|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report**  **2023-2024** | | |
| *CEBS* | | *School of Teacher Education* |
| *Literacy Education MAE 044* | | |
| *Dr. Susan Keesey* | | |
| ***Is this an online program***?  Yes  No | Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf . Indicate verification here  Yes, they match! (If they don’t match, explain on this page under **Assessment Cycle)** | |

**\*\*\* Please include Curriculum Map as part of this document (at the end), NOT as a separate file.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages. Add more Outcomes as needed.*** | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1:** Students will develop, select, and administer appropriate formative and summative literacy assessments to identify students’ strengths and areas for growth; determine effectiveness of instruction; and plan differentiated instruction  to meet the needs of diverse students in the classroom. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | Diagnostic Report in LTCY 520: The outcome will be assessed using criterion-based rubrics that distinguish student proficiency in levels 1-4. It is expected that students demonstrate a proficiency level of at least level 3 to meet the expected outcome. | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2:** Students will evaluate how the multiple roles of literacy specialists have evolved and how they are enacted within schools and districts and will be able to analyze their own knowledge and skills in relation to three areas of focus required of the Literacy Specialist. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | School based Specialized Literacy Professional Reflective Paper-LTCY 532- The outcome will be assessed using criterion-based rubrics that distinguish student proficiency in levels 1-4. It is expected that students demonstrate a proficiency level of at least level 3 to meet the expected outcomes. | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3:**  Students will develop a plan based on identified need related to the roles of Literacy Specialist and will reflect upon success and areas for growth. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | LTCY 695- Literacy Specialist Project: The outcome will be assessed using criterion-based rubric that distinguish student proficiency in levels 1-4. | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Assessment Cycle Plan:** | | | |
| Three assessments are included in this summary: the Diagnostic Report (LTCY 520), School based Specialized Literacy Professional Reflective Paper (LTCY 532), and the Literacy Specialist Project (LTCY 695). Goals for Learning Outcomes 1-3 were met. These assessments will continue to be used to evaluate student progress through the program. This report reflects the revised Literacy Education MAE, which leads to the Literacy Specialist endorsement. Based on the success and high levels of competency of students, these assessments will be used in the future to further evaluate the success of the program and our students. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1** | | | | | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | Students will develop, select, and administer appropriate formative and summative literacy assessments to identify students’ strengths and areas for growth; determine effectiveness of instruction; and plan differentiated instruction  to meet the needs of diverse students in the classroom. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Students complete a Diagnostic Report on their client from coursework in the WKU Literacy Clinic. This includes data analysis and interpretation on student assessment results and plans for instruction based upon those results and readings from class regarding best practices in literacy education and remediation. | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The Diagnostic Report requires students to analyze student assessment data, interpret meaning of scores, and make hypotheses based on data to inform instruction. Graduate students working with striving readers in the WKU Literacy Clinic complete this report and must be successful to continue in the Literacy Education MAE. The goal is that 90% of students score 3 or better on the rubric shared below. In addition, students’ performance on each individual dimension is evaluated for detailed analysis. Students should perform at least 3 on each individual criterion. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | 100% of students successfully completed the project at Level 3 or higher in each area of the rubric that is applicable to their project | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% | |
| **Methods** | Each student in the Literacy MAE completes this assignment at the end of the Literacy 520 course, which involves tutoring a struggling reader. Students submit diagnostic reports and the instructor works closely with the student to have formative discussions regarding student work. No student in this course is able to continue if they do not successfully complete this report. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | Do you have other measures of assessment for SLO 1? If so, please add those here along with all the information below. If not, you may delete this section and move on to **“… whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.”** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** |  | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | |  | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |  | |
