I. SELF-STUDY

A. Five-Year Review Planning Goals

(Note: 2018—2019 represents year three of the five-year Planning Goal Review Cycle)

1. Continue to improve candidates’ abilities to promote a “culture of literacy.” The new California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Standard 2 requires programs to instruct candidates on promoting a “culture of literacy.”

2. Demonstrate reliability of scoring of signature assessments in the Reading Program. The new CTC Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Standards require programs to demonstrate that instructors who score signature assessments are calibrated to ensure reliability.

3. Continue alignment of the Reading Program with the Common Core State Standards, the New English Language Development Standards.

4. Revise content of Reading courses to ensure that candidates are prepared for the changing role of literacy leadership in schools.
B. Progress Toward Five-Year Review Planning Goals


1. During AY 18-19, the program continued to improve candidate ability to promote a “culture of literacy,” building on efforts put in place the previous three years. Prior efforts to capture what can sometimes be an elusive “global” concept have included reflections on personal beliefs and practices; instructor modeling; and guiding students through processes for selecting, evaluating, summarizing, and reporting on literacy research. In the two previous years, we added more research-based articles on how to foster knowledge and skills about developing and supporting a culture of literacy and, most recently, a series of relevant videos to the course materials. This year, we refined a synthesis assignment in TED 661: Research Methods: Comprehension, that requires candidates to 1) articulate their understanding of the concept “culture of literacy,” 2) support their assertions with course materials (readings/videos), and 3) document theory into practice with a description of the classroom practices and materials they use to create and sustain a culture of literacy.

2. In AY 18-19, program faculty have not changed and are familiar with and have used all program assessments and rubrics relevant to their courses. As predicted in last year’s CAPR report, the program significantly expanded during AY 18-19. That said, we are in need of additional faculty and there have been no new faculty to train in the assessments. We are bringing onboard a veteran MSRL faculty member for AY 19-20; her understanding of the program and rubrics is superior. That said, we will need to onboard additional faculty to meet the program demands; when that happens, the Program Coordinator will meet with any incoming faculty members to go over the rubrics and score sample papers.

A review of signature assignments indicates that these are reflective of program goals within the contexts of California Teacher Credentialing Standards and the University’s institutional and programmatic learning goals and outcomes. As the transition to semesters takes place, these assignments will be an area for continued study and appropriate changes.

3. The program enjoys the products of efforts to align with the Common Core Standards and English Language Development Standards. As of AY 18-19, assignments and syllabi continue to have appropriate fidelity with relevant standards. Further, instructors in the program are well versed in these standards and attendant curricular and pedagogical practices.

4. In AY 18-19, the program maintained its literacy leadership strand through focused instruction using the existing and new articles and media. Candidates are now taught an effective classroom management model so that they may assist reading teachers with establishing productive order, an essential prerequisite to teaching and learning.
D. Program Changes and Needs

Significant Changes: Program growth from 14 to 45+ and growing, loss of a tenure-line faculty member (see explanation below)

Most Significant Need: A new tenure-line hire, preferably a literacy specialist with terminal degree in literacy; CTC Certified Reading Specialist preferred (see explanation below)

Overview:

The MS in Reading and Literacy program prepares individuals to diagnose reading difficulties and to teach reading programs at various levels. The program addresses literacy needs from early elementary and Transitional Kindergarten (TK) through secondary school (grades 6-12). Critical elements to support the secondary school instructor are included to build capacity in foundational early reading development, a component of literacy often excluded in pre-service programs for secondary school teachers. Including secondary literacy helps create a comprehensive TK-12 lens for program completers. Additionally, the program focuses on the critical component of coaching the adult learner. In this way, we can best prepare candidates to not only have exceptional understanding of TK-12 literacy diagnostic skills and needs, but also to be able to be agents of sustainable change in the TK-12 sector.

