

Reading/Language Arts Program

Dr. Imelda Basurto, Coordinator

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT

1. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?

The Reading/Language Arts Program assessed the following outcomes during the 2014-15 year:

- Goal 1: To prepare graduates to be knowledgeable about literacy development and instructional practices through the study of theoretical perspectives and scientific research on literacy processes and language development.

Outcomes: Graduates will be able to:

- 1.1 Compare and contrast major theories of literacy and language development
- 1.2 Apply theoretical perspectives and scientific research in the design and implementation of instructional lessons

- Goal 2: To prepare graduates with the capacity to plan, implement, evaluate, and modify literacy instruction to meet the needs of diverse struggling readers and English Language Learners.

Outcomes: Graduates will be able to:

- 2.1 Design differentiated instructional strategies based on student assessment results.
- 2.2 Provide effective clinical literacy instruction to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse struggling readers.

2. What instruments did you use to assess them?

The following instruments were used to assess the learning outcomes:

- Assessment 1: Comprehensive Exam (Outcomes 1.1, 2.1)
- Assessment 2: Theory to Practice Project (Outcomes 1.1, 1.2)
- Assessment 3: Case Study Report (Outcomes 1.2, 2.1)
- Assessment 4: Literature Review Method (Outcome 1.1)
- Assessment 5: Practicum Experience Matrix Method (Outcome 1.2, 2.1, 2.2)

3. What did you discover from these results?

- Outcome 1.1: Several assessment measures indicate some strengths and some weaknesses for students in their ability to compare and contrast major literacy development theories in a research paper. Two out of two students passed the comprehensive exam. On the 278 question mean rubric domain scores ranged from 3.17-3.67 on a 4-point scale. The

Theory to Practice Project (LEE 213) however, scores indicate that 30% excelled, 43% did well with some modeling, and 27% struggled with format and organization as well as integrating research into their papers. In the Wiki Project (LEE 244) 89% of students met or exceeded requirements, with 11% needing help.

- Outcome 1.2: Both assessment measures, Case Study Report (LEE 224) and Theory to Practice Project (LEE 213), indicate that students need more scaffolding to clearly apply theoretical perspectives and scientific research in the design and implementation of instructional lessons. The Case Study Report shows that 20% of students excelled, 46% did well with some modeling, and 12% needed a lot of scaffolding while 12% failed the assignment.
- Outcome 2.1: The results of the assessment measures for this outcome were mixed. While The Case Study Report (LEE 224) indicates that students are struggling in their ability to use assessment results to design appropriate differentiated instruction, the Practicum Experience Matrix (LEE 230) shows 66% of students excelling at this task with 93% meeting requirements.
- Outcome 2.2: The results of the assessment measure for this outcome according to the Practicum Experience Matrix (LEE 230) that 40% of students provide effective literacy instruction for diverse and struggling readers, with 60% needing guidance and modeling to achieve effective instruction.

4. What changes did you make as a result of these findings?

Curriculum revisions have been developed to strengthen students' performances relative to each of the outcomes and these changes will be implemented in 2015-16.

- Outcome 1.1: Faculty reviewed the Theory to Practice Project and the Case Study report and determined that students need extensive modeling on how to research and write a research paper with focus on organization, format, and integrating research. Faculty will be providing more models and more scaffolding for the writing process in 2015-2016.
- Outcome 1.2: Faculty determined that struggling students should be encouraged to attend the writing center and that more emphasis should be placed on incorporating research into lesson design. Faculty will be referring struggling students to the writing center and emphasizing research based lesson design in 2015-2016.
- Outcome 2.1: Faculty determined that the program needs to put more of an emphasis on differentiating instruction. Faculty will be incorporating lessons on differentiation and providing practice in their classes in 2015-2016.

- Outcome 2.2: Faculty determined that there needs to more modeling and guidance on how to provide effective literacy instruction to diverse and struggling readers. Faculty will demonstrate, show examples and discuss methods of literacy instruction in 2015-2016.
5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2015-16 academic year?
 - a. *LEE 213 Theory to Practice Project.* (Outcomes 1.1, 1.2)
 - b. *LEE 224 Case Study Report.* (Outcomes 2.1)
 - c. *LEE 230 Practicum Experience Matrix* (Outcomes 1.2, 2.1, 2.2)
 - d. *LEE 254 Program Evaluation Report.* (Outcomes 3.2)
 - e. *LEE 254 Coaching Presentation Rubric* (Outcomes 3.1)
 - f. *Comprehensive Exam.* (Outcomes 1.1, 2.1)
 - g. *Alumni Survey* (Outcomes 2.1, 2.2, 3.2)

 6. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?
 - Based on our action plan from last year, which included revising the Comprehensive Exam questions, we closely reviewed and revised the Comprehensive Exam questions so that expectations were clearly outlined for students. More specifically, questions 5 and 6 for LEE 224 were revised as well as questions 9 and 10 for LEE 278.

 - We will continue to execute our Closing the Loop Process outlined in our SOAP, whereby in this cyclical process our data is changed into information to enable all levels of our system (candidate, program and unit) in identifying areas of strength and areas for growth and improvement. These identified areas will inform our next steps and drive future decisions (i.e., whether to change or eliminate a process, course, or program; shift allocation of resources; create, change and/or eliminate a policy or procedure, etc.). This process also supports us in sustaining a program of high quality, which was acknowledged and recognized by our external reviewers.