| **Methods** |  | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | Do you have other measures of assessment for SLO 1? If so, please add those here along with all the information below. If not, you may delete this section and move on to **“… whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.”** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** |  | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | |  | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |  | |
| **Methods** |  | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | | | |
| **Results indicate that students in the Literacy Education MAE are successful in their formation of diagnostic statements and plans using assessment data.**  **Conclusions**: This assessment continues to provide rationale for our instruction and supports the work we have in place for Literacy Education MAE students.  **\*\*IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: This assessment is a critical part of our program and helps to develop students’ skills need for the workplace. We will continue to use this assessment. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric for SLO 1** | | | | |
| **100 points total** | **Exemplary**  **20 points** | **Proficient**  **18 points** | **Developing**  **15 points** | **Beginning**  **10 points** |
| Section I & II: Demographic information and Baseline Literacy Data Table and Background Information    ILA-ALP: 3.1,3.2,5.1    KTPS: 1a,1b,1h,6g,6j,6k,6l,6t,6v | Demographic information: Candidate goes beyond proficient criteria with clear, consistent information. Section is complete and includes relevant information. | Demographic information is accurate and complete. ARI overview table is included, accurate, and complete. Section is complete. | Some demographic information is accurate and complete. ARI overview table may or may not be included, accurate, and/or complete. Section may be missing some information or is vague. | Demographic information is not complete or is inaccurate. ARI overview table is not included or is not complete and accurate. Section is missing or includes inaccurate information. |
| Section III: Summary of Assessment Results    ILA-ALP: 1.1,1.2, 3.3,3.4, 7.1,7.3,7.4    KTPS: 1a,1b,1h,6g,6j,6k,6l,6t,6v | Thorough and precise discussion linking assessments, their purposes, and results for the client. An explanation of scores and implications are included and detailed. Tables are easy to read and include all relevant data. Descriptions are easy to read using guardian-friendly language. | Includes thorough discussion of each assessment administered, the purpose of each assessment, a table detailing the results of the assessment, an explanation of the scores, and what the scores mean (i.e. implications). | Includes some discussion of each assessment administered, the purpose of each assessment, may include a table detailing assessment results, and some discussion of the scores and their implications. | Missing some of the required components, score interpretation may not be correct, may not include a table of assessment results, and may lack in discussion of scores and their implications. |
| Section IV: Recommendations and Goals for Intervention    ILA-ALP: 2.1,2.2,2.3,3.3,3.4, 5.1,5.2,5.3, 7.1,7.3,7.4    KTPS: 1a,1b,1c,1h, 2a,2e,2j,2l, 5l,5m, | Thoroughly describes recommendations for intervention instruction. Specific strengths and areas of need are provided and explicitly connected to assessment data. Three to five major goals described thoroughly for future intervention sessions. Sample activities included and thoroughly described.  (KTPS: 1, 5, 6, 9) | Describes recommendations for intervention instruction. Reference to strengths and areas of need connected to assessment data. Major goals described thoroughly. Sample activities included and described. | Briefly introduces recommendations for intervention instruction. Some strengths and areas of need are provided with some connection to assessment data. Some description of major goals provided. Sample activities listed with little to no description. | Limited recommendations for intervention instruction. Few strengths and areas of need are provided with little or no connection to assessment data. No information regarding major goals provided. No sample activities included. |
| Section V: Home and School Connections and Recommendations    ILA-ALP: 2.1,2.3,3.2,3.3,3.4,5.1,5.2,5.3    KTPS: 1a,1b,1c,1h, 2a,2e,2j,2l,10d, 10f | Specific instructional recommendations for school and home are provided with very clear directions for use by parents and teachers. | Instructional recommendations for school and home are provided with directions for use by parents and teachers. | Few recommendations are given for home/school Recommendations are not written in caregiver-friendly language. Recommendations lack connections to authentic, useable resources | Few recommendations are given for home/school or are not appropriate for the needs of the client. Recommendations are not written in caregiver-friendly language. Recommendations lack connections to authentic, useable resources |
