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1. As a result of last year’s assessment effort, have you implemented any changes for your assessment including learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment tools (methods, rubrics, curriculum map, or key assignment etc.), and/or the university baccalaureate learning goals?

Our program is in the first year of major and significant changes prompted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) and the approval of new standards for advanced specialists programs in Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialists. There have been changes in course content has been revised to meet the new standards and we are in the midst of our first year of implementation approved by the CCTC. We continue to use Signature Assignments as well as the end-of-program portfolio as a summative assessment for both the Language and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential and the Language and Literacy Added Authorization. The following is our course sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Tier</th>
<th>Added Authorization (12 units)</th>
<th>Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential (24 units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fall – EDTE 200 + EDTE 205</td>
<td>Fall – EDTE 200 + EDTE 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring – EDTE 201 + EDTE 203</td>
<td>Spring – EDTE 201 + EDTE 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>Fall – EDTE 202 + EDTE 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring – EDTE 206 + EDTE 209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our M.A. includes two other embedded programs (including the Language and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential and the Language and Literacy Added Authorization) and it is organized into tiers. Several years ago our program instituted a system of “tiers” or levels. Each tier represents either the Added Authorization or credential level of the program. Tier one represents the four sequence courses for the added authorization and tier two represents the second level of courses, a sequence which comprises the specialist credential courses. Although students are not coho rted per se, the course schedule attempts to sequence the courses in a way where students sequentially progress through the program. Candidates take Tier 1 classes (12 units) to obtain the Added Authorization. If candidates wish to obtain the Language and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential, they build on the Tier 1 knowledge by continuing on to the Tier 2 classes (12 units).

Tier 1 (12 units) - Language and Literacy Added Authorization
- EDTE 200 – Practicum in Decoding and Fluency: Assessment and Instruction (3 units)
- EDTE 201 – Practicum in Comprehension: Assessment and Instruction (3 units)
- EDTE 203 – Teaching and Assessing Writing in the PreK-12 Classroom (3 units)
- EDTE 205 – Psychology and Sociology of Literacy Instruction (3 units)

Tier 2 (12 units) – Language and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential and the Language
- EDTE 202 – Language and Literacy Development in Multicultural Settings (3 units)
- EDTE 206 – Leadership in Literacy (3 units)
• EDTE 207 – Advanced Practicum in Reading Difficulties: Assessment and Intervention (3 units)
• EDTE 209 – Literature for the Diverse PreK-12 Classroom: Issues, Models and Strategies (3 units)

  a. If so, what are those changes? How did you implement those changes?

    Core faculty in our program have been meeting over the course of the last three years and have held numerous retreats to revise our program to meet the new standards.

  b. How do you know if these changes have achieved the desired results?

    Per CCTC directive and approval, all accredited programs such as our own program at Sacramento State are given a full cycle to implement, monitor and adjust our program prior to review by this agency. We anticipate that our program will be reviewed by CCTC by the end of Fall 2014.

  c. If no, why not?

    We are in a transitional period as we revise and implement our program to meet the new standards.

2. As a result of last year’s assessment effort, have you implemented any other changes at the department, the college or the university, including advising, co-curriculum, budgeting and planning?

The College of Education has undergone major restructuring changes during the 2012-13 academic year. Our former departmental structure has changed from Teacher Education to our new department know as the Graduate and Professional Studies in Education Department.

  a. If so, what are those changes? How did you implement those changes?

    The changes were structurally as well as substantive based on the new standards for advance programs in Reading and Language Arts.

  b. How do you know if these changes have achieved the desired results?

    We are in the midst of our first year of implementation which under CCTC rules allows us to implement the program prior to its evaluation. We will be reviewed by CCTC at the end of our first cycle after Fall 2014.

  c. If no, why not?
We are currently in our first year of implementation and transition from our old to our new program.

3. What **PROGRAM** (not course) learning outcome(s) have you assessed this academic year?

The core faculty in the program has met to review our assessment measures and discuss the effectiveness of our program. We continue to use the following course-embedded assessments to appraise our program.

i. Comprehensive case study of a student in EDTE 200 (fluency emphasis) and EDTE 201(comprehension emphasis)

ii. Comprehensive case study of a school/district’s literacy program in EDTE 206

iii. Culminating Portfolio

The table below provides additional details about the nature of each key assessment.

