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Department and Program Report

Academic Year of Report: 2012-2013  
College: CEPS  
Department: LLSE  
Program: MEd-Literacy

Context: The MEd-Literacy program is a 46-credit degree program designed for certified teachers. The program is offered solely on-line, with the first cohorted group beginning in the Summer, 2012. The anticipated graduation date for many of the candidates in this cohort is Summer, 2014. The second cohort began in the Summer of 2013 with their anticipated graduation date to be summer 2015. Between these two cohorts, the current enrollment is 13 candidates. At the time of this report, there are five (5) candidates admitted to begin the Summer, 2015 cohort.

1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?

2012-2013 Learning Outcomes Assessed

1. Candidate will describe understanding of language/literacy development and processes, while considering the research, historical, contemporary, and cultural perspectives in the field.

2. Candidates will describe understanding of the assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation process as it relates to current position. Candidates will share how this knowledge is used in monitoring and reporting of assessment data to interested parties.

3. Candidates will describe understanding of the teaching of literacy, considering the characteristics of students, the modeling and teaching of strategies, the selection of materials, and collegial support.

4. Candidates will describe the literacy environment of the classroom, considering space, time, materials, and student considerations in this description.

5. Candidates will share goals for own professional development and how those goals will influence teaching, work with colleagues, and leadership skills.

6. Candidates will describe own process in teaching literacy, including strategies, materials, and assessments that inform and set direction for teaching.
Reasons for these Outcomes and Alignment to Program/Department, College, and University Goals

The above outcomes are aligned with the six (6) standard areas for the WA P-12 Reading Endorsement (http://program.pesb.wa.gov/endorsements/list/rdg). The MEd-Literacy candidates are held to these accountability standards by the state.

These outcomes are also aligned with program, department, college, and university goals. The goals are aligned as follows:

1. Candidate will describe understanding of language/literacy development and processes, while considering the research, historical, contemporary, and cultural perspectives in the field.
   
   **Program/Department Goals:**
   Candidates will demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be successful as community leaders in the area of literacy
   
   **College Goals:**
   Candidates will demonstrate subject matter knowledge
   
   **University Goals:**
   Goal 1 & 2 “Maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life.”

2. Candidates will describe understanding of the assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation process as it relates to current position. Candidates will share how this knowledge is used in monitoring and reporting of assessment data to interested parties.
   
   **Program/Department Goals:**
   Candidates will demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be successful as community leaders in the area of literacy.
   Candidates will demonstrate how school and community partners will be actively involved in activities and events related to course content.
   
   **College Goals:**
   Candidates will demonstrate subject matter knowledge.
   Candidates will demonstrate a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.
   
   **University Goals:**
   Goal 1 & 2 “Maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life.”

3. Candidates will describe understanding of the teaching of literacy, considering the characteristics of students, the modeling and teaching of strategies, the selection of materials, and collegial support.
   
   **Program/Department Goals:**
   Candidates will become facilitators of learning in a diverse world.
   
   **College Goals:**
   Candidates will reflect dispositions expected of professional educators.
   Candidates will participate in opportunities to learn from a diverse representation of faculty.
   Candidates will participate in opportunities to learn with a diverse representation of candidates.
   
   **University Goals:**
   Goal 6 “Promote intellectual inquiry and encourage civility, mutual respect, and cooperation.”
4. Candidates will describe the literacy environment of the classroom, considering space, time, materials, and student considerations in this description.

Program/Department Goals:
Candidates will demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be successful as community leaders in the area of literacy

College Goals:
Candidates will demonstrate subject matter knowledge.
Candidates will demonstrate a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

University Goals:
Goal 1 & 2 “Maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life.”

5. Candidates will share goals for own professional development and how those goals will influence teaching, work with colleagues, and leadership skills.

Program/Department Goals:
Candidates will demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be successful as community leaders in the area of literacy.
Candidates will apply communication knowledge and theory to the development of effective relationships.

College Goals:
Candidates will reflect dispositions expected of professional educators.

