



**CALIFORNIA STATE
UNIVERSITY**
E A S T B A Y

ACADEMIC SENATE
Committee on Academic Planning and Review

College	CEAS
Department	Teacher Education
Program	MS in Reading and Literacy (MSRL)
Reporting for Academic Year	2022-2023
Last 5-Year Review	AY 2020-2021 to 2024-2025
Next 5-Year Review	AY 2025-2026 to 2029-2030
Department Chair	Lyn Scott, Ph.D.
Author of Review	Andrea Steinfeld, Ed.D. & Lyn Scott, Ph.D.
Date Submitted	November 5, 2023

ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

I. SELF-STUDY

Notes:

1. The MS in Reading and Literacy results in students earning the Master of Science in Reading and Literacy (MSRL) and the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA). The RLAA is a CTC-accredited program.
2. AY 22-23 represents year two of the five-year Planning Goal Review Cycle; however, after this cycle began in 2016, CEAS administration received permission to coordinate CAPR planning review cycles to the seven-year accreditation review cycle employed by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). The current CAPR five-year cycle (22-23 to 24-25) concludes with and aligns to the scheduled CTC site visit in AY 24-25. This CAPR report reflects work prior to the department chair and the author of review joining the program.

A. Five-Year Review Planning Goals

1. Develop and implement assessments to measure candidates' abilities to articulate, analyze, assess, and promote a "culture of literacy" at the classroom, school, district, and community levels.
2. Engage in course transformation to obtain Quality Matters Course Certification for all courses in the MSRL Program.

3. Develop course modules for building the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to address specific reading disabilities and instructional techniques, with a particular emphasis on Dyslexia diagnosis and intervention.

4. Review all courses for potential to include anti-racist theoretical and evidence-based pedagogical practices modules for emerging literacy leaders to use in their classrooms, schools, districts, and communities. Develop assessments for these modules and track longitudinal data for evaluation of their efficacy.

B. Progress Toward Five-Year Review Planning Goals

Report on your progress toward achievement of the 5-Year Plan. Include discussion of problems.

1. This goal builds on and significantly deepens the work accomplished in Goal 1 of the previous five-year review: “Continue to improve candidates’ abilities to promote a culture of literacy. The MSRL has completed the second year of the current five-year review cycle. During AY 22-23, the course Culture of Literacy focuses on diversity and addresses current research on the topic of culture of literacy. Students must demonstrate an understanding of current research on creating an effective culture of literacy designed to meet the needs of multilingual and diverse students.

2. Quality Matters (QM) certification is considered a “gold standard” for online course evaluation and development by the CSU. MSRL professors will remain responsible for curricular content and pedagogy within courses. In this regard, QM certification is additive; it is a peer-review process that helps ensure that the design and format of a course make for ease of access, navigation, and student learning.

3. Recently, California has been poised to implement universal screening of all kindergarteners and first graders. Although the screening program has yet to be initiated, recent signals from the Governor’s office indicate that implementation may begin within the next year or so. This means that graduates of the MSRL will be looked to by their schools and districts to provide guidance to administrators and parents, as well as peer literacy coaching to colleagues.

In recent years, dyslexia research has significantly increased, yielding additional and more nuanced understandings of underlying casualties as well as effective diagnostic and intervention strategies. In AY22-23, the program will begin the process of revising the dyslexia components. In course 660, students will learn not only the literacy continuum, but there is also an emphasis on teaching and assessing students with dyslexia with a focus on reading and discussing the California Dyslexia Guidelines.

4. Studies show unconscious bias on the part of white teachers not referring Black children for dyslexia evaluation. This narrative holds that teachers who, due to unconscious bias, hold lower expectations for Black children’s reading development may rule out dyslexia as a potential causality. And, by extension, these same teachers, unaware of their own bias, are not equipped to engage in self-checking for bias. In course 672, the candidates will learn about adolescent

literacy; valuing adolescents and their literacy beliefs, developing literacy strategies for youth, developing disciplinary literacies, and addressing program and policy issues. In this course, there will be discussions based on the framing of Black youth's digital literacies with a central focus on girls' digital literacies. The ultimate goal is to prepare the candidates to be aware of unconscious bias.

This structural racism must be recognized and dismantled by those who work within it through effective anti-racist pedagogy, coaching, and professional development. Just as we expect our MSRL graduates to provide guidance around dyslexia matters, these same graduates must also be equipped with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to serve as anti-bias/anti-racist literacy leaders for their colleagues and institutions. In AY23-24, the program will begin the process of revising courses to situate their content within a clearly articulated framework of anti-racist pedagogy and inquiry.

