacy Handbook Project and Professional Leadership - Unit Plan (ED 7450) – Rubric scored by course instructor KA3 Data Results KA3 (n=16) showed that all candidates met or exceeded all standards and requirements on the Literacy Handbook Project and Professional Leadership Plan. Analysis in Relation to Learning Outcome All candidates were able to demonstrate knowledge and application of literacy strategies through the construction of a Literacy Handbook Project. The handbook included components on effective literacy instruction supporting vocabulary/concept development, comprehension, writing, technology, and additional resources to enhance literacy learning for diverse learners in grades K-12 in whole class, small group, and individual instruction. All standards were met. Key Assessment #4 Instructional Portfolio & Case Study on an At-Risk Reader/Writer and Professional Leadership - Assessment & Intervention Project (ED 7560) – Rubric scored by course instructor KA4 Data Results KA4 (n=7) showed that all candidates met or exceeded all standards and requirements on the Instructional Portfolio Case Study and Professional Leadership Plan. Analysis in Relation to Learning Outcome All candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge and application of literacy assessment and strategy use through the one-on-one tutoring of an at-risk or struggling reader/writer. While working with their student, all candidates provided evidence of a contextual understanding of multiple reading/writing assessments, developed individualized learning objectives, implemented lesson plans to meet

individual student's learning goals, and made recommendations for future instruction in the Instructional Portfolio Case Study. Candidates consulted and collaborated with families and colleagues to explain assessment results to relevant audiences, as well as advocated for students in professional settings. All standards were met. Key Assessment #5 Literacy Assessment Portfolio & Case Study (ED 7500) – Rubric scored by course instructor KA5 Data Results KA5 (n=16) showed that all candidates met or exceeded all standards and requirements on the K-12 Literacy Assessment Portfolio and Case Study Project. Candidates worked with three students, one from each grade band (PK-5, 4-9, and 7-12) to assess and evaluate the instructional needs plan, assess, analyze, interpret, and implement instruction that meets the needs of the three learners. Analysis in Relation to Learning Outcome All candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of various literacy assessments, and how to administer, analyze, and interpret the results of the assessment tools to enhance specific and targeted reading and writing instruction for three K-12 students, one from each Ohio grade band across K-12 grades. Candidates collaborated with colleagues to analyze, interpret, and share results in a professional setting. All standards were met. Key Assessment #6 Professional Development Project and Coaching Project (ED 7650) – Rubric scored by course instructor and a highly qualified external literacy professional. KA6 Data Results KA6 (n=9) showed that all candidates met or exceeded standards and requirements on the Professional Development and Coaching Project. Candidates used a variety of research supported strategies to plan and implement a professional development and coaching experience with a professional colleague. Analysis in Relation to Learning Outcome All candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge and application of what it means to serve as a literacy leader by planning, creating, and delivering a research supported professional development presentation to a group of educators at their school site. This project was supervised by a highly qualified external literacy educator. The second part was a Coaching project which required the candidate to mentor and support a colleague/teacher while the teacher worked towards implementing the topic of the PD. The three coaching stances (facilitating, collaborating, and consulting) were utilized by the candidates. All standards were met. Key Assessment #7 Literacy Research Project and Paper (ED 7810) – Rubric scored by course instructor KA7 Data Results KA7 (n=9) showed that all candidates met or exceeded standards and requirements on the Research Project. Candidates developed a topic and designed the tools for their teacher Action research project. Implemented the study, collected data, analyzed the data, and wrote up the findings for the KA Research Project and Paper. Analysis in Relation to Learning Outcome All candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of classroom research and the components of the research process research development and a review of the literature, planning and preparing data tools, data collection, transcription, analysis, and dissemination via a master's research project paper. All standards were met. Key Assessment #8 Case Study on a Struggling Writer (ED 7220) – Rubric scored by course instructor KA8 Data Results KA8 (n=7) showed that all candidates met or exceeded all standards and requirements on the Case Study on a Struggling Writer. Analysis in Relation to Learning Outcome All candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of writing methodologies and the processes of teaching writing in grades K-12 including research and theories regarding writing, writing instruction, and the reciprocity between writing and reading. All standards were met. CEHS Survey of

