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Category 1: Program Design & Curriculum Standards

Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale, and Coordination

Each program of professional preparation is coordinated effectively in accordance with a cohesive design that has a cogent rationale.

Please note that information in italics represents changes or modifications to the program that have been made since its approval in 2001.

Any appendices (Lettered A-V) that are mentioned in the original program description are not attached to this report.

Any appendices that are related to program modifications (Numbered 1-26) are included with this report.

In order to be well-prepared as teachers, candidates need to experience programs that are:

1A) designed cohesively on the basis of a sound rationale

The University of La Verne Reading Certificate Program and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program are designed to provide candidates with opportunities for the careful building of knowledge, skills, and abilities related to the assessment, instruction, and evaluation of literacy skills for children in grades K-12.

As indicated in the Reading and Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools, reading/language arts and related disciplines are “the beneficiaries of an abundance of converging research that produces a professional knowledge base related to fostering and sustaining competence in the language arts, particularly beginning reading” (p.3). The charge to provide our educational leaders with ways to use the knowledge base “responsibly and strategically to ensure that all children will graduate with the knowledge and skills that allow them to access and employ the power of the printed word” (p. 4) is one which the university accepts.

RATIONALE FOR THE DESIGN

It is our intention that the first four courses, which include 16 units of coursework and fieldwork, meet the state Standards of Program and Quality Effectiveness
related to the Reading Certificate. Once candidates have completed these requirements, they are prepared to enter the Reading and Language Arts Credential Program, which consists of an additional five classes, or 19 units of coursework and fieldwork. Again, our goal is to ensure that these classes meet the Standards for the credential.

Since the approval of the program in 2001, the certificate and credential programs have undergone some substantive changes. First of all, one class was added to the certificate program (RDG 516) to provide a stronger bridge between RG 510 and RDG 517. The need for a class that emphasized comprehension strategies following the first course (RDG 510—phonemic awareness, alphabetic principle, word recognition) and RDG 514 (assessment) became immediately clear. Therefore, a fifth course was added to the certificate requirements, RDG 516. Candidates then took RDG 517 (children’s literature) and RDG 518 (ESL methodology) as originally outlined.

By 2007, it had become clear that it was more manageable for candidates to complete the reading certificate program in one year so that they could apply for reading coach and specialist positions in districts by the fall of each school year. Therefore, RDG 517 was reconfigured into the credential part of the program, with aspects of high quality children’s literature being integrated into the four certificate courses and then highlighted more fully in the credential portion of the program.

Both programs are constructed on the basis of the Guiding Principles which informed the development of the Reading and Language Arts Framework; the overall design is governed by our belief that candidates will acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities over time, given learning opportunities that are appropriate, effective, and carefully-scaffolded.

The Reading Certificate is designed to comprise the first half of the full Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program. The "nesting" of content and experiences related to the Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness (with Standards 2-11 providing the basis for more advanced work in Standards 12-20) allows candidates to apply coursework obtained in pursuit of a certificate toward completion of the full credential.

**Guiding Principles**

The ULV program design is based upon the following principles:

A) the importance of a balanced, comprehensive program;
B) an emphasis on the idea that students must be fluent readers at least by the end of the third grade;

C) a focus on the important skills, concepts, and strategies that students must be able to use after the third grade;

D) guidance to ensure that all educators and learners understand that specific skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking must be taught and learned;

E) the promotion of a preventive rather than remedial approach;

F) the assumption that all learners will work toward the same standards, but with the recognition that not all learners will acquire skills and knowledge at the same rate;

G) the importance of addressing the full range of learners in the classroom;

H) the assumption that virtually all students can learn to read.

CERTIFICATE

The four classes in the Certificate Program consist of READING 510, READING 514, READING 517, & READING 518. Full descriptions of the courses are contained in the syllabi (appendices A, C, E, and G). A grid which contains an overview of the fieldwork requirements for each class is located in Appendix I.

The current 2009-2010 classes in the Certificate Program currently include READING 510, READING 514, READING 516, & READING 518. All of the candidates’ fieldwork (tutorial experiences with children) now occurs during the 4.5 hour weekly class period in the Literacy Center where they tutor children one-on-one under the supervision of their professors. Each course dropped to 3 units (instead of 4) when the fieldwork became embedded.

When analyzing the graduate reading program in 2001—and seeking to find ways to strengthen the fieldwork model—full-scale efforts were made to develop a Literacy Center, where all candidates could carry out most, if not all, of their fieldwork requirements under the auspices of their instructors for the program. (Some fieldwork is completed outside of the classroom for RDG 530, to be described in the credential section of Part I of this report.)

In this way, it would become assured that candidates would receive guidance from experts with practical experience and theoretical, research-based backgrounds as they worked with the fieldwork children from the community,
hereafter referred to as “tutees.” They could benefit from hands-on experiences with immediate feedback to ascertain that the tutorial processes were as effective as possible.

An overview of the courses for the certificate and credential is provided in Appendix 1. The specific tutorial requirements (T) and the grades and other characteristics of the tutees to be provided services for each class are listed in Appendix 2. Information about the Literacy Center in general is offered in Appendix 4.

Starting in the fall term of 2008, the overall program (certificate and credential) which totaled 33 units (36 including a master’s degree) was reduced to 27 units (30 with a master’s degree). This is because candidates desired to complete certification(s) in reading in order to apply for reading coach and specialist positions in their districts by the fall of each year (e.g., for the certificate to be completed by the end of the first year and for the credential to be completed by the end of the second year).

Requirements

READING 510 (Literacy Instruction and Methodology)

This course (3 units plus 1 unit of fieldwork) is designed to provide the candidate with opportunities to translate literacy theory, research, and assessment results into instructional practices that will effectively help children to become proficient readers; to engage in and reflect upon these practices; and to develop professionally by sharing the ongoing results of these interactions and personal/professional reflections related to their effectiveness.

This class develops the “balanced literacy perspective” as candidates work with beginning readers who are developing a variety of emergent literacy skills. The “proficient reader process” is highlighted so that candidates may recognize the sequential development of skills that entail learning to read in grades 1-3. In addition, different types of intervention approaches (individual, small group, published program) are introduced.

The course is now 3 units with fieldwork requirements embedded.

The fieldwork portion of the course, two 10-hour tutorials (one with a beginning, struggling reader, and one with an older non-reader), offers participants authentic school site experiences in which they develop skills in the planning and delivery of appropriate instructional activities, based on informal and formal assessments of reading and writing. For each tutorial, a “Literary Mentor” (an experienced teacher who has taught full-time for more than three years) oversees the
candidate, participating in at least 2-3 of the tutorial sessions, observing two formal lessons, and determining whether the candidate’s performance is satisfactory by way of a written evaluation. Because candidates are working with students at two different levels, it is likely that they will be located at two different school sites and therefore have two separate mentors.

Each candidate tutors one beginning reader (grades 1-3) for ten hours in the Literacy Center. Tutoring occurs from 4-5:15 PM on the assigned course evening for RDG 510, and then class runs from 5:45-8:45 PM.

Because the tutoring is done at the Literacy Center, candidates receive immediate feedback as they tutor, ensuring the appropriateness of assessments, lesson objectives, and reading/writing strategy instruction. In addition, since the instructors oversee the tutorial process, there is a more direct match between candidate learning outcomes and the fieldwork process.

READING 514 (Literacy Assessment and Diagnosis)

This course (3 units plus one unit of fieldwork) focuses on the evaluation of the emergent, developing, and remedial reader and offers participants a wide variety of diagnostic and prescriptive techniques in reading. Participants survey and critique formal and informal assessment tools, both published and teacher-made; they learn that evaluation is a process that is interwoven with reading on a daily basis, not simply an end product.

The course is now 3 units with fieldwork requirements embedded.

The fieldwork component gives participants an opportunity to assume the multifaceted roles and responsibilities of diagnosticians as they assess two different students individually (ten hours each), one a beginning, struggling reader (grades 1-3) and the other an intermediate, struggling reader (grades 4-12). Using a wide variety of evaluative tools, materials, and procedures, they plan an appropriate and effective instructional program for each, as suited to the students’ identified strengths and weaknesses. The fieldwork requirement is satisfied through a comprehensive experience in which the participant works with the selected students individually.

Each candidate tutors one struggling intermediate reader (grades 4-6) for ten hours in the Literacy Center. Tutoring occurs from 4-5:15 PM on the assigned course evening for RDG 510, and then class runs from 5:45-8:45 PM.

Because the tutoring is done at the Literacy Center, candidates receive immediate feedback as they tutor, ensuring the appropriateness of assessments, lesson objectives, and reading/writing strategy instruction. In addition, since the
instructors oversee the tutorial process, there is a more direct match between candidate learning outcomes and the fieldwork process.

**READING 516 (Individualization of Reading Instruction)—Added in 2001**

This course was developed to assist candidates in assessing students’ needs and weaknesses in the areas of reading comprehension, critical thinking, and writing development, providing appropriate instruction, and evaluating the effectiveness of this instruction. It is entitled “individualization of instruction” because candidates learn, through course readings and assignments and practical implementation in the tutorial component, to work with a wide range of diverse students for whom effective instruction is essential. Diversity is approached in terms of learners’ wide range of differences in culture, language, attitude, learning styles, specific learning disabilities, and background knowledge. (Please see CCTC’s response to our decision to add RDG 516, Appendix 3).

The course is 3 units with fieldwork requirements embedded.

Each candidate tutors one struggling intermediate reader (grades 4-8) for ten hours in the Literacy Center. Tutoring occurs from 4-5:15 PM on the assigned course evening for RDG 516, and then class runs from 5:45-8:45 PM.

Because the tutoring is done at the Literacy Center, candidates receive immediate feedback as they tutor, ensuring the appropriateness of assessments, lesson objectives, and reading/writing strategy instruction. In addition, since the instructors oversee the tutorial process, there is a direct match between candidate learning outcomes and the fieldwork process.

**READING 517 (Literature and Literacy)—Moved to Credential Level, 2008**

This course (3 units plus one unit of fieldwork) focuses on the study of classic and contemporary literature for children and adolescents; its relationship to social values and aesthetic standards; the evaluation of literature and literature curricula used within classrooms and school libraries; and the instructional strategies and presentational methods used to stimulate personalized and creative responses to literature. As a wide variety of genres and literary elements are introduced, candidates learn specific ways to guide and support developing readers as they engage in the study of literature and to encourage them to read independently as they progress toward the goal of becoming lifelong readers. Notable authors and award-winning books, as well as current research in the field of children’s literature, are presented.

The course is now 3 units with fieldwork embedded; however, it has been moved to the credential portion of the program with a new number: RDG 521.
As part of the effort to streamline the coursework so that candidates could complete the certificate within one year of starting the program and to coincide with a fall timeframe in order to be certified within their districts, RDG 517 was considered for repositioning in the program.

Because a good deal of quality literature is introduced during the certificate portion of the program (RDG 510, RDG 514, RDG 516, and RDG 518), recommendations were made by the Reading Advisory Committee, as well as by many of the candidates and professors, to move RDG 517 to the credential level.

The fieldwork portion of the course gives candidates the opportunity to work for 10 hours with two-four struggling, “reluctant readers” so that they can develop their ability to present a wide variety of literary genres and elements to children who need motivational support in the area of reading. As each participant works within a school fieldwork setting with students, in collaboration with a Literacy Support Person (librarian, media specialist, resource center specialist, or reading and language arts specialist), (s)he also has the experience of doing an informal evaluation of the literature curriculum in that setting (10 hours at the school site), based on guidelines presented in class.

Each candidate tutors one “reluctant” learner (grades 2-8) for ten hours in the Literacy Center. Tutoring occurs from 4-5:15 PM on the assigned course evening for RDG 521, and then class runs from 5:45-8:45 PM. Please see more comprehensive description of RDG 521 under the Credential section of Standard 1.

READING 518 (Concept Development and Language Acquisition)

This course (3 units plus 1 unit of fieldwork), is designed to help candidates develop an understanding of primary (L1) and second (L2) language acquisition processes and their concomitant relationship(s) to concept formation and literacy. The course pursues the logical movement from language to reading/writing, including the many variables that contribute to successful experiences in the acquisition of language and the development of fluent literacy behaviors. Strategies for the development of background knowledge, academic language, concept formation, and vocabulary are specifically addressed, and perspectives on developmental, linguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic influences are presented. Particular attention is paid to ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic differences among learners.

The course is now 3 units with fieldwork embedded.
The fieldwork portion of the course, a tutorial with an ELL student (ten hours), a language sample data collection assignment (5 hours), and a conversational style analysis (5 hours), offers participants authentic experiences in which they focus on language and literacy development. Through interactive activities with fluent and ELL students and related class discussions, candidates broaden their understanding of the various influences that affect students’ learning and the strategies that can support their development in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. They also add to their repertoire of instructional support strategies for English Language Learners and become cognizant of many different components of sheltered instruction.

*Each candidate tutors one English learner (grades 3-8) for ten hours in the Literacy Center. Tutoring occurs from 4-5:15 PM on the assigned course evening for RDG 518, and then class runs from 5:45-8:45 PM.*

*Because the tutoring is done at the Literacy Center, candidates receive immediate feedback as they tutor, ensuring the appropriateness of assessments, lesson objectives, and reading/writing strategy instruction. In addition, since the instructors oversee the tutorial process, there is a more direct match between candidate learning outcomes and the fieldwork process.*

**Sequence of Courses**

**RDG 510**, the first class in the series, introduces candidates to a comprehensive range of literacy strategies. Through extensive course readings and fieldwork with a struggling, beginning reader and an older reader, they develop a large cadre of instructional strategies. They also utilize a variety of assessments to inform their instructional decisions. Candidates learn the difference between working with struggling, beginning readers and non-readers and come to understand the contrast between a preventive and remedial approach. Through supervision by their “Literacy Mentors,” they receive feedback and clarification on their assessment and instructional decisions as they interact with their fieldwork students. In addition, in this course, candidates are introduced to some basic classroom intervention models.

*Candidates in RDG 510 work with one beginning reader in grades 1-3 and receive timely, explicit feedback from their professors (rather than from Literacy Mentors, as originally designed). They also have the opportunity to engage in classroom discussions with their colleagues after the tutorial sessions end. This allows them additional options for recommendations, modifications, and ideas for future tutorial sessions. The classroom discussions take place during the FW SEM portions of each class session, listed in the syllabi (contained in Part II of this report.) Many informal assessments are introduced, along with the Ekwall*
Shanker Informal Reading Inventory, and the assessment process is highlighted as the basis upon which candidates set instructional objectives and plan lessons.

This is the ideal first course for candidates to take, as it focuses on the emergent reader/writer and the relationship between alphabet knowledge and phonemic awareness as they relate to the development of word recognition strategies and beginning writing/spelling. Assessments for sight words, phonics, structural analysis, spelling, and writing are presented to candidates and then administered to the tutees during the tutorial component of the class.

RDG 514 (Literacy Assessment and Diagnosis), the second class, is designed to enhance candidates’ abilities to use formal and informal assessment tools. Their fieldwork includes the assessment of a beginning, struggling reader and an intermediate struggling reader. Through course readings and demonstrations, candidates build on the beginning knowledge of assessment that they gained in RDG 510 and become more proficient diagnosticians. They also learn new instructional strategies in this course, as well as knowledge about state-approved intervention programs. This information, coupled with learnings from RDG 510, can be drawn upon to create a successful assessment profile for each fieldwork student at the end of RDG 514, which includes instructional recommendations and intervention suggestions.

This course is designed to connect logically and strategically to RDG 510 in that when they begin RDG 514, candidates possess a beginning repertoire of literacy assessments and strategies, particularly in the areas of phonemic awareness and word recognition, spelling, and beginning writing, which they can then build upon further as they learn additional assessments and strategies in the “assessment” class (RDG 514).

In RDG 514, candidates learn to administer a wide variety of informal and formal assessments (including the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Survey Test) in order to determine what goals to set for their tutees. There is a particular focus on the issue of assessment in this class.

Candidates tutor one struggling intermediate learner in grades 4-6 and receive timely, explicit feedback from their professors. The primary focus is on matching assessment needs identified through testing and state standards to appropriate instructional objectives for their tutees. They can then utilize the strategies taught in RDG 510 and RDG 514 to plan effective lessons.

RDG 516 (Individualization of Reading Instruction), the third class, was developed after CCTC approval of the program in order to bridge a perceived gap after the first two classes. Because of the emphasis on emergent reading in
RDG 510, there did not seem to be sufficient time to address comprehension instruction in enough depth, even with some comprehension strategies being taught in RDG 514.

Therefore, in RDG 516, candidates come to understand the processes which lead to comprehending and composing and the variables that affect them (e.g., background knowledge, academic language, vocabulary/concept development). Course instructors model and demonstrate a wide variety of instructional strategies in comprehension, vocabulary development, and writing, which the candidates, in turn, use with their tutees as appropriate.

Candidates tutor one struggling intermediate learner in grades 4-8 and receive timely, explicit feedback from their instructors. The primary focus is on matching assessment needs identified through testing and state standards to appropriate instructional objectives for their tutees. They can then utilize the strategies taught in RDG 510, RDG 514, and this class to plan effective lessons that help tutees to improve in the targeted areas of need and to build on further in their areas of strength. By the time candidates have completed RDG 516, they can see the entire range of emergent “learning to read” skills through “reading to learn” skills.

RDG 517 (Literature and Literacy), the third class, offers candidates a broader view of literature genres and quality reading materials. While students are introduced to decodable texts, predictable texts, basal readers, leveled readers, and wordless picture books in RDG 510, in this class they explore the wider world of such genres as folk literature, realistic fiction, fantasy, and biography; and they develop additional strategies to motivate and engage students. The importance of independent reading is also emphasized, though it is introduced in the first two courses. Fieldwork experience with a group of reluctant readers, in collaboration with a Literacy Support Person (librarian, media specialist, resource center specialist, or reading and language arts specialist), shows candidates the relationship between reading proficiency and wide reading habits, and highlights the critical need for teachers to address the development of motivation to read, not simply skills.

This class has been moved to the credential level and is taken by candidates in their second year of the program. Please see course description related to standards for the credential.

RDG 518, the last certificate course, offers candidates a comprehensive view of language development, including second language acquisition, and the factors that may come into play as children develop. As candidates work with an ELL student, they apply the theories they learn in this course, while drawing upon the strategies and assessment abilities they developed in the first three classes.
Also, they become more highly skilled at working with students from diverse backgrounds. Though they learn some ESL and sheltered strategies in RDG 510, recognize the limitations of some assessments with learners from different cultural backgrounds in RDG 514, and develop a repertoire of multicultural quality literature resources (including multicultural literature and instructional strategies in RDG 517), they must demonstrate a more solid command of individualized support for English language learners in RDG 518.

RDG 518 (Concept Development and Language Acquisition) is now taken directly after RDG 516 (referred to as the “comprehension class”), as RDG 517 is no longer part of the certificate program. Candidates are exposed to high quality multi-cultural literature in RDG 518 (to be expanded upon additionally in RDG 521 at the Credential level).

Candidates tutor one English learner who is at the “early intermediate” or “intermediate” level of English proficiency based on CELDT scores in grades 2-8 and receive timely, explicit feedback from their instructors. The primary focus is on matching assessment needs identified through testing and state standards with appropriate instructional objectives for their tutees. They can then utilize the strategies taught in RDG 510, RDG 514, and RDG 516 to plan effective lessons that help tutees to improve in the targeted areas of need and to build on further in their areas of strength. There is a particular focus on the issue of instructional planning in this class.

Modifications for English learners are emphasized throughout this class, now that candidates have a solid understanding of assessment and a wide repertoire of strategies from the three previous classes. Candidates are required to use the California ELD standards so that appropriate modifications can be made for diverse language learners, particularly related to reading and writing, though attention is also paid to listening and speaking development, as they are interdependent skills.

The syllabi for the certificate courses (510, 514, 516, and 518) are contained in Part II of this report.

Relationship to Guiding Principles

In all courses, the goal is for candidates to develop the ability to assess skills and deliver instruction effectively within a balanced, comprehensive program (criterion A listed under the Guiding Principles, above). Work with beginning, struggling readers in RDG 510 and struggling, intermediate readers in 514 highlights the need to support students in becoming fluent readers by the end of third grade (criterion B). This objective reflects the promotion of a preventive, rather than a remedial, approach (criterion E). Assigned readings, class demonstrations,
discussions, and fieldwork with struggling, reluctant readers in RDG 517 and struggling intermediate readers in RDG 514 provides candidates with the skills, concepts and strategies that children must be able to use starting in third grade and above (criterion C).

RDG 517 is no longer part of the certificate level course requirements, but candidates have tutorial experiences with children from each of the following grade levels in the certificate courses, including a beginning reader, struggling intermediate learners, and an ELD learner (510, 514, 516, 518): 1-3, 4-6, 4-8, and 2-8). See Appendix 1.

Throughout the program, candidates receive the guidance needed to ensure that they understand that specific skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking must be taught and learned (criterion D). ULV instructors, as well as the Literacy Mentors in RDG 510 and the Literacy Support Persons in RDG 517, demonstrate to candidates that with appropriate support, all students (grades K-12, struggling or non-struggling, proficient or non-readers) can be taught to read (criterion H). Every course contains learning strategies for addressing the full range of learners in the classroom, with a specific focus on the ELL student in RDG 510 and 518 (criterion G). An emphasis on the developmental nature of language and literacy acquisition in all classes supports the perspective that all learners will work toward the same standards, but may not acquire the target skills and knowledge at the same rate (criterion F).

There are no longer Literacy Mentors for the required fieldwork; instead, all candidates are overseen by course instructors during the tutorial portions of each class, as described earlier.

When ULV candidates complete the Certificate Program satisfactorily, they will be well-prepared to work within schools to assist teachers and to adapt reading materials, as appropriate. They will possess the ability to play a consultative role in the selection of materials and programs at the district and county levels and can take leadership responsibility within the context of the school site.

It is more appropriate to say that candidates who earn the Reading Certificate will most likely play consultative roles at their school sites as coaches or teachers of reading or reading intervention programs. District and county level work would follow completion of the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program.

CREDENTIAL

The five classes in the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program consist of EDUCATION 501, EDUCATION 504, READING 520,
READING 525/525F, AND READING 530. Full descriptions of the courses are contained in the syllabi (appendices K, M, O, Q, and S). A grid which contains the fieldwork requirements for each class is located in Appendix U.

There have been several modifications to the credential portion of the program since 2001:

• RDG 525 and 525F were combined into RDG 525, with essentially the same coursework—but a heavier emphasis on the interpretation of literacy research and the technical structures and designs inherent in good studies.

• RDG 525F, which was a separate fieldwork portion, became part of RDG 525, with a tutorial component in the Literacy Center.

• RDG 517 was renumbered as RDG 521, and became the second class in the credential portion of the program, to follow RDG 520. The focus of the class on children’s literature remained the same as described originally in the Certificate portion of the program.

• EDUC 501 and 504, the “measurement” and “research methods” courses, were originally offered to a wide range of candidates in various graduate programs; therefore, the classes included graduate level university candidates from various disciplines. The Reading Advisory Committee and many candidates and instructors felt that there was not enough emphasis on testing and measurement practices within the field of literacy; similarly they believed that candidates in the Credential program should be exposed to more research issues (design, structure of studies, interpretational processes) in literacy, rather than generic research studies in education.

Therefore, EDUC 501 and EDUC 504 became the purview of the Graduate Reading Program in 2005. Instructors from the Graduate Reading Program began to teach them separately to the graduate reading candidates only. They retained their original course numbers at that time.

• However, as instructors within the Credential program became more skilled in teaching EDUC 501 and EDUC 504—they recognized that a continuum had developed: candidates began the process of investigating the themes inherent in testing/measurement in RDG 514 (Certificate level) and continued the process in EDUC 501; after that, they addressed the research content in EDUC 504 and completed it in RDG 525 (Credential level).

Since the four courses were so carefully scaffolded (with some overlap in content), it was decided that EDUC 501 and EDUC 504 could be combined in a new course, RDG 524, which would meld the best of both classes, yet delete
unnecessary redundancy. This course would logically connect RDG 514 and RDG 525, placed between the two. The result was the placement of RDG 524 after RDG 521 and prior to RDG 525.

Requirements

EDUCATION 501 (Educational Assessment)

EDUC 501 gives candidates help in developing and understanding the basic principles of assessing student educational accomplishment (qualitative and quantitative) including, but not limited to, the construction and evaluation of educational and psychological assessment instruments. The class includes information on test interpretation, explores the cognitive bases for selecting and using tests, offers a survey of descriptive statistics, and introduces ethical considerations related to assessment and testing. Candidates are given hands-on experience in the use of selected well-known measurement tests in education and counseling. As part of the course requirements, candidates prepare criterion-referenced test items which distinguish among different levels of the cognitive domain, define and interpret educational and psychological statistical terms and psychometric concepts; and evaluate a standardized educational and psychological test, according to its psychometric characteristics.

*EDUC 501, now as part of RDG 524, contains most of the content original to the course, yet limits the assessment instruments (both quantitative and qualitative) to the field of literacy. In addition, portions of this class which replicated some content in RDG 514 (e.g., the bell curve, stanines, frequency distributions, and percentiles/percentages) are now only briefly reviewed in RDG 524. Other requirements are the same.*

*The course is 3 units with no tutorial fieldwork requirements.*

EDUCATION 504 (Methods of Research)

EDUC 504 presents candidates with salient criteria for the evaluation of research, opportunities to critically analyze representative research, current studies on the nature of scientific thinking, and a survey of methods employed in research, critiques of research, and assigned projects. During the course, candidates are asked to apply criteria in the evaluation of research articles and research design, identify a topic in the area of literacy and review the research literacy on that topic, and develop an appropriate research design for their selected topic.

*EDUC 504, now as part of RDG 524, contains much of the content original to the course, but the assignment for the literature review has been moved to RDG 525 where candidates choose a subject of interest and create a policy presentation to
present to a simulated Board of Education. Some of the research design content has been built into RDG 524, while additional content is presented in RDG 525 to assure the logical flow of content described above.

The course is 3 units with no tutorial fieldwork requirements.

READING 520 (Advanced Methods and Materials)

This course (3 units plus one unit of fieldwork) offers candidates opportunities to develop advanced, professional perspectives on reading and language arts curriculum, instruction and assessment. A wide range of strategies within all areas of literacy (including phonemic awareness, phonics, other word recognition skills, spelling, vocabulary, comprehension, and writing) is highlighted through demonstration and modeling techniques, by which students continue to enhance their own repertoire of techniques to support students of all literacy development levels. They develop their abilities to make instructional decisions, based on research and assessment. The course content also emphasizes the structure of the English language and the relationships among language, spelling, reading and writing.

This course is now 3 units with fieldwork requirements embedded. The content is related to the particular issues that older students with severe reading difficulties face: gaps in skills and strategies, low self-esteem/self-efficacy, motivational challenges, and need for differentiation of instruction. Content includes word recognition (as appropriate for the older learner) vocabulary development, comprehension and metacognitive strategies, writing instruction, and motivational approaches.

The structure of the English language and the relationship among language, spelling, reading, and writing is now addressed at the Certificate level in RDG 510 initially and developed further in RDG 518; then it is re-emphasized in RDG 530 at the Credential level. Phonemic awareness is the purview of earlier courses, as well—and RDG 525 at the Credential level, to be described later.

The fieldwork component gives participants practice in working with classroom literacy teachers (Literacy Partners) and selected target students who need literacy support. Through a combination of collaborative interactions with the classroom teachers and their own abilities to assess, instruct, and evaluate progress, candidates design instruction and intervention lessons via Literacy Support Sessions for two readers: a beginning reader and an older, non-reader (10 hours). To ascertain whether the school-site contexts in which they do their fieldwork are based on a “balanced, comprehensive” literacy perspective, they complete two Literacy Philosophy Evaluations (10 hours) before beginning work with the students.
Each candidate tutors one secondary learner with severe reading difficulty (grades 7-12) for ten hours in the Literacy Center. Tutoring occurs from 4-5:15 PM on the assigned course evening for RDG 520 and then class runs from 5:45-8:45 PM.

Because the tutoring is done at the Literacy Center, candidates receive immediate feedback as they tutor, ensuring the appropriateness of assessments, lesson objectives, and reading/writing strategy instruction. In addition, since the instructors oversee the tutorial process, there is a more direct match between candidate learning outcomes and the fieldwork process.

**RDG 521 (Literature and Literacy, replaces RDG 517, originally at the Certificate level)**

This course (3 units plus one unit of fieldwork) focuses on the study of classic and contemporary literature for children and adolescents; its relationship to social values and aesthetic standards; the evaluation of literature and literature curricula used within classrooms and school libraries; and the instructional strategies and presentational methods used to stimulate personalized and creative responses to literature. As a wide variety of genres and literary elements are introduced, candidates learn specific ways to guide and support developing readers as they engage in the study of literature and to encourage them to read independently as they progress toward the goal of becoming lifelong readers. Notable authors and award-winning books, as well as current research in the field of children’s literature, are presented.

The course is now 3 units with fieldwork embedded.

As part of the effort to streamline the coursework so that candidates could complete the certificate within one year of starting the program and to coincide with a fall timeframe in order to be certified within their districts, RDG 517 was repositioned in the program.

Because a good deal of quality literature is introduced during the certificate portion of the program (RDG 510, RDG 514, RDG 516, and RDG 518), recommendations were made by the Reading Advisory Committee, as well as by many of the candidates and professors, to move RDG 517 to the credential level.

The fieldwork portion of the course gives candidates the opportunity to work for 10 hours with two-four struggling, “reluctant readers” so that they can develop their ability to present a wide variety of literary genres and elements to children who need motivational support in the area of reading. As each participant works within a school fieldwork setting with students, in collaboration with a Literacy
Support Person (librarian, media specialist, resource center specialist, or reading and language arts specialist), (s)he also has the experience of doing an informal evaluation of the literature curriculum in that setting (10 hours at the school site), based on guidelines presented in class.

Each candidate tutors one “reluctant” learner (grades 3-8) for ten hours in the Literacy Center. Tutoring occurs from 4-5:15 PM on the assigned course evening for RDG 521, and then class runs from 5:45-8:45 PM.

This course focuses on the struggling reader who is “reluctant” because of its emphasis on motivational literature and the engaging nature of the activities and strategies presented in the class. Because the tutees for this class may have extreme motivational issues, it was decided that this class would provide the most supportive context for them.

**RDG 522 (Literacy Instruction for Special Needs Learners—Added in 2004 and dropped in 2008)**

For a period of four years, another course, RDG 522, was a part of the Credential sequence. It was offered directly after RDG 520 during 2004-2008. In this class, candidates tutored an RSP child with a specific learning disability and became conversant with the processing disorders that underlay the learning difficulties. Candidates developed instructional strategies and modification techniques in order to meet the needs of these particular learners.

The course, developed after 2001 approval of this program, was dropped from the curriculum in 2008 as a result of the movement to mainstream special education students. It was felt that having candidates tutor only RSP students in RDG 522 was not reflective of the larger educational trend in schools.

Therefore, portions of RDG 522 are being integrated into the other courses, and an expert instructor in the field is being contracted to offer mini-workshops to candidates as they work with RSP students throughout the course of the entire program. It is planned that this instructor will do at least four workshops with candidates to help them assess and plan effective (modified) instruction for students who are identified for an RSP Program at their schools.

Each candidate will be required to work with one RSP student during their 70 hours of tutorial fieldwork. The Literacy Center Coordinator will place the appropriate child with each candidate to meet this requisite.
READING 524 (Educational Assessment /Research Methods)--Added 2008

This course represents the compilation of EDUC 501 and EDUC 504 and the strengthening of the scaffolding of three courses, from the Certificate to the Credential: RDG 514 to RDG 524 to RDG 525. It includes the basic principles of assessment (quantitative and qualitative) as they relate to student educational accomplishment. Validity and reliability are addressed, as well as issues of possible test bias. Further, candidates are introduced to research design methods (experimental, quasi-experimental, and ethnographic) and provided with the basic tenets underlying sampling, instrumentation, and implementation processes for studies.

RDG 525 AND RDG 525F (Reading Research, Theory, and Process; Supervised Fieldwork Experience)

RDG 525 (3 units plus 2 units of supervised fieldwork) provides an in-depth, advanced study of the teaching of reading as a thinking and problem-solving process. Based on current research from highly-respected and valid sources, the course content focuses upon the theoretical underpinnings of reading as a constructive act and includes teaching methodology options; criteria for selection and use of materials; and techniques for the evaluation of methods and materials. Strategies for supporting students whose literacy levels span a wide developmental continuum are discussed, and special considerations involved in providing optimal literacy programs for ELL students are highlighted.