| Appendices    ILA-ALP: 2.1,2.3,5.1,5.3    KTPS: 1a,1b,1h,5l,5m | Includes definitions of terms (A), recommended independent and instructional level book lists (B), and instructional tools related to recommendations (C) that are detailed and thorough to benefit the reader. | Includes definitions of terms (A), recommended independent and instructional level book lists (B), and instructional tools related to recommendations (C) that are detailed and thorough to benefit the reader. | Includes definitions of terms (A), recommended independent and instructional level book lists (B), and instructional tools related to recommendations (C). Some are not appropriate or not thorough. | Does not include definitions of terms (A), recommended independent and instructional level book lists (B), and instructional tools related to recommendations (C) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2** | | | | | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | Students will evaluate how the multiple roles of literacy specialists have evolved and how they are enacted within schools and districts and will be able to analyze their own knowledge and skills in relation to three areas of focus required of the Literacy Specialist. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | School based Specialized Literacy Professional Reflective Paper-LTCY 532- The outcome will be assessed using criterion-based rubrics that distinguish student proficiency in levels 1-4. It is expected that students demonstrate a proficiency level of at least level 3 to meet the expected outcomes. | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students must achieve at least a 3 on each component of the rubric provided below.  **Rubric attached after this table.** | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | 100% of students successfully complete the project at Level 3 or higher in each area of the rubric that is applicable to their project | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% | |
| **Methods** | This reflective paper is a required assignment in the beginning of LTCY 532 Literacy coaching course. All program participants are required to complete this course. 100% of the participating students scored 3 or better on each component of the rubric provided below. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** |  | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** |  | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | |  | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |  | |
| **Methods** |  | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** |  | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** |  | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | |  | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |  | |
| **Methods** |  | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | | | |
| **Results**: All students successfully completed this assessment, which required that they evaluate themselves as Advanced Literacy Professionals. We were not surprised by this, as our students are excellent.  **Conclusions**: This assessment continues to provide rationale for our instruction and supports the work we have in place for Literacy Education MAE students. It also sets a foundation for student growth and reflection.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: This assessment is a critical part of our program and helps to develop students’ skills need for the workplace. We will continue to use this assessment. | | | | | | | |

Rubric for SLO 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Score | Category | Exemplary | Proficient | Developing | Beginning |
| /10 | Introduction and Conclusion | Clearly introduces the paper and purpose and then clearly concludes the major findings. | Introduction and/or conclusion are not clearly written or don’t include final statement | Lacking in some of the qualities of clarity, purpose, conclusion. | Not clearly defined or clear. Inconsistent with intention of the paper. |
| /10 | Historical role of Literacy Specialist    ILA: 1.4    InTasc: 4o,9b, 10l | Thoroughly describes how the role of the literacy specialist evolved in recent years, including citations from course readings. | Describes how the role of the literacy specialist evolved in recent years, some citations. | Describes how the role of the literacy specialist has evolved, some gaps in information or lacking citations. | Lacking major content asked in the prompt and/or lacking citations. |
| /10 | Current roles of Literacy Specialist    ILA: 1.4, 4.2    InTasc: 3, 4o, 4p, 9b,10l | Thoroughly describes the multiple roles and responsibilities of literacy specialists and how they are enacted in detail and with citations from course readings. | Describes the multiple roles and responsibilities of literacy specialists and how they are enacted in detail, with citations. | Includes roles and some responsibilities of literacy specialists, lacking some detail. Some gaps in citations. | Lacking major content asked in the prompt and/or lacking citations. |