Graduated Students – completed at the end of the program 11 graduating candidates were surveyed on the CEHS Survey of Graduated Students, and there were 7 participants (n=7) who completed the survey. All participants showed that they were 100% satisfied with the courses, the quality of instruction, and relationships with program faculty. Furthermore, the candidates were 100% satisfied that the program prepared them in their educational study, felt that the field experiences supported their learning and employment. 86% identified that they were satisfied with the relevance of coursework on their future career plans and 71% were satisfied with the overall sense of community in this online program. 100% of candidates felt that the quality of advising by the program faculty was Excellent (43%) or Good (57%). As such, 57% would recommend the program without reservations, 29% would recommend with some reservations, and 14% would not recommend the program to others. Analysis in Relation to Learning Outcome Candidates stated the strength of the program as • “A variety of field experiences, online learning that was personalized, multiple resources and access to professors.” • “Instructors, hands on methods to take into the field.” • “The faculty was always readily available if we needed anything and most of them understood circumstances that we as students couldn't help. They all realized that we are completing our master's degrees and that we are not only full time students but that we also have full time jobs as well.” • “The level of support I received during my program was amazing. I had quite a bit of personal things come up during my masters, and I never felt like my schooling would suffer because of it. • “The support received from the faculty (Hannah, Lee, Brooke) - they were constantly available when needed! Gave great guidance throughout the courses and were knowledgeable in what they were teaching!” • Hannah Chai was an amazing advisor and teacher. She was tough, but very supportive and was always there to help! Identified areas of improvement as • “I think just staying relevant, which they do and supporting the working teachers in their classes to the best of their abilities.” • “I think one area of improvement could be, being more understanding of any holiday breaks we have and how that might affect any work we have to do or work that we get back. In a sense letting us utilize holiday breaks to help catch up or get ahead.” • “Many parts of the program felt like my hand was being held. We are in grad school and I didn't feel like I was treated that way.” • “I think that people need to be ready to do a lot of work. My first few semesters in my master's program was really great, I loved the creativity. Then the last few semesters with everything going on in the world was really tough to balance and manage everything. I think it's wise that students really understand what they are getting into and I think that a faculty/program advisor should be ready to share that with people. I don't want people to get scared away, but they need to realize all that they are going to have to do while they may have a full time job, a family and other personal things going on in their lives.”

KA1 Subtest I (038) Improved in 6/10 competencies from 2018-19 to 2019-2020. Increased in constructed response assignments from previous year and well above the state average. Decreased in 4/10 competencies. Subtest II (039) Improved in 3/10 competencies from 2018-19 to 2019-2020. Increased in constructed response assignments compared to previous year. Decreased in 7/10 competencies. Additional notes There was one candidate who was not a Reading Endorsement

candidate, took the OAE and failed. *NOTE There were three candidates who completed the Reading Endorsement program more than three years prior who took the exam during the 2019-2020 year. KA2 Candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of the theoretical, historical, and evidence-based components of reading, writing, and language, speaking, and listening development throughout the grades connecting the theoretical understanding with classroom instruction. KA3 Candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of effective literacy strategies including vocabulary/concept development, comprehension, writing, technology, and resources to enhance literacy learning for diverse learners in grades K-12. KA4 Candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of at-risk or struggling readers/writers from a contextual understanding of individual reading/writing assessments, developing learning objectives, implementing lesson plans to meet a student's learning goals, and making recommendations for future instruction. KA5 Candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of various literacy assessments, and how to administer, analyze, and interpret the results of the assessment tools to enhance specific and targeted reading and writing instruction for K-12 learners. KA6 Candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of what it means to serve as a literacy leader in planning, developing, and presenting a supervised professional development and coaching and mentoring of an adult professional. KA7 Candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of classroom research and the components of the research process including research development and a review of the literature, planning and preparing data tools, data collection, transcription, analysis, dissemination via a Master's research project paper. Areas to Improve Facilitating stronger understanding of APA style guide. KA 8 Candidates were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of writing methodologies and the processes of teaching writing in grades K-12 including research and theories regarding writing, writing instruction, and the reciprocity between writing and reading. Indirect Assessment CEHS Survey of Graduated Students Candidates stated the strengths of the program • Excellent faculty and staff. Meaningful assignments, wonderful textbooks that became extra resources for teachers, supportive professors. • Given that this was an online course, they provided opportunity for those taking the course to feel like they were in a real class. • I really enjoyed learning from all my instructors for each class. They thoroughly explained expectations and assignments and were always ready to provide support and additional assistance when needed. • Organization, purposeful, and enjoyable • The CEHS program is very organized in a way that students can easily access materials needed to be successful. The materials are targeted to the needs of graduate students, keeping in mind their already heavy workload. • The Literacy Program's strengths were meaningful course work as well as great support from the professors. • You provide a lot of real-life internships and experiences. I like how the master's program provides evening online classes and keeps in mind that we are working adults with a schedule. The professors are very helpful and always return emails and phone calls promptly. The program sets challenging yet achievable expectations. Identified areas of improvement • NA or No recommendations for changes (3) • More small group discussions • Some of the courses felt like they repeated activities like case studies. The program might be richer with more of a variety of activities. • I don't like how our graduation was cancelled completely. Receiving a master's is a very important event in my life and I am upset that the university did not

make an effort to do some virtual or something else.

IV. ACTIONS TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

The data were shared with faculty and administration at the Literacy Committee Meeting on October 13, 2022. At this meeting, the faculty analyzed the KA data to ensure consistency and reliability. The progress of the candidates in the program was also discussed. Additionally, the report is posted in the TED Faculty Pilot page (WSU's learning management system). Revisions to the relevant Master syllabi and Key Assessment were made so that the courses and program aligned to the Ohio Reading Standards.

V. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Additional documentation, when provided, is stored in the internal Academic Program Assessment of Student Learning SharePoint site.