Content in RDG 525 is research-focused. Candidates, after having completed eight courses, are asked to choose an area of interest and to write a policy paper, based on research, including a literature review. The elements of a good study are reviewed (from RDG 524), and the steps for writing a literature review leading to a policy description and stance are provided. Candidates then present their recommendation for the adoption or rejection of a policy to the hypothetical members of the Board of Education.

The fieldwork portion of the course, RDG 525F (30 fieldwork hours), gives participants the opportunity to work with a small group of “proficient” children (including at least two ELL students) so that candidates can develop their ability to present a variety of literacy strategies which support the language and reading/writing development of fluent English-speaking students, as well as English Language Learners. As participants work within their school fieldwork settings and document their instructional practices with the students, they also have the experience of creating and implementing two formal lesson plans, which are observed and evaluated by the ULV Fieldwork Supervisor. (See I-381 for the supervisor’s and candidates’ responsibilities.) Credit is given for the fieldwork
experience and is dependent upon successful completion of READING 525 (a concurrent course) and satisfactory documentation of appropriate instruction during the 30 fieldwork hours and the two formally-observed lessons.

There is no longer a separate fieldwork component entitled RDG 525F, as all fieldwork requirements in the program are now carried out within the Literacy Center. RDG 525 is a 3-unit course, with fieldwork embedded.

Each candidate tutors one beginning, struggling reader (grades 1-3) for ten hours in the Literacy Center. Tutoring occurs from 4-5:15 PM on the assigned course evening for RDG 525, and then class runs from 5:45-8:45 PM.

This is the last opportunity candidates have to work with an emergent reader since their first experience in RDG 510, so it represents an opportunity for them to synthesize all that they have learned in their coursework.

Because the tutoring is done at the Literacy Center, candidates receive immediate feedback as they tutor, ensuring the appropriateness of assessments, lesson objectives, and reading/writing strategy instruction. In addition, since the instructors oversee the tutorial process, there is a more direct match between candidate learning outcomes and the fieldwork process.

READING 530 (Reading Specialist Leadership)

This course (3 units, plus 1 unit of fieldwork) is designed to provide reading specialist candidates with opportunities to learn how to develop effective leadership skills, act as agents of change in their schools and districts, and work constructively with students, peers, parents, and other educationally-oriented personnel and community members. The course focuses on making program, curriculum, instructional, and intervention decisions and on strengthening candidate profiles as teacher-leaders to ensure effective implementation of all parts of their school or district program design. Reading specialist candidates are encouraged to join professional associations and required to develop curriculum vitae to expand career options. They must also attend five conferences while they are in the specialist program in order to remain current with methodologically sound research and its application to classroom practice.

The course is now 3 units with fieldwork requirements embedded.

As part of this course, 20 hours of time are devoted to professional, site-based fieldwork. Candidates develop mini-workshops, based on assessed needs, and make formal presentations to three public school audiences: students, parents, and faculty (10 hours). They also research and distribute information about state-approved language arts programs and analyze the Reading and Language
Arts Framework; finally, they each use the pertinent information they have learned to evaluate a language arts program, including technological components, at a local school site (10 hours).

While there is no tutorial component connected to the course, the original requirements for other kinds of fieldwork remain the same: formal presentations to students, parents, and colleagues; analyses of state-approved language arts programs currently used in schools and a comprehensive evaluation of one of these programs.

In addition, candidates are also required to write a proposal to present at a literacy-related conference (IRA, CRA, CATESOL, etc.) and to have completed the attendance of at least five literacy-related professional conferences.

Leadership styles and qualities are analyzed in this course, along with the roles of the reading coach and reading specialist within a school or school district. Candidates learn how to evaluate published programs and how to work with colleagues and administrators as they develop school literacy programs.

Sequence of Courses

The courses in the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program are designed to build upon the knowledge, skills, and abilities which have been developed and reinforced throughout the Certificate Program.

The new sequence is as follows: RDG 520, RDG 521, RDG 524, RDG 525, and RDG 530.

Certificate candidates are not required to take the full array of test/measurement and research content, so the RDG 521 class remains at the Credential level. Because they have had some introduction to the concepts in RDG 514, however, it seemed more efficient to allow them to continue with the tutorial courses (RDG 520 and RDG 521), followed by RDG 524—but preceding RDG 525 and RDG 530 where knowledge about test/measurements and research is then more comprehensively applied.

EDUC 501 is the in-depth “assessment” course, which is prerequisite to the other content courses in the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Program. It builds on the specific assessment information provided in RDG 514, which focuses specifically on literacy assessment. This class includes information on test interpretation, cognitive bases for the selection and use of tests, descriptive statistics, and legal and ethical considerations related to assessment and testing. Such a knowledge-base is not only important because candidates are learning to function in leadership and decision-making capacities related to the selection and
administration of tests, but also because the information on statistics and psychometrics will be necessary for the required research critique and paper in RDG 525.

**EDUC 501 was integrated into RDG 524 in 2008.**

The next course, **EDUC 504**, presents specific criteria for the evaluation of research and offers candidates experiences with research by asking them to participate in a survey of methods employed in research, to do required critiques of research, and to develop projects in their area of interest (literacy). In order for candidates to understand the content of RDG 520, which includes research design issues, this information must be integrated into candidates’ professional perspectives on research.

**EDUC 501 was integrated into RDG 524 in 2008.**

**RDG 520** presents a more advanced version of RDG 510, in that candidates participate more fully in the demonstration of instructional strategies. As they learn new strategies to build on their repertoire of knowledge gained in the Certificate Program, they model them for colleagues and then incorporate them, as appropriate, into their fieldwork with a beginning reader and an older, non-reader. In addition, the course readings emphasize more sophisticated linguistic elements and in-depth features related to the structure of the language, which build on the beginning concepts candidates learned in RDG 518.

**RDG 520 now focuses on the older reader with severe difficulties.** There is a particular focus on the issue of diversity in this class, as it is defined broadly to include more than just language ethnicity, and culture—but also gender, SES, age, social justice issues, and other possible influences that may lead to students' marginalization in schools. Steps are currently being taken to develop an assignment within RDG 520 that synthesizes what candidates have learned about these kinds of factors and their effect on literacy development. It will be a Reflection Paper with an emphasis on this broader concept of diversity.

Because candidates consider “diversity,” particularly through the lenses of culture, language, ethnicity, and learning disabilities in the courses that precede RDG 520, this course represents a timely placement in the sequence because the idea of “diversity” can be expanded more globally.

In this class, candidates also begin to develop “leadership” perspectives, as they collaborate with their “Literacy Partners” in assessing, setting goals, instructing, and evaluating the progress of their fieldwork students—and as they evaluate their fieldwork settings to ascertain that they represent “balanced literacy” teaching contexts.
The leadership emphasis is present throughout the credential part of the program but is emphasized more strongly now in RDG 530 than in RDG 520.

**RDG 521** (Literature and Literacy) now follows RDG 520 so that candidates can build on their knowledge of assessments and strategies but focus more specifically on using high quality literature to entice reluctant struggling readers to engage more fully in reading and writing practices. Award-winning books (Newberry, Caldecott, etc.) are also presented to candidates and made available as they work with their tutees.

Because a large amount of quality literature is introduced in earlier courses (predictable texts, picture books in RDG 510; chapter books/novels and state recommended literature in RDG 516; multicultural works and graphic novels in RDG 518), the decision to place this course at the credential level was made.

As described in depth in earlier portions of this report, **RDG 524** represents the compilation of EDUC 501 and EDUC 504 and the strengthening of the scaffolding of three courses, from the Certificate to the Credential: RDG 514 to RDG 524 to RDG 525. This continuum should prove to be effective in helping candidates to learn about the principles and theories of assessment and research and then to have opportunities throughout the program to apply them on a continuous basis.

The next class, **RDG 525/525F** offers candidates a clinical experience, in which they are supervised by a ULV-trained Fieldwork Supervisor. The idea of the teaching of reading as a thinking and problem-solving process is emphasized, and candidates are asked to apply a wide range of assessment, instructional, and evaluation techniques as they work with a small group of proficient readers, which includes at least two ELL students. Because of their background in measurement in EDUC 501, candidates should be more proficient at recognizing when assessments may be inappropriate or invalid for use with target students.

The instructional model that is utilized in the fieldwork, the Sheltered Observation Instruction Protocol (SIOP), involves the utilization of a variety of good lesson planning strategies, combined with a high level of structured support for ELL students. This model is a more complex representation of the ELD lesson plan format in RDG 510 and the sheltered lesson plan format in RDG 518. (Written permission to use the Abbreviated SIOP form as an evaluation instrument for the two formally-observed lessons has been granted to ULV by the publisher, Allyn and Bacon, J-382).

**RDG 525**, which replaced RDG 525/525F, is no longer the class in which candidates tutor English learners. Instead, their work with English learners
occurs during RDG 518, as described in the Certificate portion of the program. Instead, RDG 525 is the “research” class that builds on concepts from all coursework but most specifically RDG 514 and RDG 524.

RDG 525 emphasizes the research process more deeply than in any other course. Not only are candidates asked to read research (as is the case in the other courses), but they are asked to critique it and to develop a paper, based on primary and secondary research, which leads to a proposal for their own classroom-based research studies.

The assignment has been modified somewhat but still includes a critique of research in a chosen area and a literature review designed to promote a position related to an instructional stance, based on the research. This is represented in the policy paper and presentation. There is a particular focus on technology in this class, as the presentations are done in power-point format and presented to colleagues and the instructor.

The information candidates have learned in EDUC 501 (related to educational measurement) and in EDUC 504 (related to research) is prerequisite to their understanding of the RDG 525 course content. Because they engage in research critiques, they must have an in-depth understanding of measurement instruments and procedures and some knowledge of statistics, which they gain in EDUC 501. They must also recognize problems with internal and external validity, which deals with research designs, the primary content of EDUC 504.

Again, the combination of EDUC 501 and EDUC 504 is reflected in RDG 524, which is required before candidates take RDG 525.

Finally, the focus on psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic foundations of reading and writing is highlighted heavily in RDG 525, though it is initially presented in RDG 517 and RDG 518. Candidates analyze the concept of “classroom culture” as it relates to the in-school progress and success of students who are linguistically, ethnically, and culturally diverse.

This is still true in RDG 525. Candidates encounter “classroom culture” literature and analyze a broad range of educational, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic variables (building on the idea of diversity in RDG 520) that may affect learning.

However, this course is typically referred to as the “research” class because candidates investigate a policy issue and justify its adoption or deletion based on information from research; they then write a literature review, forming the basis for a presentation on this policy. There is a particular emphasis on technology in this class, so the presentation is required in power-point format with specific guidelines to follow.
The last required course, **RDG 530**, is designed to provide a forum for the culmination of all skills and abilities acquired in the program, with a strong focus on the development of candidates as professional leaders in the field of literacy. It offers various opportunities for candidates to engage in program, curricular, instructional, and intervention decision-making processes and evaluation. They are asked to choose state-approved published programs to present (and informally evaluate) during the course so that they can more fully develop their knowledge of intervention options beyond what has been learned in earlier courses.

In their professional capacities as literacy leaders, each candidate must also carry out three in-service presentations for public school audiences, based on assessed needs: parents, faculty, and students. They also do a formal evaluation of a targeted school-site language arts program, including technological components, to determine if it is comprehensive, basic, or partial.

*In place of doing one formal evaluation of a school site program, candidates are asked to present programs to their colleagues throughout the class so that all candidates can see examples of partial, basic, comprehensive, and intervention programs. The analysis of each program is first carried out by the presenter—but then also continued by colleagues in more detail as the presentations occur.*

Because candidates evaluate programs, they utilize the knowledge gained in earlier classes related to assessment and instruction. Having analyzed the *English and Language Arts Framework* in various classes throughout both the Certificate and Credential courses, they have become familiarized with its contents and can apply the criteria contained in it to program evaluation.

*At the end of this course, candidates are asked to submit five evaluations of conferences and/or workshops that they have attended during their participation in the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program. They are also required to develop a current Curriculum Vita (CV) and are asked to submit a proposal to present at a literacy conference; they are encouraged to follow through with the actual presentations upon acceptance.*

*Being a strong leader is the ideal topic for a last class prior to having candidates take the Reading Specialist Competency Exam, which is an assessment that reflects candidate knowledge. Candidates can see that being an effective mentor for others entails not only a broad educational knowledge base—but also personal and professional characteristics that engender respect from others and lead to their effectiveness as leaders.*
Relationship to Guiding Principles

At this advanced level of preparation, candidates are adept at recognizing whether literacy programs contain all of the necessary elements to be considered balanced and comprehensive (criterion A). In RDG 520, they evaluate the fieldwork setting contexts to determine if they accurately reflect the balanced literacy perspective. In RDG 525, they are supervised by a ULV-trained Fieldwork Supervisor, who ensures that the fieldwork occurs at a school which supports the balanced literacy philosophy. In RDG 530, candidates evaluate a school program to ascertain that it is both comprehensive and balanced and to make recommendations for improvement, if it is not.

RDG 520 no longer includes a critique of one school program but instead an in-depth literature review on a current and significant literacy policy issue in schools.

RDG 520 offers candidates an additional opportunity to learn skills and strategies for working with beginning readers so that the children will have additional support in becoming fluent readers by the end of third grade (criterion B), a preventive approach (criterion E). Fieldwork, course readings, and class demonstrations and discussions allow them to interact with the older, non-reader with a higher level of effectiveness in the teaching of reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills than they were able to do in RDG 510 (criterion C). These experiences also prepare them for working with more proficient readers in RDG 525/525F.

RDG 520 does build on what candidates have learned about the proficient reading process and the challenges that face struggling students as they fall behind. It is logical that after working with children in RDG 510 in grades 1-3 and then children (struggling) in grades 4-8 in RDG 514 and RDG 516 that they will be able to understand the influences that may cause learners to progress more slowly than others. Their interaction with English learners in RDG 518 further emphasizes these kinds of factors (especially related to language and background knowledge. At this point, it is appropriate that candidates gain knowledge about older students with severe reading difficulties, as they now have the background necessary to understand what effective instruction for these learners must include.

As candidates progress through the program, they develop deeper levels of understanding about how students learn to read. Assignments and fieldwork lessons are designed to incorporate the receptive skills of listening and reading and the expressive skills of speaking and listening (criterion D). In addition, candidates work with a full range of learners (beginning, struggling readers;
beginning readers; older non-readers; proficient readers; and ELL students. (And, through course discussions, they learn how to work with mainstreamed learning disabled children.)

They now work with an RSP student at least once throughout the program and are supported by the consultant who offers four workshops to the candidates on the special needs learner.

Through these many experiences candidates develop a broader understanding of how to provide differentiated instruction and recognize that all students are capable of learning to read if given the appropriate motivation, instruction, and support (criteria G and H), even though they may acquire skills and knowledge at different rates (criterion F).

ULV candidates, in developing their expertise throughout these classes, become well-informed about the research which supports proficient reading behavior and about the intervention options available to struggling students. They attain more confidence in their own levels of knowledge and abilities and can begin to take on leadership responsibilities.

The culminating activity of the Credential Program, which follows RDG 530, is the administration of the Reading Specialist Competency Exam. Candidates are given 8 broad topics as a parameter for their review and then during the exam answer five essay questions related to five of the areas (with topics rotated from cohort to cohort). Candidates must have a minimal score of 15 points in each of the five areas, and their score from all five must total at least 80/100 in order for them to pass the exam.

When ULV candidates satisfactorily complete the Reading and Language Arts Credential Program, they will be ready to work with students in multiple settings and to perform multiple roles. They can offer effective assistance and support to classroom teachers; appropriately select and adapt instructional materials; provide staff development and in-service education; assess student progress and monitor achievement; do direct intervention work with students; and finally, work with schools, school districts, and/or County Offices of Education. They will be professional leaders who can contribute a wide variety of skills, abilities and knowledge to the field of literacy.

1B) coordinated effectively in keeping with their intended designs

In order to provide quality preparation for candidates in the certificate and credential programs, it is important that the coordination of field experiences, administrative components, and collaborative interactions is effective and that
there is a high level of consistency between the ULV stated rationale and its relevancy to the contemporary conditions of schooling.

Field experiences

Field experiences throughout the certificate and credential program involve several different formats. The three designs include what might be called the clinical model, the collaborative model, and the support model.

Clinical model

At the certificate level, the clinical model for fieldwork is illustrated in RDG 510, where a “Literacy Mentor” (an experienced teacher who has taught full-time for more than three years) oversees the candidate, participating in at least 2-3 of the tutorial sessions, observing two formal lessons, and determining whether the candidate’s performance is satisfactory by way of a written evaluation. Each Literacy Mentor is paid a stipend, attends a meeting at the beginning of the course, in which the philosophy (including the balanced literacy perspective), goals, and requirements for the course are outlined. During the meeting, participants have the opportunity to clarify roles and responsibilities.

At the credential level, RDG 525/525F represents the “clinical” class. Candidates are supervised by a ULV-trained Fieldwork Supervisor, who has “shadowed” the class (attended each session as an auditor/participant) for one full semester. The supervisor makes three visits to each candidate: one, to determine that the fieldwork placement is appropriate (meets requirements within the context of a balanced literacy philosophy); and two more, to observe them as they work with a small group of proficient readers, including two ELL students, and to formally evaluate the lessons.

The primary model in the ULV Graduate Reading Program (both the Certificate and the Credential level) is a clinical one. As described at the beginning of Part I, candidates now tutor a wide variety of children as they carry out their fieldwork requirements in a one-on-one tutorial setting. Seven classes include ten hours of tutoring each, along with lesson plans, a Diagnostic Report that is sent to the children’s schools, and a Literacy Profile for the parents. All instructors are present to provide immediate guidance and feedback during each tutorial session of each course.

As an “aside,” because of a concern about implying that the program might be potentially viewed as following a “medical model,” where struggling students need to get “better” (instead of altering the context to provide more support to them from the outside), we termed our program facility the Literacy Center, rather than the Literacy Clinic.
Collaborative model

The collaborative model can be seen in RDG 517, a certificate course, where candidates conduct fieldwork experiences with a small group of struggling, reluctant readers at a school site. They work in collaboration with a Literacy Support Person (librarian, media specialist, resource center specialist, or reading and language arts specialist), who observes twice during the fieldwork sessions: once, to observe one of the “assigned” fieldwork requirements (e.g., the “Abbreviated Literary Link” or the “Verbal or Visual Presentation of Literature”); and the second time, to assess the effectiveness of the interactions, materials, and instructional methods. The support person responds by providing feedback and additional suggestions for the use of resources or modifications in lesson presentation and by filling out an evaluation of the candidate’s performance.

At the credential level, the collaborative model operates in RDG 520. Candidates work with two students (a beginning reader and a non-reader) and collaborates with the literacy teachers (Literacy Partners) of these students to set goals, plan instruction, and provide for evaluation. During the third or fourth session of the fieldwork experience (out of 5 sessions), candidates give each teacher an Oral Formative Update on the types of lessons that have been implemented, indicating whether the objectives are being met within the tutorial sessions. At the end of the experience, the candidate and the teacher evaluate the student’s progress together.

Through candidates no longer tutor at school sites, the ULV Literacy Center has formed a partnership with the Bonita Unified School District. The district, in need of staff development in the area of literacy, has asked reading candidates to make presentations on different aspects of reading/writing across multiple grade levels. Therefore, candidates will now be in collaboration with the teachers from this district as they plan for their three required presentations in RDG 530: one to colleagues (other teachers), one to students (not their own), and one to parents.

Assistance model

This model offers candidates opportunities to receive direction, feedback, and recommendations in a wide variety of ways. One way is through classroom interactions, where the instructor presents theories and models for assessment and instruction, providing time for clarification and elaboration. Another way is through the support of the instructor and colleagues during structured Fieldwork Seminar portions of each class, time set aside to discuss problems, issues, strategies, and successes related to fieldwork. A third way is through the use of videotaped instructional segments or tape-recorded diagnostic segments which candidates bring to present and share during class in order to receive feedback and recommendations.
In the certificate program, both RDG 514 and RDG 518 are based on the assistance model. As students engage in tutorial work during the fieldwork experience, they bring to class their fieldwork concerns and questions so that instructor and colleague suggestions can be provided. Candidates also bring an audio-taped segment of their diagnostic activities in RDG 514, and both classes contain Fieldwork Seminar portions, which are dedicated to the discussion, resolution, and support of fieldwork issues.

RDG 530, the last class in the credential program, is also built upon this model. Candidates provide in-service education presentations to three public school audiences (parent, faculty, and student), and they also evaluate a language arts program at a school site. Assistance, support, and feedback is provided to candidates through class content, audience evaluations of their presentations, and discussion with colleagues and their instructor during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the course.

The assistance model now has a different definition since the Literacy Center has been established. The program received a grant from the Parson’s Foundation to invest in observation booths with video recording capabilities. Candidates now videotape specified lessons in literacy while they are working with their tutees; then, the videotapes are used as demonstration lessons for other candidates. In this way, candidates provide assistance to other candidates. Discussion and clarification follows the showing of these videotapes.

Balanced Literary Perspective Agreement

At every school site where candidates carry out their fieldwork experiences, they meet with the principal (and reading specialist, if possible) to discuss the philosophy which underlies their teaching methodology and interactions with children. The candidate provides the principal with an excerpt from the Reading and Language Arts Framework, which offers a specific definition of a balanced literacy program and outlines the components that it should contain.

If the principal (and reading specialist, should there be one) agrees that the literacy program the school offers is in support of this philosophy, (s)he signs the Balanced Literacy Perspective Agreement, which the candidate also signs. The forms are then returned to the course instructor. (If the candidate feels, at any time, that the program context is not “balanced,” a university instructor may be asked to visit the school site to ensure that the candidate is placed appropriately—and if not, to effect a change in location.)

This agreement is no longer necessary because the tutorials are carried out within the Literacy Center, which subscribes to the balanced literacy philosophy.
Administrative Components

The administrative components of the two programs are addressed in depth in the Common Standards, a separate part of this document. Please refer to the appendices in that part for specific documentation.

Each candidate, whether a main campus or off-campus student, has a ULV advisor who provides a specific schedule to follow and makes certain that all requirements are met. The advisors use a checklist which is a record-keeping tool that documents that the candidates' entrance requirements are met, as well as ongoing requirements, such as course work completion, at designated times.

*The off-campus program (which at one time was comprised of five clusters) was completely “taught out” starting in 2005, as a response to the difficulty of ensuring enrollment numbers and maintaining quality control over the curriculum and the instruction.*

Candidates are assessed on the basis of their fieldwork evaluations, course grades, participation, and satisfactory completion of course requirements. For the specialist credential, several additional requirements, including adequate professional development (5 conference presentations) and a passing score on the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Examination, must be met.

*These requirements are still in effect.*

Candidates are also given opportunities to assess the program and the ULV faculty and staff. They evaluate every instructor each semester; they evaluate the ULV-trained Fieldwork Supervisors at the end of the semester in which they are supervised; and they evaluate the credential program at the time that they complete it (as well as a year after they complete it.) The principals at the schools who employ a ULV Reading Specialists also evaluate the candidate's performance (related to program effectiveness) after one year of uninterrupted candidate employment.

*Candidates do evaluate every instructor each semester, plus they fill out Candidate Competency Forms (Appendix 18) when completing each course in the program. The evaluations and forms are then analyzed to determine what changes should be made in the program.*

*Also, candidates evaluate the credential program at the time that they complete it when they fill out the Candidate Competency Self-Evaluations (Appendix 24), as well as a year after they complete it. The principals at the schools who employ...*
ULV Reading Specialists also evaluate the candidate's performance (related to program effectiveness) after one year of uninterrupted candidate employment (Appendix 25).

Collaboration

ULV has many avenues for collaboration. Faculty/staff meetings (by course) for main campus and off-campus instructors are held, where transportation and air fare is provided, when the distance merits it.

Faculty and staff meetings are provided for all instructors, full-time and adjunct. Since there is no longer an off-campus program, distance is not an issue for instructors, and they can easily attend meetings as long as they are held after 4 PM (the regular teaching day for full-time teachers who are also adjuncts at ULV). Monthly program meetings are held, and Reading Advisory Council Meetings take place twice a year.

The Department of Education interacts on a monthly basis with the other university departments, through a meeting called Faculty Assembly. Common issues, as well as the specific concerns of each department, are discussed. Department of Education faculty also serve on university-wide committees and are well-represented.

In order to collaborate with the personnel who provide field experience supervision for our candidates, half-day in-service meetings at held at the beginning of the start dates for the target courses (e.g., RDG 510—Literacy Mentors; RDG 517, Literacy Support Persons; RDG 520, Literacy Partners; RDG 525/525F, ULV Fieldwork Supervisors) During this time, course syllabi are surveyed, requirements are presented, and the fieldwork staff may ask questions or clarify information about their roles in the fieldwork process.

This is no longer necessary because of monthly program meeting and the “shadowing” process (described below).

A separate requirement for the ULV Fieldwork Supervisors of RDG 525/525F is that they must “shadow” the class for one full semester (audit every session) in order to fully understand the course content and the requirements for satisfactory fieldwork completion. All ULV Fieldwork Supervisors are paid by the university for their participation in the shadowing process.

The “shadowing” process is used for the training of all new instructors and for any instructor (even a full-time one) who is learning to teach a new course. The shadower audits the course, takes notes and completes a binder of content information, and meets regularly with the course instructor. The instructor then
serves as a mentor to such faculty members when they teach courses or the first time.

Consistency

The rationale upon which the ULV program is based, as described throughout the response to Standard 1, is broad enough to encompass changes in our student population, particularly related to increased diversity and the resulting specific need for differentiation of instruction. A sample survey, based on a random sample of 15 school districts that our candidates serve (1998-1999 data), indicates that particular locations, particularly in the Los Angeles area, have a high percentage of students, many of whom are ELL students, from Asian and Hispanic backgrounds, along with four other groups (J-383).

The design and content of both the certificate and reading specialist courses offers candidates many ways in which to address the full range of learners in classrooms. Given a sound rationale which underlies the programs, as well as the direction provided by the Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness, ULV can be assured that its graduates will have the knowledge base, skills, perception, and sensitivity to “enhance all students’ potential as producers and users of language” (Reading and Language Arts Framework, p. 4).

Our program rationale easily encompasses the changes we see in our school populations, and there is more emphasis on responding to students who represent a “diverse” group than ever before. In addition, the tutorial model lends itself well to the need for differentiation of instruction for learners, and candidates develop the perspective that different learners’ needs may be quite different from one another, leading to the importance of specialized and tailored instruction.
Standard 2
Developing Fluent Reading
Reading Certificate

Category 1: Program Design & Curriculum Standards

Standard 2: Developing Fluent Reading

The program provides each candidate with current research-based skills and knowledge about instructional strategies for developing fluent reading in students at all grade levels, including speakers of English and English language learners. The program provides instruction in linguistic elements (including phonemic awareness and the phonological and morphological structure of the English language); decoding/word attack strategies (such as systematic instruction in sound-symbol relationships; spelling instruction; the role of extensive practice with appropriate materials (such as decodable texts); and skills and strategies that contribute to independent reading.

The program provides each candidate:

2A) with current research-based skills and knowledge about instructional strategies for developing fluent reading in students at all grade levels

RDG 510

Readings

Candidates read a variety of texts which contain research-based skills and knowledge about instructional strategies for developing fluent reading. The Phonological Awareness Handbook for Kindergarten and Primary Teachers (Ericson and Juliebo), as well as the Phonics, Spelling, and Word Study book (Glazer), and Improving Reading—Handbook of Strategies (Johns and Lenski) provide research bases for the practical ideas which are presented. (See B-175 For content listing.)

Chapter 7 from the Johns and Lenski handbook, entitled “Strengthening Reading Through Writing,” focuses on the writing process (prewriting, writing, revising/editing, and publishing) and offers suggested conference questions for specific writing situations. The idea of “reading like a writer” in order to strengthen writing skills via a wide variety of reading experiences is emphasized (B-186).
In addition, several articles from Read All About It: Readings to Inform the Profession, compiled by the California State Board of Education, are utilized to offer research-based information. These articles include:

- “Learning to Read: Schooling’s First Mission” by E. McPike
- “Every Child Reading: An Action Plan” by Learning First Alliance
- “Reading Fluency: Techniques for Making Decoding Automatic” by Samuels, Schermer, and Reinking
- “Teaching Decoding” by Moats
- “Beyond Phonics: Integrated Decoding and Spelling Instruction Based on Word Origin and Structure” by Henry
- “What Reading Does for the Mind” by Cunningham and Stanovich

New texts have been adopted for RDG 510 in order to ensure currency of information and to respond to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 6.

A new primary text used for this course, Teaching Reading in the 21st Century by Graves, Juel, and Graves (2007) describes the fluent reading process across a number of chapters: “Reading and Learning to Read,” “Reading Instruction,” “Emergent Literacy,” and “Fluency.”

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Aside from completing the assigned research-based readings, candidates are required to completed 3 reading responses, which are submitted to the instructor and discussed with colleagues in class. Candidates also integrate Information from the readings into their Double Entry Journals as they reflect upon how their work with fieldwork students builds upon research findings.

The “reading like a writer” concept is discussed during Session 11, and the interdependent nature of the processes of reading and writing is highlighted (A-136). Candidates are encouraged to approach the instruction of reading and writing in such a way as to acknowledge and affirm this interrelated process.
Throughout the course, students add research-based strategies (drawn from class discussions and readings) for developing fluent reading to their Strategy Notebooks (B-162), which they continue to enhance as they move through the sequence of classes in the program.

*Class requirements and assignments for RDG 510 now include lesson plans for each tutorial session, a Diagnostic Report to Schools, and a Literacy Profile for Parents. For each, candidates emphasize development of the fluent reading process for their tutees.*

**RDG 514**

**Readings**

*Alternative Assessment Techniques for Reading and Writing* (Miller) includes a chapter on alternative ways of assessing reading skills and attitudes—and in so doing, includes important instructional strategies such as PreP, QAR, think-alouds, story frames, and others which can meet the needs of students.

Part IV of the main text by Rubin, *Diagnosis and Correction in Reading Instruction*, deals with the “diagnostic reading and correction program in action” and offers instructional suggestions for all areas of literacy needs, which candidates may relate to their own tutorial students, as appropriate. Chapter 11 also contains case study scenarios highlighting students with difficulties in the areas of word recognition, main ideas, lack of phonics skills, word by word reading, plus ideas for appropriate instruction.

*New texts have been adopted for RDG 514 in order to ensure currency of information and also to respond to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 7.*

*Chapters 2 and 3 describe steps for assessing and guiding reading instruction throughout the emergent literacy process and as learners develop word identification strategies.*

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

The Clinician’s Summary Reports (#1 GATES, #2 SDRT, #3 QRI-3) each include sections entitled “Diagnostic Summary” and “Recommendations.” Given the
specific needs of each tutee (based on assessment), the candidate must outline the instructional recommendations and strategies that the student’s teacher should follow (see D-218-224).

*Candidates currently implement the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Survey Test as main assessments to help determine what skills tutees need in order to become fluent readers. These areas are then translated into instructional goals on the RDG 514 Lesson Plan.*

*The Case Study Assessment Profiles that must be completed for the two case study students also include a section on goals to be set for the student and activities to match them; candidates draw upon the content from RDG 510 to address these requirements.*

*The Case Study has been reworked into the Diagnostic Report to Schools and the Literacy Profile for Parents. In both assignments, candidates match assessed needs to instructional goals and then take steps to provide appropriate and effective instruction to support tutees in reading effectively.*

*During the Fieldwork Seminar portions of class, candidates share ideas for instructional strategies to meet fieldwork students’ needs.*

*This is still the case during the Fieldwork Seminar (FW SEM) timeframes (as indicated in the syllabus, Appendix 7).*

*During the Case Study Assessment Presentations, colleagues share ideas for instructional strategies to meet fieldwork student’s needs.*

*This is still the case.*

Session 7 of the course provides an opportunity for candidates to discuss oral reading fluency norms, as explained in the article by Hasbrouck and Tindal, “Curriculum-Based Oral reading Fluency Norms” (C-200).

*2B) including speakers of English and English Language Learners*
RDG 510

Readings

New texts have been adopted for RDG 510 in order to ensure currency of information and also to respond to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 6.

The new text by Graves (2007) includes specific sections in each chapter on theoretical and foundational research and strategies for working with English learners. Therefore, candidates receive information for students who are English Only and those who are English learners. Candidates use this information when working with their tutees.

As candidates work with their target fieldwork students (one beginning, struggling reader and one older non-reader reader), they learn beginning methods for scaffolding instruction for ELL students, as well. The text entitled Working with Second Language Learners (Cary) offers answers to the ten most frequently asked questions by teachers about how to support ELL students effectively in their learning.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

As part of the requirement to do two formal lessons during the tutorial sessions with their fieldwork students, candidates must specify particular scaffolded support activities for ELL students in order to practice including these ELD components (and to prepare for later fieldwork with ELL students in RDG 518). The primary goal is to help make the content more comprehensible for the students and to enable them, through use of various learned strategies, to become more fluent and proficient readers of the English language.