University Goals:
Goal 4 “Build mutually beneficial partnerships.”
Goal 6 “Promote intellectual inquiry and encourage civility, mutual respect, and cooperation.”

6. Candidates will describe own process in teaching literacy, including strategies, materials, and assessments that inform and set direction for teaching.

Program/Department Goals:
Candidates will apply communication knowledge and theory to the development of effective relationships

College Goals:
Candidates will demonstrate a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

University Goals:
Goal 1 & 2 “Maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life.”
2. How were they assessed?

Table
Description of the MEd-Literacy Assessment Process
Includes Standard of Mastery

Because this MEd-Literacy Program began Summer 2012, and neither cohort has yet to complete the program, what is presented here is what has been achieved so far.
Cohort 1 = Candidates who began MEd-Literacy in Summer, 2012 and enrolled through Summer 2013
Cohort 2 = Candidates who began MEd-Literacy in Summer, 2013 (Therefore their assessment data only reflects Summer 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>What Methods were Used?</th>
<th>Who was Assessed?</th>
<th>When was it Assessed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Candidate will describe understanding of language/literacy development and processes, while considering the research, historical, contemporary, and cultural perspectives in the field</td>
<td>• Discussion Boards, Presentations, Coaching Reports, Summative Module Papers, Philosophy Paper, IRIS Assessments</td>
<td>• Cohort 1</td>
<td>• During enrollment in: EDLT 520-Literacy Curriculum-Design and Delivery EDLT 592A-Practicum EDLT 521 Program Organization: Literacy Coaching Leadership EDLT 592B-Practicum EDLT 535-Teachind Diverse Learners EDLT 592C-Practicum EDLT 526-Assessing Literacy EDLT 528-Personalizing Literacy Instruction EDLT 592D-Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Discussion Boards, Presentations</td>
<td>➢ Cohort 2</td>
<td>➢ During enrollment in: EDLT 534-Learning Theories EDLT 523-Issues and Trends in Literacy Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard of Mastery:
Rubrics are used to assess each of these course components. Rubrics are based on a 10-point scale and posted in the electronic course before the assignment is given. Rubric criteria includes “exceeds the standard,” “meets the standard,” and below the standard: areas. Rubrics are completed and returned to the candidates with the evaluated assignment.
2. Candidates will describe understanding of the assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation process as it relates to current position. Candidates will share how this knowledge is used in monitoring and reporting of assessment data to interested parties.

- Discussion Boards, Assessment Collection, Case Studies, Summative Module Papers, IRIS Assessments
- Cohort 1
- Cohort 2

- Discussion Boards, Motivation to Read Profile (MRP),

**Standard of Mastery:**
Rubrics are used to assess each of these course components. Rubrics are based on a 10-point scale and posted in the electronic course before the assignment is given. Rubric criteria includes “exceeds the standard,” meets the standard,” and below the standard: areas. Rubrics are completed and returned to the candidates with the evaluated assignment.

3. Candidates will describe understanding of the teaching of literacy, considering the characteristics of students, the modeling and teaching of strategies, the selection of materials, and collegial support.

- Discussion Boards, Coaching Sessions, Strategies Collection, Case Studies, Summative Module Papers, IRIS Assessments
- Cohort 1
- Cohort 2