**Table 1: Overview of Key Assessments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Type of Assessment (formative/ summative)</th>
<th>When administered</th>
<th>Details about Administration</th>
<th>CCTC Standards, Performance Outcomes, etc. Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #1.</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>End of each semester (Tier 1)</td>
<td>Individual faculty assesses candidate work</td>
<td>Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 7, 8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive case study of a student in EDTE 200 and EDTE 201 (* and **)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #2.</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>First semester: Tier 2</td>
<td>Instructors of class assess candidate work</td>
<td>Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 7, 8-1,13, 14, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive case study of student with severe reading difficulties in EDTE 207 (**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #3.</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>End of Tier 2</td>
<td>Instructor of class assesses candidate work</td>
<td>Program Standards 2,3,4, 5, 6, 7, 8-11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive case study of a school/district’s literacy in EDTE 206 (**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment #4.</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>End of program</td>
<td>Faculty in program</td>
<td>Program Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Type of Assessment (formative/summative)</th>
<th>When administered</th>
<th>Details about Administration</th>
<th>CCTC Standards, Performance Outcomes, etc. Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culminating Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>work collaboratively to assess each candidate</td>
<td>2,3,4, 5, 6, 7, 8-11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(* and **)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our program is continuing to use Signature Assignments within each course as formative assessments for our Added Authorization and credential candidates. Each course in the Added Authorization as well as the credential program includes a Signature Assignment. These assignments are intended to be core assignments that are central to the content of the course. In sum, they represent essential content for each course.

Signature Assignments used for Formative Assessment

EDTE 200    Case Study: Fluency
EDTE 201    Case Study: Comprehension
EDTE 202    Case Study: Language, Literacy and Culture
EDTE 203    Case Study: Self as a Teacher of Writing and Authentic Writing Assessment
EDTE 205    Case Study: Applying Research to a Reading Curriculum
EDTE 206    Case Study: Examining a Whole School
EDTE 207    Case Study: A Seriously Disabled Reader
EDTE 209    Position Paper: A Professional Perspective on an Issue Related to Juvenile Literature

4. What method(s)/measure(s) have you used to collect the data?

The core measure of completer performance in our program continues to be the three major case studies that are completed in EDTE 200, 201 and 206. Completers also submit either an Added Authorization or credential portfolio. Most students submit this portfolio at the end of their coursework. Our program is projecting the implementation of an Advisory Group Survey and the creation of a process wherein we collect Dispositions Papers from our candidates. Our goal with the Advisory Group Surveys was to continue our close relationships with working professionals in our local school districts. Our attempt was to formalize what has always been a professional relationship. We have periodically asked these individuals to give us feedback about the content of our program and the preparation of our candidates. From this qualitative data, faculty continues to discuss at their monthly area group meetings, concerns expressed by the advisory group.

In addition to the end-of-program portfolio, a consistent practice in our program has been to assess candidates through their performance on the Signature Assignments for each course. As previously stated, each course within our Added Authorization and credential has a Signature Assignment. Faculty instructors rate these papers on the following criteria which go beyond the course content: (a) clarity of writing and responsiveness to the assigned task; (b) integration of theory/research to support response; (c) demonstration of
willingness to consider alternative perspectives as well as those that differ significantly from their own; and (d) demonstration of higher order thinking/intellectual curiosity. These mirror the core outcomes which all graduate students in the Graduate and Professional Studies in Education Department must achieve. A passing grade for these papers is a “B.” These are formative assessments and candidates are allowed to re-write and re-submit these papers so all candidates should ultimately achieve a passing grade, if they opt to re-write these papers.

5. What are the criteria and/or standards of performance for the program learning outcome?

The criteria of performance for our program are based on the standards for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization. Per CCTC, “The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization program includes a purposeful, developmentally-designed sequence of course work and field experiences that builds upon the foundational knowledge, skills and competencies developed in the preservice program. It effectively prepares candidates to teach all students to read and helps candidates understand the challenges of developing literacy among California’s diverse population. Successful candidates will be able to maximize literacy development for all students.”