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 510 now include a RDG 510 Lesson Plan with a “diversity section” in which candidates respond to their assigned reading with ideas for how to modify instruction for diverse students, especially English learners.

Some candidates will also be working with English learners (as their tutees) for this course and will be using modifications suggested in their reading and included in instructor lectures/presentations.
**RDG 514**

**Readings**

In the *Diagnosis and Correction in Reading Instruction* text, Rubin addresses factors which affect reading performance, particularly related to language and dialect differences. Steps for a model ESL lesson are also outlined.

*New texts have been adopted for RDG 514 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text for RDG 514 in Appendix 7.*

**DISCUSS**

*The Collins and Cheek text (1999) addresses the issue of test bias and the importance of including informal assessment into the diagnostic process for English learners. The Kohn text describes the limitations of using only standardized, norm-referenced assessments and clearly delineates how such testing can underestimate the skills of English learners.*

*One chapter also identifies modifications for the assessment and instruction of non-English speaking students.*

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Discussion on test validity during Session 3 of the course centers on test biases such as culture, language, or regional differences. Candidate’s knowledge of these issues will affect how they view the test results of ELL students (C-196)

Session 4 of the class includes a discussion on non-educational and educational factors which may affect the test performance of students. Such issues as culture, dialect, and language differences may particularly influence testing procedures and outcomes for ELL students.

The norming process for norm-referenced tests is explained during the Session 3 class; the instructor explains the importance of having the “norming sample” for a test drawn from the population which includes the ELL students.
Class requirements and assignments for RDG 514 include the opportunity for candidates to administer “out of level” tests to get an accurate depiction of what learners can do with respect to reading and writing. Since many English learners read below grade level, this practice enables candidates to analyze their strengths and weaknesses so as to plan more appropriately for their instruction.

**RDG 517**

Readings

In *Literature and the Learner*, Goforth includes a chapter on multicultural literature which reflects “parallel cultures.” She cites the benefits of having young people explore literature of parallel cultures, both for ELL students and for English-Only students and provides instructional strategies for helping students to develop fluent reading. Literature reflecting different ethnic and language groups is presented, and issues related to stereotyping are also addressed.

*Multicultural Voices in Contemporary Literature* by Day is a compendium of multicultural readings, complete with author information, annotations, and instructional suggestions for helping students to approach these pieces successfully.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Students are asked to discuss advantages and disadvantages with organizing literature in culture-specific and thematic arrangements. They explore the implications of choosing literature to reflect the language, ethnic, and cultural populations of students in their classes: learners can identify with the characters, set personal purposes for reading, and become more engaged in the reading, thereby being more successful with it (Sessions 12 and 13, E-283-285).

*RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.*

**RDG 518**

Readings

Students read about various theories and approaches to language acquisition in Chapter 7 of Gleason’s book, *The Development of Language*. Information about
how primary languages develop is used to understand second language acquisition (H-375).

In Sheltered Content Instruction, Echevarria and Graves cover all aspects of working with ELL students of diverse abilities (H-368): theoretical and historical foundations, sheltered instruction in the content areas, affective issues, learning strategies, curriculum adaptations, adjusting discourse to enhance learning, and self-evaluation and collaborative implementation.

New texts have been adopted for RDG 518 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 9.

The Peregoy and Boyle text explicitly traces the process of language acquisition, both in L1 and L2. The issues of what transfers from L1 to L2 when a student is able to read/write (has CALP) in L1 is analyzed. Specific developmental steps, along with varying factors that affect proficiency and time to achieve it, are presented. Chapter 5 is devoted to emergent literacy (reading and writing) research and strategies for English learners.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

A primary goal of this course is to help candidates develop an understanding of primary L1) and second (L2) language acquisition and recognize the variables that contribute to fluent literacy behaviors. In addition, they also learn strategies for helping ELL students to become fluent readers:

The fieldwork portion of the class involves a 10-hour tutorial with an ELL student, during which time the candidate provides instruction to support the student in skills needed for content area understanding and proficient reading. A formal lesson plan write-up for the ELL student is required (G-324), which includes implementation of the lesson and presentation to the class. Candidates also complete Fieldwork Logs (G-324), in which documentation of instruction and hours of work with the student are recorded.

Class discussions centering on second language acquisition learning strategies for ELL students occur in all sessions, starting with Session 10 (G-332). They include issues such as BICS and CALP and types and selection of learning strategies for ELL students (Sessions 11 and 12, G-333-334).
Class requirements and assignments for RDG 518 now include the development of an into/through/beyond lesson in which candidates take the proficiency level of the tutee into account as they determine the three parts of this sequence.

All candidates practice the incorporation of SDAIE elements into their lesson plans, as well as into the into/through/beyond sequence.

A short paper is required in the course in which candidates find three research articles related to L2 acquisition to answer a question they have posed (e.g., How can background knowledge be activated/developed sufficiently before reading?).

2C) linguistic elements (including phonemic awareness and the phonological and morphological structure of the English language)

RDG 510

Readings

The Phonological Awareness Handbook, (Ericson and Juliebo), as well as the Phonics, Spelling, and Word Study book (Glazer) provide the primary information for candidates to learn about linguistic elements—and phonemic awareness and the phonological and morphological structure of the English language, in particular. The handbook is devoted to phonological awareness and phonemic awareness tasks, and Chapter 1 of the Glazer text deals specifically with how to teach and assess phonics, morphemic analysis, and spelling (B-181).

The Improving Reading—Handbook of Strategies (Johns and Lenski) book also offers ideas for how to put these understandings into practice (B-183).

In addition, the following articles support the development of this information:

• “Reading Fluency: Techniques for Making Decoding Automatic” by Samuels, Schermer, and Reinking

• “Teaching Decoding” by L. Moats

• “Beyond Phonics: Integrated Decoding and Spelling Instruction Based on Word Origin and Structure” by Henry
New texts have been adopted for RDG 510 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text for RDG 510 in Appendix 6. The Graves text focuses on alphabet recognition, phonemic awareness, phonics, and sight words in Chapters 4 and 5.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

As they engage in their tutorial work with the two fieldwork students, candidates are responsible for determining, through assessment, if phonemic awareness, phonics, or structural analysis and word origin strategies are appropriate instructional needs. If so, these strategies must become part of the Case Study Analysis, which is developed throughout the semester and submitted for each fieldwork student at the end of the class.

The concepts of phonemic awareness and phonology are discussed in Session 3 of the class (A-128), in which candidates define phonological awareness and phonemic awareness and discuss how to assess, prepare lessons, and evaluate progress in these areas. In addition, they view a video segment on phonemic awareness and phonics and participate in rhyming, blending and segmenting phonemic awareness tasks.

Resources for phonemic awareness assessments from the Johns and Lenski handbook are also surveyed during class.

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 510 now include required Activity Demonstrations in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, and spelling. Each candidate presents one strategy which colleagues then respond to and utilize in lessons with their own tutees, as appropriate.

The elements of phonemic awareness, phonics, (phonological structure), spelling, and morphological structure (structural analysis) must be assessed throughout the tutorial process and documented on the RDG 510 Lesson Plan. The same elements must be included in the Diagnostic Report to Schools and the Literacy Profile for Parents.

The Ekwall-Shanker Reading Inventory includes ten assessments such as phonics tests, structural analysis tests, and passages which are used for miscue analyses in word recognition. Candidates are taught how to administer the subtests and learn how to do the miscue analyses to identify instructional goals for their tutees.
RDG 514

Readings

Both of the main texts, *Diagnosis and Correction in Reading Instruction* and *Alternative Assessment techniques for Reading and Writing*, focus heavily upon linguistic elements. Students learn to identify them and to determine how to assess them within the context of the testing process. Candidates often do item analyses, highlighting phonics and structural analysis (morphemic) elements, as part of the diagnostic procedure for their tutees, and they use specific informal assessment instruments, as well, to determine strengths and weaknesses in these areas.

*New texts have been adopted for RDG 514 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text for RDG 514 in Appendix 7.*

*The Collins and Cheek chapter on word identification includes information on assessing and instruction for sight word knowledge, phonic analysis, structural analysis, and contextual analysis.*

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

A large part of the assessment process in this course includes the use of formal and informal instruments:

Within the context of standardized tests, candidates give students phonemic awareness tests, phonics tests, and structural analysis tests (which deal with morphemic units—prefixes, roots, affixes, contractions). It is required, for each student, that these areas are addressed initially (Profile Requirements, D-206-208). If there is a need, additional testing is done. At the end of the fieldwork experience in this course, candidates then write Case Study Assessment Profiles, containing instructional recommendations related to these areas.

As part of their Summary Reports on three formal tests (D-218-224), candidates look closely at phonics and structural analysis items on the Gates-MacGinitie and the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. When they give the QRI-3, they also do a miscue analysis to determine miscue patterns in order to recommend appropriate word-attack instruction.
Within the context of more informal assessments, candidates draw from the Miller text, *Alternative Assessment Techniques for Reading and Writing*, to utilize checklists and other informal instruments, to assess knowledge of alphabet knowledge, concepts about print, phonemic awareness, phonics, structural analysis (see D-252).

**Class requirements and assignments for RDG 514 include the incorporation of assessments in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, (phonological structure (spelling) and morphological structure (structural analysis) in the RDG 514 Lesson Plan, the Diagnostic Report to Schools, and the Literacy Profile for Parents.**

Candidates are required to administer the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Survey test in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their tutees in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, and structural analysis.

**RDG 516**

**Readings**

One of the new texts in RDG 516 is the second half of the Graves text used in RDG 510. However, the focus in the second half of the book includes additional attention to morphological structure (structural analysis). A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text for RDG 516 in Appendix 8.

Chapter five focuses on the structure of spoken and printed words, including word families and phonograms, morphemes, and affixes (prefixes and suffixes.)

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 516 include a videotaped lesson with a tutee on one strategy that is appropriate for the student. In many cases, since the tutees are in grades 4-6, lessons are done in the areas of phonics, phonological structure (spelling) and morphological structure (structural analysis). The lessons are then shown as demonstration lessons to the instructor and colleagues so that feedback can be provided.

Candidates are required to administer the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test to determine what objectives to set for their tutees. At the lower levels, there are phonics tests which help candidates to set goals in word recognition.
RDG 518

Readings

The linguistic elements of phonology and morphology are specifically addressed in Gleason’s text. In Chapter 1, phonological development (sounds and sound patterns) in infancy and childhood is approached, as well as semantic, morphological, and syntactical development (H-373). In Chapter 3, she addresses phonemes and phonetic properties, along with pronunciation and child-phonology rules. Chapter 5 is devoted to morphology and syntax, in which Gleason describes early grammar and the development of grammatical morphemes during the preschool years.

New texts have been adopted for RDG 518 in order to ensure currency of information and also to respond to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text for RDG 518 in Appendix 9.

The issue of differences in phonological and morphological structures among languages—and the resulting confusion that some English learners may experience is highlighted in the Boyle and Peregoy text. Chapter 5 emphasizes phonics, word family, and sight word instruction and the relationship between spelling and word recognition.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates discuss all of the elements of phonology and morphology (listed above in the Readings), and they must demonstrate knowledge of these concepts on a midterm and final examination (H-365-367).

Also, they are required to do a Language Sample Collection and Analysis, a fieldwork exercise with a child who is a fluent English speaker, in which they analyze a language sample from one child. The analysis includes the following components: mean length of utterances, number of holophrases (or telegraphic phrases), number of prepositions, number of conjunctions, number of compound sentences, number of complex sentences, the identified stage of negatives, the identified stage of questions, and placement in Brown’s order of morphemes. During class, the analysis for this child is then compared with similar analyses of other children the same age (Session 8, using Language Sample Collections to do a class analysis, G-331).
When candidates view *The Human Language*, a film series narrated by Noam Chomsky (H-363), they observe how children develop phonemic awareness and acquire the phonological and morphological structures of the English language. Children in various stages of acquisition are portrayed.

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 518 include assessments for English learners in the areas of phonics, phonological structure (spelling) and morphological structure (structural analysis) and linked instruction to support the tutees.

Candidates now view the video entitled *Genie*, a film in which candidates observe what happens when children are not provided feedback as they develop language. They see that regular syntax and vocabulary is not acquired.

**2D) decoding/word attack strategies (such as systematic instruction in sound-symbol relationships)**

**RDG 510**

Readings

The *Phonological Awareness Handbook*, (Ericson and Juliebo), as well as the *Phonics, Spelling, and Word Study* book (Glazer) provide the primary information for candidates to learn about a wide variety of decoding and word attack strategies. Chapters One and Two in Glazer focus on the difference between explicit and implicit phonics instruction and provide model lessons for phonics skills. Though most attention is given to direct, systematic instruction in sound-symbol relationships, the use of onset-rime strategies and the creation of word walls are also presented.

The following articles also support the development of word attack strategies:

- “Reading Fluency: Techniques for Making Decoding Automatic” by Samuels, Schermer, and Reinking
- “Teaching Decoding” by L. Moats

New texts have been adopted for RDG 510 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text for RDG 510 in Appendix 6.
Much time is devoted to the teaching of explicit, systematic instruction of phonics in the Graves text. Chapter 1 in the Bear, Invernizzi, Templeton, and Johnston text (Words Their Way, 2008) Words Their Way identifies the relationship between spelling and decoding. Various types of word study activities for the identification of phonics patterns are presented.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

In Session 4 of the class (see A-129), candidates discuss problems with fluency and oral reading and become familiar with the use of miscues to determine strengths and weaknesses in students’ word attack skills. They also learn strategies for developing fluency such as Structured Repeated Readings and oral reading alternatives to “round robin reading.”

Specific phonics strategies are also addressed, as well as structural analysis, context clue and sight word strategies. In Session 5 (see A-130) the use of phonics with consonants and vowels is introduced. Resources such as the Revised Dolch List, Words for Teaching Vowel Sounds, and Frequently-Occurring Prefixes and Suffixes are discussed.

In Session 6 (see A-131), candidates are also asked to “define” phonics and to discuss the importance of teaching it as a decoding strategy. They also practice administering phonics and phonemic awareness assessments (provided in the course texts) and learn the most important phonics generalizations. In class, two phonics lessons are demonstrated by the instructor, one which is an explicit lesson, and one which is implicit.

If phonics or other word attack strategies represent an area of need for either tutee (as they most certainly will with the beginning reader, at least), appropriate assessments and instructional activities must be utilized as part of the fieldwork process and documented through the Double Entry Journal, class discussion, and Case Study Analysis.

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 510 include specific attention to decoding/word attack strategies (such as systematic instruction in sound-symbol relationships. (Candidates often refer to this class as the “phonics” class, in fact.)
Activity Demonstrations, the RDG 510 Lesson Plans, and typically a guest speaker (matriculated graduate of the program) to present on phonics instruction highlight various ways of teaching phonics. Some attention is also paid to analytic phonics during which word walls, word families, onset-rimes, and phonograms are introduced.

Also, candidates learn how to assess whether tutees know the basic sight words associated with their grade levels and learn strategies for teaching them. Other word recognition strategies such as context clues and structural analysis are also addressed in the required reading, as well as in class lectures/demonstrations.

**RDG 514**

**Readings**

The two main texts, Rubin’s *Diagnosis and Correction in Reading Instruction* and Miller’s *Alternative Assessment techniques for Reading and Writing*, include suggestions for the teaching of decoding/word attack strategies, as well as information about how to assess them. Rubin’s book contains an entire section (section 12, D-267) of word recognition skills and vocabulary expansion, with an emphasis on both how to diagnose and correct weaknesses in these areas. Miller devotes two separate chapters (2 and 6, D-253 and D-256) to the assessment of competencies and weaknesses in word identification skills and oral reading, which also entail the description of instructional methods to addresses such needs. (In some cases, especially performance-based assessment activities, the assessment method and the instructional technique are one and the same.)

New texts have been adopted for RDG 514 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text for RDG 514 in Appendix 7.

The section on Word Identification and Reading includes a full description of the importance of phonics, assessment tools, and appropriate instructional approaches.

*The Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory* includes a section on how to do a miscue analysis with particular attention paid to the patterns of phonics miscues for assessment purposes. The text provides many examples of how the scoring of phonics miscues should look.
Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Within their fieldwork experiences with two students (a beginning, struggling reader and an older non-reader) candidates give three formal tests, which contain decoding/word attack components, plus many informal tests highlighting these areas (C-190).

They also tape record a segment from their fieldwork experience; then, in class, they give a description of the setting, the assessment tool used and the response of the student. Colleagues provide responses to the segment, offering an evaluation of the effectiveness of the testing experience and providing suggestions for any instructional recommendations which emerge from it.

Fieldwork Seminar portions of each class provide opportunities to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the case study students. For example, in Session 12 (C-203), the instructor and classmates offer suggestions for appropriate possible instructional recommendations stemming from shared assessment data.

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 514 include the administration of the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory and the Gates-MacGinitie. Candidates administer decoding tests to tutees.

RDG 518

Readings

In Sheltered Content Instruction, Echevarria and Graves explain how language transfers from the primary (1) language to the second language (L2). BICS/CALP and other factors that affect second language instruction are discussed. These issues have implications for the teaching of decoding and work attack strategies to ELL students.

New texts have been adopted for RDG 518 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 9. Peregoy and Boyle address alphabetic writing, print concepts in emergent literacy, and various methods of word recognition such as phonics and sight word development.
Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

During Fieldwork Seminar portions of class (Sessions 11-13, G-333-335), candidates discuss their ELD tutorial, during which time decoding and word attack strategies (and problems related to such instruction) are shared.

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 518 include components which ask candidates to determine if decoding/word attack skills are important for their tutees to address.

2E) spelling instruction

RDG 510

Readings

Specific Readings that address spelling instruction include Phonics, Spelling and Word Study by Glazer. Chapter 3 (see B-182) is devoted entirely to the discussion of the relationship between phonics and spelling and to instructional activities for spelling (as well as offering some student self-assessments of spelling development).

New texts have been adopted for RDG 510 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 6.

The Bear text offers information on assessing orthographic development and presents five stages of spelling so that candidates may see where students “fit” in this developmental process.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

One class session is specifically devoted to spelling competency and instruction (see A-132). Candidates learn the stages of spelling development, discuss reasons for spelling problems, and learn spelling techniques for instruction. Spelling may represent an area of weakness for either tutee and would then also be incorporated into the fieldwork instruction.
Class requirements and assignments for RDG 510 now include candidate administration of the spelling inventories within the Bear text and the determination of their tutees’ stages of spelling. They recognize that word recognition and spelling are “mirrored processes.”

Candidates also use many of the activities described in the Bear text for their Activity Demonstrations, making sure that the selected activity matches the stage of spelling identified for the presentation. They also use these activities with their tutees, as appropriate.

RDG 514

Readings

The Miller and Rubin texts offer strategies for the assessment of spelling, though many of the actual instructional strategies for instruction are presented earlier in RDG 510.

New texts have been adopted for RDG 514 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 7. Informal assessments for spelling and word identification inventories are presented in the Collins and Cheek text.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates view a developmental spelling test from the Miller text during Session 12 of the class in order to determine if it is an appropriate assessment for their case study students. They also use sight word identification tests and assessment of spelling, based on writing samples, to determine if spelling is a need for either candidate. If so, spelling is included on the profile requirements sheets (D-206 and 208).

Also, knowledge about spelling stages and strategies learned in RDG 510 will be incorporated into the instructional recommendations for the case study students, as appropriate, and will be revisited and shared during RDG 514 class discussions of fieldwork students’ needs.
Class requirements and assignments for RDG 514 include the administration of the Bear informal spelling inventories as assessments for the RDG 514 Lesson Plan, the Diagnostic Report to Schools, and the Literacy Profile for Parents.

Candidates are also encouraged to identify whether the miscues tutees make when reading orally match spelling problems that also occur when they write.

2F) role of extensive practice with appropriate materials (such as decodable texts)

RDG 510

Readings

The handbook by Johns and Lenski offers an extensive listing of books without words, alphabet books, and pattern (predictable and decodable) books, as well activities for each type.

The Working with Second Language Learners book by Cary also provides suggestions for how to make texts more comprehensible for ELL students. Cary emphasizes that only when students are successful with reading are they successful in school; and only when they are successful with reading do they want to read more, eventually becoming avid, lifelong readers.

Finally, in their handbook, Johns and Lenski discuss ways to encourage students’ love of reading, addressing the necessity for matching books to readers and providing a wide variety of books written at readers’ independent reading levels.

New texts have been adopted for RDG 510 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 6.

Decodable texts, predictable texts, alphabet books, concept books, and picture books are large topics within the purview of this course. Candidates not only read about them, but are given suggestions for titles of excellent books within these categories.
Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Discussion of decodable and predictable texts begins during Session 4 when fluency and oral reading issues are addressed (see A-129). The idea of offering children books which they can decode, based on instruction they have received, is explored fully. The instructor reads aloud a decodable text and distributes copies of others for candidates to see. The practice of sending home decodable texts with children to read with their parents at home is recommended; not only do parents feel involved in the reading process, but they view their children as readers, which becomes a successful experience for all.

In addition, predictable texts, which also offer students successful opportunities to read, help students to feel like real readers. The instructor reads aloud one or two predictable books and distributes copies of others. The practice of using read-along tapes (for subsequent re-readings) with predictable books is supported.

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 510 now include the sharing of books from different genres such as decodable texts, predictable texts, alphabet books, concept books, and picture books. Candidates use them with their tutees during lessons.

In addition, candidates work with the parents of their tutees to take home some of these materials for children to read independently or with them.

RDG 514

Readings

Assigned readings from this assessment course do not deal specifically with reading materials, though the attention to independent, instructional, and frustration levels (Session 7, C-199) involves a short discussion about using materials that are appropriate for these levels. For example, we use decodable texts at the independent reading level; guided reading texts at the instructional reading level; and read-alouds (to children) texts at the frustration reading level.

Because the three reading levels (independent, instructional, frustration) are brought up repeatedly in the reading for this class, the idea of introducing
children to quality reading materials for different purposes is presented. For fluency, candidates may rely upon decodable or predictable texts for their tutees. For motivational purposes, they may suggest picture books or chapter books. They understand that children should not be given materials to read at their frustration levels—but may choose to read such books aloud to them.

The appendix for the Collins and Cheek book also includes an interest and attitude inventory.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Extensive practice with appropriate materials is highlighted when candidates make instructional recommendations for fieldwork students, based on identified strengths and weaknesses (e.g., for a student struggling with a phonics generalization, a decodable text which includes words following this pattern would be suggested).

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 514 now include the administration of at least one interest/attitude survey to support the selection of appropriate quality reading materials for tutees. This survey may be from the Ekwall Shanker (RDG 510), the Collins and Cheek text (RDG 514), or another source.

RDG 517

Readings

Candidates become familiar with a wide range of genres and reading materials in the Literature and the Learner text by Goforth: picture books, folk literature, fantasy, realistic fiction, biography and information books, and multicultural literature. Goforth includes a large range of instructional recommendations for how to give students practice with a variety of genres to increase motivation to read and to develop proficiency in reading.

In Session 3, the class discusses Anderson’s article entitled “Research Foundations to Support Wide Reading.” Candidates learn the importance of “book floods” to encourage children (by providing access to books and interesting materials) to develop vocabulary and reading competence through independent reading (E-277).
Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Within the course, candidates classify books with pictures (wordless books, storybooks, illustrated books, concept books, informational storybooks, photo essay, and information books) and view demonstrations of instructional strategies and literary responses to picture books.

They also work with a small group of reluctant readers, for whom they select appropriate reading materials (based on reading level, interest, and age) from various genres throughout the 10 hours of fieldwork in order to increase student motivation to read and reading proficiency.

*RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.*

**RDG 518**

Readings

In the Echevarria and Graves book, text modifications to make the reading more comprehensible for ELL students are presented.

*New texts have been adopted for RDG 518 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 9.*

*The Peregoy and Boyle text includes sections on quality books for English learners, as well as a chapter on the benefits of independent reading.*

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

During their fieldwork meetings and for the required lesson with their ELL students, candidates are responsible for selection of appropriate materials (related to age, interest, readability) and for modifying texts to enable ELL students to be successful in approaching the reading. Use of read-along tapes is recommended to provide re-reading opportunities and opportunities to hear correct modeling. Given such practices, the student’s decoding and word-attack
strategies should be more successful when the text is then encountered again independently.

In RDG 518, candidates must select appropriate texts for helping their tutees (who are English learners) to develop reading and writing skills. This includes the choosing of texts for lessons so that tutees can practice accordingly with feedback from the candidates.

2G) skills and strategies that contribute to independent reading

RDG 510

Readings

Chapter 1 of the Johns and Lenski handbook focuses on the development of positive attitudes toward reading and the problems of lack of motivation, limited interests, and infrequent outside reading behaviors, ideas which are discussed in depth during Session 2 of the course (A-127).

New texts have been adopted for RDG 510 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 6.

The first 5 chapters of the Graves book addresses the many factors that need to be in place so that students can and will read independently. Aside from the skills addressed in other standards, children also need to be motivated to read and stay engaged when they do read. Chapter 3 is devoted to this topic.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Related to the importance of independent reading, candidates are asked to include at least one affective goal in their Case Study Analysis for each tutee. This goal is centered around increasing motivation to read, finding engaging texts, and more frequent independent reading behaviors (B-156; see #3).

Candidates also survey and utilize resources which enable them to determine independent reading behaviors and attitudinal issues about reading during
Session 2 of the class: interest inventories, reading attitude inventories, experience inventories, self-report reading scales and reading surveys, conversational profiles, and attitudinal scales for parents. Based on the results of such instruments, they then develop related goals for the tutees.

Students practice with the candidates during tutorial sessions and then are supported in choosing appropriate independent reading materials to take home (Appendix 26). Selections are dependent upon tutees’ strengths in alphabet knowledge, word recognition, and comprehension, as well as their independent reading levels.

**RDG 516**

**Readings**

New texts have been adopted for RDG 516 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 8.

A full chapter in the Graves text is devoted to independent reading (Encouraging Independent Reading and Reader Response). Authors discuss how to provide a rich array of reading materials, helping readers to respond to text, three frameworks that promote literature and reader response.

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Related to the importance of independent reading, candidates are asked to work with their tutees to identify interests and independent reading levels. Selecting materials for lessons and pleasure reading is part of the overall Lesson Plan process.

**RDG 514**

**Readings**

In Chapter 10, Rubin presents authentic assessment tools such as interest inventories and reading autobiographies. Miller also provides a list of commercial
individual reading inventories, other sample interest inventories, and content reading inventories (D-256).

*New texts have been adopted for RDG 514 in order to ensure currency of information and also in response to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 7.*

*One interest/attitude inventory is provided in the Collins and Cheek book, and the discussion about the purpose of such assessments is significant in encouraging children to read independently.*

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Candidates use assessment instruments which they learned about in RDG 510, as well as other instruments presented in the main texts (listed under Readings, above) Also, during their Oral Formative Update (C-190 and D-228) on the development of work with either case study student, colleagues share information related to independent reading behaviors and goals set for the tutee. Session 3 and Session 4 of the class specifically include these kinds of discussions. Recommendations for instruction and activities to increase independent reading behaviors are later made as part of the Case Study Assessment Profile write-ups.

*Class requirements and assignments for RDG 514 include the assessment of both motivation and reading/writing skills for the purpose of setting tutorial objectives.*

**RDG 517**

**Readings**

In addition to offering techniques for presenting different genres of literature to students, Goforth sets forth five principles for designing and implementing a literature curriculum, one of which includes reading with the whole class, in small groups and independently. Discussion of this material occurs during Session 11 of the class (E-283) and highlights the importance of independent reading in developing reading fluency and proficiency.

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**
The objective of the fieldwork portion of this class is to work with a small group of reluctant readers who are struggling (reading one to two years below grade level). These are students who technically CAN read—but who DO NOT choose to read. Based on assessments (Student Selection Guidelines, F-287-288), and evidence of reading levels (grade equivalency), candidates select 2-4 target fieldwork students.

In small groups, candidates jigsaw developmental characteristics that influence readers’ literary preferences: language, social, and cognitive development (Session 2, E-276).

Candidates administer interest inventories (appropriate to age and grade level) to the students who have been identified as “reluctant” readers. They also report on the results of interviews and discussions related to their students’ disinterest in reading. (Session 4, E-278). Many requirements for the course involve activities which are designed to motivate these students to increase their enjoyment of reading, such as the Verbal or Visual Presentation of Literature, and Abbreviated Literary Link (E-272).

*RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.*
Standard 3
Comprehension & Study Strategies
Reading Certificate

Category 1: Program Design & Curriculum Standards

Standard 3: Comprehension and Study Strategies

The program provides each candidate with current research-based skills and knowledge about reading comprehension, including foundational skills in academic language, background knowledge, concept formation, and vocabulary development. The program provides candidates with skills and knowledge related to the teaching of comprehension strategies such as text analysis (both narrative and expository text structure), thinking and study strategies (such as inference, summarization, predicting, questioning and clarifying); and independent reading of high quality books.

The program provides each candidate:

3A) with current research-based skills and knowledge about reading comprehension

RDG 510

Readings

The Johns and Lenski text, Improving Reading, includes two chapters which target the development of reading comprehension: In Chapter 5, candidates learn instructional strategies to promote the following comprehension skills: main ideas, facts/details, sequence, predicting outcomes, problem solving, using prior knowledge, monitoring comprehension while reading, understanding text structure, and processing text. Chapter 6 contains reasons why readers may not be “strategic” (e.g., lack of clear purpose, inflexible rate of reading, preoccupation with decoding, etc.) and suggests ways to help them overcome these problems (B-185).

Candidates also read an extensive article for Session 8 in Read All About It: “Developing Expertise in Reading Comprehension” (Pearson, Roehler, Dole, and Duffy). This article presents research which is based on schema theory and describes the history of instructional research in comprehension, ending with the search for an instructional plan of action and the implications for classroom instruction (A-134).
New texts have been adopted for RDG 510 in order to ensure currency of information and to respond to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 6.

Both the Graves text and the Ekwall-Shanker include an emphasis on the need for students to make meaning as they are learning to read. The entire process of comprehending is delineated in the Graves text across multiple chapters, and attention is given to the research base of knowledge that supports this view of reading as a meaning-making process. The differences among text structures are introduced within both narrative and expository texts.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

As candidates work with their two fieldwork students (a struggling, beginning reader and an older non-reader), they must attend to the area of comprehension, as addressed by the related readings and research, as they use assessment tools, set goals, and provide instruction for the tutees.

Session 8 (A-134) of the course targets reading comprehension specifically. During this class session, candidates discuss the role of academic language in comprehending connected discourse and the use of prior knowledge to make links to new terminology. They then take this research and apply it to their fieldwork situations.

As candidates participate in the videotape segment presentations, evaluation of the effectiveness of comprehension strategies also occurs and suggestions for other similar strategies are made by the instructor and colleagues.

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 510 now include lesson plans for each tutorial session, a Diagnostic Report to Schools, and a Literacy Profile for Parents. For each, candidates emphasize how to focus on the development of “reading for understanding” with their tutees.

In particular, when candidates administer the Ekwall-Shanker Reading Inventory passages, they analyze both aspects of reading: word recognition and reading comprehension. As they tally scores for each, they recognize that just sounding out words is not enough; the act of engagement with text (comprehension) is just as important. This idea is further strengthened in RDG 514 and RDG 516 as candidates learn to administer and interpret a wide variety of other assessments.
RDG 514

Readings

In addition to providing suggestions for specific tools to assess comprehension, Rubin presents reading comprehension taxonomies, as well as instructional strategies. She emphasizes questioning strategies and other skills within a “diagnostic and reading correction program” context (D-262).

*New texts have been adopted for RDG 514 in order to ensure currency of information and to respond to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 7.*

*The chapter in Collins and Cheek on Providing Appropriate Reading Instruction introduces comprehension strategies within different approaches (basals, language-based, multisensory) with supporting research.*

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates draw upon comprehension strategies introduced in RDG 510, as well as from Rubin’s text, to create the recommendations for instruction when they write their Case Study Assessment Profiles and present them to their colleagues.

*Class requirements and assignments for RDG 514 include the administration of two tests that include “comprehension” components: the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory and the Gates-MacGinitie.*

*Candidates also participate in analyzing scenarios from the Gates-MacGinitie, in which they see how comprehension “proficiency” is determined in a standardized, norm-referenced context; these assessment results are translated into appropriate comprehension objectives on the RDG 514 Lesson Plan, the Diagnostic Report to Schools, and the Literacy Profile for Parents.*

*In fact, a separate TaskStream rubric for guaging candidates’ ability to assess children is being developed as a way to monitor their developing competency in aggregating assessment data in order to use it to inform instruction (Appendix 19).*
RDG 516

Readings

The second half of the Graves text deals primarily with comprehension in Chapters 8-14, which are assigned for RDG 516, particularly Chapter 8 which is entitled “Teaching Comprehension Strategies.” Topics include the need for strategies to be flexible, establishing purposes for reading, and many key comprehension strategies such as asking and answering questions, making inferences, and summarizing.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

When candidates administer the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (SDRT), they look at the strengths and weaknesses of tutees in the area of comprehension and then select strategies to match the children’s needs.