- Discussion Boards, Literature Reviews, Article Analyses
- Discussion Boards, Motivation to Read Profile (MRP),
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard of Mastery: Rubrics are used to assess each of these course components. Rubrics are based on a 10-point scale and posted in the electronic course before the assignment is given. Rubric criteria includes “exceeds the standard,” “meets the standard,” and below the standard: areas. Rubrics are completed and returned to the candidates with the evaluated assignment.</th>
<th>EDLT 523-Issues and Trends in Literacy Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. Candidates will describe the literacy environment of the classroom, considering space, time, materials, and student considerations in this description. | **•** Discussion Boards, Literature Reviews, Article Analyses, Case Studies, Summative Module Papers, IRIS Assessments  
**•** Cohort 1  
**•** During enrollment in:  
EDLT 520-Literacy Curriculum-Design and Delivery  
EDLT 592A-Practicum  
EDLT 521 Program Organization: Literacy Coaching Leadership  
EDLT 592B-Practicum  
EDLT 535-Teaching Diverse Learners  
EDLT 592C-Practicum  
EDLT 526-Assessing Literacy  
EDLT 528-Personalizing Literacy Instruction  
EDLT 592D-Practicum |
| | **•** Cohort 2  
**•** During enrollment in:  
EDLT 534-Learning Theories  
EDLT 523-Issues and Trends in Literacy Instruction |
| ➢ Discussion Boards, MRP Report | ➢ Discussion Boards, MRP Report |
5. Candidates will share goals for own professional development and how those goals will influence teaching, work with colleagues, and leadership skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Discussion Boards, Reflection Papers, Summative Module Papers, IRIS Assessments</th>
<th>• Cohort 1</th>
<th>• Discussion Boards, Reflection Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of Mastery:</strong> Rubrics are used to assess each of these course components. Rubrics are based on a 10-point scale and posted in the electronic course before the assignment is given. Rubric criteria includes “exceeds the standard,” meets the standard,” and below the standard: areas. Rubrics are completed and returned to the candidates with the evaluated assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Candidates will describe own process in teaching literacy, including strategies, materials, and assessments that inform and set direction for teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Discussion Boards, Coaching Reports, , Case Studies, Reflection Papers, Summative Module Papers, IRIS Assessments</th>
<th>• Cohort 1</th>
<th>• During enrollment in: EDLT 520-Literacy Curriculum-Design and Delivery EDLT 592A-Practicum EDLT 521 Program Organization: Literacy Coaching Leadership EDLT 592B-Practicum EDLT 535-Teaching Diverse Learners EDLT 592C-Practicum EDLT 526-Assessing Literacy EDLT 528-Personalizing Literacy Instruction EDLT 592D-Practicum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What was learned?

At the time of this report, the second cohort has just begun their progression through the program, and the first cohort has yet to finish. Therefore, there is limited data available. However, within program meetings, literacy and special education faculty (who also assist in teaching the courses) have had discussions about the content of the courses and the candidates’ progression through those courses.

First, because of the implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) within Washington Schools, it was decided that the assignments needed to clearly reflect the candidates’ understanding of the CCSS within course assignments.

Second, it was discussed that those candidates who are currently teaching produced much deeper reflections and understanding of content within their assignments. The Literacy Faculty attributed this to the fact that most of the criteria for the assignments ask the candidates to complete the practical portions within their classrooms. This requires the candidates to make clear connections between the content of the course and the implementation of the concepts within their own teaching. It appears that those not currently teaching receive lower scores on assignments (as evidenced by the assignment rubrics).

Finally, because the program is offered solely on-line, it appears that those who are stronger writers achieve higher grades on their assignments (as evidence by assignment rubrics), and therefore the course(s). This has affected at least two (2) candidates who do not appear to be as strong of writers as others enrolled. The lower grades have affected their status within the program.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

Each of the instructors updated the course content from Cohort 1 to Cohort 2. Because of the implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in Washington Schools, the content of the courses now reflects the candidates’ understanding and implementation of the CCSS within their teaching protocols.
Also, each of the instructors for the courses has updated/revised the assignment rubrics based on the information received through the completed Cohort 1 assignments.

Finally, instructors are offering more writing assistance and resources to these on-line students. Writing resources are posted within the electronic course, instructors conduct telephone writing conferences with candidates, and candidates are encouraged to meet with a representative from the CWU Writing Center.

The information about these changes is recorded in program minutes so that there is a record for other faculty to view. Candidates are notified of the changes through announcements and documents within the electronic course.

5. What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?

The MEd-Literacy Program began Summer, 2012. It was not until Cohort 2 (Summer 2013) began that there were enough candidates to complete this Student Learning Outcomes Report. Therefore, this is the first year the Literacy Program has submitted this information. As a result there was no previous assessment report with which to respond.

6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University:

The Literacy Faculty has no questions or suggestions at this time.