| /10 | Self-analysis and reflection related to role of Literacy Specialist    ILA 1.4, 4.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3    InTasc: 3p,3q,3r, 4, 9b,c,d,I,m, 10b,c,f,j,p,r,s,t | Thoroughly analyzes own knowledge and skills related to 3 areas (student, teacher, system), including strengths and areas of need. Is candid and honest, addressing gaps in knowledge. Refers to course readings using citations. | Analyzes own knowledge and skills related to 3 areas with some reference to strengths and areas of need. Is candid and honest, addressing gaps in knowledge. Refers to course readings with citations. | Surface level discussion of own knowledge and skills related to 3 areas (student, teacher, system), with limited description of strengths and areas of need. | Lacking major content asked in the prompt and/or lacking citations. |
| /10 | Grammar, mechanics, APA formatting and citations | Excellent grammar, clearly has been proofread with no errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation. Correct use of APA format in citations and in formatting. | Few errors that do not disrupt meaning. | Several grammatical and proofreading errors that do disrupt meaning. | Many grammatical and proofreading errors that do disrupt meaning. Limited attempt to use correct APA format and/or incorrect citations and formatting. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3** | | | | | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | Students will develop a plan based on identified need related to the roles of Literacy Specialist and will reflect upon success and areas for growth. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | LTCY 695- Literacy Specialist Project: The outcome will be assessed using criterion-based rubric that distinguish student proficiency in levels 1-4. | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Through the completion of a Literacy Specialist Project, students will develop a plan based on identified need related to the roles of Literacy Specialist and will reflect upon success and areas for growth. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | 100% of students successfully complete the project at Level 3 or higher in each area of the rubric that is applicable to their project | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% | |
| **Methods** | Students meet with literacy faculty and cooperating teachers and administrators to identify needs and plan for next steps. Ongoing support is provided in the creation and implementation of the plan. Plan is presented with reflection and outcomes to faculty and fellow students. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** |  | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** |  | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | |  | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |  | |
| **Methods** |  | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** |  | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** |  | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | |  | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |  | |
| **Methods** |  | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | | | |
| **Results**: Results varied within each student’s assessment, in that all topics were different. However, their success in implementing their projects far exceeded expectations.  **Conclusions**: Based on reflection upon last year’s results, it was determined that 6 meetings per student were necessary to ensure student success.This provided ample feedback and support to students.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle**: Students will continue to complete the Literacy Specialist Project in upcoming years, as it was shown to demonstrate skills that students will need if they do move into the Literacy Specialist role. | | | | | | | |

Rubric for SLO 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section and ILA-ALP and KTPS Standards** | Unacceptable | Needs Improvement | Acceptable | Exemplary |  |
| **Evaluation of Need**  **ILA-ALP: 6.1, 6.3, 6.4**  **KTPS: 5, 9k** | No attempt at need assessment included in the project | Need not clearly assessed or defined; lacking measurement of need | Need was assessed and measured appropriate for the candidate’s population | Clear description of how need was assessed; measurement appropriate for candidate’s population | /10 |
| **Relevant Literature Connections**    **ILA-ALP: 1.1,1.2,1.3,1.4**  **KTPS: 9a, 9n** | No inclusion of relevant literature or very superficial connection between literature and project. | Literature review includes some relevant articles that are somewhat linked to the topic of the project. Research may be shared in a list-type writing, rather than in a meaningful way to demonstrate themes. | Literature review includes research rationale for choices made in the project related to professional learning and to the topic focus of the professional learning experience. Research is shared in meaningful way—demonstrating clear knowledge of the subject. | Well-developed Literature Review provides research rationale for choices made in the project related to professional learning and the topic focus of the professional learning experience. Eight or more resources included that are relevant to the topic and/or method. Research is compiled and shared in meaningful way and not simply listed off by article. | /10 |