RDG 518

Readings

Most of the reading material for this course which includes instructional strategies for the development of fluent reading are related to ELL students. The Echevarria and Graves book, Sheltered Content Instruction, outlines specific strategies for focusing on content and on instructional activities that are meaningful and comprehensible. Chapter 5 includes specific strategies for teaching reading and writing in the content areas, and Chapter 7 highlights text modifications which can make the reading of assigned materials easier and more successful for ELL students, thus increasing the potential for greater levels of comprehension (H-370-371).

New texts have been adopted for RDG 518 in order to ensure currency of information and to respond to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 9.

The Peregoy and Boyle text carefully presents the development of BICS into CALP (reading/writing) for English learners and offers multiple pathways for
learners to access content. This emphasis takes into account what is necessary for teachers to do to ensure that learners comprehend what they read.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

One of the goals of this course is for candidates to acquire specific strategies for helping ELL students to become fluent readers and writers, as well as “competent comprehenders” of written text. Therefore, as they read the text on sheltered content instruction, as well as Gleason’s Development of Language book, they learn how oral language and literacy skills are acquired. They also begin to differentiate between oral and written language (realizing that speaking is not just “talk written down”) and are ready to begin to apply instructional strategies for comprehension in a tutorial context.

The 10-hour tutorial with an ELL student offers candidates practice in modifying instruction so that content reading material can be approached with understanding by the learner. Having been exposed to assessment and instruction for ELL students, the theoretical and historical foundations of English language learning, specific learning strategies, and possible curriculum adaptations, candidates are ready to support the tutee by providing activities that will help him/her to comprehend content more effectively (Sessions 10-13, G-332-335). One formal lesson plan is required, as well, which is designed specifically to include modifications which make instruction and reading materials more comprehensible (H-351-353).

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 518 include the RDG 518 Lesson Plan with built-in modifications for English learners (the ABC’s and other SDAIE strategies), the Diagnostic Report to Schools, and the Literacy Profile for Parents.

Both the Into/Through/Beyond assignment/presentation and the required research paper ask candidates to synthesize what they know from the research to help English learners comprehend what they read.

3B) with foundational skills in academic language development and background knowledge
RDG 510

Readings

Chapter 5 of the Johns and Lenski handbook includes information on the role of academic language in the comprehension of connected discourse and the importance of the activation of students’ prior knowledge before reading. The authors also explain how teachers can help students use prior knowledge to make links to new terminology (B-185)).

In addition, specific sections from the Cary text, Working with Second Language Learners, focuses on helping teachers to find useful information on a student’s cultural background in order to draw upon it for reading comprehension purposes. The links students make between their own backgrounds and the readings in which they engage are key elements in promoting understanding of what is read.

New texts have been adopted for RDG 510 in order to ensure currency of information and to respond to the needs of candidates. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 6.

The concept of schema, or background knowledge is a major topic in the Graves text, and candidates learn that what learners know about a topic before they engage in reading about it will affect their level of understanding.

The issue of academic language and technical vocabulary as part of handling increasingly more difficult texts is also made clear, along with strategies for helping learners to develop it.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates must do two formal lessons presented during the tutorial sessions. The lesson plan format for this course requires that they include prior knowledge activation and development activities before students engage in the reading of the text.
One demonstration lesson consists of the instructor reading a selection with the class for which prior knowledge has been activated and then one in which it has not been activated; the contrast emphasizes the value and importance of schema building (B-185).

Discussion of the various ways to activate schemata occur at different times: as reading comprehension is introduced in Chapter 5 of the Johns and Lenski text; as students present their two lessons with ELD components (Lesson #1, B-149-153); and as fieldwork issues are discussed during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class.

Class requirements and assignments for RDG 510 include having candidates pay particular attention to the background knowledge of learners as a way of predicting their success with comprehension passages and texts. They are also introduced to 30 academic language terms which they begin to teach explicitly to their tutees as a way of helping them navigate texts with greater facility.

RDG 514

Readings

Background knowledge issues are addressed when candidates read about and then give the QRI-3 passages; if students do not have sufficient schema to read the passage, the passage cannot be used in the assessment process (D-247).

New texts have been adopted for RDG 514, including the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory; candidates must determine the appropriateness of administering particular passages to learners, depending upon their schema, or background knowledge. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 7.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

All issues related to academic language and background knowledge are considered when the results of various formal and informal tests are reported by candidates during Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class and within the contexts of the 3 Clinician’s Summary Reports (D-218-224).
Also, as the Gates-MacGinitie is administered, candidates help tutees develop academic language such as “passage,” “paragraph,” “selection,” “main idea,” “primary point,” etc. This language of school is necessary for students to have to be able to talk about texts and the processes they use when reading/writing.

RDG 516

Readings

The second half of the Graves text is required for RDG 516, in which the comprehension process is clearly delineated and the importance of background knowledge and academic language development is highlighted. A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 7.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The emphasis on schema in this class is strong, as candidates learn to administer the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test to their tutees. They quickly see the effect that schema has on the understanding of reading passages, and this knowledge builds on what they discovered when they gave assessments in previous courses.

RDG 518

Readings

Academic language development is primarily addressed during Session 11 of the course, where the concepts of BICS (Basic Interpersonal Conversational Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) are presented (G-333). The monitor model and the interdependence hypothesis are analyzed during class, and Cummins’ Quadrants are presented. Candidates then share examples of activities that would fit into each quadrant, highlighting Quadrant D as the “academic language” quadrant—or school language—quadrant (H-354). In the same session, they begin to discuss ways in which to provide sheltered components to make content more comprehensible (Quadrant B activities) which provide the necessary scaffolding for ELL students until they can operate independently in Quadrant D.
Various ways of providing adequate background knowledge prior to asking ELL students to read and write are offered in Chapters 6 and 7 of the Echevarria and Graves text. Attention is paid to celebrating and being responsive to cultural diversity and to helping students make links between what they know and the concepts presented in the reading material (H-370-371).

New texts have been adopted for RDG 518 in which major attention is paid to schema development as a prerequisite for comprehension (Graves text), and strategies are provided which take this need into account (50 Strategies for English Learners.) A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 8.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

All of the sheltered content components described in the texts and discussed in class address making content comprehensible and helping students to develop the academic language of school (CALP). They are also incorporated into the fieldwork tutorials and log entries.

The lesson plan format for the formal lesson with the ELL student contains criteria relating to the development of background knowledge: Section III, connections to previous learning and linkage of new concepts to past learning (H-351). In addition, candidates are encouraged to provide schema activation and development activities prior to having students engage in reading/writing activities during all tutorial sessions.

The “into” portion of the Into/Through/Beyond presentation emphasizes ways to help English learners develop background knowledge prior to reading. This element is also included in the RDG 518 Lesson Plan.

3C) with foundational skills in concept formation and vocabulary development

RDG 510

Readings

In Johns and Lenski’s handbook, the authors include various ways for students to identify and understand words. They discuss activities for word building and word pattern sorting, and explain the use of the context clue strategy as one method readers may use to understand the meanings of unknown words.
(providing good context is available). One part of the chapter deals with the extension of meaning vocabulary.

Information from *Working with Second Language Learners* includes techniques for getting reluctant speakers to speak English and for making the instructor’s spoken language more comprehensible. This process involves teaching ELL students new concepts, as well as helping them to learn the English vocabulary for concepts they already possess and can name in their primary languages. One full chapter is also devoted to teaching grade-level content to English beginners, which necessitates the teaching of content area vocabulary (Chapters 3, 4, and 7, B-174).

_The new texts that have been adopted for RDG 510 (Graves, in particular), has an entire chapter on vocabulary and concept development (Vocabulary Development, Chapter 7). A full Table of Contents is included for each assigned text in Appendix 6._

_There are sections on teaching individual words, as well as word learning strategies. One part of these sections discusses how to introduce new words that represent new concepts._

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

In the class session which emphasizes the identification and understanding of words (Session 5, A-130-131), candidates review strategies for the word recognition of unfamiliar vocabulary, such as structural (morphemic) analysis and context clues. The following strategies are also modeled by classmates: Knowledge Rating Guide, Semantic Maps, Word Maps, Vocabulary Self-Collection Strategy, Contextual Redefinition, Preview in Context, List-Group-Label, and Feature Analysis Grids.

The survey of Resources from the Johns and Lenski handbook also reveals lists of 15 Frequently Occurring Prefixes and 24 Useful Suffixes which should be taught to students in order to help them unlock the meanings of many unknown words which include these morphemes. A list of affixes with invariant meanings is presented, as well.

Since candidates share fieldwork experiences during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the course, they also discuss concept-building and vocabulary-
building experiences that they are doing with their tutees; colleagues provide additional observations and suggestions for other similar activities at these times.

*As candidates do Activity Demonstrations on word recognition strategies, they differentiate between the idea of developing a “concept” and simply defining new vocabulary for which concepts already exist. They point out appropriate ways to handle difficult words as they come up during the demonstrations.*

**RDG 514**

**Readings**

Miller addresses vocabulary briefly in Chapter 3 of her text, in which she provides a brief description of vocabulary knowledge and suggests ways to improve ability in vocabulary knowledge (D-255).

In RDG 514, the Collins and Cheek text has a separate section on the development of vocabulary, which leads to higher comprehension. Specific strategies are suggested.

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Candidates use suggested methods from Miller’s text as part of their instructional recommendations for tutees.

*Candidates learn to contrast “vocabulary” assessments with “context clue” assessments on norm-referenced, standardized tests such as the Gates-MacGinitie and on informal reading inventories, such as the Roe and Burns. They administer the vocabulary subtests of these assessments to determine how children are performing in this area.*
RDG 516

Readings

A specific text entitled Words, Words, Words (Allen) is required in this course (Appendix 8), so candidates learn the importance of vocabulary development (based on research) and are given tools to use with their tutees.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates videotape one vocabulary strategy in the Observation Booth with their tutee) from the Allen book and use it as a demonstration lesson for their classmates. In this way, everyone is able to see multiple strategies being modeled, rather than just reading about them in the text. Discussion and feedback from the class and the instructor offer clarification and elaboration.

RDG 518

Readings

The Gleason text identifies the progression of phonological, semantic, syntactic, and concept development in children (Chapters 3-7, H-373-375). A class discussion is held on concept development, specifically, with a supplemental handout distributed for additional clarification (H-355-356).

The session on approaches to language acquisition, which focuses on several theories (behavioral, linguistic, interactional, information-processing, and social interactionist), includes the different ways in which these theories account for language, concept, and vocabulary development. A separate handout on these theories, based on Gleason’s Chapter 7, is provided (H-360).

The new texts that have been adopted for RDG 518 include chapters on the development of vocabulary, as well as information on how concepts are formed. (See Appendix 9.)
**In the Genie film (produced by Nova), there is a major emphasis on the importance of input and feedback in language development, showing that syntax and “real” vocabulary will not occur without it.**

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

The class discussions on concept development and semantic development, described under Readings above (which include issues of how children learn vocabulary), plus the Language Sample Collection (H-345-348) that candidates do as a fieldwork activity, highlight stages of concept development and specific features of language and vocabulary that children display as they mature.

Candidates view excerpts from a videotape series entitled The Human Language, Parts 1-3 (H-363). They are able to observe changes in children’s speech patterns and stages of concept, vocabulary, and grammatical development when they watch these segments, which contain excellent representative examples of how language is acquired.

*All RDG 518 Lesson Plans must include steps for frontloading vocabulary with English learners prior to the teaching of a set of strategies.*

The program provides candidates with:

**3D) skills and knowledge related to the teaching of comprehension strategies such as text analysis (narrative and expository structures)**

**RDG 510**

**Readings**

In particular, two chapters from the Johns and Lenski text present activities for helping students to monitor comprehension while reading, for understanding text structure, and for processing text. The comprehension problem that results from a lack of comprehension monitoring is explored, and suggestions are made for ways to support students in developing more effective practices (Chapters 5 and 6, B-185-186).

Cary also addresses the issue of textbook difficulty, and recommends ways to adapt lessons so that the content is more comprehensible for ELL students, with identification of text structure being one method.
The Graves text includes a chapter on emergent literacy the idea that learners develop “emerging knowledge” about text structures. Without being able to predict how content will be presented, readers are not able to comprehend as well.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

In class, candidates learn such text structure strategies as Story Maps, Character Maps, Story Frames, Idea Mapping and Probable Passages. In addition, a variety of processing-text strategies are introduced such as Herringbone, Retelling, Story Pyramids, Summarizing, Venn Diagrams, and Discussion Webs (Session 9, A-134).

Also, the instructor and classmates model ways of making textbook structures more comprehensible for ELL students. Textbook Tours, graphic organizers, and Main Idea Signposts are presented, as well as Think Aloud Modeling (Session 9, A-134).

The Ekwall Shanker offers passages which include both narrative and expository passages, which are administered to tutees. The Fieldwork Seminar portion of the class provides opportunities to discuss different text structures and describe learners’ various reactions to them because of their specific structures.

RDG 517

Readings

An important part of this class is the presentation of different genres of literature, to which teachers must expose students in order to cover all areas of the Reading and Language Arts Standards. Many of these genres contain narrative readings—but some of them primarily emphasize expository texts (such as Biography and Information Books in Session 9, E-282). Because Goforth includes “learner response modes” to complement the teaching of each type of literature in Literature and the Learner, text structure is highlighted, and a variety of comprehension techniques is introduced within the discussion of each genre, which are highly engaging and interactive.
Text analysis becomes an important prerequisite for candidates when they create Abbreviated Literary Links for books used with their fieldwork tutees. (F-300). Part of the rationale for developing the Link in the first place is to design activities which emphasize the development and structure of the text, which make the reading more enjoyable and understandable for the student. The Link is also an appropriate context for focusing on comprehension because the connect-construct-create format (similar to an into-through-beyond sequence) emphasizes the meaning-making process in reading.

Comprehension techniques from the Goforth text, or other comprehension strategies, such as those demonstrated in RDG 510 and RDG 514, may be included in the Abbreviated Literary Link or within other fieldwork session activities.

*RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.*

**RDG 518**

**Readings**

Specifically, Chapters 6 and 7 of the Echevarria and Graves text (H-370-371) provide recommendations for scaffolding content instruction for ELL students, leading to higher levels of comprehension.

*The new texts that have been adopted for RDG 518 include the importance of teaching English learners different text structures so that they can get the “big picture” when they read (See Appendix 9.)*

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

As candidates learn how to modify texts, include contextualization, and create possible study resource guides for their ELL tutees, they focus on the development of techniques which emphasize how the identification of text structures can support comprehension; and they work toward including these strategies into their fieldwork sessions, making the materials they present to their tutees as comprehensible as possible.
In class, candidates identify different text features that they would expect to see in narrative and expository texts in order to help their tutees make the transition from “mostly narrative” to “mostly expository” texts in the upper grades.

**3E) skills and knowledge related to the teaching of thinking and study strategies, such as inference, summarization, predicting, questioning and clarifying**

RDG 510

Readings

Chapters 5 and 6 of the Johns and Lenski text (B-185) deal the teaching of thinking and study strategies. Comprehension strategies involving main ideas, facts/details sequencing, predicting outcomes, making inferences, questioning, and problem solving are addressed. In addition, Chapter 8 highlights study and test-taking strategies, including previewing texts, summary writing, note-taking, test-taking preparation, and use of charts and graphs (B-186).

*Questioning and predicting are focuses of the RDG 510 text (Graves), especially in the chapter on reading instruction, focusing on the processes of actively engaging students in reading and responding to texts.*

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates practice demonstrating comprehension strategies such as Reciprocal Teaching, Request, Say Something, Questioning, DRTA, and QAR, and then incorporate them into their fieldwork tutorials, as appropriate. They also draw upon other strategies, described in their texts, as appropriate, and report on their effectiveness during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of class.

*In the Activity Demonstrations and in the strategies that the instructor models, candidates begin to analyze thinking and study strategies.*
RDG 514

Readings
Chapter 7 of Miller’s Alternative Assessment Techniques for Reading and Writing (D-257) includes a description of reading comprehension and presents specific questioning strategies such as QAR and the use of a self-monitoring (metacognitive) assessment device which serves as an instructional technique for students to use to monitor comprehension as they read.

In addition, Rubin addresses study strategies in Chapter 14 of her text. She includes such topics as how to study, following good study procedures, knowing the textbook, asking questions, and following directions D-286).

The Collins and Cheek text (Appendix 7) discusses ways in which higher order thinking processes can be assessed. The difficult of “capturing” these processes in an assessment context is highlighted. There is a separate chapter on Study Skills and Strategies, as well.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice
Discussion of Miller’s Chapter 7 and Rubin’s Chapter 14 helps candidates decide if such strategies would be appropriate for their tutees (D-257-258). These skills are highlighted during Session 13 of the course (“Learning Strategies and Study Skills,”C-204).

Attention is paid to test questions that ask candidates to sequence events or to make inferences, or to identify main ideas, at which point strategies for engaging in these higher order thinking processes are presented.

RDG 517

Readings
The techniques and strategies presented within each genre in the Goforth text call upon candidates to instruct students to make inferences, to summarize, to predict, to question, and to clarify. For example, picture walk activities encourage students to predict and to question. The “Uses of TV and literature” suggestions ask them to clarify concepts that are presented and to contrast modes between
the two mediums; they summarize a book when they engage in the Abbreviated Literary Link; and they make inferences when they use drama with literature.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

GRIP, QAR, ReQuest, Reciprocal Teaching, Retells, and “thinking strategies” are appropriate activities for use within the fieldwork sessions, as well as ideal activities for inclusion in the Abbreviated Literary Links. These activities may also be modified to “work” within the context of the Verbal and Visual Presentation of Literature assignment and the Sharing of a Favorite Picture Book assignment (E-279).

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

3F) skills and knowledge related to the independent reading of high quality books

RDG 510

Readings

Chapters on “Encouraging a Love of Reading,” “Strengthening the Home-School Partnership,” and the appendices of types of books from the Johns and Lenski text contribute to the information needed by candidates to help engage children in the independent reading of high quality books.

An article by Cunningham and Stanovich from Read All About It: “What Reading Does for the Mind” supports the need for children to read often and widely in order to become proficient readers.

The Read-Aloud Video (B-154) by Jim Trelease presents compelling reasons why parents and teachers should read aloud to students in order to model the process, develop the students’ listening vocabularies, and motivate them to read on their own.

The Graves text (Appendix 7) offers information on the importance of reading during instruction and reading independently (for practice). Candidates learn to teach for transfer so that students can apply learned skills to their own reading.
Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

One of the goals for each tutee must be related to the affective domain. Such objectives include providing access to high quality books of interest for students, developing motivation to read, helping students to “make matches” with books, and supporting students’ efforts to read independently more frequently.

Parents are encouraged to become part of the process. In Session 13 of the class, candidates discuss ways to help families support literacy learning. Topics include conducive home environments, “real reading” at home, development of self esteem, and motivating children to succeed in school.

In addition, research underlying in-school free reading programs is presented, and candidates discuss the article by Cunningham and Stanovich entitled “What Reading Does for the Mind,” which documents the positive effects of wide reading.

Tutees in the Literacy Center are asked to do independent reading at home during the week. Candidates determine a child’s independent and instructional reading levels and then use materials at the instructional level for class tutorials while recommending books at the child’s independent level for pleasure reading.

Candidates help children select books for reading at home and converse with parents about the importance of having the child read habitually in a quiet, low-risk environment. Books are sent home with the families for this purpose, and tutees fill out “pleasure reading” forms (Appendix 26).

RDG 514

Readings

Chapter 16 of the Rubin text addresses ways to include parents in the diagnostic-reading and correction program at schools. Issues such as involving parents and grandparents in reading with children, limiting television viewing in lieu of supporting independent reading behaviors, and educating families about ways to make reading at home more successful are discussed.
The Collins and Cheek text (Appendix 7) defines a reader’s independent level as the level at which he can read materials successfully on his own. The Personal Reading chapter includes information on the importance of personal reading, motivating students to read, and techniques for developing personal reading habits. Recommendations are made for linking children with appropriate reading materials.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The discussion during Session 14 of the course gives candidates the opportunity to talk about ways in which parents could be included in their child’s reading process. They brainstorm ideas for educating parents about the reading process, how to support their children during reading, and how to encourage their children to engage in independent reading at home. The importance of providing children with direct access to books is emphasized.

Candidates are urged to “kid watch” when children are reading independently to identify which behaviors are proficient and which ones need additional support. This can be viewed as an informal assessment. Tutees are offered choices of books to take home to read for pleasure.

**RDG 516**

**Readings**

There is a specific chapter in the Graves text which describes the process and importance of independent reading (Appendix 8). Ideas for encouraging students to read independently during school and outside of school are presented.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates provide tutees with “at home” reading sheets for them to track what they are reading for pleasure (Appendix 26). Two versions are available: one for the younger reader and one for the older reader. Candidates choose the appropriate format for their tutees. Efforts are made to connect English learners with content for which they have some background knowledge.
RDG 517

Readings

An article by Anderson entitled “Research Foundations to Support Wide Reading” is discussed during Session 4 of the course (E-278). The author’s main point is that we know that wide reading leads to development of vocabulary, better spelling, and more proficient reading and writing. Anderson emphasizes the importance of frequent independent reading.

Because various genres and ways to present books within them are the focus of the Goforth text, candidates develop a wide repertoire of recommendations for book suggestions to help students to find independent reading materials that match their interests. Each chapter has a list of recommended books for each genre, as well as notable award-winning books and authors. They also experience the reading of additional required children’s book within each genre, which are listed on the syllabus (E-274).

The text entitled Multicultural Voices in Contemporary Literature has information about various well-known authors of multicultural literature and provides a listing of the authors’ books. If students show an interest in the works of a particular author, candidates can help fieldwork students to select other books by him/her in order to encourage continued independent reading.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The main goal of the class is to help candidates develop ways to motivate reluctant readers and encourage them to read independently. The information from both texts, the assigned children’s books, and the class assignments and activities are designed to guide them in creating rich literature experiences for their fieldwork students, in particular, and for all students with whom they will work, in general.

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.
**RDG 518**

**Readings**

The Peregoy and Boyle text includes a chapter on “The Many Benefits of Independent Reading,” offering many motivational and interactive strategies for helping English learners to engage in the real reading process.

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Candidates provide tutees with “at home” reading sheets for them to track what they are reading for pleasure (Appendix 5). However, oftentimes it is important to select books that may typically be far below grade level for tutees who are English learners—so candidates also learn to take “maturity” level into account as well. Books with easier vocabulary should not feel “babyish” to older tutees; similarly, a younger tutee who is more proficient should not be exposed to content that is beyond his maturity level. The “match” between reader and text is important.
Standard 4
Planning & Delivery of Reading Instruction Based on Assessment
Reading Certificate

Category 1: Program Design & Curriculum Standards

Standard 4: Planning and Delivery of Reading Instruction Based on Assessment

The program provides opportunities for each candidate to participate in the ongoing assessment and evaluation of students’ reading and writing, including speakers of English and English-language learners. Each candidate masters the planning and delivery of appropriate reading and writing instruction, based on formal and informal assessment and evaluation results, to meet the reading and writing needs of all students. Instruction in the program includes extensive candidate experience in the assessment and evaluation of student reading and writing, and emphasizes the relationship between assessment and instruction.

The program provides opportunities for each candidate:

4A) to participate in the ongoing assessment and evaluation of students’ reading and writing

RDG 510

Readings

In this course, candidates begin to learn how to assess students’ skills in reading and writing, to plan and deliver appropriate instruction, and then to evaluate progress. The Johns and Lenski handbook presents checklists and other informal instruments for assessing phonemic awareness, word attack strategies, sight word knowledge, sense of story, and comprehension and study strategies (B-184-185).

The Glazer text offers self-monitoring (Chapter 2) and self-assessment tools in spelling (Chapter 3), as well as methods for assessing students’ knowledge of word groups, origins, and expanded vocabulary (Chapter 4) in order to determine appropriate instructional strategies (B-181-182).

The Phonological Handbook by Ericson and Juliebo presents instructional strategies for the teaching of phonemic awareness, such as rhyming, blending,
and segmentation Preteaching and postteaching tests to be administered by
teachers are included (B-177).

All assigned texts are chosen with an emphasis on assessment leading to
instruction, as described in earlier standards. (There is also a specific writing
focus in RDG 516 and 518.) Chapter 14 in the Graves text (Classroom
Assessment) focuses on assessment as inquiry, analyzing and summarizing the
data in reading/writing, and reporting and decision-making for instruction.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates in RDG 510 are responsible for gathering assessment data about
their two tutees (a beginning reader and an intermediate struggling reader) in
order to plan instruction for them. They must set goals for the students based on
assessments related to two or three of the following areas: motivation, phonemic
awareness, word recognition strategies, vocabulary, study skills, metacognition,
spelling, writing, and comprehension. Two of the goals must be cognitive, and
one must be affective, as prescribed in the Guidelines for the Case Study
Analysis (B-156-157).

The videotapes of fieldwork “segments,” contributed by candidates, also offer
classmates opportunities during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class to
assess the literacy skills of the students who are represented in the clips.

In RDG 510, candidates complete a series of lesson plans to identify
assessments in emergent literacy and word recognition skills that lead to the
setting of instructional objectives for tutees. Candidates use writing samples as
informal assessments of tutees’ writing.

RDG 514

Readings

RDG 514, Literacy Assessment and Diagnosis, provides candidates with
information about many types of informal and formal assessment instruments
and offers them experience in using a variety of assessments with two tutorial
students: a beginning reader and a more proficient, developing reader. In Part I,
 Rubin covers initial information on tests, measurement and evaluation, as well as
the teacher’s role in a diagnostic-reading and correction program. In Part II, she
addresses factors that affect reading performance on different kinds of tests. In Part III, she introduces instruments and techniques for the assessment and diagnosis of reading performance: standardized reading achievement tests, informal reading inventories, diagnostic reading tests, and observation and performance-based assessments (D-261-269).

The Miller book offers candidates a wide variety of informal devices to assess reading and writing ability: checklists, inventories, anecdotal records, questionnaires, observation, and charts. Miller also addresses holistic scoring and the use of informal writing inventories to assess writing. Finally, she includes portfolio assessment information and describes elements that comprise a useful working portfolio and provides reproducible devices that can be included in a portfolio assessment program (D-252-260).

Additional guidance for using portfolio assessment is offered to candidates in the book entitled Portfolio Planner: A Step-By-Step Guide to Portfolio Assessment by Jasmine. Forms for collecting portfolio information about language arts (as well as other content areas) are provided, including Conference Forms (D-245-246).

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Candidates must administer three required tests, as well as a number of other selected assessments, to each of their fieldwork students: The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, and the Qualitative Reading Inventory. For each test, a Clinician’s Summary Report must be written (D-218-224).

One class activity which gives candidates practice in interpreting test scores as part of the assessment process is called interpreting “Scenarios from the Gates” (C-196 and D-215-217). In pairs, they read each scenario; using the norms booklet for the test, they answer and discuss the questions, clarifying and elaborating, as needed.

In addition, as indicated by the Profile Requirements sheet (D-206-208), other assessments must be given to address the following areas of literacy: phonemic awareness (beginning student), word recognition strategies, comprehension, motivation/interest, fluency, and (older reader) study skills and metacognition.

All assessment information is recorded and described in the final Case Study Assessment Profiles (D-209-214), which provide a comprehensive overview of the students’ weaknesses and strengths.
The tape-recorded excerpts of assessment processes that candidates share with colleagues during class also allow them to practice the evaluation of student progress (D-225-227).

As candidates learn about informal and formal assessments, they analyze the California Language Arts Framework in the areas of reading and writing and determine the needs of their tutees. Objectives are set related to all areas of reading, as well as writing. These objectives are included in the lesson plans for each class, as well as the Diagnostic Report to Schools and the Literacy Profile for Parents.

The RDG 514 Lesson Plan has a specific section on assessment of reading and writing, which represents a key assessment in our program. Candidates upload these assessments, and instructors evaluate them using a TaskStream rubric.

Two test reports are also required in this course: The Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory and the Gates-MacGinitie. Candidates assess their tutees using these measures (along with a variety of others) and write reports on the results (what they found to be the strengths and weaknesses of the tutees), along with initial instructional recommendations.

RDG 516

Readings

Readings for RDG 516 include the Graves text, which devotes a chapter to the process approach to writing and the evaluation of students’ writing during the writing workshop and through the use of rubrics.

There is also a separate text on writing (Blasingame and Bushman, 2005) which includes Chapter 6 on the nature and importance of assessment, including high-stakes testing, authentic assessment, portfolio assessment, and a variety of assessment rubrics. Six-trait writing assessment practices are also described.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

As candidates learn about informal and formal assessments, they analyze the California Language Arts Framework in the areas of reading and writing and determine the needs of their tutees. Objectives are set related to all areas of reading, as well as writing. These objectives are included in the lesson plans for
each class, as well as the Diagnostic Report to Schools and the Literacy Profile for Parents. Candidates pay particular attention to the six traits of writing.

**RDG 517**

Readings

The text entitled Literature and the Learner does not include specific literacy assessments, but the author gives numerous suggestions in each chapter for activities that will engage the learner in responding to various literature genres. Goforth, the author, suggests that these activities may be used as performance-based assessments for judging students’ reading and writing skills, as well as their expertise within (and enjoyment of) a given genre.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Because candidates are working with two-four reluctant readers, they first learn to administer interest inventories. The assigned projects for the course then call upon them to create a series of activities to help the students to become more highly motivated to read. During each tutorial session, the candidate uses observation and performance-based activities to assess the students’ levels of interest and skills in order to plan objectives for the next fieldwork session.

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

**RDG 518**

Readings

The book by Tannen entitled That’s Not What I Meant provides the basis for assessing children’s levels of pragmatic knowledge, or their ability to use language effectively for practical interactions in the real world (H-377-379). She describes conversational signals and devices that speakers use to communicate with others and investigates specific conversational strategies that affect meaning.

The Gleason text presents attributes of language that occur at various stages of children’s development, which offers a set of criteria for assessing children’s acquisition of language (H-372-376).
The new texts for RDG 518 include Peregoy and Boyle, who devote Chapter 5 to English learners who are beginning to write and read, including assessments for emergent literacy development. Chapter 6 is entitled English Learners and Process Writing, and a section on the assessment of English learners’ writing progress is included, specifically related to portfolio assessment and holistic scoring.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Using the specific components from the Tannen book, candidates observe, tape record, and analyze a conversation among children or students (or between a younger person and an adult). The results of the analysis indicate the proficiency with which the participants can manage the “pragmatics” of social interactions (H-338-341).

The Language Sample Collection and Analysis also gives candidates experience in observation of language patterns. They observe and record language samples from a child, bring them to class for analysis, determine what patterns are typical for particular grade levels, and then use these “norms” to assess the development of the child they observed (H-345-348).

As candidates learn about informal and formal assessments, they analyze the California ELD Framework in the areas of reading and writing and determine the needs of their tutees. Objectives are set related to all areas of reading, as well as writing. These objectives are included in the lesson plans for each class, as well as the Diagnostic Report to Schools and the Literacy Profile for Parents.

4B) to include speakers of English and English language learners

RDG 510

Readings

The Cary book, Working with Second Language Learners, explains how teachers may assess a student’s English, find information about their cultural backgrounds to plan schema-development activities, and observe student writing to determine ways to improve it (B-173-174).
In *Phonics, Spelling and Word Study*, Glazer presents the “foibles” of the English language, which can help instructors to assess and understand miscues in reading and errors in writing, especially with respect to students whose first language is not English (B-180-182).

*The Graves text in RDG 510 includes separate sections entitled “Strengths and Challenges of Diversity,” which related to chapter topics. In the case of assessment, recommendations are made for modifying assessment for diverse students, including English learners.*

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Candidates are required to plan instruction that will benefit English Language Learners. The required lesson plan format for the course includes the ABC’s needed for success with ELL students: providing a low AFFECTIVE filter; activating BACKGROUND knowledge, and including linguistic and non-linguistic CONTEXTUALIZATION. Candidates must assess student needs prior to setting objectives for the lessons (B-149-153).

*Related to the “Diversity” section of each lesson plan (in this case, the RDG 510 Lesson Plan), candidates include information on how to modify assessment and instruction for tutees who are English learners.*

**RDG 514**

**Readings**

One of the tests discussed in the Rubin text is the TOLD (Test of Language Development) and The TOLD 2, which are used for the purposes of assessing language development. These tests may be utilized with ELL students as part of the Case Study Assessment process.