Curriculum Changes:

During semester conversion, the design of the MS in Reading Instruction changed. The degree was elevated from an M.Ed. Option to a Master of Science (MS) degree. The new name of the degree was approved as the MS in Reading and Literacy (MSRL). The total program length is 30 semester units and includes both the MSRL and the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA). Candidates may transfer up to nine (9) qualifying units towards the MS. If they do not have the qualifying units, they must complete a series of program electives. Upon successful completion of the required coursework the MSRL is posted; for recommendation to CTC for the state-issued RLAA, the candidate must also submit documentation of three or more years of classroom teaching

While most students complete the MSRL, there are usually one or two per cohort who to complete the RLAA only. In this instance, they need only complete the first 14 units of the MSRL.

As semester conversion has now passed the one-year mark, in 2019-20, courses and signature assignments will undergo review by the faculty to ensure coherence with program goals and alignment to California Teacher Credentialing Standards and the University’s institutional and programmatic learning goals and outcomes. This will be an ongoing area for faculty to study and to implement appropriate changes.
Students:

Students admitted to the program are post baccalaureate degree holders who have also completed an approved teacher preparation program and hold a valid Multiple Subject and/or Single Subject Credential. An earned 3.0 Grade Point Average (GPA) in all upper division or post baccalaureate coursework. The MS in Reading Instruction program requires applicants to submit a statement of purpose, evidence of successful teaching experience, and three current letters of recommendation.

Reading specialists are also being hired as literacy coaches for schools and districts. Although all Reading positions require a deep understanding of literacy development, coaching teachers requires a different set of skills than working directly with public school students. Our candidates must be skilled in Reading development, literacy instructional methods, and adult learning theory. Course content ensures that our program prepares candidates to be the literacy leaders of the future.

A major goal of the program is to increase the number and diversity of candidates. To do this, as semester conversion rolls out, the program will engage in three program-level interventions to increase candidate diversity. The numbering below aligns with the program-level components outlined in CEAS’ 2017 Candidate Diversity Recruitment Plan. These include 1) implementing a mentoring program for all diverse program applicants to ensure they understand and can meet all admission requirements, 2) exploring options for external funding to support the recruitment and admission of diverse candidates, and 3) extending outreach to selected communities that have diverse potential applicant populations. These efforts have already begun and should show fuller impact in our next program report.

Faculty:

The most significant change impacting this area of need has been program growth. Since the new coordinator assumed her role, the program has grown from one cohort of 14 students to two cohorts totaling 45 students. In addition, in AY18-19 one of the two tenured faculty teaching in the program left to assume other duties. With continued growth expected and only one dedicated faculty member, there is a critical need to hire another tenure-track literacy specialist, preferably one who possesses the CTC-authorized Certified Reading Specialist Credential. It is challenging to find such faculty and it may be the case that we hire a tenure-line faculty member with a terminal degree in Education with relevant emphases in language/literacy/culture. The key goal is to bolster our ability to deliver high quality MS-level instruction in such literacy areas as theoretical models and processes, along with their practical applications in instruction, assessment, and intervention. In recent years, the department has seen the retirement of several literacy specialists; remaining faculty with literacy training are needed to teach literacy courses in the basic credential programs and are also in demand to teach courses in other programs in extension.
Staff:

During AY17-18, as a small program, the Coordinator managed most clerical needs, with the assistance of Extension and CEAS’ collaborative staffing model.

Resources:

Assessment:

Other: Elevation to the MS in Reading and Literacy

The Chancellor’s Office approved elevation of the program to the Master of Science in Reading and Literacy, effective with the Summer 2018 entering cohort. We successfully completed one year of the MSRL in AY18-19

II. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT

A. Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)

1. Demonstrate a thorough understanding of theory and research on an effective culture of literacy for diverse prekindergarten through high school students, their families, and communities;

2. Demonstrate knowledge of research-based instructional practices in each component of literacy and the ability to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for each component of literacy instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language development, reading and listening comprehension, and vocabulary development, and writing;

3. Successfully plan and implement a balanced literacy environment, including the selection and use instructional materials, technology, routines, and strategies that are appropriately aligned with students’ assessed language and literacy needs; and

4. Complete an action research project in the field of literacy, including a review of the research literature, planning and implementing an instructional unit, and an analysis of student learning and research results

Our candidates will:

UAO1: Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards to implement universal design and research-based programs to achieve equitable learning outcomes.