| **Plan**  **ILA-ALP: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 4.4, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.2, 7.3**  **KTPS:**  **3a,3b,3c,3k 3o,3p, 4b,4d,4g,4k,4l, 4q 5a, 5b, 5f, 5h 9f, 9g, 9h, 9k, 9l** | No clear plan was created or followed in the project; research is not present or does not support the work; participant feedback is not collected or used | Plan is loosely defined but lacks the research base to support the steps included and/or lacks attempts to obtain participant feedback | Plan built upon needs of constituents and based upon research; includes participant feedback for on-going reflection and growth | Includes clearly delineated steps for addressing identified need; supports plan with research; includes a variety of coaching tools based upon the need of the population; includes plans for obtaining and interpreting participant feedback for on-going reflection and growth | /20 |
| **Findings**  **ILA-ALP: 6.1, 6.2, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4**  **KTPS: 9g,9h,9k,9l** | No attempt at sharing findings or a confused attempt. | Limited attempt at sharing findings. Vague statements not based on actual data or experiences. | Findings are shared thoughtfully and thoroughly and are based on data or experiences. | Clear, precise and thoughtful findings are shared based on the data and experiences of the whole project. | /10 |
| **Professional Support**  **ILA-ALP: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.2**  **KTPS: 9g,9h,9k,9l** | No attempt to communicate with peers regarding progress or to provide feedback on others’ work. | Limited attempt to communicate with peers regarding progress; limited support of peers through the process of the work. | Shares progress with peers and offers feedback to others regarding their projects. | Advanced Literacy Professional shares progress with peers and offers constructive feedback and support for others; consults and advocates on behalf of teachers and students | /10 |
| **Reflection- NCTE Six Dimensions**  **ILA-ALP: 6.1, 7.2**  **KTPS: 9a,b,c,e,I,k,l,m,n,o** | Literacy professional does not reflect on his/her coaching and literacy leadership as related to the NCTE Six Dimensions in the role of the literacy coach | Literacy professional attempts to reflect on his/her coaching and literacy leadership as related to the NCTE Six Dimensions in the role of the literacy coach, but misses many dimensions or reflection does not address them clearly. | Literacy professional reflects on his/her coaching and literacy leadership as related to the NCTE Six Dimensions in the role of the literacy coach | Literacy professional thoroughly reflects on his/her coaching and literacy leadership thoughtfully as related to the NCTE Six Dimensions in the role of the literacy coach | /10 |
| **Reflection- Professional Learning and Leadership**  **ILA-ALP: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.2, 7.3**  **KTPS: 9a,b,c,e,I,k,l,m,n,o** | Does not address the fact that reflection is an interactive process or ways it helped to hone the work; Does not describe how he/she demonstrated leadership, facilitation, or coaching skills; does not describe how he/she has advocated for teachers and students. | Limited description of how reflection is an interactive process or ways reflection helped to hone the work in this process; Limited description of how he/she has demonstrated leadership, facilitation, or coaching skills; limited description of how he/she has advocated for teachers and students. | Describes how reflection is an interactive process and helped to hone work to fit the needs of others; Describes how he/she has demonstrated leadership, facilitation, and coaching skills; describes how he/she has advocated for teachers and students | Clearly and thoughtfully describes how reflection is an interactive process and helped to hone work to fit the needs of others; Describes how he/she has demonstrated leadership, facilitation, and coaching skills; describes how he/she has advocated for teachers and students | /10 |
| **Reflection- Professional Learning and Leadership**  **ILA-ALP: 6.1, 7.3, 7.4**  **KTPS: 9a,b,c,e,I,k,l,m,n,o** | Does not describe how research and/or continued participation in a professional organization has helped him/her to hone the craft in terms of literacy leadership | Limited reference to how research and/or continued participation in a professional organization has helped him/her to hone the craft in terms of literacy leadership | Describes how research and/or continued participation in a professional organization has helped him/her to hone the craft in terms of literacy leadership. | Thoughtfully and thoroughly describes how research and/or continued participation in a professional organization has helped him/her to hone the craft in terms of literacy leadership | /10 |
| **Reflection- Professional Learning and Leadership**  **ILA-ALP: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.2**  **KTPS: 9a,b,c,e,I,k,l,m,n,o** | No reference to how knowledge of adult learning allowed for engagement in collaborative decision making. | Limited reference to knowledge of adult learning and its link to engagement in collaborative decision making with colleagues. | Describes how knowledge of adult learning allowed for engagement in collaborative decision making with colleagues to design, align, and assess instructional practices and interventions within and across classrooms | Thoughtfully and thoroughly describes how knowledge of adult learning allowed for engagement in collaborative decision making with colleagues to design, align, and assess instructional practices and interventions within and across classrooms | /10 |