*Chapter 12 of the Collins and Cheek text includes information related to assessment for non-English speaking students.*
After discussing issues of language, regional, and cultural bias in standardized tests, candidates may determine that an assessment that they have administered to an ELL student may not have complete validity and might wish to “triangulate” by administering additional, more valid, assessments as part of the Case Study Assessment process for these fieldwork students.

Class discussions focus on tests that may be regionally or culturally biased. The limitations, in particular, of norm-reference standardized tests for English learners are identified. The Kohn text provides a basis for discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of such tests for diverse populations.

Candidates note example of test items that might be considered invalid assessments for English learners as they administer the Roe and Burns and the Gates-MacGinitie to their tutees.

RDG 516

Readings

The Graves text in RDG 516 includes separate sections entitled “Strengths and Challenges of Diversity,” which related to chapter topics. In the case of assessment, recommendations are made for modifying assessment for diverse students, including English learners.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Related to the “Diversity” section of each lesson plan (in this case, the RDG 516 Lesson Plan), candidates include information on how to modify assessment and instruction for tutees.
RDG 518

Readings

The Sheltered Content Instruction book contains a sheltered instruction model (Chapters 3-7, H-369-371), which incorporates information on observation and performance-based assessment, instruction, and evaluation. Candidates learn how to judge the effectiveness of instructional activities and then to plan next steps, based on the assessment of a student’s learning during a given step in the process.

The entire text by Peregoy and Boyle addresses the needs of English learners and covers reading and writing assessment and strategies in depth.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates must assess the ELL student’s skills in reading and writing in order to plan appropriate and effective fieldwork instructional sessions and to write up and implement the required formal lesson plan (H-351-353).

The specific needs of the English leaner are taken into account as students are assessed and evaluated, as reflected in the RDG 518 Lesson Plan, the 50 Strategies text demonstration (in an into/through/beyond format), and the Diagnostic Report to Schools and Literacy Profile for Parents.

Each candidate masters:

4C) the planning and delivery of appropriate reading and writing instruction, based on formal and informal assessment and evaluation results, to meet the reading and writing needs of all students

RDG 510

Readings

A focus on the planning and delivery of appropriate reading and writing instruction, based on assessment, is present in all three texts for this course. While they each offer a variety of methods for assessment (as described in 4A and 4B, above), they also provide a wide range of instructional activities for
addressing the literacy needs of students (as presented in the responses to Standards 2 and 3).

Planning and delivery of instruction is emphasized in the Graves text and the Bear text. Chapter 2 in Graves include the importance of cognitive modeling, focusing on academically relevant tasks, employing active teaching, and fostering active learning. Chapter 3 includes methods for creating a literate environment to foster appropriate reading and writing instruction. The Bear text offers a wide variety of instructional activities and strategies which candidates can select, based on the developmental levels of their tutees.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Activities and projects which provide connections between assessment and planning/delivery of reading and writing instruction for this course include the following:

Two ten-hour tutorials with a beginning, struggling reader and an older non-reader are required. They include the process of assessment, followed by appropriate instruction, as documented by the Double Entry Journal, the two formal lessons, and the Case Study Analysis for each student.

A videotaped segment of a fieldwork lesson, which includes the identified goal(s) for the lesson, based on a specific assessment procedure, as well as appropriate instructional activities to match the lesson objective(s), is also required.

Candidates not only develop in-depth plans for their tutees for each lesson plan, but they also do Activity Demonstrations for their colleagues, designed to match instructional objectives from the Bear text; these activities reflect the planning and delivery part of the instructional process.

RDG 514

Readings

Both the Rubin and Miller texts present assessments, both formal and informal (as described earlier in the responses to this standard). In addition, the authors
also recommend instructional strategies to match areas of identified need, based on the assessments. For example, Miller includes sections such as Improving Ability in Sight-Word Recognition and Sight-Word Identification and Improving Ability in Structural Analysis (D-254), and Rubin’s Part IV (Chapters 11-15) provides a wide range of strategies for “correction,” based on diagnostic information (D-266-268).

The Collins and Cheek text offers recommendations for organizing assessment information and them planning for effective classroom reading instruction (Chapters 4 and 5.) Chapter Six (Providing Appropriate Reading Instruction) highlights the planning and delivery process, as well, by describing approaches to effective reading instruction. Candidates keep this information in mind as they plan for each lesson with their tutees.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

For each of the required assessments which they administer (two standardized tests and an informal reading inventory), candidates must complete a Summary Report which provides information on the results of the assessments and prescribes appropriate instruction to match the identified needs (D 218-224).

During the Tape-recorded excerpts of diagnostic segments and the Oral Formative Update on the development of work with a fieldwork students, candidates look at assessment information and make suggestions for appropriate instruction to match it).

The end-of-course Case Study Assessment Profiles that the candidates write for each fieldwork student include pre-assessment information, new assessments given, results of the assessments, profiles of the students’ strengths and weaknesses (based on the assessments), and goals to be set for the students, along with instructional strategies and activities matched to the goals.

The RDG 514 Lesson Plan, as well as the Diagnostic Report and the Parent Literacy Profile, have components on planning and delivery. Also, during the Fieldwork Seminar part of each class session, candidates discuss elements of planning and delivery with their instructor and colleagues.
RDG 517

Readings

The literature presented in Multicultural Voices and Literature and the Learner spans a large range of genres and includes writers from different cultural and language backgrounds. Candidates learn to tailor their instruction and to select their reading materials based on the skills, reading levels, and interests of the students with whom they are working.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates must offer appropriate and motivational literature to their fieldwork students, who are reluctant readers. The entire ten-hour fieldwork experience with students is devoted to providing experiences that will engage the learners in such a way as to encourage them to pursue more frequent reading behaviors, including independent reading outside of school. The experience itself is documented though the Dialogue Journal entries.

The Dialogue Journal (F-302) too, allows candidates to communicate with their colleagues and instructor in order to provide and receive input regarding appropriate activities and materials to meet the identified needs of fieldwork students.

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

RDG 518

Readings

In Sheltered Content Instruction, the authors describe the language issues that make it difficult for ELL learners to comprehend content area material. As teachers observe students’ interactions and responses in classroom situations, they learn to provide immediate and appropriate sheltered support for the students, as recommended in the text.
Specific sections on how to plan for differentiated instruction are offered in the Peregoy and Boyle text, along with a chapter on classroom practices for English learner instruction. Chapter 7 includes ideas for planning and delivery of strategies for beginning and intermediate English learners. The 50 Strategies book also provides numerous recommendations for activities to meet the assessed needs of English learners through effective planning and delivery of instruction.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The 10-hour tutorial experience with the ELL student requires the candidate to determine the student’s language abilities and to plan and deliver appropriate instruction to meet his/her needs, following the sheltered model presented in the text by Echevarria and Graves.

Parts of the midterm and final examination also present scenarios involving the assessment of student needs and require the candidate to suggest appropriate instructional strategies (H-365-367).

This class includes a specific emphasis on planning. A rubric for planning represents one of the program’s key assessments (Appendix 20). The RDG 518 Lesson Plan, as well as the Diagnostic Report and the Parent Literacy Profile, have components on planning and delivery. Also, during the Fieldwork Seminar part of each class session, candidates discuss elements of planning and delivery with their instructor and colleagues.

The 50 Strategies demonstration is a representation of both the planning and delivery phases of a lesson for an English learner.

Instruction in the program includes:

4D) extensive candidate experience in the assessment and evaluation of student reading and writing and emphasizes the relationship between assessment and instruction

(Please note: Because the course readings have been described comprehensively in earlier responses to this standard, only the non-readings, assignments, activities, and practice opportunities will be included below.)
A large amount of modeling and demonstration by the instructor, as well as by colleagues, occurs during the RDG 510 class sessions. For example, in Session 3, the instructor models how to mark a “Concepts About Print Checklist” and then suggests activities to help students if specific gaps are identified (A-128). A video segment on phonemic awareness and phonics is also viewed by the candidates in which both the assessment process and activities for the development of these skills are demonstrated. Such modeling and practice opportunities occur throughout the course on a regular basis.

Candidates also report on their fieldwork experiences during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class. During these times, they share what assessments they have given, as well as instructional ideas for helping students within their areas of weakness. During this process, they receive feedback, clarification, and elaboration.

The Case Study Analysis (B-156-157), which is written by candidates for each fieldwork student, combines the results of assessment with descriptions of instructional strategies in order to meet identified goals. The Double Entry Journal also offers a way for candidates to reflect upon the assessment-goal-instruction-evaluation cycle and to note questions they want to raise in class or examples they would like to share with their colleagues (B-141).

In every certificate class, candidates work with tutees whom they assess and for whom they plan and deliver lessons. Throughout the course of the certificate program, they work with four students for a total of 40 hours.

Each major assignment (lesson plan, Diagnostic Report to Schools, Literacy Profile for Parents) requires candidates to match assessments to instruction.

Discussions during class and throughout the Fieldwork Seminar portion focus on this tightly-knit process. Candidates must justify the assessments they select, the objectives that emerge from the assessments, and the plans they create for their tutees. There is also a Reflection portion of each lesson plan in which some of
the elements of assessment and planning are analyzed for their appropriateness and for the sake of learning about possible future modifications.

RDG 514

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The requirements for using specified assessment instruments ensure that candidates will have many practice opportunities for matching assessment results to appropriate instruction. The Case Study Assessment Profiles (D-209-214), due at the end of the course, are designed to show the connections between assessment and instruction for both a beginning, struggling reader and an older, non-reader.

The sharing of information about the assessment process, along with ideas for appropriate instructional recommendations, occurs regularly during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of each class. Each candidate is also responsible for presenting one Oral Formative Update, which is graded by the instructor (D-228-230).

Throughout the course, the instructor models how to give tests, demonstrates how to follow directions for test administration, explains how to use norms manuals, and presents many kinds of informal assessment instruments. (For example, during Session 4, the class analyzes the Informal Inventory Test of Concepts for Primary Grade Students, and the instructor provides direction for administration of the Gates-MacGinitie Test. Students are encouraged to raise questions and share anticipated problems before they give the tests to their fieldwork students.) Modeling and practice opportunities occur consistently throughout the course.

The advantages and disadvantages of using computer software programs for test administration and scoring are also discussed (Session 7, C-199). Students share titles of software programs they have seen implemented at their schools or in other school settings.

The Tape-recorded Excerpt of a diagnostic segment also provides the basis for the modeling of assessment procedures, followed by discussion about the student's strengths and weaknesses. It generates ideas for instruction that
candidates may want to include in their Case Study Assessment Profile recommendations.

Toward the end of the course, candidates are asked to share the results of one Case Study Assessment Profile with the parent, guardian, or teacher of the target student. When instructional recommendations are made, the candidate includes suggestions for possible small-group instruction, extra tutorial help, after-school intervention programs, or discussion of needs with a school study team.

In every certificate class, candidates work with tutees whom they assess and for whom they plan and deliver lessons. Throughout the course of the certificate program, they work with four students for a total of 40 hours.

Each major assignment (lesson plan, Diagnostic Report to Schools, Literacy Profile for Parents) requires candidates to match assessments to instruction.

Discussions during class and throughout the Fieldwork Seminar portion focus on this tightly-knit process. Candidates must justify the assessments they select, the objectives that emerge from the assessments, and the plans they create for their tutees. There is also an Evaluation portion of each lesson plan in which some of the elements of assessment and planning are analyzed for their appropriateness and for the sake of learning about possible future modifications.

RDG 516

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

In every certificate class, candidates work with tutees whom they assess and for whom they plan and deliver lessons. Throughout the course of the certificate program, they work with four students for a total of 40 hours.

Each major assignment (lesson plan, Diagnostic Report to Schools, Literacy Profile for Parents) requires candidates to match assessments to instruction.

Discussions during class and throughout the Fieldwork Seminar portion focus on this tightly-knit process. Candidates must justify the assessments they select, the objectives that emerge from the assessments, and the plans they create for their
tutees. There is also an Evaluation portion of each lesson plan in which some of the elements of assessment and planning are analyzed for their appropriateness and for the sake of learning about possible future modifications.

RDG 517

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The main text for this course, Literature and the Learner, offers an extensive repertoire of instructional recommendations for use with the literature. The instructor of the course models assessment procedures (e.g., the use of teacher checklist and parent questionnaires in Session 3, E-277 presents instructional strategies (e.g., demonstrating instructional strategies and literary responses to highlight the art in picture books in Session 4, E-278), and highlights the importance of matching instruction to the identified needs of the learner (e.g., asking candidates to share scaffolding techniques and schema-building activities for ELL students in Session 8, E-281).

Many of the recommended teaching strategies involve the use of instructional technology such as AV media, television, and computers (Session 5, E-279).

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

RDG 518

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The ELL tutorial, with Fieldwork Log documentation and required formal lesson plan, is the primary means of helping candidates to gain experience in the assessment and instruction of student reading and writing in this course. Since the textbook on sheltering strategies is so explicit (and builds on the knowledge learned in RDG 510), students are provided with excellent guidance. In addition, they receive modeling and demonstration by the instructor during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class when clarification is needed.

In every certificate class, candidates work with tutees whom they assess and for whom they plan and deliver lessons. Throughout the course of the certificate program, they work with four students for a total of 40 hours.
Each major assignment (lesson plan, Diagnostic Report to Schools, Literacy Profile for Parents) requires candidates to match assessments to instruction.

Discussions during class and throughout the Fieldwork Seminar portion focus on this tightly-knit process. Candidates must justify the assessments they select, the objectives that emerge from the assessments, and the plans they create for their tutees. There is also an Evaluation portion of each lesson plan in which some of the elements of assessment and planning are analyzed for their appropriateness and for the sake of learning about possible future modifications.
Standard 5

Intervention Strategies at Early & Intermediate Grade Levels
Reading Certificate

Category 1: Program Design & Curriculum Standards

Standard 5: Intervention Strategies at Early & Intermediate Grade Levels

The program provides each candidate with knowledge of and ability to apply instructional models and strategies that align with ongoing assessment results. The program focuses on research-based intervention models that are effective at early and intermediate reading levels.

The program provides each candidate:

5A) with knowledge of and ability to apply instructional models and strategies that align with ongoing assessment results

RDG 510

Readings

The Phonological Awareness Handbook presents literacy concepts, offers instructional strategies, and describes phonemic awareness tasks the instructor may use to help students who are not able to do the tasks satisfactorily. Small group and individual (tutorial) models are presented, with the recommendation to group by need, based on assessment results provided by tools such as checklists (B-175-177).

The Phonics, Spelling, and Word Study book also includes assessment procedures, plus “matched” instructional strategies. Self-assessment and self-monitoring strategies indicate that the student’s perception of his or her own needs is important and valid. Identified student needs lead to varying types of instructional models: individual work with teacher, peer help, and small group work (B-180-182).

The Improving Reading handbook is designed to help teachers link strategies to areas of identified need. Chapter 8 includes ways of bringing parents into the
learning experience, so that they can volunteer in the child's classroom or work more effectively with him/her at home (B-186).

The primary text (Graves) for this class focuses on excellent intervention approaches that include one on one work, small group instruction, and whole class methods. Chapter 2 on Reading Instruction includes components of intervention models such as direct explanation, teaching for understanding, and cooperative learning. In all cases, the choices instructors make for the models depends upon assessment results and alignment with state standards.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The tutorial model for this class (ten hours of work with a struggling, beginning reader; ten hours of work with an older non-reader) also translates into ways to provide such support in small-group settings. In the Case Study Analysis (B-156-157) for each tutee, the candidate outlines needs, instructional strategies which were selected based on these needs (plus an evaluation of the effectiveness of the strategies), and new goals/strategies for the student’s regular classroom teacher or another tutor to address once the fieldwork experience has been completed. Finally, candidates make suggestions, as appropriate, for more structured intervention models for the tutees, which emerge from the class information in Session 14 (A-138).

Candidates discuss advantages and disadvantages of different intervention formats, based on assessed student needs: tutorial, group, whole class, push-in, pull-out, and after school. Candidates are also introduced to the state-approved published intervention programs listed on the CDE website during the second class meeting.

RDG 514

Readings

The premise of the Rubin text is that instructors must continuously assess, diagnose, and instruct appropriately throughout all stages and areas of literacy development. She labels this process as the “diagnostic-reading and correction program,” and it is the integral theme throughout the text. If a teacher identifies an area of need, it must be addressed immediately.
Rubin’s Chapter 16 is devoted to the relationship between parents and teachers as “partners” in the diagnostic-reading and correction program (D-268-269). Rubin discusses research on parental (and grand-parental) involvement with children’s education and presents ideas for involving them with their children’s literacy at home and at school. Title 1 programs are also described as possible support opportunities for children who qualify.

In “Catch Them Before They Fall,” Torgeson (C-196) discusses the need for “preventive teaching,” based on a wide variety of assessments, early in the young reader’s experiences and suggests that older readers have a lessened probability of making improvement. He notes, however, that intervention models at the intermediate levels may be necessary.

*The Collins and Cheek text introduces candidates to a variety of formal and informal assessment procedures so that they can link the data to objectives and instruction. The assigned reading includes attention to grouping for instruction, including intraclass and interclass formats. Information on modifying instruction for struggling readers is also discussed in the sections on the basal reader approach, the language-based approach, the multisensory approach, and the computer-assisted approach.*

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

As candidates use a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies with their two fieldwork students (a beginning reader and a developing reader) in order to create their Case Study Assessment Profile (D-209-214), their ultimate goal is to identify the child’s strengths and weaknesses within a broad range of literacy areas (Profile Requirements, D-206-208). They make recommendations for appropriate instruction, based on these strengths and weaknesses.

During the Case Study Assessment Profile Presentations, candidates then (a) give colleagues an overview of the students’ profiles, (b) suggest instructional recommendations that the students’ classroom teacher or tutor might use, (c) report on the parent, guardian, or classroom teacher responses to the Profile, and (d) suggest other intervention options that might be appropriate for the fieldwork students. Intervention recommendations are based on information from RDG 510, as well as from Session 14 information in RDG 514 on state-approved intervention programs (C-205).
Candidates work with intermediate, struggling learners in grades 4-6, with specific emphases on linking assessment with instruction. They identify the children’s weaknesses and strengths through assessment and then develop appropriate instruction for the tutees.

**RDG 517**

Readings

All of the literature activities and instructional recommendations related to a wide variety of genres, including multicultural literature (referred to as literature from “parallel cultures” in the Goforth text and as “multicultural voices” in the Day text) are designed to give teachers a variety of ways to reach learners. Though the focus in not specifically on intervention, the use of selected strategies for particular students (and specific attention to styles of learning and learner preferences) within small groups or tutorial contexts is addressed.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The main fieldwork assignment, to work with a small group of reluctant readers, represents a type of intervention. Candidates must learn about their fieldwork students’ backgrounds, interests, and levels of motivation; they then provide activities, based on quality literature, designed to engage them in a variety of literacy experiences. The end goal is to encourage these learners to become independent, lifelong readers.

*RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.*

**RDG 518**

Readings

The information in this course represents more a “preventive approach” to the development of children’s literacy skills—but the guidelines for tailoring lessons to ELL students’ background knowledge, interests, and levels of language proficiency indicate that various grouping strategies for ELL students are necessary.
The information on concept development, as well as phonological, semantic, morphological, and syntactic development (Sessions 2-5, G-328-330) allows candidates to determine whether children are developing naturally, following typical time frames, or if extra support may be necessary for some children.

*The Peregoy and Boyle text emphasizes individualized instructional practices for English learners. Intervention models are also presented which include group work, cooperative learning, thematic instruction, and content-based instruction. The information provided in this text allows candidates to make informed decisions about valid assessment practices for English learners, followed by appropriate instructional models and instructional practices.*

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Though candidates are working with one ELL student in this class, the Session 12 class discussion (G-334) on flexible grouping (friendship, topic, interest, ability, need) demonstrates possible options they have when working with small groups of students in order to meet particular goals.

Within the sheltered model, varying levels of support may be necessary for ELL students. For example, candidates may design a graphic organizer to help a learner approach a particular reading—or they may choose to use the Inspirations CD-Rom software program to support students in designing their own computer-created graphic organizers for the text (H-364).

The objective of the Language Sample Collection and Writeup is for candidates to collect data that provides a representative sample of a child’s language; to analyze it within a larger group of samples contributed by classmates; and through the analysis of all of the samples, to determine the characteristics of “average” language development. Once candidates have this information, they can evaluate whether or not a particular child needs additional support in conceptual, phonological, semantic, morphological, or syntactic development.

After the class analysis of the Language Sample Collection (during the Fieldwork Seminar portion of the class), candidates contribute ideas for possible instructional strategies/interventions that may be appropriate for children who have weaknesses in language development. If they feel that the language needs of an identified student are too great to be addressed through classroom
intervention methods, the candidate may recommend to refer the child to a school study team for further evaluation.

*Candidates work with English learners in grades 2-8, with specific emphases on linking assessment with instruction. They identify the children’s weaknesses and strengths through assessment and then develop appropriate instruction for the tutees.*

**The program focuses on:**

5B) research-based intervention models that are effective at early and intermediate reading levels

**RDG 510**

**Readings**

The Johns and Lenski text contains a separate chapter entitled “Strengthening the Home-School Partnership,” which is an appropriate section during which to introduce the concept of intervention models. The chapter includes parent and volunteer support and sets the stage for a broader discussion of possible interventions (Chapter 9, B-186).

Candidates read “Every Child Reading: An Action Plan,” by the Learning First Alliance (A-128). The authors’ position is that the idea of “every child reading” is an attainable goal. They provide an overview of pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten programs, beginning reading programs, second grade programs and beyond, and programs for older nonreaders and ELL students. If necessary program elements are missing, literacy leaders at schools must find ways to add them in appropriate ways.

RDG 510 information from both the Graves (Chapters 1-7 specifically) and the Bear “Words Their Way” texts emphasize instructional and intervention approaches for children in grades 1-3. Instructional principles based on research are incorporated into each chapter, with references to the studies and articles that they relate to. Researchers such as Pressley, Taylor, Pearson, Good and Brophy, and Graves are cited, for example.
Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

In Session 14 (A-138), information from a specialized book entitled *Literacy Assessment* (2001, Houghton Mifflin, authors Cooper and Kiger) is presented to the class by the instructor as a way to build on the information in Chapter 9 of the Johns and Lenski text. The concept of “intervention” is defined, and some basic options are described (handout, B-164).

*The instructor explores the concept of intervention models within the classroom, that is, with a small group at some time during the day, or with a specialist who may come into the room to teach the small group.*

*Next, the idea of a pullout program is introduced, where students leave the classroom for a period of instruction by a certified teacher. This must occur at a time when literacy instruction is not being provided to the majority of the class.*

*The, the extended-day program option is presented, where the students come to school early or stay later for additional instruction (provided by a certified teacher).*

When the candidates do their Case Study Presentations (for one tutee) at the end of the course, they include suggestions for possible intervention choices that may be appropriate for the student (Session 15, A-139).

*Candidates work with beginning readers in this course but begin to see that all students have both strengths and weaknesses as they begin the process of emergent literacy. Theories of beginning reading/writing instruction (traditional, constructivist, and sociocultural—with credit given to the researchers who study them) are used as the basis for the tutorial with tutees in grades 1-3.*

*Candidates also refer to the research from their texts and in-class articles when they respond to it via the Study Guides that are assigned to accompany each set of assigned readings.*
RDG 514

Readings

Chapter 11 of Rubin’s text, “The Diagnostic-Reading and Correction Program in Action,” (D-266) emphasizes ways to help children overcome reading difficulties. She addresses the uses of group and peer instruction as effective ways to provide extra scaffolding for children within the classroom context.

In addition, Rubin describes the benefits of using computers in a diagnostic reading and correction program, explaining various ways that CAI can be used to develop literacy skills. Making word processing programs available to students who are learning the writing process makes the revising and editing stages much more efficient, and helping students to learn computer skills is an authentic activity that will help them to survive in today’s high-technological context. “Tutorial” opportunities provided by software programs (and supported by teacher guidance and input) can engage some struggling readers in ways that standard class interactions may not.

In Chapter 15 (D-268), Rubin continues to explore ideas for extra support for children who need to accelerate their reading and writing to age-appropriate levels. She provides an overview of different types of learners who face various challenges in developing literacy and then discusses teachers and parents as partners in support programs.

Also included in Chapter 16 (D-268-269) of the Rubin book are explanations of how Title I and special education programs can support students’ success. The author highlights prevention, early intervention, integration, continued monitoring and supports as needed.

Building on the idea of “intervention” presented in RDG 510, the instructor of RDG 514 asks candidates to download the Annotated List of AB 2519 Language Arts Adopted Programs from the California Department of Education (CDE) website (C-205). They are asked to read the annotated descriptions of state-approved programs to see what kinds of intervention options are available for students who need help that is more structured than in-class small group work or tutoring (D-235-244).
The use of the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory (by Roe and Burns, 2007) as a method for determining student needs highlights the importance of analyzing the individual strengths and weaknesses of readers at early and intermediate levels. Research-based information on the use of informal reading inventories is provided in this text.

In addition, the Collins and Cheek text focuses on assessments that are appropriate for students in early intermediate grades, with separate sections on informal and informal instruments. Assessments with high degrees of reliability and validity are described (survey reading tests, diagnostic reading tests, achievement tests), followed by methods for organizing assessment information and then providing appropriate instruction. The work of researchers who are well-known in the field of measurement and assessment is cited (e.g., Banks, Barrentine, Neck and Juel, Bond, Burns, Clay, and Fry.)

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Once this list of adopted programs has been downloaded, candidates discuss possible intervention options for students at all grade levels (D-205). Annotated descriptions give information about components and recommended grade levels:

Labeled as Intervention Programs:

Language! A Literacy Intervention Program, Grades 1-12

Breaking the Code, Grades 4-8

Corrective Reading Comprehension, Grades 4 –8

Corrective Reading Decoding, Grades 4-8

Not labeled as Intervention Programs but used as such:

Write Source Language Program K-8
Candidates are asked to share programs that they have seen in operation at school sites, and to add information or pose additional questions, as they arise.

*This activity now occurs in RDG 510 and sets the stage for candidates to discuss assessments in RDG 514 that accompany the choice of intervention options.*

In RDG 514, Candidates use the assessment results of the Burns and Roe Informal Reading Inventory, the Gates MacGinitie, and other informal assessments such as writing samples, sight words lists, the Bear spelling inventories, and other subtests from the Ekwall-Shanker (RG 510) to set objectives for tutees who are intermediate struggling readers; they then plan effective instruction for the tutees throughout the term, as represented by their lesson plans. The TaskStream rubric for evaluating their ability to provide appropriate assessment/evaluation is uploaded and graded by their instructor (Appendix 19).

Candidates also refer to the research from their texts and in-class articles when they respond to it via the Study Guides that are assigned to accompany each set of assigned readings.

**RDG 516**

*Readings*

The Graves text (Chapters 8-14) offers research-based models for struggling intermediate learners, extending the content presented in RDG 510 (contained in Chapters 1-7).
Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates tutor an intermediate struggling learner in grades 4-6.

Candidates also refer to the research from their texts and in-class articles when they respond to it via the Study Guides that are assigned to accompany each set of assigned readings.

RDG 518

Readings

Well-known researchers in the field of language acquisition offer assessment information and instructional applications based on theories of L2 in the Peregoy and Boyle text (e.g., Au, Boyle, Collier, Cummins, Terrell, Krashen, and Freeman and Freeman). A full section on “Using Research and Expert Views to Inform Practice” is included in the first chapter on different kinds of programs for English learners, depending upon the proficiency levels of the students.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates tutor an English learner (early intermediate or intermediate level) in grades 2-8, completing lesson plans, a Strategy Demonstration, a Diagnostic Report to Schools, and a Literacy Profile for Parents. The link between appropriate assessment and instruction for English learners is emphasized. The TaskStream rubric for evaluating their ability to carry out an effective “planning” process is uploaded and graded by their instructor (Appendix 20).

Candidates also refer to the research from their texts and in-class articles when they respond to it on the Study Guides that are assigned to accompany each set of assigned readings.
Standard 6
Areas of Study Related to Reading & Language Arts (Certificate Level)
Reading Certificate

Category 1: Program Design & Curriculum Standards

Standard 6: Areas of Study Related to Reading & Language Arts (Certificate Level)

In the program, each candidate acquires a professional perspective through examination of research and research-based practice pertaining to how students learn to read; the structure of the English language, including phonology, morphology, and orthography; second language acquisition; relationships among language, spelling, reading and writing; and psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing.

In the program, through examination of research and research-based practice, each candidate acquires a professional perspective pertaining to:

6A) how students learn to read

It is important to note that all candidates in the program purchase copies of the Reading and Language Arts Framework, which is published by the California Department of Education, as well as Read All About It: Readings to Inform the Profession, published by the California State Board of Education. These materials are used throughout all of the courses and provide research-based information in all areas of literacy assessment and instruction.

RDG 510

Readings

Research-based information on learning to read from the Johns and Lenski text is primarily contained in Chapters 2-4 (B-184-185), in which the authors discuss what teachers must do to foster emergent literacy and beginning reading and to develop fluency and successful oral reading behaviors, including a wide variety of word attack skills.

Glazer cites research support throughout her text as she presents beginning reading skills that children must be taught in order to become readers. These
skills include phonemic awareness, phonics, and word study approaches and contained in Chapters 1-4 (B-181-182).

In the Reading and Language Arts Framework, the concept of “comprehensive and balanced” literacy programs is presented in the Introduction and Guiding Principles, pp. 1-7. This perspective is research-based and offers candidates the philosophical context in which the teaching of literacy should be taught.

From Read All About It: Readings to Inform the Profession, candidates read the following articles, which relate to learning to read: “Learning to Read: Schooling’s First Mission” by McPike and “Reading: A Research-Based Approach” by Fletcher and Lyon.

A full chapter of the Graves text (Chapter 1) is devoted to the research underlying the Reading Process, including the cognitive-constructive view of reading. “Reflect and apply” opportunities are embedded so that candidates can create informed responses based on research, demonstrating a professional perspective on how students learn to read and the components of proficient reading.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Research-based practices include the two assigned ten-hour tutorials and the Case Study Analysis and Presentation for each tutee (B-156-160).

Aside from the assignments which connect with the tutorial, candidates do an Activity Demonstration that is grounded in research; they discuss the strategy with their colleagues as a way of reflecting on its soundness based on what is known about how students learn to read.

RDG 514

Readings

The model of how children learn to read is approached by Rubin within the framework of using ongoing assessment to identify students’ strengths and weaknesses as they develop emergent literacy skills, such as word attack skills, fluency, and vocabulary.
Miller’s book contains a variety of assessment tools and strategies, based on research. Published by the Center for Applied Research in Education, it includes the use of informal devices in assessing emergent literacy skills, word identification skills, oral reading, and vocabulary and instructional strategies to support students with needs in these areas.

Chapter 3 of the Reading and Language Arts Framework, discussed during Session 1 of the class, presents content standards and instructional practices for Kindergarten Through Grade 3, which is the target time frame for “learning to read.”

From Read All About It: Readings to Inform the Profession, candidates read “Catch them Before They Fall” by Torgeson. This author presents research to support the concept of early identification and prevention as children begin to learn to read, and he outlines elements of an effective reading program so that teachers can lessen the possibility of reading failure.

The Collins and Cheek text presents the full range of assessment procedures for children who are learning to read. Each chapter has an “Applying What You Read” component to allow candidates to use the research information provided to understand the assessment and instructional processes.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Research-based practices include the 2 Case Study Assessment Profiles (ten hours of fieldwork per student) and Presentations (C-209-214 and C-231-234).

Aside from the assignments which connect with the tutorial, candidates do two test reports which include all aspects of learning to read/write that are grounded in research and presented in the texts.
RDG 517

Readings

The Goforth “Reflection Guides,” based upon research that represents three different models of school literature programs, provide candidates with informed criteria for the evaluation of such programs.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates apply this research when they use the Reflection Guides in the Goforth text to carry out the assigned Literature Program Evaluation (ten hours of fieldwork) at a school site.

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

6B) the structure of the English language, including phonology, morphology, and orthography

RDG 510

Readings

Three of the required texts for this course focus heavily on the structure of the English language (phonology, morphology, orthography): The Phonological Awareness Handbook by Ericson and Juliebo (B-175-177); Improving Reading: A Handbook of Strategies by Johns and Lenski (B-183-187); and Phonics, Spelling and Word Study: A Sensible Approach by Glazer (B-180-182). In each text, research is cited to support the strategies that are presented. In addition, all of the authors are from major universities which emphasize research.

Johns and Lenski include a chapter on phonology and phonemic awareness (Chapter 2, B-184), as well as a chapter on phonics and structural analysis/ morphology (Chapter 4, B-185).