UAO2: Demonstrate the ability to create environments, systems, and practices in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness.
UAO3: Work collaboratively with students, parents, and professional colleagues to achieve equitable outcomes and equitable environments.

UAO4: Know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

B. Program Learning Outcome(S) Assessed
   In 2017-2018, UAOs 1, 2, and 4 were assessed and discussed. As the CTC has recently implemented a new requirement that dyslexia be included in the curriculum, this will become a focus in the assessment courses.

C. Summary of Assessment Process
   No new assessment instruments were developed. However, with the conclusion of our first year under semesters, we will proceed to our scheduled AY19-20 review of the entire assessment process.

D. Summary of Assessment Results
   A previous report documented that, in 2015-2016, additional scaffolds were added to further support assessment, analysis, planning delivery, and reflections in TED 6253. As a result of these changes, candidates scores increased to 4/4 on the target rubric-based assessment. In 2016-2017, under a prior program coordinator, the plan was to “further investigate… the content/instruction in these particular areas,” however, as there was a focus on semesterization and a subsequent change in program coordination, there was no accessible evidence to determine if, in fact, such “further investigation” was conducted.

   In keeping with Item C above, in AY 17-18, the new Coordinator and core faculty agreed to begin discussions around the assessment assignments and rubrics, but to wait make any changes until additional information is gathered after all courses have cycled through the semester process.

E. Assessment Plans for Next Year
   As stated above and in our previous report, following the implementation of semester instruction, rolls core faculty will conduct a thorough review of courses, assessments, and data quality. Thus, during AY 18-19, we continued to use existing signature assignments. AY 19-20 will involve a review and revision of these assignments.
III. DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM DATA & RESOURCE REQUESTS

A. Discussion of Trends & Reflections

There has been an increase in the demand for qualified literacy interventionists at the classroom and school level. There are several possible reasons: continued pressure from legislative and political groups to increase overall literacy test scores, decrease remediation/intervention time, and deliver mainstream instruction to students with special needs. Further, as California’s student population is among the most diverse in the nation, many teachers realize that basic certification is no longer adequate to the task. Those teachers that seek to excel at meeting their students’ needs are pursuing robust advanced training in literacy.

Of equal importance is the increased interest in accessible and dynamic interactive online instruction, both of which the MSRL deliver. In moving to a fully online format with brief weekly synchronous video-mediated class sessions and plenty of online office hours, MSRL candidates are able to engage with their professor and each other in real time from the comfort of their home or school laptop—without having to commute.

Teachers are notoriously time-constrained by the work they must do outside of regular school hours. In addition, there are large populations of teachers who would like to earn an advanced degree, but are prevented from doing so by lack of proximity to a CSU campus or family obligations. Using video technology, we build close communities of learners and attract previously non- or underserved populations of educators.

B. Request for Resources: A new tenure-line hire in literacy

As stated in our last report, the MSRL program has nearly tripled in size; to accommodate the demand, we opened a second entry point (SP 19) in addition to our regular summer entry (SU 19). We admitted 20 students in SP19 and, in SU19, we admitted our largest cohort ever (26).

With only one dedicated faculty member for teaching, advising, and coordinating for 45 students, there is an urgent need for a tenure line faculty member with an advanced degree and experience in literacy. In recent years, the department has seen the retirement of several literacy specialists; remaining faculty with literacy training are needed to teach literacy courses in the basic credential programs and are also in demand to teach courses in other programs in extension.

Preferably, the new hire would have the Certified Reading Specialist Credential (CRS). However, it is challenging to find such faculty and it may be the case that we hire a tenure-line faculty member with a terminal degree in Education with relevant emphases in language/literacy/culture. The key goal is to bolster our ability to deliver high quality MS-level instruction in such advanced literacy areas as theoretical models/processes and their practical applications in instruction, assessment, and intervention.