C. Program Changes and Needs

Overview:

The MS in Reading and Literacy is a one-year program that results in students earning the Master of Science in Reading and Literacy (MSRL) and the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA). The RLAA portion of the MSRL is a CTC-accredited program.

The MSRL prepares individuals to assess, diagnose, and address reading and literacy needs across diverse populations of preK-12th grade. With few exceptions, candidates are all credentialed teachers working in preK-12 schools. Building on their basic credential training, the MSRL candidates develop advanced knowledge and skills in the areas of literacy instruction, assessment, diagnosis, intervention, and comprehensive literacy curricular planning. Students also develop a research question and write an in-depth literature review focusing on an area in literacy. Students also have the opportunity to study their hypothesis and participate in the IRB process. While many students use their advanced training in their classroom practice, others become school literacy interventionists, peer coaches, district curriculum coordinators, and more.

Curriculum Changes:

There will be revisions to the program courses based on student feedback as well as providing candidates with a more robust and well-rounded program. The course sequence has changed and the course titles have changed to ensure the student learning outcomes are aligned with the CTC standards. Here are the following changes:

Course Number	Revised Course Name in Curriculog
TED 660	Reading and Language Arts: The Literacy Continuum Short name: Literacy Continuum

TED 661	Reading and Language Arts: Reading and Writing to Comprehend Text Short name: Read/Write to Comprehend Text
TED 662	Reading and Language Arts: Culture of Literacy: Focus on Diversity Short name: Culture of Literacy/Diversity
TED 663	Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Assessment Short name: Literacy Assessment
TED 664	Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Intervention Short name: Literacy Intervention
TED 695	Reading and Language Arts: Practicum, Integrating Curriculum through Fieldwork Short name: Practicum

The total program is 31 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 often one or two per cohort who choose to complete the RLAA only. In this instance, they need only complete the first 14 units of the MSRL.

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 MSRL program requires applicants to submit transcripts, a statement of purpose, 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.

Progress on another major program goal during the last cycle involved an increase in the number and diversity of candidates. In AY 16-17, there were only 14 students in the program; diversity numbers for that year were incomplete, but it appears that the majority of students (approximately 70%) identified as white. By Fall 2020 enrollment and diversity increased as follows:

	Fall 2020
Asian	4.2%
Black	2.1%
Hawaiian/PI	2.1%
Latinx	25%
Unknown	8.3%
White	58.3%
Total Enrollment	48 (100%)

Faculty:

Currently, the MSRL has seven faculty members: one tenured associate professor and five lecturer faculty. The program chair has a Ph.D. in Language, Literacy, and Culture. The reading coordinator has a master's degree in Child and Adolescent Literacy and an Ed.D in Organizational Leadership. Of the remaining five faculty, one has a master's degree in education and a Ed.D in Educational Leadership with an emphasis in early education. Another faculty member has a Ed.D in Education Equity. Another faculty member is a graduate from this program and has her master's in Reading. And lastly, a faculty member has a master's in reading and an Ed.D in Educational Leadership with an emphasis in Educational Psychology. The faculty has a wealth of experience in reading, leadership, language, culture, and education equity.

Staff:

During AY22-23, the coordinator managed most clerical needs, with the assistance of Extension and CEAS' collaborative staffing model. As the program has expanded, the coordinator's workload has expanded to meet the needs of the increased student load and a staff admission coordinator provides program support.

Resources: Request for a tenure line faculty member with an advanced degree and experience in Reading and Literacy.

Assessment: See below

Other: Honor Received: In both 2020 and 2021, Cal State East Bay’s MSRL Program was ranked #3 in the national “Top 20 List of Master’s in Reading and Literacy” by www.bestvalueschools.org

II. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT

Overview: For AY22-23, The MSRL maintained the four Program Learning Objectives (PLO) adopted for the preceding five-year review cycle, which concluded with AY 20-21. All PLOs were assessed annually prior to COVID-19, which prevented assessment in clinical settings, e.g., PLOs 3 and 4. PLOs will be reviewed in AY22-23, as COVID-19 allows.

A. Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) and Alignment to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO)

PLO1. 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; (ILO 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6)

PLO2. 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; (ILO 1, 2, and 6)

PLO3. 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; (ILO 1, 3, and 6)

PLO4. 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 (ILO 1, 2, and 6)

Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in AY20-21

PLO 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

PLO3: 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; (ILO 1, 3, and 6)

ILO 1: Written Communication

ILO 2: Critical Thinking

Note: In AY 21-22, the MSRL program assessed PLO2. It should be noted that ILOs 1 (Critical Thinking) and 2 (Written Communication) were also both assessed using the same assignment and rubric for PLO 2. These three learning outcomes (ILO1, ILO2, and PLO1) are all well aligned and the assessment used is significantly robust and lends itself well to the assessment of all three.