Ericson and Juliebo address phonological awareness and teaching activities for phonemic awareness. They also include spelling pretests and posttests.
Glazer provides a chapter on teaching and assessing spelling and phonemic and morphemic awareness, as well as information on the study and foibles of the English language (Chapter 1, B-181). Chapter 4 (B-182) deals with word study and the teaching of word making.

From Read All About It: Readings to Inform the Profession, candidates read the following articles, which relate to the structure of the English language: “Reading Fluency: Techniques for Making Decoding Automatic” by Samuels, Schermer, and Reinking and “Teaching Decoding” by L. Moats.

A professional perspective on these elements includes an understanding of how these elements are related. The Graves and Bear texts makes a clear case for how research supports the concept that alphabet knowledge and phonemic awareness will set the stage for phonics development and other word recognition skills that incorporate the sound, meaning, and spelling systems.

The Bear text highlights the interrelationships between the stages of spelling and children’s decoding skills, showing that the orthographic and phonological systems are linked.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Research-based practices include the two assigned ten-hour tutorials and the Case Study Analysis and Presentation for each tutee (A-122-123). In addition, the two lesson writeups and the Double Entry Journal entries focus on specific student weaknesses in the areas of phonology, morphology, and orthography.

The three required reading responses ask candidates to reflect upon the research which has been presented and to summarize it by noting main points and then apply the information to their fieldwork situations, as appropriate.

Candidates administer the Bear Informal Spelling Inventories and the Ekwall-Shanker Informal Reading Inventory, basing their interpretations of the assessment results on a strong professional perspective that demonstrates the an understanding of the connection among sounds, meaning, and spelling (phonology, morphology, and orthography). The authors of both texts provide extensive research bases for this assessment information.
RDG 514

Readings

The Miller and Rubin texts provide research-based information on assessing and teaching phonemic awareness, phonics, other word attack skills (such as structural and morphemic analysis), and vocabulary and spelling development.

In Read All About It, the article entitled “Curriculum-Based Oral Reading Fluency Norms for Students in Grades 2-5” (C-200) by Hasbrouck and Tindal offers a broad discussion of research in the area of fluency, gives fluency examples, and addresses expectations, goals and techniques.

The norms booklets for the Gates-MacGinitie, SDRT, and QRI-III provide information on test research, statistics, the norming population for the test, subtests, and item analyses within specific areas such as spelling, word parts (roots, prefixes and suffixes), and syllable patterns.

The Kohn text describes the challenges students face in being able to demonstrate their knowledge of phonology, morphology, and orthography in a standardized testing setting and urges educators to consider adding alternative methods of assessment to determine students’ abilities.

Assessments in the Collins and Cheek text focus on phonology and morphology, in particular. Phonics tests in the Gates-MacGinitie and Structural Analysis informal assessments suggested by Collins and Cheek highlight these areas. Candidates see how analyzing what children can do within all areas of the reading process allows them to provide the most effective instruction, as promoted by researchers who describe the interrelationships among these skills.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Research-based practices include the two assigned ten-hour tutorials and the Case Study Analysis and Presentation for each tutee, as well as the three Clinician Summary Reports and the results of other formal and informal assessments, which include phonology, morphology, and orthography.
The test reports in RDG 514 draw from research-based information from course texts and offer candidates opportunities to apply what they know about phonology, morphology, and orthography as they plan assess and then plan appropriate instruction for their tutees who are struggling intermediate readers/writers.

The Tasksteam assessment rubric for RDG 514 includes elements of these three systems.

RDG 518

Readings

The Gleason text includes a wide variety of research related to language acquisition. Chapter 3 focuses on phonological development, Chapter 4 on semantic development, and Chapter 5 on morphology and syntax (H-373-374).

In the article “Dyslexia” in Read All About It” (G-363) Shaywitz explains that dyslexia is basically a phonological-processing problem and provides a rationale for why some very “smart people” have trouble learning to read. The author presents a phonological model and points out several myths about dyslexia.

Peregoy and Boyle describe how readers develop skills within the areas of phonology, morphology, and orthography in their primary language—and then cite the theoretical foundations of developing these same systems in an L2. Transfer issues are focused on in detail, along with scaffolding approaches to support English learners.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The Human Language Series video series, Parts I-III (H-363), focuses on how children develop phonological awareness and morphological knowledge and offers candidates an opportunity to connect their readings with the video content.

Research-based practices for this course include informed and in-depth responses to questions about the structure of the English language on both a midterm examination and a final examination.
The required Literacy Project may focus on structure of the English language issues, as well (H-357-359).

The Genie film (Nova) demonstrates that while a language learner may develop the sound system (phonology) and the meaning system (morphology), the syntactic system will not be fully developed unless learners have adequate input before the age of maturation (12).

Tutorial lessons are created with reference to phonology, morphology, and orthography, but with modifications that support English learners during their development.

6C) second language acquisition

RDG 510

Readings

Cary’s text addresses ways to support ELL students to speak English, to make their reading materials more “readable, and to improve their English writing. His References and Resources sections in Chapter 10 support the research bases underlying his recommendations (B-174).

The Graves text identifies modifications for English learners at the end of each chapter (1-7 for this course) so that increasingly more sophisticated information can be synthesized by candidates as they continue through the book. The research and theories underlying L2 are applied consistently.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

As part of the two plans for each tutee which candidates must create, implement, and evaluate, there is a requirement to include specific ELD components (the ABC’s) for ELL Students (B-149-153).

Candidates take into account the modifications that need to be made for English learners as they approach the “diversity” section on the lesson plans.
RDG 516

Readings

Chapter 13 of the Graves text is entirely devoted to the topic of Reading Instruction for English-Language Learners. A full section on research emphasizes the importance of language knowledge, the importance of literacy in the first language, and cross-language/cross-cultural influences that affect L2 acquisition. Candidates develop a professional perspective that allows them to understand how English learners become proficient in reading/writing as a result of these significant influences.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The Study Guide for Chapter 13, along with responses on the “diversity” section of the lesson plans for RDG 516 allow candidates to demonstrate a professional perspective that is research-based and well-informed.

RDG 518

Readings

The Echevarria and Graves text provides research-based theories of second language acquisition. In addition, the authors describe the differences between BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Language Proficiency), as well as explaining the linguistic interdependence hypothesis, which accounts for why ELL students who are literate in L1 acquire English more quickly and approach the process of reading English more easily. (Chapters 2 and 3, H-369-370).

Also, this text includes the components of the sheltered instruction model which candidates follow in working with their ELL tutees (Chapters 4-7, H-370-371).

Candidates demonstrate that they have a professional perspective on how English learners become readers and writers. They can cite theoretical and research-based information from the Peregoy and Boyle text to describe what competencies an English learner possesses, depending upon his stage of language proficiency (CELDT levels: beginning, early intermediate, intermediate, early advanced, advanced).
Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Research-based practices for this course include the ten-hour tutorial with an ELL student, plus the formal sheltered lesson plan and recorded activities in the Fieldwork Log (H-369-370).

The required Literacy Project may focus on second language acquisition issues, as well (H-357-359).

Confirmation of the skills of the English learner (tutee) occurs during the assessment process. In addition, the presentation from the 50 Strategies text must be appropriately based on the stage of L2 acquisition and the skills of the English learner for whom the strategy is created (into/through/beyond format).

All lesson plans need to include the ABC’s for English learners: lowering the affective filter, developing background knowledge, and including linguistic and non-linguistic contextualization.

The TaskStream “planning” rubric for this class evaluates candidates’ abilities to plan effective instruction for English learners based on research and L1-L2 theories of acquisition.

6D) relationships among language, spelling, reading, and writing

RDG 510

Readings

The “Balanced Literacy” approach is presented and described in the Reading and Language Arts Framework, as described in earlier sections. From this perspective, language, spelling, reading, and writing are interconnected processes (Session 3, A-128-129).

The Glazer text presents research on phonics, morphemic analysis, and spelling and emphasizes the understanding of sound-symbol relationships; the author provides information how to assess and teach these elements (Chapter 1, B-181)
and explains the strong relationship between phonics and spelling (Chapter 3, B-182). In addition, she addresses word groups, origins and expanded vocabulary techniques. Throughout the discussions, she highlights the interconnections among language, spelling, reading, and writing and the interdependence of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Johns and Lenski (Chapter 7, “Strengthening Reading Through Writing,” B-186) explore the links between reading and writing, based on research, and explain the writing process in detail (prewriting, writing, revising/editing, and publishing). Conferencing and Guided Writing activities are presented. The idea of learning to “read like a writer” further emphasizes the connection between reading and writing.

Fletcher’s book How Writers Work (B-178-179) incorporates the elements of reading, writing, listening, and speaking as students move through the writing process from the point of view of a writer. (Though it is not specifically research-based, it builds on the research from the Johns and Lenski handbook.)

From Read All About It: Readings to Inform the Profession, candidates read “Beyond Phonics: Integrated Decoding and Spelling Instruction Based on Word Origin and Structure” by Henry (B-133). This article focuses on the connections among high levels of phonemic awareness, phonics, and spelling. They also read “What Reading Does for the Mind” by Cunningham and Stanovich (B-138). which presents research about the related language skills (writing, spelling, and verbal skills) that develop as a result of reading a great deal.

The Bear text confirms the need for phonemic awareness and alphabet knowledge in order for learners to be able to read, write, and spell. The interdependence of language skills is consistently reiterated in this book.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Research-based practices include the two assigned ten-hour tutorials and the Case Study Analysis and Presentation for each tutee. Candidates assess their fieldwork students’ progress and provide instructional support in areas of weakness, including reading, writing, and spelling.

Candidates can point to the strengths and weaknesses of tutees as language, spelling, reading and writing skills reveal interconnections and predictable
patterns. This larger, more informed “big picture” represents a professional perspective, not simply an isolated approach that views skills separately.

**RDG 516**

**Readings**

*In RDG 516, Chapter 12 in the Graves text (Writing and Reading) emphasizes the “reading/writing connection” as well as the importance of language development in general as a basis for increasing literacy skills. Candidates develop a professional perspective by recognizing these interrelationships and their roles in supporting all areas of language simultaneously, not sequentially.*

*The Blasingame and Bushman text on the teaching of writing includes information on the multi-genre approach in writing and emphasizes how the development of literacy involves “reading/writing” connections. The third part of the text deals with planning for writing instruction and adding grammar, mechanics, and spelling as critical parts of the literacy process. They focus on the importance of input and the idea that students must be reading and listening to language products in English to acquire the language in which they are learning to write.*

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

*All tutorial-related processes and products in this course include all of the language processes and are based on the philosophical position that language, spelling, reading and writing are interdependent. One element is not assessed or included within an intervention model without an analysis of the others.*

**RDG 518**

**Readings**

*The Sheltered Content Instruction text offers theoretical and research-based information on literacy transfer from L1-L2. The idea that one needs familiarity with the spoken language before being able to develop literacy in that language highlights the interdependence between spoken language and reading/writing.*
The Gleason text provides a clear picture of how children acquire language, and shows, through extensive research, how communicative competence and metalinguistic awareness lead to the development of literacy in the school years (Chapter 10, H-376).

The language acquisition theories presented in the Peregoy and Boyle text are predicated on the idea that all language skills are interrelated; as one develops, so do others. The role of social interaction in developing all of the language skills is described in detail, along with multiple approaches for the scaffolding of these skills for English learners.

The “50 Strategies for Teaching English Learners” text includes sections on planning, student involvement, vocabulary development, and comprehension. Of importance is the Theoretical Overview in Section I, addressing the issue that effective instruction for English learners should include all language skills throughout all parts of instruction. Candidates choose from the recommended activities and strategies in order to create a Strategy Demonstration for their colleagues; they include language, spelling, reading, and writing.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The required Literacy Project may focus on the interrelationships among language, spelling, reading, and writing (H-357-359).

The ten-hour tutorial with an ELL student offers candidates opportunities to apply the research on second language acquisition in a practical setting. As they work with their tutees, oral language development occurs, and candidates help students with the interdependent skills of reading, writing, and spelling within content area contexts.

Strategy Demonstrations to their colleagues include language, spelling, reading, and writing as part of the Into/Through/Beyond procedure English learners. (Listening and speaking are part of “language” in this sense.)

6E) psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing
RDG 510

Readings

Cary’s research, which provides answers to teachers’ questions about working with ELL students, focuses on the psychological factors which are inherent in the learning process when learners are from a variety of cultural, ethnic, and language backgrounds. Making content comprehensible, developing links between students’ background knowledge and content, and supporting students’ primary languages when English is the language of instruction are some of the topics he addresses. He also emphasizes ways to minimize communication conflicts in a multilingual classroom where issues of different dialects, writing systems, perspectives, and beliefs are present.

The Graves text in this course introduces the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model in Graves, which takes into account the learner’s attitude toward literacy development and the importance of social interaction for obtaining feedback and input, especially for English learners.

Also, the concept of creating a “literate environment” so that students feel a sense of efficacy and see themselves as part of the literacy “team” is promoted so that peers support one another in the reading/writing process. Graves also approaches the importance of positive attributions and the “critical” importance of success in Chapter 3.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Cary’s research on working with second language learners is applied to the development of the two required lesson plans which include the ABC’s for supporting ELL students (A-122).

The Literacy Center tutorial model offers opportunities for candidates to develop a bond with their tutees and to build on strengths, while working on weaknesses. Tutees see others in the center who are also receiving support, and the general feeling/tone is a positive one. Candidates work from the Vygotskian theory of the gradual release of responsibility (presented in Chapter 2 of Graves), serving as the “more capable others” until the tutees can operate independently. Much scaffolding occurs during the tutorials, which lead to successful experiences for learners.
**RDG 514**

*Readings*

*The Collins and Cheek text offers a full chapter on Personal Reading, which introduces techniques for helping students to view themselves as readers and writers. Issues such as class atmosphere, bibliotherapy, and creative reading practices are discussed so that candidates will have some strategies for helping children to increase motivation and proficiency in literacy.*

*Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice*

*Looking at the “whole learner” is important in this class, as all forms of assessments are introduced (including attitude surveys and interest inventories). Psychological and sociolinguistic influences are seen as valid, significant factors which play a large role in how quickly and proficiently learners approach the processes of learning to read and write. These factors are embedded into the lesson plans, the Diagnostic Reports, and Literacy Profiles.*

**RDG 516**

*Readings*

*The Graves text (Chapter 8) emphasizes the importance of scaffolding for students so that they can achieve success. Prereading activities and guided reading methods for groups highlight what students can learn from each other. Five frameworks that can be used with small groups are presented.*

*The Blasingame and Bushman text describes procedures for establishing a writing environment (including writing apprehension and the “psychological environment”) and analyzing physical, emotional, and cognitive aspects of learners.*

*Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice*

*With a strong emphasis on comprehension in this class, candidates can use strategies from Graves with their tutees to lead to what Graves calls “a successful learning experience.” Similarly, as candidates set objectives for*
writing, they can develop individualized rubrics using the 6 traits of writing to provide what tutees need. They may focus on a particular aspect of the writing process (prewriting, drafting, editing, etc.), depending on what the writing assessment data indicates for the tutee.

**RDG 517**

**Readings**

Goforth’s Chapter 9 on “Literature Reflecting Parallel Cultures: A Celebration of Unique and Universal Perspectives,” presents an overview of the benefits that young people gain from exploring multicultural literacy, both for children who speak English as a first language and for children who are ELL students. She also presents the historical development of literature reflecting parallel cultures and provides instructional focuses and strategies to present the selected literature. By providing literature that reflects the language, culture, and heritage of the students, students’ identification with the reading material, sense of self-esteem, and purposes for reading can more easily be supported by teachers.

Day’s research on biases in multicultural literature provides the basis for candidates to evaluate specific books to see if they represent “quality” reading materials and can meet both the cognitive and affective needs of their students, who may be from diverse backgrounds.

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Research-based practices include an “Evaluation of a Book for Bias” requirement (G-295-298) and the selection and presentation guidelines for multicultural literature to their fieldwork group.

*RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.*
The Echevarria and Graves book includes a full chapter on affective issues, which involve psychological and sociolinguistic factors in learning to read and write. The authors cite research to support the following practices: using alternate grouping strategies, focusing on relevant background knowledge, providing activities that are meaningful to students, creating roles in the classroom for family and community members, holding high expectations for all learners, and being responsive to cultural and personal diversity (Chapter 4, H-370).

The text That’s Not What I Meant! is written by Deborah Tannen, Ph.D., whose research deals with pragmatics and the ways in which people communicate with one another within various sociolinguistic contexts (H-377-379). As she presents specific elements of “conversational style,” she makes the case that signals and devices that people use when they interact can have a major impact of the message (or metamessage) that is given to the receiver of the communication. Ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socioeconomic differences influence these communications in very specific ways and can cause dissension in classrooms unless teachers understand the workings of pragmatics and the backgrounds of their students.

The Peregoy and Boyle authors emphasize the importance of safety and security in the classroom for English learners, as well as highlighting the importance of creating a sense of belonging. They also describe how sociolinguistic interactions in the classroom affect teaching and learning.

The authors also discuss the effectiveness of “collaborative contexts” for the development of writing for English learners. Not only do peer help to clarify and elaborate, but they also act as models.

Candidates apply the Echevarria and Graves material in their tutorial with an ELL student, taking care to consider both cognitive and affective issues. These sensitivities should be reflected in the lesson plan write-up, as well.
The Conversational Style Analysis of two-five students involved in oral language communication builds on the Tannen research. Specific criteria for the analysis is drawn from the text (H-338-341).

Part III of the Development of Human Language videotape series focuses specifically on sociolinguistics and the pragmatics that govern how speakers interact in various contexts. Issues related to gesturing, tone, volume, and pacing are emphasized, as well as differences in “politeness” and “appropriateness” within cultures.

*Psychological and sociolinguistic factors are taken into account for each tutee and embedded into the lesson plans, the Diagnostic Reports, and Literacy Profiles related to both reading and writing. The into/through/beyond strategy demonstration In RDG 518 synthesizes the components of effective teaching for English learners.*
Standard 7
Application & Reinforcement Through Field Experiences
Reading Certificate

Category 2: Field Experience Standard

Standard 7: Application & Reinforcement Through Field Experiences

Each candidate in the program completes field experiences that relate to the candidate’s professional goals; enable the candidate to integrate theory and practice; include work with beginning readers, English language learners, and students with reading difficulties; and provide opportunities to demonstrate and reinforce knowledge and skills that are embedded in the Program Design and Curriculum Standards. In the fieldwork, each candidate practices the assessment of struggling readers at both early and intermediate levels of reading acquisition, and the tutoring or small-group instruction of struggling readers at two or more reading levels, including the non-reader level and one or more higher levels. The program places candidates at field sites where the instructional approaches and methods are consistent with a balanced comprehensive program of reading and language arts instruction. Institutional faculty and field-site faculty collaborate in program design and implementation.

Each candidate in the program completes field experiences that:

7A) relate to the candidate’s professional goals

When candidates apply to the Reading and Language Arts Certificate Program, they are given a brochure which lists all of the fieldwork requirements in which they will be engaged. (Until the program is fully-approved, however, the brochure cannot be published.) Access to Reading Certificate course syllabi, including course goals/objectives and fieldwork requirements) is provided through the ULV main campus Education Office and the ULV off-campus School of Continuing Education Office, as well as through Blackboard (BB) “virtual classroom” tools which are hosted on the ULV website (J-384-386).

Candidates are encouraged to consider their own professional goals and to determine if meeting the program objectives and engaging in the required fieldwork contained in the four Certificate courses will prepare them to embark on their own broader, professional quests. University advisement is available to them, and candidates may communicate with advisors or professors through e-mail, Blackboard (BB) interactions, phone, personal meetings, or fax.
The 40 hours of tutorial experience within the Reading Certificate program with a wide variety of students (including English learners) who represent different grade levels provides a strong clinical model within which candidates can specialize in all aspects of instruction in reading/writing. Their expertise will allow them to serve as reading teachers, literacy coaches, and teacher specialists in the area of language arts.

7B) enable him/her to integrate theory and practice

RDG 510

In RDG 510, candidates base their instructional interactions (leading to the Case Study Analyses) with two tutees on the research presented through readings and class discussion. They are also provided application opportunities when they connect research and practice within the entries in their Double Entry Journals, view and respond to videotape segments of instruction, and develop their own (and respond to other) Case Study Analysis Presentations.

Candidates are provided with research-based readings from assigned texts and instructor lectures from which they draw current information about literacy development for emergent learners. The RDG 510 Lesson Plans, Activity Demonstrations, Study Guides, Diagnostic Report to Schools, and Literacy Profile for Parents (developed during the tutorial process with a beginning reader in grades 1-3) offer opportunities for application of the theory to practice.

RDG 514

Candidates draw from the research-based assessment information that they learn in RDG 514 to assess two fieldwork students in a comprehensive manner, using a wide range of informal and formal assessment tools. As they administer the three required tests (Gates, SDRT, and QRI-3) and the additional selected assessments, they keep in mind the theoretical premises to which they have been introduced in class.

They also use research-based information from their texts and class discussions to integrate theory and practice as they interact with their two fieldwork students, listen to tape-recorded excerpts of assessment sessions, complete the final two Case Study Assessment Profiles, and present one of the Case Study Assessment profiles to their colleagues. The Case Study Assessment Profile includes two summary sections, one on diagnosis and the other on recommendations for instruction and intervention, as appropriate.

Candidates are provided with research-based readings from assigned texts and instructor lectures from which they draw current information about literacy
development for intermediate struggling readers/writers. The RDG 514 Lesson Plans, Clinician’s Summary Reports (Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory and Gates-MacGinitie) Study Guides, Diagnostic Report to Schools, and Literacy Profile for Parents (developed during the tutorial process with a struggling intermediate reader in grades 4-6) offer opportunities for application of the theory to practice. The newly-developed TaskStream rubric for assessment will also be utilized beginning in the fall of 2009.

RDG 516

Candidates are provided with research-based readings from assigned texts and instructor lectures from which they draw current information about literacy development for intermediate struggling readers/writers. The RDG 516 Lesson Plans, Vocabulary Strategy Demonstrations, Study Guides, Diagnostic Report to Schools, and Literacy Profile for Parents (developed during the tutorial process with a struggling intermediate learners in grades 4-6) offer opportunities for application of the theory to practice.

RDG 517

In this literature and literacy class, candidates work with a small group of reluctant readers who need to be encouraged to read independently. They draw from research-based course readings and discussions to create lessons for their students, including an Abbreviated Literary Link and a Verbal or Visual Presentation of Literature, among other activities.

Candidates also make links between theory and practice as they write in their Dialogue Journals about the progress of their fieldwork students, giving and receiving input from both colleagues and their instructor.

Another aspect of their fieldwork, a Literature Program Evaluation at a school site, involves determining which theoretical premise the school’s program is based upon (Pure Literature Approach, Literature-based Language Arts Approach, or Literature Across the Curriculum Approach) and evaluating it using the appropriate rubric from the Goforth text (F-303-310).

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

RDG 518

The fieldwork in this class has three components: ten hours of fieldwork with an ELL student, plus a formal lesson plan; a Language Sample Collection and Analysis with an English-Only child; and a Conversational Style Analysis with two-five fieldwork participants.
All of these fieldwork experiences are based on the research theories presented in class related to concept and primary language acquisition, second language acquisition, and pragmatics. The required lesson plan formats and structured rubrics for the evaluation of the fieldwork experiences ensure that candidates will engage in extensive application of this knowledge. Questions about the practical fieldwork experiences and their relationship to the research can also be raised during the Fieldwork Seminar Portion of each class.

Candidates are provided with research-based readings from assigned texts and instructor lectures from which they draw current information about emergent learners. Candidates also read research articles and write a short paper using these sources on one aspect of language acquisition.

The RDG 518 Lesson Plans, ELD Strategy Demonstrations, Study Guides, Diagnostic Report to Schools, and Literacy Profile for Parents (developed during the tutorial process with an English learner in grades 2-8) offer opportunities for application of the theory to practice. The newly-developed TaskStream rubric for planning will also be utilized beginning in the fall of 2009.

7C) include work with beginning readers, English language learners, and students with reading difficulties

RDG 510

In RDG 510, candidates with two tutees: a beginning, struggling reader (grades 1-3), who needs additional support in order to become proficient and an older non-reader (grades 4-12), who needs strong intervention strategies. Ten hours of fieldwork are required for each tutorial (20 total). The purpose of the fieldwork is to assess students’ strengths and weaknesses and to use appropriate instructional strategies to develop the students’ literacy skills.

Appendix 2 includes the tutorial requirements for the program. Candidates engage in ten hours of tutoring with a beginning reader in grades 1-3 along with all of the required assignments and assessments described in earlier standards.

RDG 514

The two fieldwork students with whom candidates work in this course include a beginning, struggling reader (grades 1-3) and an intermediate struggling reader (grades 4-12). Ten hours of fieldwork are required for each tutorial (20 total). The purpose of the fieldwork is to provide an in-depth assessment of the
students’ strengths and weaknesses through the use of formal and informal tools and give appropriate recommendations for instruction and intervention.

**RDG 516**

*Appendix 2 includes the tutorial requirements for the program. Candidates engage in ten hours of tutoring with a struggling intermediate learner in grades 4-6 along with all of the required assignments and assessments described in earlier standards.*

**RDG 517**

In this course, candidates work with a small group of reluctant, struggling readers (grades 4-12) who do not read independently for pleasure. These are students who are reading 1-2 years below grade level. The purpose of the ten hours of fieldwork with this group is to utilize motivational, appropriate instructional strategies to expose the students to quality literature and to encourage them to begin to read more frequently.

*RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.*

**RDG 518**

Candidates work on a one-to-one basis with an English Language Learner (grades 4-12) who needs additional support in content area reading and writing. The purpose of the ten-hour fieldwork experience is to support the student’s ability to read content area materials more effectively, using sheltered techniques and strategies presented in the course.

*Appendix 2 includes the tutorial requirements for the program. Candidates engage in ten hours of tutoring with an English learner in grades 2-8 along with all of the required assignments and assessments described in earlier standards.*

**7D) provide opportunities to demonstrate and reinforce knowledge and skills that are embedded in the Program Design and Curriculum Standards**

**RDG 510**

The ten hours of fieldwork with each tutee offers candidates opportunities to learn about implementing appropriate assessments and tailoring instruction to meet identified needs. Candidates view the full range of literacy skills before determining, through assessment, which areas should be addressed: phonemic
awareness, word attack skills (phonics, structural analysis), comprehension, spelling/writing. Motivational issues are also emphasized.

Reinforcement is provided through discussions during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class, Literacy Mentors’ feedback on the tutorials and lesson plans, and instructor responses to the Double Entry Journal. The instructor and colleagues also respond to the Case Study Analyses and Presentations, based on fieldwork, which will carry over into the RDG 514 fieldwork activities.

Reinforcement of knowledge and skills in the areas of phonemic awareness, word attack skills (phonics, structural analysis), comprehension, and spelling/writing occur during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of each class, the instructor’s response to candidate study guides and activity demonstrations, immediate personal feedback during tutorial sessions, and graded comments on assignments.

RDG 514

In addition to the three required assessments (Gate-MacGinitie, Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, and Qualitative Reading Inventory-3), candidates use a variety of tools to determine the weaknesses and strength of their fieldwork students. For the beginning, struggling reader, they address the areas of phonemic awareness, word recognition strategies (such as phonics and structural analysis), fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, motivation/interest, and writing/spelling. For the older reader, they provide assessments in the areas of word recognition strategies, comprehension, motivation/interest, study skills, metacognition, writing, and spelling.

When candidates write up the Case Study Assessment Profiles and provide intervention recommendations, they also demonstrate that they can plan appropriate instruction, based on assessment.

Reinforcement is provided through the instructor’s responses to the three Clinician’s Summary Reports, which are written for each fieldwork student. As candidates add to their repertoire of assessment information, the instructor can offer additional suggestions or ideas for modification in the process before the two Case Study Assessment Profiles are completed.

Classmates also offer input related to the fieldwork process through the Oral Formative Updates, the tape-recorded excerpts of an assessment segment, and discussion during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class.
Reinforcement of knowledge and skills in the area of assessment (informal and formal) and planning (including emergent literacy skills, as well as vocabulary development, comprehension, motivation/interest, study skills, metacognition, writing, and spelling) occur during Fieldwork Seminar portions of each class, the instructor’s response to candidate study guides and test reports, immediate personal feedback during tutorial sessions, and graded comments on assignments. A new assessment (Taskstream rubric on assessment) will be added in the fall of 2009.)

RDG 516

Reinforcement of knowledge and skills in the areas of vocabulary development, comprehension, motivation/interest, study skills, metacognition, writing, and spelling occur during Fieldwork Seminar portions of each class, the instructor’s response to candidate study guides and strategy demonstrations, immediate personal feedback during tutorial sessions, and graded comments on assignments.

RDG 517

The ten hours of fieldwork with a small group of reluctant, struggling readers allows candidates to build on the information they learned in the two previous fieldwork experiences. In this course, they focus on motivational strategies to encourage independent reading, while providing support in reading strategies, as well.

Reinforcement occurs during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the course, through feedback by the Literacy Support Person (F-294), instructor responses to the formal “sheltered” fieldwork lesson, and fieldwork students’ responses to the literature activities. Also, candidates are given input and feedback via the Dialogue Journals which set up conversations between candidate and instructor, as well as between candidate and other candidates.

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

RDG 518

The fieldwork opportunities in this course allows candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skills in the areas of language development, structure of the
English language, second language acquisition, and psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing:

During the Language Sample Collection and Analysis, candidates study elements of children’s language related to phonological, semantic, and syntactic development. The whole class then analyzes the data to see what stages typically occur at different ages.

Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of second language acquisition when they engage in a ten-hour tutorial with an ELL student. They must assess the student’s literacy needs within the content area context and design instruction that follows the sheltered model presented in class. Candidates can also apply basic reading strategies they have learned in earlier courses, as appropriate.

When candidates do the Conversation Style Analysis, they show that they have comprehended and applied premises underlying the study of pragmatics; in discussing various communication issues related to speakers of varying cultures, language, and ethnic backgrounds, they also address psychological and sociolinguistic factors that influence literacy behaviors.

Reinforcement is provided through discussion of the fieldwork experiences during the Fieldwork Seminar portion of the class, through the instructor’s response to the formal written lesson plan and feedback on the midterm and final exam (which include concepts related to the research and theories presented in class and applied in the fieldwork experience), and through their own self-evaluation within their Fieldwork Log entries.

 Reinforcement of knowledge and skills in the areas of language development, structure of the English language, second language acquisition (speaking, listening, reading, writing), and psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing occur during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of each class, the instructor’s response to candidate study guides and ELD Strategy Demonstrations, immediate personal feedback during tutorial sessions, and graded comments on assignments, including the research paper.

In the fieldwork each candidate practices:

7E) the assessment of struggling readers at both early and intermediate levels of reading acquisition
**RDG 510**

Assessment of a beginning, struggling reader and an older, non-reader is required for the Case Study Analysis that candidates do for each tutee. They must provide appropriate assessments in all literacy areas to determine needs that must be addressed, after which they utilize instructional strategies learned in the course to meet these needs.

Candidates assess a beginning reader in this class using the Ekwall-Shanker Informal Reading Inventory (including assessments for phonics, alphabet knowledge, comprehension, and structural analysis as well as many other informal assessments such as sight word tests, the Bear Spelling Inventory, and writing samples. They emphasize work in the areas of weakness that emergent readers need to development in order to become proficient readers.

**RDG 514**

The main focus of this class is assessment. Candidates implement a wide variety of informal and formal assessment strategies to develop a Case Study Assessment Profile for a beginning, struggling reader (1-3) and an intermediate struggling reader (4-12). They then use the results to recommend appropriate instructional and intervention suggestions.

*Candidates assess an intermediate struggling reader in this class using the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory (including a miscue analysis for word recognition) and comprehension; the Gates-MacGinitie for phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension; and many other informal assessments such as sight word tests, comprehension questions, retells, and writing samples. They emphasize work in the areas of weakness that struggling intermediate readers need to read and write at grade level.*

**RDG 517**

Candidates assess the attitudes of a small group of intermediate, struggling readers (grades 4-12) as they utilize interest inventories and interviews to determine what literature selections and instructional strategies will motivate the learners to read independently. As this group consists of students who read 1-2 years below grade level, candidates also integrate learnings from RDG 510 and RDG 514 to provide reading strategy support, as appropriate.

*RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.*
RDG 516

Candidates assess an intermediate struggling reader in this class using the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test for vocabulary and comprehension; other assessment instruments used in previous classes, and many other informal assessments such as sight word tests, comprehension questions, retells, and writing samples. They emphasize work in the areas of weakness that struggling intermediate readers need to read and write at grade level.