6. What data have you collected? What are the results and findings, including the percentage of students who meet each standard?

Our primary data has been collected through the end-of-program portfolios that students in our program submit. The following are the strengths and areas for improvement based on this data set.

**Strengths:**

i. Candidate Performance: Our candidates continue to exhibit strong assessment skills in the area of decoding. The Added Authorization/credential portfolios reflect depth of understanding in reviewing an entire school/district level literacy program. Our completers show evidence in their portfolios of this skill.

ii. Program effectiveness: Anecdotal feedback from our local partners confirms that our completers are successful once they read the field.

**Areas for improvement:**

i. Candidate performance: Academic writing was previously identified as an area for improvement. CSUS has approved a new Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement. All students must pass this requirement as of Fall 2010 or take an approved course that improves writing skills.

ii. Program effectiveness: Each course in either the Added Authorization or credential our program has a Signature Assignment. A few of the courses have a rubric for their Signature Assignments that have been reviewed by the core faculty. Our goal for the current year is to establish systematic rubrics for each of
our courses and to have them reviewed by the core faculty. A second area for improvement is increasing the feedback we get from our school/district level partners in university’s service area.

a. In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations?

Most of our graduate students are doing extremely well in most areas to achieve the expectations. Since our program is an advanced program, our candidates have a number of years of teaching experience and bring this wealth of knowledge into our program. This is a major asset that allows them to perform extremely well in our program.

b. In what areas do students need improvement?

Our students could improve in the following areas:
- Focus on a Culture of Literacy
- RtI 2 model
- Use of data
- Prek & adolescent literacy
- Instruction/curriculum expert
- Leadership/Coaching
- Adult Learning Theory (working w/ other adults)
- Information/Technology/library skills
- Research-based best practices

7. As a result of this year’s assessment effort, do you anticipate or propose any changes for your program (e.g. structures, content, or learning outcomes)?

Our program is excited about the new standards for the Added Authorization and Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential. We plan on using one of our courses (possibly EDTE 206) as a graduate capstone class. Another area which we wish to explore is increasing the amount of content that we present in non-traditional formats. This includes greater online content delivery as well as changing course offering to include weekend classes. Since most of our students are working teachers, our goal is meet the challenge faced in terms of literacy instruction in a diverse state such as California.

a. If so, what changes do you anticipate? How do you plan to implement those changes?

As we revise and transition our program to meet the new CCTC standards, our program will provide greater emphasis in the following areas:
- Focus on a Culture of Literacy
- RtI 2 model
- Use of data
• Prek & adolescent literacy
• Instruction/curriculum expert
• Leadership/Coaching
• Adult Learning Theory (working w/ other adults)
• Information/Technology/library skills
• Research-based best practices

Given these changes, we will provide a more robust program in the area of language and literacy.

b. How do you know if these changes will achieve the desired results?
8. Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year? How?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Sub Goals</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Yr 2</th>
<th>Yr 3</th>
<th>Yr 4</th>
<th>Yr 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcome #1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on a Culture of Literacy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program provides opportunities for candidates to review current research on elements of an effective culture of literacy at the classroom, school, district, and community levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The students will</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LO #2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prek &amp; adolescent literacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn the normal progression of complexity for each component of literacy, as explicated in the Foundations/Standards and their Frameworks, the expected stages and patterns in students’ development including early and adolescent literacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The students will</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO #3</td>
<td>Leadership/Coaching</td>
<td>The students will</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO #4</td>
<td>Adult Learning Theory (working w/ other adults)</td>
<td>The students will</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Candidates can facilitate collaborative processes with teachers and administrators for designing, implementing, and evaluating action research projects, case studies, and/or state or federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO #5</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Assess Information, technology and library skills</td>
<td>Assess Information, technology and library skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Technology/library skills</td>
<td>Candidate will incorporate information, technology and library skills into classroom activities in which students learn to access, evaluate, use and integrate information and ideas found in print, media, and digital resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>