B. Summary of Assessment Process

For ILO1, ILO3, PLO1

Instrument: Continued use of Program-developed Analytic multiple criteria-trait rubric; five (5) criteria across 1-to-4 scale (4 being highest proficiency score); total points = 20 (see rubric in **APPENDIX A** at end of this report)

Task: In a 3-5 page paper, select, summarize, and synthesize multiple (3-5) peer reviewed research articles or reports on early literacy acquisition, processes, studies, and/or methodologies.

Sampling: Two cohorts of MSRL students enrolled in TED 660: Research Methods I; $n = 18$ (SP21) and $n = 19$ (SU 21).

Sample

Characteristics: Since all students must take 660, this sample includes all students in the program in AY 19-20

Data Collected: Final Course Paper for TED 660

Prompt:

In this assignment, you will practice the selecting, analyzing, and synthesize peer-reviewed research into a cohesive scholarly paper on a topic related to early literacy. Submission should be at least 3-5 pages; a graduate-level, scholarly essay; APA formatted; and mechanically flawless.

Avoid quotations in short APA papers; demonstrate your ability to summarize and synthesize in your own words. Reference the rubric for this assignment before and during writing.

Collector

Evaluator: TED 660 Course Instructor

Data

Analysis: Data were totaled for each Research Report Rubric category and summarized by cohort in Tables 1 and 2 below. In addition, for year-over-year comparison purposes, data from the 18-19 ILO Report are found summarized in Table 3

Table 1: AY20-21 Data: Spring 2021 Cohort ($n = 18$)

Criteria	Total Students Per Raw Score $n = 18$				ave
	1	2	3	4	
Clear, concise introduction with solid thesis statement that orients reader to purpose of the paper	-	-	2	16	3.89
Supporting information from 3-5 topic appropriate peer-reviewed journal articles that are recent or seminal	-	-	1	17	3.94
Clear, focused, discussion aligned to thesis and supported by analysis and synthesis of articles.	-	-	1	17	3.94
Focused, articulate, relevant conclusion	-	-	1	17	3.94
Scholarly essay written in Standard Edited English, with no distracting mechanical or other errors; properly APA formatted	-	1	1	16	3.89

Table 2: AY20-21 Data Summer 2021 Cohort ($n = 19$)

Criteria	Total Students Per Raw Score $n = 19$				ave
	1	2	3	4	
Clear, concise introduction with solid thesis statement that orients reader to purpose of the paper	-	-	-	19	4.0
Supporting information from 3-5 topic appropriate peer-reviewed journal articles that are recent or seminal	-	-	-	19	4.0
Clear, focused, discussion aligned to thesis and supported by analysis and synthesis of articles.	-	-	-	19	4.0
Focused, articulate, relevant conclusion	-	-	3	16	3.84
Scholarly essay written in Standard Edited English, with no distracting mechanical or other errors; properly APA formatted	-		5	15	3.74

Table 3: Comparison to AY18-19 Data: Spring 2020 Cohort ($n = 18$)

Criteria	Total Students Per Raw Score $n = 18$				ave
	1	2	3	4	
Clear, concise introduction with solid thesis statement that orients reader to purpose of the paper	-	-	1	17	3.94
Supporting information from 3-5 topic appropriate peer-reviewed journal articles that are recent or seminal	-	-	1	17	3.94
Clear, focused, discussion aligned to thesis and supported by analysis and synthesis of articles.	-	-	1	17	3.94

Focused, articulate, relevant conclusion	-	-	1	17	3.94
Scholarly essay written in Standard Edited English, with no distracting mechanical or other errors; properly APA formatted	-	1	1	16	3.83

C. Summary of Assessment Results

Main Findings:

The results of the assessments indicate maintenance of the substantial year-over-year improvement from AY 18-19 in mastering PLO1 and ILO 1, 2. We attribute this to the implementation of recommendations made in previous CAPR reports, but most especially to a marked increase in the frequency and intensity of individualized student academic advising/tutorials (see discussion that follows).

To improve student success in this program and ILO assessment, the AY 18-19 report included three recommendations, including a self-paced module on APA, an assignment in which a sample paper would be analyzed, and providing a list of on-campus and other writing resources. In AY 19-20, two of the recommendations were implemented: providing information about available writing resources (e.g., on-campus, OWL Purdue for APA, etc.) and reviewing a sample paper. The APA self-paced module was not implemented; rather, the program significantly increased advisor meetings at several points during the term (4-6 times on average) with students to discuss their draft papers. At these meetings, the advisor provided individualized formative feedback on content and style, along with targeted APA instruction.