RDG 518

In this course, the fieldwork component includes ten hours of work with an ELL student to develop content area literacy. Because the focus is content-area, the target grade level should be one that typically includes the use of textbooks (grades 4-12). Assessment is ongoing as candidates work with the student, determining what content objectives are appropriate, as well as the materials and strategies they should select to match the objectives to the student’s reading level, background knowledge, and level of language proficiency.

Candidates assess an English learner in this class using the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory (including a miscue analysis for word recognition) and comprehension; the Gates-MacGinitie for phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension; and many other informal assessments such as sight word tests, comprehension questions, retells, and writing samples. They emphasize work in the areas of weakness that struggling intermediate readers need to read and write at grade level.

7F) the tutoring or small-group instruction of struggling readers at two or more reading levels, including the non-reader level and one or more higher levels

RDG 510

Candidates are responsible for providing appropriate instruction in targeted literacy need areas for two fieldwork students: a beginning, struggling reader (grades 1-3) and an older non-reader (grades 4-12).

RDG 510 tutorials include beginning, emergent readers in grades 1-3.
RDG 514

RDG 514 includes struggling intermediate learners in grades 4-6.

RDG 516

RDG 516 includes struggling intermediate learners in grades 4-6. These students are brought in because they are reading at least two years below grade level and are not working at grade level at their schools.

RDG 517

The primary goal of the fieldwork requirement in this course is that candidates provide instruction and activities that will motivate and engage a small group of reluctant, struggling readers (grades 4-12). Literary strategy support is also integrated throughout the various lessons and interactions with the learners.

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

RDG 518

The student with whom the candidate works during the fieldwork tutorial for this course is an ELL student (grades 4-12) who needs additional support in content area reading and writing. Scaffolded, sheltered instructional strategies are utilized, based on theories and principles related to second language acquisition.

RDG 518 includes English learners in grades 2-8.

The program places candidates:

7G) at fieldsites where the instructional approaches and methods are consistent with a balanced comprehensive program of reading and language arts instruction

Note: Since the writing of this document began, money has been designated to develop a Literacy Clinic on the main campus of the university, as explained at the end of Standard One. The start-up date for the Clinic is expected to be during the spring or summer of 2001. When the Clinic is operational, many of the fieldwork experiences that now occur in other school settings can be implemented there. In that way, a “balanced
literacy perspective” can be assured. Off-campus clusters will continue to offer the fieldwork experiences as described below.

The Literacy Center is the site for all required fieldwork at the Certificate level. The entire program is based on a model of balanced literacy and includes all of the components of reading and writing as described in-depth in earlier standards. Because candidates do their fieldwork on site with the course instructors—and all instructors are trained in a consistent manner—the balanced comprehensive program model is ensured.

RDG 510

In RDG 510, candidates select their fieldwork students from one or two school sites in order to include the beginning, struggling reader and the older non-reader. Fieldwork is done in the form of a one-to-one tutorial, and fieldwork effectiveness is evaluated through Literacy Mentor responses, by the entries in their Double Entry Journals, by the lesson write-ups with ELL components, through discussions during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of class, via videotapes of fieldwork segments, and through the Case Study Analysis and Presentations.

Parents or guardians of the students are also required to sign permission forms to allow the candidates to work with the fieldwork learners (B-147).

Candidates in the program must, upon beginning fieldwork at a particular school site, make an appointment with the principal to discuss the “balanced literacy perspective” that underlies the candidate’s work with the tutees. The principal is given an overview of the balanced literacy perspective, entitled the “Balanced Literacy Perspective Agreement” (B-140), which is based on an excerpt taken from the Reading and Language Arts Framework. This form must be signed before the candidate may begin work with the tutee. Since the candidate will not be working within the context of another teacher’s class, no school site supervisor signature is necessary.

All fieldwork occurs in the Literacy Center, as described above.

RDG 514

This fieldwork is also tutorial-based, and the work is carried out at school sites during candidates’ preparation periods or during before-school or after-school time frames. Though selection of fieldwork students may emerge from teacher recommendations at a particular school site, the candidate must visit the school setting and meet with the principal. During this interview, the candidate must explain that the assessment procedures will be done from a “balanced literacy
perspective,” and the principal will be asked to sign the “Balanced Literacy Perspective Agreement” (B-140).

Parents or guardians of the students are also required to sign permission forms to allow the candidates to work with the fieldwork learners (D-226).

The satisfactory completion of the fieldwork experience will be determined through evaluation of the Clinician’s Summary Reports, the tape-recorded assessment excerpt, discussions during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class, the Oral Formative Update given by each candidate, and the two Case Study Assessment Profiles and Presentations.

_All fieldwork occurs in the Literacy Center, as described above._

**RDG 517**

The fieldwork for this course must be done at a school site, where the candidates work with a small group of struggling, reluctant readers (grades 4-12). This work may occur within the context of the candidate’s own class, or another class such as English, a language arts period, an elective period, or as a before-school or after-school small-group support experience.

Candidates must ask the Reading Specialist, Literacy or Media Specialist, or Language-Arts Specialist at the school, the Media Support Person, to provide input into the fieldwork experience by making two observations during the fieldwork hours. One observation should occur when candidates present one of the “assigned” fieldwork requirements (such as the Abbreviated Literary Link, the Verbal or Visual Presentation of Literature, the picture book presentation), and the other may occur at any pre-determined time. The support person then fills out a short evaluation form, based on her observations (H-294). The specialist is also invited to make course recommendations for additions or modifications after having seen the syllabus and observing the ULV candidate.

As in the other fieldwork situations, the specialist who observes during the two meetings must be asked to sign the “Balanced Literacy Perspective Agreement.” If, after the first communication, the candidate feels that the setting does not represent such a perspective, or if the specialist is not comfortable signing the agreement, another site must be chosen. If a ULV instructor or advisor feels that more information is needed about a school site, additional steps may be taken to visit the site and to meet with school administrators.

Parents or guardians of the students are also required to sign permission forms to allow the candidates to work with the fieldwork learners if the students are not part of the candidate’s regular class (F-286).
The satisfactory completion of the fieldwork experience will be determined through the lesson evaluations by the Literacy Support Person, the evaluation of the candidate’s Dialogue Journal, and through presentations and participation.

This course has been moved to the Credential level as RDG 521.

**RDG 518**

Since the candidate will be working in a one-on-one situation with an ELL student, the experience will take place outside of regular classroom activities (or in a setting such as a study hall).

As always, candidates must meet with the principal at the school where the fieldwork will be done, and the principal must be apprised of the nature of the tutorial and the balanced literacy perspective before signing the Balanced Literacy Perspective Agreement. The principal should recognize that within this perspective, second language acquisition theories will be applied.

Parents or guardians of the student are also required to sign permission forms to allow the candidates to work with the fieldwork learner (H-362).

The satisfactory completion of the fieldwork experience will also be determined through evaluation of the sheltered lesson plan and the Fieldwork Log.

The Language Sample Collection and the Conversational Style Analysis, which together represent 10 hours of fieldwork, do not require documentation of the balanced literacy perspective because data is simply being gathered for analysis during class. However, parents or guardians of the students are also required to sign permission forms to allow the candidates to collect (and tape record) this information (H-337 and 361).

All fieldwork occurs in the Literacy Center, as described above.

**The program provides that:**

7H) Institutional faculty and field-site faculty collaborate in program design and implementation

Within the Certificate Program, only two courses include other field-site faculty directly: RDG 510 and 517. When these faculty members turn in the evaluation forms for the candidates’ lessons, they are also asked to make recommendations for course changes. These recommendations are returned to the Reading
Program Chair on the main campus or to the Off-Campus Director of Reading if the program is offered through the School of Continuing Education (SCE).

If school-site administrators or specialists have questions they would like to ask about having ULV candidates working at their school sites, they have immediate access to the two directors through e-mail, voice mail, the regular phone system, and fax.

Through the Reading Advisory Council (RAC), which meets twice a year, administrators, teachers, and specialists from local schools, as well as community members, faculty, and students communicate about program design and implementation.

Also, “course content” meetings are held whenever course requirement changes are needed. For example, instructors from Sacramento and Long Beach were flown to the main campus last summer to discuss the new course outline for RDG 518. Their recommendations often stem from direct contact with school site personnel who work with the ULV candidates and who would like to see additional, modified, or more specific content in particular areas of literacy.

For off-campus clusters, meetings are held near cluster satellite locations so that those who are interested in attending can do so. Administrators and school personnel from schools where our candidates do their fieldwork are invited to attend.

Institutional faculty and field-site faculty are the same; there is no longer an off-campus program, and all instructors oversee the tutorials in each course.
Standard 8
Application of Research-Based & Theoretical Foundations
Reading Certificate

Category 3: Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance

Standard 8: Application of Research-Based & Theoretical Foundations

Each candidate articulates and applies an understanding of the research basis and theoretical foundations for instruction in reading and language arts, and of relevant research and theories pertaining to language, assessment and evaluation.

In the program, each candidate articulates and applies an understanding of:

8A) the research basis and theoretical foundations for instruction in reading and language arts

RDG 510

In this course, must articulate and apply an understanding of the research basis and theoretical foundations for instruction in reading and language arts through a variety of methods:

They must do three reading responses, based on research information about instructional methods in reading and language arts, in which they summarize the main points and show how they can be related to the fieldwork experiences (A-122 and B-142-145).

In their Double Entry Journals, in the personal response/reflections/research links column, they must address how the research information about instruction presented in class relates to the activities that they describe in the record of specific events column (B-141).

When they present the videotape of a segment of fieldwork, they provide the research-based information that underlies the instructional strategy that is highlighted in the segment (B-148).
Candidates cite relevant research during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class, as it relates to strategies used with the fieldwork tutees.

They must also integrate 3 outside readings of research into their Case Study Analyses (B-156, see #10) and explain how the information contributed to their understanding of selected instruction within the tutorial process.

Research-based information is provided to candidates in the areas described in earlier standards for RDG 510. They receive this information through assigned class readings and additional articles as well as through instructor lectures. They also must include the theories underlying their Activity Demonstrations and link study guide responses to the research. When discussing their tutorials during the Fieldwork Seminar portion of classes and during their Activity Demonstrations, they must articulate knowledge of the research.

RDG 514

In addition, candidates give an Oral Formative Update (C-190) to their classmates related to the fieldwork assessment process. This oral “report” gives them an opportunity to relate research and principles of assessment and instruction as they present concerns and ask questions about the next steps in the process.

When candidates present a tape-recorded excerpt (C-190) of a diagnostic segment with their fieldwork students, they self-evaluate their role in the process and discuss the efficacy of the testing procedure. They are encouraged to cite research to support responses to these segments, as appropriate.

Finally, when candidates communicate with the parent, guardian, or teacher of one case study student, they share research premises and recommend instructional strategies or intervention options (C-205). The development of the ability to articulate issues clearly and support recommendations with current research information is an important part of the professional development of the candidate.

Research-based information is provided to candidates in the areas described in earlier standards for RDG 514. They receive this information through assigned class readings and additional articles as well as through instructor lectures. They also must include the theories underlying the Clinician’s Summary Reports (test reports) link study guide responses and to the research. When discussing their tutorials during the Fieldwork Seminar portion of classes and during their
discussions on assessment report findings, they must articulate knowledge of the research.

**RDG 516**

*Research-based information is provided to candidates in the areas described in earlier standards for RDG 516. They receive this information through assigned class readings and additional articles as well as through instructor lectures. They also must discuss the theories underlying the Vocabulary Strategy Demonstrations and link study guide responses and to the research.*

**RDG 517**

Most of the requirements in this course ask candidates to design instructional sequences in the area of literature to motivate reluctant readers to engage in the reading process more fully and more frequently. The author of the main text in the course derives information from research-based theories and principles. For example, the Abbreviated Literacy Link (F-300-301) includes such components as the building of background knowledge and the connection of personal information to new information in the literature. The idea of the extension activities parallels the idea of the “beyond” activity, which develops a concept or theme more fully for readers. Even though candidates do not cite “research” when they discuss the text ideas, they see how the instructional activities can be included in a comprehensive, balanced curriculum and can provide sound rationales for using them.

What can be articulated is the need for learners to engage in independent readings, and candidates can draw from Anderson’s article, “Research Foundations to Support Wide Reading” (E-278) when talking with their fieldwork students about the importance of independent reading within a variety of genres. Such information can also be communicated to parents and teachers.

*RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.*

**RDG 518**

*Research-based information is provided to candidates in the areas described in earlier standards for RDG 518. They receive this information through assigned class readings and additional articles as well as through instructor lectures. They also must include the theories underlying the language acquisition paper and the Strategy Demonstration and link study guide responses to the research.*
RDG 510

When candidates do the Case Study Analyses and one Case Study Analysis Presentation (B-156-160), they base their findings on research from class readings and make recommendations for additional instructional and intervention options. The need for appropriate instruction, based on assessment results, is a primary focus of this assignment, and during the presentation, candidates have the opportunity to present a “professional perspective” to colleagues.

This class emphasizes the ways in which language processes are assessed and evaluated. Each of the three assigned texts includes information on using multiple (informal and formal) assessments for reading and writing. Using this research-based information (provided in earlier standards), candidates apply it to the lesson plans, the Diagnostic Report to Schools, and the Literacy Profile to Parents as they develop a profile for their tutee in grades 1-3.

RDG 514

Based on research presented in their texts and in assigned articles, candidates integrate assessment information with the theories and principles they have learned in compiling a comprehensive overview of each case study student. The Case Study Assessment Profiles (D-209-214) require them to incorporate knowledge of affective, developmental, and physical issues, correspondences and differences among testing data, and rationales for the discrepancies. Their ability to articulate knowledge about reading and language arts assessment plays a large role in the effectiveness of the assessment profiles.

This class with its major emphasis on testing and measurement describes the various ways in which language processes are assessed and evaluated. Each of the assigned texts includes information on using multiple (informal and formal) assessments for reading and writing. Using this research-based information (provided in earlier standards), candidates apply it to the lesson plans, the two test reports, the Diagnostic Report to Schools, and the Literacy Profile to Parents as they develop a profile for their tutees in grades 4-6.
RDG 516

This class—moving more specifically into the areas of comprehension and vocabulary development and building on assessments presented and administered in previous classes—describes the various ways in which language processes are assessed and evaluated. Each of the assigned texts includes information on using multiple (informal and formal) assessments for reading and writing. Using this research-based information (provided in earlier standards), candidates apply it to the lesson plans, the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test report, the Diagnostic Report to Schools, and the Literacy Profile to Parents as they develop a profile for their tutees in grades 4-6.

RDG 518

A major assignment in this course is the Literacy Project (H-357-359), which involves collecting research from outside sources in order to develop topics related to primary language acquisition and second language acquisition. Though the paper is not technically intended to be a “research paper” (as some of the projects are based on interviews and films), the object is for the candidate to build on a thesis and support the main points with relevant readings from the field of literacy. APA style is required, and all articles must be attached.

Many theories of language acquisition are presented in this course, and candidates can identify activities that would be representative of each one. For example, the behaviorist approach would lend itself to many practice opportunities and repetition. As the linguistic, interactional, information procession, and social interactionist approaches are described, candidates articulate classroom behaviors that would be representative of such models, both during class discussions and on the midterm and final examination (G-365-367).

The ten-hour tutorial with an ELL student also requires candidates to note ongoing assessment and instruction in the Fieldwork Log (H-349-350). The candidate must be able to draw from theories of second language acquisition (and related terminology such as BICS, CALP, Interdependence Hypothesis) to provide rationales for instructional decisions when communicating with colleagues during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class about the progress of the student.

This class emphasizes the ways in which language processes are assessed and evaluated. Each of the assigned texts includes information appropriate assessments for English learners in the areas of reading and writing. Using this research-based information (provided in earlier standards), candidates apply it to the lesson plans, the Diagnostic Report to Schools, and the Literacy Profile to
Parents as they develop a profile for their tutee in grades 2-8. They also articulate the theoretical bases underlying the ELD Strategy Demonstration lesson and paper on second language acquisition.
Standard 9
Curriculum & Instructional Practices
Reading Certificate

Category 3: Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance

Standard 9: Curriculum & Instructional Practices

Each candidate demonstrates effective instructional practices and intervention models and strategies in reading and language arts instruction for English speakers and English language learners. Each candidate demonstrates a thorough understanding of the research basis and theoretical foundations for alternative instructional practices and intervention models and strategies, and of fundamental issues related to these professional practices.

Each candidate demonstrates:

9A) effective instructional practices and intervention models and strategies in reading and language arts instruction for English speakers

RDG 510

Through the tutorials with two tutees, a beginning struggling reader and a non-reader, candidates assess students’ strengths and weaknesses, and provide appropriate one-on-one instructional experiences for them. From class readings (such as Johns and Lenski, Chapter 9, B-186), they learn how to develop self-esteem in such learners and how to motivate them to succeed in school. In fact, the Case Study analyses that are developed from the tutorial experiences must include at least one affective goal for each student.

By giving the students interest inventories and asking parents to answer a questionnaire (A-129 and B-165-166), candidates learn about the reading practices of students at school and in the home and can address affective and practical issues such as lack of interest in reading and limited access to books.

In addition, the candidates consider alternative intervention strategies presented in RDG 510 (B-164) that would be appropriate for these students at the conclusion of the tutorial experience. They write these recommendations in their
Case Study Analyses and communicate the results of the tutorial and the new suggestions to their colleagues during the Case Study Analysis Presentation.

The texts in RDG 510 include instructional practices and intervention models for emergent readers, in general, as they learn to read. This instruction is based on research that supports the balanced literacy perspective. Candidates draw upon this research as they plan instruction for their tutees and use it when they do their study guide responses.

RDG 514

Building on what candidates have learned in RDG 510, they work with two students in one-on-one situations, where they can utilize a wide variety of assessment tools in a non-threatening context. The process of assessment concludes with strong recommendations for additional support in specific areas of literacy, along with ideas for specific instructional strategies.

Candidates have a wide variety of intervention options to consider. They may recommend a tutorial, a small support group focused on student needs, or explicit teacher-directed lessons within a whole class context. In addition, they may suggest that the school consider adopting one of the California state-approved intervention programs, which are presented in Session 14 of the course (C-205).

At the end of the class and following the write-up of the two Case Study Assessment Profiles, candidates communicate the results of the fieldwork, along with intervention recommendations, to the parent, guardian, or teacher of one of the fieldwork students.

The intervention models and practices described in the readings for this course are aligned with assessment that is valid and appropriate for the intended learners. The research underlying the decision made in matching instructional practices with assessment is highlighted as candidates develop profiles for their tutees.

RDG 516

The intervention models and practices in this course focus on the research underlying comprehension, vocabulary, and writing, as described in the readings for this course. Candidates are asked to relate the theories that support these intervention approaches as they do their Vocabulary Strategy Demonstrations and discuss instructional options for their tutees during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of class.
RDG 517

One intervention for the fieldwork group of struggling, reluctant readers is the fieldwork experience itself. Candidates learn all they can about students’ literacy practices in the home from discussions with the students and determine attitudes toward reading through the use of an interest inventory (F-291-293).

The goal of the fieldwork is twofold: the candidate wants to utilize strategies that will engage the students in quality literature and help to motivate them to read independently, while supporting their reading and writing development, as well. The course offers the availability of a wide variety of materials to share with the students, and the main text provides a large range of instructional suggestions for students of all age and grade levels.

A Literacy Mentor at the school site observes at least two of the small group sessions and provides input, as appropriate, to support the intervention process.

As part of the fieldwork requirement, candidates also evaluate the literature program at the school site where the fieldwork occurs (F-303-310). They apply what they have learned about literacy by looking for effective components that school programs should include, as presented in the Goforth text. In this way, they also become more capable of identifying and making use of available instructional resources.

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

9B) effective instructional practices and intervention models and strategies in reading and language arts instruction for English language learners

RDG 510

In this course, though candidates do not work directly with ELL students, they begin to acquire a knowledge-base about strategies for supporting them. The Cary text, Working with Second Language Learners, offers a variety of beginning strategies for scaffolding instruction so that ELL students can be provided full access to the curriculum. In addition, the author suggests ways to make students feel more comfortable about speaking, reading, and writing in English so that their confidence levels will remain high.
The lesson plan format which is used for the two formal lessons with the tutees, includes the ABC’s (low affective filter, background knowledge activation, and contextualization), elements that are necessary for the success of ELL students. In this way, candidates slowly acquire the information needed to provide effective instruction for second language learners when they do their tutorial in RDG 518.

*Candidates are introduced to the importance of modifications for English learners in the RDG 510 class as they utilize the Graves text, which includes special sections on appropriate scaffolding for English learners. The research underlying these practices is described, and candidates link the information to their own instruction for English learners in the “diversity” section of their lesson plan.*

**RDG 518**

The tutorial with an ELL student in this course is representative of the “preventive” approach to the teaching of reading and writing. Candidates are given a wide variety of instructional “sheltering” strategies for helping second language learners to have full access to the curriculum content, while developing language and literacy skills. The sheltered model presented in the Echevarria and Graves book offers a viable model for instruction that can be implemented in a tutorial, small group, or whole class context.

*As a course on first and second language acquisition, RDG 518 provides an in-depth research base for theories underlying L1 and L2 development. Candidates use this information as they plan for their tutees (English learners) and provide rationales for their instructional decisions during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of class. They also develop a Strategy Demonstration using the ABC’s for English learners embedded in the “into/through/beyond” format.*

**9C) a thorough understanding of the research basis and theoretical foundations for alternative instructional practices and intervention models and strategies and of fundamental issues related to these professional practices**

The Reading and Language Arts Framework, as well as the Read All About it: Readings to Inform the Profession text, provide candidates with the perspective that a preventive, rather than a remedial, approach is preferred in helping students to become proficient readers. Intervention models exist only when students are not making progress that is age-appropriate, and should be thoughtfully incorporated into a school curriculum.
RDG 510

In this course, candidates begin to talk about possible intervention models, particularly with respect to the concept of “universal access” described in the “Key to Curricular and Instructional Profiles” in the framework. Candidates discuss instructional grouping and scheduling issues and define “differentiated instruction.” Reading intervention programs are defined as those which provide students with additional instruction in reading that is designed to accelerate their reading to an age-appropriate level.

Candidates also consider intervention models such as individual tutorial programs, small-group work within classrooms, pullout programs, and extended day programs. They recommend the options that might be appropriate for their case study students when they make their Case Study Analysis Presentations.

Through the course, as candidates assess their tutees and set instructional objectives for them, they work toward the final products in the course: the Diagnostic Report and Literacy Profile to Parents. These write-ups reflect a thorough understanding of the research basis and theoretical foundations for alternative instructional practices and intervention models and strategies; each step of the tutee profile development demonstrates an understanding of solid research, practical applications for learners who need support, and a strong sense of professionalism when they are able to create these synthesized profiles. In addition, they have a Parent Conference with the parents/guardians of their tutees and offer a professional perspective on the children’s development during the tutorial.

RDG 514

When candidates take RDG 514, they build on the knowledge of intervention options that they considered in RDG 510. They discuss the effective uses of learning and media centers, reading resource rooms, computer-assisted instruction opportunities, and peer instruction opportunities (Session 10, C-202).

In addition, candidates download the Annotated List of AB 2519 Language Arts Adopted Programs (C-202) and discuss the components of programs labeled as “intervention” programs specifically, as well as partial programs that could be used for intervention purposes to fill in necessary gaps in target areas of literacy (C-235-244).

At the end of the course, candidates make suggestions for appropriate instructional and intervention options for their fieldwork students within their Case
Study Assessment Profile; and further, they communicate their suggestions to the parent, guardian, or teacher or one of the students.

This “assessment” class offers opportunities for candidates to read in-depth research about assessment instruments and evaluation that are both valid and reliable for learners. As they administer a variety of assessments (including the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory and the Gates-MacGinitie), they analyze test items and link possible “problem” items that violate the theoretical premises of good assessment. These issues are identified in test reports and during Fieldwork Seminar discussions. In addition, they have a Parent Conference with the parents/guardians of their tutees and offer a professional perspective on the children’s development during the tutorial.

RDG 516

As candidates take this third class at the certificate level, they begin to see more clearly how knowledge from research can inform instruction, and they become more comfortable making the links between theory and practice. When they do their Vocabulary Strategy Demonstrations and discuss the progress of their tutees, they cite important research findings. These findings lead to effective decision-making about support for struggling readers/writers, which is demonstrated in the Diagnostic Report and Literacy Profile to Parents. In addition, they have a Parent Conference with the parents/guardians of their tutees and offer a professional perspective on the children’s development during the tutorial.

RDG 518

In this class, even though candidates work one on one with tutees, they are also asked to consider whole-class and small-group intervention options (described in their texts) as they write a paper on second language acquisition. They also refer to research from articles selected for the paper as they make presentations to their colleagues and discuss multiple alternatives that would be appropriate in larger school settings (not simply one-on-one tutorials). In addition, they have a Parent Conference with the parents/guardians of their tutees and offer a professional perspective on the children’s development during the tutorial.
Standard 10
Crosscultural Practices
Reading Certificate

Category 3: Standards of Candidate Competence & Performance

Standard 10: Crosscultural Practices

Each candidate demonstrates the ability to respect, understand, and teach students who are different from the candidate, including ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic differences.

Each candidate demonstrates:

10A) The ability to respect, understand, and teach students who are different from the candidate, including ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic differences

RDG 510

In this class, before students work with their two tutees, candidates approach the topic of developing positive attitudes toward reading. Within this context, they explore issues related to self concept, reading opportunities, books in the home, parents as role models for reading, and psychological perspectives toward the school and school culture.

When they begin to read the Johns and Lenski and Cary texts, they recognize the role of background knowledge and concept development in comprehending what is read and identify ways to determine information about their students’ cultural backgrounds and prior knowledge.

The lesson plan format for the tutorial includes ELD support elements that will ensure a higher level of success for ELL students: low-risk environment, activation and development of schemata, and linguistic and non-linguistic contextualization (B-149-153). In Session 8, the instructor models a lesson which includes the use of objects, videos, pictures, and movement, paraphrasing, and first language support, elements which the candidates then incorporate into their own lessons.

In Session 9 (A-134-135), the candidates participate in the modeling of ways to offer multiple paths into texts in order to make text meaningful for students. They discuss ways of supporting students’ primary language development through the establishment of a classroom community that values all language and through
encouragement to parents to maintain the primary language at home. Independent reading and parent support is the topic of Session 13 (A-138).

Candidates demonstrate their sensitivity to respect, understand, and teach students who are different from the candidate through positive interactions with their tutorial students, who may represent a variety of ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic backgrounds. Awareness of the importance of diversity is further developed through class discussions and sharing experiences during the Fieldwork Seminar portions of the course.

*Each chapter in the Graves text includes a selection on the “Strengths and Challenges of Diversity,” in which attention is paid to topics such as grouping, ensuring success, experiences with print (often related to home environments, including SES factors), amount of support needed for at-risk students and English learners, and others. As candidates build the profiles of their tutees and discuss the choices they make and the influences that apply related to diversity, they The ability to respect, understand, and teach students who are different from themselves.*

**RDG 514**

A primary way in which this class helps candidates to respect differences in background (ethnic, cultural, linguistic, gender) is by highlighting the problems with test validity when the tests are used with a wide variety of students. Issues of test bias are introduced, and students share examples of “regional” vocabulary from standardized tests (introduced as examples in class) that their own students in California may not recognize (Session 3, C-196).

When miscue analysis procedures are presented, candidates learn to differentiate between a miscue in decoding and a difference in dialect. (Session 7, C-199-200). Respect for students’ linguistic differences is highlighted.

In Session 4 (C-197), candidates discuss factors which affect reading performance, such as home environment, dialect and language differences, gender differences, and educational histories. Ways to address diversity in the regular education classroom are explored.

During Fieldwork Seminar portions of the class, candidates share information on their fieldwork students’ backgrounds, including the factors just mentioned, and they work together with their colleagues to suggest ways to provide successful experiences for the students.

The last part of the class involves having candidates share fieldwork results with the parent, guardian, or teacher of one of the case study students. In this way,
they become more knowledgeable about the importance of the school-home communication process and gain additional insight into their fieldwork students’ backgrounds.

**Testing issues for this course highlight the many differences among learners.** Analyses of test items (Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory and Gates-MacGinitie) illustrate how regional and cultural biases may be operating. The Kohn book describes the norming process for standardized tests in detail; candidates recognize that the results of such tests demonstrate differences among student proficiency levels but do not offer much diagnostic information. (Results are shown by positioning on the bell curve related to percentiles and stanines, for example.) Candidates can see that ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic differences affect test results and should be taken into account when interpreting assessment and evaluation data.

**RDG 516**

The writing text clarifies that specific instruction resources must be considered as candidates plan instruction for a diverse population (Part III in Graves). The authors also attend thoroughly to the concept of portfolio assessment, which can be used effectively to highlight the abilities of learners who represent different cultures, ethnicities, genders, linguistic characteristics, and socio-economic levels. Candidates recognize that these learners may be different from themselves but that with appropriate support can achieve proficiency in reading and writing.

**RDG 517**

The focus of this course is to help students who, for many different reasons, have not developed an interest in reading. Candidates talk with their fieldwork group of “reluctant readers” about their reading histories, and they administer an informal reading inventory to help them plan instruction that will be motivational for the students.

In small groups within the 517 class, candidates jigsaw possible developmental characteristics that influence readers’ literary preferences: language, social, and cognitive development (Session 2, E-276-277). They also identify the primary language backgrounds of their fieldwork students and some of their “home literacy practices” as a starting point for considering literature selections that reflect the students’ language and cultural backgrounds (Session 3, E-277-278).

In the chapter on multicultural literature (“parallel cultures”), Goforth defines multicultural literature as “any literary genres that authentically depict the diversity of society by realistically portraying the unique lifestyles and heritage of all social,
cultural, and ethnic groups” (F-316). The candidates in the class discuss the benefits to be gained from exploring multicultural literature, and they model techniques and strategies for presenting it.


Candidates demonstrate their ability to teach students from a diversity of backgrounds through the development of positive relationships with their fieldwork students, as indicated in their Dialogue Journals and by contributions in class; their success in motivating the students to engage in the reading of quality (including multicultural) literature; discussions during Fieldwork Seminar portions of the course; and thoughtful approaches to the Evaluation of a Book for Bias assignment.

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

RDG 518

In this class, candidates learn the theories of primary and second language acquisition and how literacy transfers from L1 to L2. The fieldwork experience with an ELL student offers them an opportunity to apply what they have learned about the components of sheltered instruction.

Throughout the tutorial process, candidates work toward providing “construction of meaning opportunities” in reading and writing which are meaningful, which celebrate cultural and linguistic diversity, and which are based on high expectations for the learner (Session 12, G-334).

Candidates are responsible for ensuring that their lessons contain such components as age-appropriate content concepts and vocabulary, adjustment of speech, student-centered real-life activities, scaffolding techniques, and linkage of new concepts to past learning. The formal sheltered required lesson plan for this tutorial includes the application of these elements (H-351-353).

Candidates also demonstrate sensitivity to students of diverse backgrounds through entries in their Fieldwork Log (H-349-350), which include session descriptions, obstacles faced, insights arrived at, and reflections about the success of their interactions with the ELL fieldwork student.
This course is primarily devoted to the understanding of English learners and the influences that affect the development of L1 and L2 language acquisition. All of the assignments require candidates to analyze the work of their tutees (English learners) in light of the many differences they bring to the process of language and literacy development.

In addition, the “disposition” identified for RDG 518 (to be discussed more fully in the Credential standards is “Crosscultural Competence.” On their RDG 518 Lesson Plans, candidates describe the process in which they are involved for developing a stronger sense of crosscultural competence in their professional lives. They may provide reflections, classroom scenarios, and anecdotes which illustrate how they are becoming more effective educators in terms of crosscultural competence (Appendix 5). The disposition is also highlighted by all of the candidates during class discussions.
Standard 11
Assessment, Evaluation, & Instruction
Reading Certificate

Category 3: Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance

Standard 11: Assessment, Evaluation, & Instruction

Each candidate demonstrates the ability to assess and evaluate students’ needs, abilities and achievement by using a variety of measures: formal and informal, individual, and group. Each candidate demonstrates the ability to apply what is learned through assessment and evaluation to the development and delivery of appropriate instruction in reading and language arts.

Each candidate demonstrates the ability:

11A) to assess and evaluate students’ needs, abilities, and achievement by using a variety of measures: formal and informal; individual and group

RDG 510

The fieldwork part of this course includes work with two students (beginning, struggling reader and an older, non-reader). Candidates demonstrate that they can assess and evaluate students’ needs, abilities, and achievement by assessing both students in a wide range of literacy areas, providing appropriate instruction, and evaluating the effectiveness of their instruction. The primary end product which documents this process is the Case Study Analysis for each student and the Case Study Analysis Presentation for one tutee.