Table 3 above shows data from AY 18-19 for the SP19 cohort. Two years out, scores across the board for two cohort recipients of the intensive advising and sample paper review reveal dramatic improvement (see Tables 1 and 2 above). While students find the sample paper review orienting and helpful, the preponderance of students have provided unsolicited feedback that cite the one-to-one meetings as having a strong positive effect on their ability to meet the challenging demands of scholarly writing. Feedback includes an awareness of and appreciation for the significant extra time this requires of faculty. Given the successful outcomes the data suggest and the effects on student persistence to the degree, the program will continue the intensive advising model.

Recommendations for Program Improvement:

Continue the intensive advising model for writing course papers and the literature review. Revisit 662 to ensure all students are demonstrating an understanding of the culture of literacy and how this impacts the school community.

Next step for Closing the Loop:

At this juncture, there is no evidence of a meaningful “loop” left to close. Thus, we will continue the intensive advising model for writing course papers and the literature review and monitor year-over-year assessment results.

D. Assessment Plans for Next Year

We will continue to assess ILO one. In addition, it should be noted that the program has strong DEI elements, modeled and fostered by well-trained and experienced faculty and evident in program courses. We have developed a new diversity assessment for PLO3, ILO3 and first data will be included in next year’s annual report.

III. DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM DATA & RESOURCE REQUESTS

A. Discussion of Trends & Reflections

There continues to be an **increase in the demand for qualified literacy interventionists at the classroom and school level**. In previous reports, likely reasons for this trend were given: 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. These trends continue.

Of equal importance, and as program growth would attest, there continues to be **increased interest in accessible and dynamic interactive online instruction, both of which the MSRL delivers**. 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 historically non- or underserved populations of educators.**

B. Request for Resources:

Request for a tenure line faculty member with an advanced degree and experience in literacy.

Appendix A

TED 693 Master's Project Rubric

Criteria	1	2	3	4	Weight
Clear, concise introduction with solid thesis statement that orients reader to purpose of the paper	Little or no evidence of clear, concise introduction with solid thesis statement that orients reader to purpose of the paper	Partial or minimal evidence of clear, concise introduction with solid thesis statement that orients reader to purpose of the paper	Clear evidence of clear, concise introduction with solid thesis statement that orients reader to purpose of the paper	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of clear, concise introduction with solid thesis statement that orients reader to purpose of the paper	
Supporting information from 3-5 topic appropriate peer-reviewed journal articles that are recent or seminal	Little or no evidence of supporting information from 3-5 topic appropriate peer-reviewed journal articles that are recent or seminal	Partial or minimal evidence of supporting information from 3-5 topic appropriate peer-reviewed journal articles that are recent or seminal	Clear evidence of articulate explanation of supporting information from 3-5 topic appropriate peer-reviewed journal articles that are recent or seminal	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of articulate explanation of supporting information from 3-5 topic appropriate peer-reviewed journal articles that are recent or seminal	
Clear, focused, discussion aligned to thesis and supported by analysis and synthesis of articles.	Little or no evidence of explanation of discussion aligned to thesis and supported by analysis and synthesis of articles.	Partial or minimal evidence of discussion aligned to thesis and supported by analysis and synthesis of articles.	Clear evidence of discussion aligned to thesis and supported by analysis and synthesis of articles.	Clear, consistent, and convincing evidence of discussion aligned to thesis and supported by analysis and synthesis of articles.	
Focused, articulate, relevant conclusion	Little or no evidence of focused, articulate, relevant conclusion	Partial or minimal evidence of focused, articulate, relevant conclusion	Clear evidence of understanding of focused, articulate, relevant conclusion	Clear, consistent, convincing evidence of focused, articulate, relevant conclusion	
Scholarly essay written in Standard Edited English, with no distracting mechanical or other errors; properly APA formatted	Little or no evidence of sound mechanics, scholarly voice, and/or APA formatting; work does not meet graduate-level writing expectations	Partial or minimal evidence of sound mechanics, scholarly voice, and APA formatting; work may not meet graduate-level writing expectations	Clear evidence of nearly flawless mechanics, scholarly voice, and APA formatting; work meets graduate-level writing expectations	Clear, consistent, convincing evidence of flawless mechanics, scholarly voice, and APA formatting; work clearly meets graduate-level writing expectations	