Candidates utilize a variety of measures to assess students’ needs and strengths. They locate the results of standardized test information (group tests); have discussions with the tutee’s teacher(s), as appropriate; and use informal interest inventories, classroom reading inventories, checklists, tests, miscue analyses, lists, observation, and performance-based assessment tools, many of which are contained in the Glazer text and in the Resources section of the Johns and Lenski handbook.

The candidates in RDG 510 learn to use a variety of assessment measures from the first day of the class as they prepare to tutor a child in grades 1-3. Most of the measures they use are informal (sight word tests, spelling inventories, writing samples, phonics tests), but some are more “formalized” such as the Ekwall Shanker; for this assessment, candidates administer reading passages and do a miscue analysis in order to determine strengths and weaknesses of their tutees. Also included in their assessment repertoire are anecdotal records and
interest/attitude surveys. They do not administer a standardized (norm-referenced) test until RDG 514.

Most of these assessments are administered individually to the tutees, although some of them could be given to a group (such as the phonics tests).

**RDG 514**

As this is the “literacy assessment” class, the emphasis is on learning about and implementing many kinds of assessment instruments. Within the context of their fieldwork with two students (a beginning, struggling reader and an older non-reader, candidates administer two standardized tests: the Gates-MacGinitie, a reading survey test and the SDRT, a diagnostic reading test. They also utilize a classroom reading inventory, the QRI-3.

In addition, candidates must assess students’ strengths and weaknesses in the following areas: phonemic awareness, word recognition strategies (phonics, sight words, structural analysis, context clues), fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing/spelling, and motivation for the beginning reader; word recognition strategies (phonics, sight words, structural analysis, context clues), vocabulary, comprehension, writing and spelling, motivation, study skills, and metacognition for the intermediate reader (D-206-208). As a result, they use oral reading fluency norms, miscue analyses, phonics and phonemic awareness tests, oral reading tests, the cloze procedure, observation, checklists, think-alouds, surveys, journals, and other types of informal assessment strategies.

Candidates demonstrate their ability to use a wide variety of methods for assessment and evaluation through satisfactory completion of the three Clinician’s Summary reports, the presentation of their tape-recorded assessment segment, the Oral Formative Update with one fieldwork student, and the 2 Case Study Assessment Profiles and Case Study Assessment Presentation.

In addition, candidates then communicate the results of one Case Study Analysis to a parent, guardian, or teacher of the fieldwork student in order to describe assessment results and recommend possible intervention options.

In this “assessment” class, candidates administer a variety of informal and formal assessments. Along with those they learned in RDG 510, they also administer the Burns and Roe Informal Reading Inventory and the Gates-MacGinitie. Reading Survey Test. The Roe and Burns is an individual test, while the Gates is a group test. Other assessments are typically used as individual ones, but may be administered to groups if students have written directions and their own answer sheets such as some of those within the Ekwall-Shanker.
RDG 516

In this class, candidates learn to administer and interpret the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, which is designed as a group test. However, after tutees take the test, candidates do an item analysis to see which areas of phonics (lower levels) and comprehension (levels 3 and above) need additional support. They work in groups to identify “types of questions” such as main ideas, details, sequence, and inferences. This is a formal test when given in a standardized fashion. The assessments (both formal and informal) learned in RDG 510 and 514 are also part of the assessment repertoire, and candidates give those that are appropriate, based on their tutees.

RDG 517

In order to meet the needs of “reluctant” readers, candidates use interviews and interest inventories, plus informal conversations with their fieldwork students, to determine appropriate instruction in the area of literature. They assess as they teach, monitoring student responses to the literature presented and learning which presentational strategies are most effective with the group.

Candidates demonstrate the assessment process through entries in their Dialogue Journals, as well as discussion during the Seminar Fieldwork portion of the class related to results of interest inventories and conversations with students.

They also evaluate a school’s literature program (F-303-310) in order to determine whether it contains the necessary elements to meet students’ literacy needs, both motivationally and cognitively.

*RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.*

RDG 518

The assessment process in this class is demonstrated by candidates in three ways. First of all, they engage in a Language Sample Collection of a child, which provides information on the child’s language related to the use of the following structures: holophrases, phrases, clauses, complex sentences, conjunctions, prepositions, passive voice constructions, figurative language, stages of negativity and questioning, and placement in Brown’s order of 14 morphemes. The information is then used to compare and contrast these findings with other children of the same age, as well as with children of different ages.
The second assessment process is contained within the Conversational Style Analysis, which provides information on the use of pragmatics. Candidates analyze the use of such elements as facial expressions, choice of words, rapport and solidarity devices, and pacing. The literal messages, as well as the “meta-messages” of the conversation are analyzed with respect to the use of these techniques, indicating the level of pragmatic facility that each fieldwork student possesses, as well as different cultural perspectives that are revealed during the conversations.

Finally, candidates use assessment skills when they work with an ELL student during a ten-hour tutorial. They determine the learner’s level of motivation, background knowledge, and language proficiency (levels of BICS and CALP) through interactions with the student, as well as through performance-based assessments such as the student’s oral reading and writing ability, oral and written responses to reading material, and use of vocabulary when discussing content area topics.

Assessment skills are documented when candidates write up the formal lesson plan for the ELL students, discuss fieldwork progress during Fieldwork Seminar portions of the course, and make entries in their Fieldwork Logs, which document new goals for each session, based on ongoing assessment.

All of the tests presented in earlier classes (formal and informal) are possible assessments for candidates to choose. In this class, a strong emphasis is placed on what candidates learned about the writing process and how to create rubrics (as presented in RDG 516). Therefore, they also include informal writing rubrics which are individualized for their tutees, based on their needs.

Candidates also learn about the components of the CELDT test and use the assessment information they gather about their tutees to see if the levels identified by the CELDT still appear to be valid.

11B) to apply what is learned through assessment and evaluation to the development and delivery of appropriate instruction in reading and language arts

RDG 510

The development and delivery of appropriate instruction is evaluated through the activities and reflections described in the Double Entry Journal; the Literacy Mentors’ response (B-155); the comprehensive Case Study Analysis for each
tutee (which includes pre-assessment information, student background information, goals and activities, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities), and contributions during class related to instructional effectiveness (e.g., during the videotaped instructional segment presentation and the Presentation of one Case Study Analysis to colleagues).

The lesson plans, Diagnostic Reports, and Literacy Profiles are based on assessments and “matched” instruction for tutees. When candidates write and present their projects (to the instructor, to their colleagues, and to parents), they justify the assessment and instructional decisions they have made.

RDG 514

After candidates have completed administering a variety of assessment instruments to both case study students, they create a Case Study Assessment Profile for each one, in which appropriate new goals, instructional strategies, and possible interventions are recommended for the student. This end product, as well as instructional suggestions provided in the Clinician’s Summary Reports and during the Case Study Assessment Profile presented to colleagues, documents their ability to develop appropriate instructional plans. As mentioned above, candidates also recommend instructional plans to the parent, guardian, or teacher of one of the fieldwork students, providing rationales for their suggestions.

The two test reports, lesson plans, Diagnostic Reports, and Literacy Profiles are based on assessments and “matched” instruction for tutees. When candidates write and present their projects (to the instructor, to their colleagues, and to parents), they justify the assessment and instructional decisions they have made.

A new evaluation (Taskstream rubric, Appendix 19) is used to determine candidate competencies in the area of assessment.

RDG 516

Candidates continue to develop profiles for their tutees in RDG 516, along with all of the required products that indicate competencies in assessment and appropriate planning. The assessment of writing (using rubrics and state standards) is emphasized.

RDG 517

The effectiveness of instructional decisions made by candidates in this class is represented by their entries in the Dialogue Journals (read and responded to by the instructor and classmates), the input of the Literacy Support Person, the
Abbreviated Literacy Links and Verbal or Visual Presentations of Literature, and observation of the fieldwork students’ increased interest in independent reading and positive behaviors during fieldwork session interactions.

RDG 517 (as RDG 521) is now required at the Credential level of the program.

RDG 518

One way in which the delivery of appropriate instruction is documented in this class is through the candidates’ Fieldwork Log entries for the ELL tutorial, in which they list the objective for each session (based on assessment), a description of the lesson activities and instructional strategies, an evaluation of the extent to which the session objective was met, and new goals for the next session.

Also, the lesson plan write-up for the ELL student, which involves the planning implementation, and evaluation of lesson effectiveness, following the sheltered instruction model, demonstrates the candidate’s ability to provide appropriate instruction within the context of content area reading and writing.

The EDL Strategy Lesson, RDG 518 Lesson Plans, Diagnostic Reports, and Literacy Profiles are based on assessments and “matched” instruction for tutees. When candidates write and present their projects (to the instructor, to their colleagues, and to parents), they justify the assessment and instructional decisions they have made. Modifications for both assessment and instruction, appropriate for English learners, are highlighted and discussed during presentations and the Fieldwork Seminar portion of each class.
# Reading Certificate: Standards 1—11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tutorial Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Diagnostic Report/Case Study</th>
<th>Literacy Profile to Parents</th>
<th>Study Guides (Research Based)</th>
<th>&quot;Diversity&quot; Section of Lesson Plans</th>
<th>Activity or Strategy Demonstration</th>
<th>TaskStream Rubrics</th>
<th>Research Paper/Literature Review</th>
<th>Candidate Dispositions</th>
<th>Candidate Competency Form (Self-Evaluation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG 510</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>6, 9, 10</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 514</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>6, 9, 10</td>
<td>4, 6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 516</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11</td>
<td>3, 5, 4, 7, 11</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>6, 9, 10</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 518</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>6, 9, 10</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 12
Leadership Skills & Professional Development
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Category 4: Program Design and Curriculum Standards

Standard 12: Leadership skills and Professional Development

The program provides in-depth knowledge, skills, and experiences that enable each candidate to develop an advanced professional perspective on reading and language arts curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The program provides specialized activities and effective experiences that promote leadership skills and foster the ongoing professional development of all candidates.

The program provides in depth knowledge, skills and experiences that enable each candidate to:

12A) develop an advanced professional perspective on reading and language arts curriculum, instruction, and assessment

RDG 520

Readings

This course, advanced methods and materials, presents candidates with a wide range of strategies within all area of literacy. These strategies are modeled by the instructor and by colleagues in the course. A primary text, Diagnostic Teaching of Reading (P-605) presents information related to assessing before, during, and after the “reading event,” and includes a full chapter (Chapter 11, P-609) on instructional techniques, building on the strategies candidates learned in RDG 510 and 514.

The book by Fearn and Farnan, Interaction: Teaching Writing and the Language Arts, focuses on the writing process, taking the knowledge base from the Certificate Program and expanding it more fully. This text includes a historical look at literacy instruction, providing an overview of the way in which history has informed language arts and citing trends in the research on cognition and the use of creative thinking skills in teaching and learning. The writers define writing as a finely-tuned “craft,” which must be developed over time and with excellent instructional support. They also take their readers through the writing process, one step at a time, offering an in-depth discussion on each part, plus recommendations for instruction and assessment.
The Wood and Harmon text, *Strategies for Integrating Reading and Writing*, includes strategies for older students not presented in previous classes and emphasizes the importance of developing both reading and writing simultaneously. It also goes beyond the writing basics that were offered at the Certificate level, including ways to meet the cognitive and affective needs of older students. Strategies for oral reading, the use of writing frames in writing instruction, and guides for “textbook reading” are introduced, proving candidates with more in-depth knowledge about methods for adolescents.

In addition, there is a full chapter on using technology to integrate reading and writing, which is an important medium for engagement of older students, as well as an effective instructional approach.

Related to the areas of comprehension and metacognition, the Tovani text offers excerpts from the classroom in which candidates learn how older students (adolescents) feel when they cannot understand what they are reading—and how to respond appropriately. This book gives candidates a perspective on the affective underpinnings of students’ inability to read, rather than just providing a series of instructional steps, which most of the books in previous courses tended to offer. It focuses specifically on motivational reasons why poor readers do not see themselves as real readers and writers and proposes many new strategies for helping them to set purposes for reading and to utilize access tools (such as “comprehension constructors”).

The QRI-4, an informal reading inventory, provides an overview of the assessment process for all of the components of literacy (except emergent strategies such as alphabet knowledge and phonemic awareness), helping candidates to review the components of an IRI while taking it further—into a distinction between skills assessment with narrative texts and skills with expository texts. Independent, instruction, and frustration levels can be determined for learners that are not the same for expository as for narrative materials, highlighting the influence of schema (content and text structure) and interest on the comprehension process.

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Candidates are each asked to present (explain and model) at least two instructional strategies from the Walker text (0-543). They sign up for selected strategies at the beginning of the semester and demonstrate them in class to their colleagues (P-573). By the ending date of the class, having seen strategies presented in decoding and word recognition, comprehension, motivation, writing, and vocabulary, they have developed a wide repertoire of strategies in all areas.
of literacy. They can then show other teachers how to implement them at their own school sites or districts during the presentation of staff inservices.

Instructional scenarios at the end of most chapters in the Interactions text offer candidates practice in dealing with typical scenarios that they will encounter in their work with students and in mentoring other faculty members (e.g., Chapter 4, P-589). Such simulations provide them with important practice in a risk-free environment—the RDG 520 class—before they encounter such situations with their students. They can then perform with confidence when they are demonstrating the techniques for other faculty at their schools or within their districts.

Candidates use the Wood and Harmon text when they match strategies to assessments for their lesson plans, Diagnostic Reports, and Literacy Profiles. As they do the required Adolescent Research Paper for RDG 520, they choose at least three research articles related to attitude, motivation, lack of interest in independent reading, and low sense of self-efficacy; they then present the findings to their colleagues, bringing in ideas related to those presented in the Tovani text and to which they respond via study guides.

In addition, each candidate administers the QRI-4 to the older learner who has severe reading difficulties, gaining an overview of the influences that contribute to struggling adolescents’ challenges with reading and writing. Their paper and assigned readings add to a fuller understanding of the student’s profile and the possible explanations for why the student is still not proficient in reading and writing.

Higher level reading and writing strategies and attention to the affective domain allow candidates to develop a more professional perspective on the processes of learning to read and write. The Adolescent Research Paper brings these understandings together, supported by research. As mentors, they can demonstrate instructional methods with colleagues and other professionals while sharing the theoretical foundations upon which they are based.

**RDG 521**

**Readings**

Candidates become familiar with a wide range of genres and reading materials in the Literature and the Learner text by Goforth: picture books, folk literature, fantasy, realistic fiction, biography and information books, and multicultural literature. Goforth includes a large range of instructional recommendations for how to give students practice with a variety of genres to increase motivation to
read and to develop proficiency in reading, which help candidates to see the larger picture behind the students’ struggles with literacy.

In addition to offering techniques for presenting different genres of literature to students, Goforth sets forth five principles for designing and implementing a literature curriculum, one of which includes reading with the whole class, in small groups and independently. Discussion of this material highlights the importance of independent reading in developing reading fluency and proficiency.

The class also discusses Anderson’s article entitled “Research Foundations to Support Wide Reading.” Candidates learn the importance of “book floods” to encourage children (by providing access to books and interesting materials) to develop vocabulary and reading competence through independent reading. They adopt a professional perspective when they recognize that strategy instruction in addition to the behavior of habitual engagement in real reading practices support learners in becoming proficient.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Within the course, candidates classify books with pictures (wordless books, storybooks, illustrated books, concept books, informational storybooks, photo essay, and information books) and view demonstrations of instructional strategies and literary responses to picture books. They synthesize the kinds of materials they have been exposed to throughout the previous courses in a way that helps them to become “experts” so that they can make recommendations to other professionals.

They also tutor reluctant readers in grades 3-8, for whom they select appropriate reading materials (based on reading level, interest, and age) from various genres throughout the 10 tutorial hours in order to increase student motivation to read and reading proficiency.

The objective of the fieldwork portion of this class is to work with reluctant readers who are struggling (reading one to two years below grade level). These are students who are not proficient and are particularly reluctant to read and write. In small groups, candidates jigsaw developmental characteristics that influence readers’ literary preferences: language, social, and cognitive development.
Candidates administer interest inventories (appropriate to age and grade level) to the students who have been identified as “reluctant” readers. They also report on the results of interviews and discussions related to their students’ disinterest in reading. Many requirements for the course involve activities which are designed to motivate these students to increase their enjoyment of reading, such as the Verbal or Visual Presentation of Literature, and Abbreviated Literary Link. Candidates view the “whole learner” in this class as they seek to engage and support children who have become unmotivated to engage in reading/writing.

RDG 525

Readings

Issues and Trends in Literacy Education provides candidates with twenty articles, based on research, on all areas of literacy development (R-679). Chapter topics include research on balanced literacy, phonics, multicultural diversity, reading assessment, literacy materials, spelling, emergent literacy, content literacy, early intervention, and writing. The readings are much more sophisticated than those presented in previous courses, as readers now have much greater background knowledge for the topics and can handle the complexity.

Echevarria, Vogt, and Short’s text, Making Content Comprehensible for English Language Learners, (R-671) builds on candidates’ knowledge (developed throughout RDG 510 and 518, specifically) of how to work effectively with ELL students by presenting the SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) a lesson planning format that is more detailed than those introduced in other classes (R-671) but which is designed to incorporate more support than previous models have contained. Indicators of lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice, lesson delivery and review/assessment are considered in great depth.

The Nieto text (Language, Culture and Teaching) brings in psychological and sociological influences which affect the language and literacy acquisition of all students, but of language minority groups, in particular. Candidates investigate the ways in which tracking and teacher reconceived perceptions of students’ ability may influence their progress school and can keep this important information in mind when considering intervention options for children (an added “piece” to intervention, which they have not addressed in earlier classes). Candidates can use this information to add to their perspective on the tutee in RDG 525, a beginning struggling reader in grades 1-3.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice
More advanced perspectives on curriculum and instruction are developed as candidates work with a small group of proficient readers, including two ELL students (Q-619). The group work is representative of the kinds of groups they may work with in other teacher’s classes or in after school sessions at schools. All students’ needs must be taken into account, and candidates must provide instruction which benefits proficient readers, as well as supporting the ELL students within the group so that they may progress at the same rate.

The research which candidates read in the class is integrated into their fieldwork during class discussions, and all aspects of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP model) are considered for each fieldwork lesson and documented by way of the entries in their fieldwork journals (R-639), class discussions, and formal lesson plans and observations (evaluated by their ULV Fieldwork Supervisor).

Candidates demonstrate an advanced perspective on reading and language arts curriculum, instruction, and assessment by becoming a Seminar Leader for one evening whereby they lead the class discussion on assigned readings and articles. They encourage their colleagues to move from the research information to discover what the classroom implications would be.

The research that candidates read in the class is integrated into their fieldwork during class discussions, Fieldwork Seminar discussions, their lesson plans, and the Literacy Profile. Specific research on the policy topic of their choice is included in Policy Simulation Paper and presentation.

**RDG 530**

**Readings**

The focus of this course is for candidates to develop the “professional perspective” of the reading specialist. They read texts on the roles and responsibilities of the reading specialist (R. Bean), how to be a “leader” (Pellicer), and how to set up independent reading programs in schools (Pilgreen. They also read the IRA pamphlet on the role of the reading specialist. In effect, they learn what reading specialists can and should do in districts and schools. This course goes beyond the theory, techniques, and materials that are presented in earlier classes and takes the information into a more professional domain.

Bean’s text offers information on how to initialize, implement, and evaluate language arts programs at school sites; how to coach, assess instruction, and develop partnerships with the school, the community, and families.
A main text in this course which addresses the need good leaders in schools is Pellicer’s *Caring Enough to Lead*. After discussing the role of the reading specialist through filling out the personal information sheet, doing a prediction map activity, and sharing the information from the pamphlet published by IRA on the role of the reading specialist, candidates begin to read the Pellicer book, jotting down “Pellicer Pearls” which relate to their own professional and personal experiences. Many class discussions are then based on the premises he presents, and candidates determine what specific leadership characteristics a reading specialist should demonstrate.

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

The assignment in RDG 530 to describe and present a state-approved instructional program to colleagues helps candidates to develop an overview of all the possible programs (comprehensive, basic, and partial) that are available for purchase and to determine what components the programs include (T-705-714, 715, and 716-717). Though the list of programs is made available in RDG 514, the programs themselves are not presented in depth until candidates are in this class. Candidates need to know what approved published programs are available and what they include in order to make appropriate decisions related to program selections.

Candidates evaluate published programs that are identified by the California Department of Education website as partial, basic, comprehensive, and intervention. Though the list of programs is made available in RDG 514, the programs themselves are not presented in depth until candidates are in this class. Candidates need to know what approved published programs are available and what they include in order to make appropriate decisions related to program selections. They demonstrate an advanced professional perspective when they analyze and evaluate these programs.

**The program provides:**

12B) **specialized activities and effective experiences that promote leadership skills and foster the ongoing professional development of all candidates**

**RDG 521**

*The main text for this course, Literature and the Learner, offers an extensive repertoire of instructional recommendations for use with the literature. The instructor of the course models assessment procedures (e.g., the use of teacher checklist and parent questionnaires), presents instructional strategies (e.g., demonstrating instructional strategies and literary responses to highlight the art in
picture books), and highlights the importance of matching instruction to the identified needs of the learner (e.g., asking candidates to share scaffolding techniques and schema-building activities for ELL students).

When candidates apply this information as they respond to course requirements (such as the Verbal and Visual Presentation, the Abbreviated Literary Link, the Evaluation of a Quality Book, and the Evaluation of a Book for Bias), they participate in specialized activities that will help them to develop further as professionals and share with others in leadership roles at schools.

RDG 525

The experiences which contribute to the candidates’ development of leadership ability include in this course include the Article Critique and the Research Paper (with their proposal for a study and presentation to the class, R-666-668). Through these assignments, candidates become the research experts and articulators of information about research, which will be a part of their responsibilities as reading specialists.

They are also completely responsible for setting goals for a small group of proficient readers (including two ELL students) in their fieldwork, carrying out the instruction, and making decisions, as appropriate. This is the type of leadership role they will have to assume when working with groups as reading specialists.

Candidates develop leadership ability when they write the Policy Implementation Paper (with required review of the literature and presentation to the class) and act as Seminar Discussion Leader for their colleagues (as described above). Through these experiences, candidates become research experts and articulators of information about research, which will be a part of their overall responsibility as reading specialists.

RDG 530

Virtually all of the activities in this class are related to the role of the reading specialist as a school leader, as the course is entitled “Reading Specialist Leadership.” The three required inservice presentations (to students, parents, and faculty); the development of a professional Curriculum Vita, and the completion of five conference evaluations (signifying ongoing professional development) are all part of the transition activities necessary to help candidates move, psychologically and physically, from their positions as teachers to reading specialists and professional leaders.
The information above is still accurate. In addition, candidates also learn the philosophy underlying the importance of independent reading and can serve as support personnel at school sites where an independent reading program is being developed.

Both the Pellicer and Bean texts emphasize the knowledge, behaviors, and characteristics of leaders in school contexts.

The SSR Handbook offers candidates information on the importance of setting up independent reading programs at schools and provides suggestions on how to implement such programs effectively. As specialists, they then have the tools they need to develop or support such a program and the theoretical bases upon which to recommend it.

New to the program in the past year (fall of 2008) is the addition of the candidate “dispositions” which accentuate the importance of specific characteristics that are important for educators to possess (Appendix 5). Although all of the dispositions are important, the one that was chosen to complement RDG 530 was Commitment to Professional Development.

Candidates are asked to respond, on a weekly basis, to the question of how they are developing related to this disposition. They may cite examples of scenarios or anecdotes from their own workplace or from their Literacy Center involvement. They may also choose to offer reflective observations or respond to a “professional development” issue from the course readings. (Other dispositions are linked with different courses in the program.)
Standard 13
Research & Evaluation Methodology
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Category 4: Program Design and Curriculum Standards

Standard 13: Research and Evaluation Methodology

The program provides knowledge and skills in research design and methodology that enable each candidate to understand emerging findings in the literature related to literacy education. The program provides focused knowledge and skills in local program evaluation methods that enable the candidate to generate reliable information about local program strengths, weaknesses, and effects.

The program provides knowledge and skills in research design and methodology that enable each candidate to:

13A) understand emerging findings in the literature related to literacy education

ED 501

Readings

In ED 501, candidates learn the basic principles of assessing student educational accomplishment. The main text Measurement and Assessment in Teaching (L-498) covers three specific areas: the measurement and assessment process; classroom tests and assessments; and selecting and using published tests. This information is important for reading specialists to know, as they will be selecting tests to be used in districts and administering them at specific school sites.

Also, the information in this book builds on what candidates learned in RDG 514. In that class, information related only to literacy assessment was introduced. The concepts of reliability and validity were discussed, but only briefly. ED 501 offers a much deeper view of measurement and statistics.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The requirement for the paper in ED 501 offers candidates several choices that provide “real life” application opportunities (L-476). These choices include describing and evaluating the test selection process utilized in their own schools; describing and analyzing a test interview (L-477) with a knowledgeable testing professional in their district; or analyzing a district or school test, using a carefully outlined “test analysis format” (L-478).
Another project that helps candidates to develop an advanced professional perspective is the choosing of a test for a district, based on specified criteria. They must determine the purpose for the test, identify the school or group “need,” determine the test group, and collect and discuss validity information. Part of the process includes collecting all test review information from texts and test guides, as well as from test publishers. This procedure is one with which reading specialists must be familiar in order to make decisions related to test selection and purchase in their schools.

This class is now embedded into RDG 524.

EDUC 504

Readings

This is a “methods of research” course in which candidates acquire broad-based knowledge concerning the nature of research, research design, and data collection/analysis. Because candidates must have a deep knowledge of research in order to read research articles, critique research, and create research proposals, which are requirements for RDG 525, this course is taken first. In addition, because reading specialists must understand issues of sampling, issues and measures of validity and reliability, and various types of research methods in order to read scholarly research, this information is critical.

The two texts for ED 504, Understanding Research Methods (N-537) and How to Build the Best Questionnaires in the Field of Education (N-534), introduce various types of research design (experimental design, true experimental, pre-experimental, and quasi-experimental). Basic statistical information, which is necessary for the understanding of test interpretation, is included such as scales of measurement; chi square tests; the mean, median, and mode; standard deviation; and the Pearson Correlation Coefficient. A separate section on reviews of literature (Part B, N-538), which are contained in most research articles, is included, which gives candidates a head start on how to develop a literature review for their paper in RDG 525.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

One of the problems with research is the possibility of threats to internal validity. If internal validity is jeopardized (through selection biases, history interactions, instrumentation problems, maturation, or other confounding issues), then the results of published research will not be credible. These issues are explored in the tests and assignments for EDUC 504.
Since reading specialists are “experts” in reading research, they should be aware of such possibilities and be careful only to share research knowledge with staff and administration that emerges from well-done studies. EDUC 504 covers this body of information about “good designs” in depth. In the class, candidates are asked to do analyses of studies and to examine threats to validity and draw conclusions about the “believability” of the study (N-517-521).

This class is now embedded into RDG 524.

RDG 524

The new course entitled RDG 524 (Educational Assessment and Research Methods) still includes the Linn and Miller text used in EDUC 501. The major content focuses of the class are the same, except that candidates do not write a research paper; the research paper is now required in RDG 525.

Basic statistical information, which is necessary for the understanding of test interpretation and research studies, is included such as scales of measurement; chi square tests; the mean, median, and mode; standard deviation; and the Pearson Correlation Coefficient, presented in Linn and Miller.

A required text for this course is the same Methods of Research book originally used in EDUC 504. The second portion of the course presents methods of research; candidates acquire broad-based knowledge concerning the nature of research, research design, and data collection/analysis. Because candidates must have a deep knowledge of research in order to read research articles, critique research, and create research proposals, which are requirements for RDG 525, this class necessarily precedes RDG 525.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Candidates now use the Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook to find an evaluation of a test instrument; then they report the findings as they do their own analysis of the test review related to criteria such as validity, reliability, and usability (Assignment #1 on the RDG 524 syllabus in Appendix 2).

The candidates select a test that is used at their own schools and analyze its components using the criteria for valid and reliable assessment from the Linn and Miller text (Assignment #2 on the RDG 524 syllabus in Appendix 2).

They also take an exam (Exam #1 as listed on the syllabus in Appendix 2) covering basic statistical information and must compute means, medians, modes, percentiles, standard deviations and z-scores from data provided to them.
Candidates do an assignment in which they analyze a research study in the area of literacy (Assignment #3 on the RDG 524 syllabus in Appendix 2). If internal validity is jeopardized (through selection biases, history interactions, instrumentation problems, maturation, or other confounding issues), then the results of published research will not be credible. They present these findings to colleagues.

They also take an exam (Exam #3 as listed in the RDG 514 syllabus, Appendix 2) in which they are presented with several research studies and asked to identify their research designs, along with the components of each and strengths/weaknesses.

The competencies that candidates develop in RDG 524 (building on the information in the RDG 514 assessment course) allow candidates to select appropriate and well-developed studies for their research paper in RDG 525 that are credible.

RDG 525

Readings

This course is intended to support candidates in their development of research skills, as well as their ability to know how to “read” research. Understanding Research Statistics (R-669) is a text that helps them to review the information learned in ED 501 and 504.

The new text for this course (Research Design by J. Creswell) continues to focus on the elements of strong research design while enabling candidates to apply what they have learned as they use studies and articles to write their own research paper (including a literature review) on a policy issue within the field of literacy. This text clearly outlines how to write a “review of the literature” and describes how to write research questions. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods procedures are also reviewed.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The research article critique and research paper assignment (Q-619 and 620) ask candidates to use their knowledge of research and measurement in order to critically analyze research, read a wide variety of research (assigned and recommended) and eventually determine what kind of research project they might like to carry out in their own classrooms.

Throughout the course of the semester, candidates are given opportunities to analyze research articles in class with colleagues to prepare for the writing of
their own critique (R-660-665). One of the first articles they encounter is by Pressley, Rankin, and Yokoi (Q-627). They read it with the purpose of determining what “parts” a typical research study contains. Then, additional information is reviewed related to internal validity (R-648) so that threats (which were introduced in ED 504) can be considered, as well.

Candidates’ introduction to a variety of research topics spurs their own interest in selecting a research question for their paper—and then pursuing the development of the paper (from the proposal stage to the library and internet research, R-667) to their proposal for carrying their own possible classroom research study.

*Candidates use studies and articles to write their own research paper (including a literature review) on a policy issue within the field of literacy. They then write the Policy Implementation Paper, complete with evidentiary support from at least ten research sources and present it to their colleagues as a “Board of Education Policy Simulation Presentation.”*

**The program provides focused knowledge and skills in local program evaluation methods that enable the candidate to:**

- **13B) generate reliable information about local program strengths, weaknesses, and effects**

**ED 501**

An activity that candidates engage in during ED 501 which contributes to their capabilities to evaluate programs includes the analyses of many different standardized tests throughout the semester. Not only do they present different tests to colleagues and, in small groups, evaluate them, but they also practice reading and interpreting test results (e.g., the STAR Test, L-482).

Certainly, a large part of the reading specialist’s program evaluation includes the ability to interpret tests to answer such questions as whether the program is effective (and determine if the test results are credible) and to be able to report the results to faculty, administration, and parents. Since reading programs must be developed through a carefully-orchestrated set of steps from the determination of students’ needs, through the selection and purchase of materials, to the program evaluation in terms of instrumentation and student progress, this kind of knowledge base is critical.

*These requirements are now embedded into RDG 524, and the new course still retains the elements listed above.*
ED 504

An important way for candidates to practice using their knowledge of basic methods of research is by doing the “types of research” exercise (N-508 and 509). It is critical that when reading specialists support a given perspective offered by a researcher, they understand the research method which was used to conduct the research—and can recognize if the research is “believable.” In this way, specialists know which research can be used to support instructional decisions and which research is questionable when making program and instructional recommendations at schools.

*These requirements are now embedded into RDG 524, and the new course still retains the elements listed above.*

RDG 521

*When a reading specialist engages in the task of carrying out program evaluation at a school, necessary competencies include the ability to interpret assessments to answer such questions as whether the program is effective (and determine if the test results are credible) and to be able to report the results to faculty, administration, and parents. Since reading programs must be developed through a sequential set of steps from the determination of students’ needs, through the selection and purchase of materials, to the program evaluation in terms of instrumentation and student progress, this kind of knowledge base is critical. Therefore, the statistical information, as well as a full understanding of validity and reliability taught in this class is essential.*

*It is also critical that when reading specialists support a given perspective offered by a researcher, they understand the research method which was used to conduct the research—and can recognize if the research is “believable.” In this way, specialists know which research can be used to support instructional decisions and which research is questionable when making program and instructional recommendations at schools. The second portion of this class on research design offer the information candidates need to analyze solid research that support the theoretical and philosophical bases of a literacy program.*

RDG 520

*A main requirement in this class is that candidates carry out a Literacy Philosophy Evaluation of two school sites to determine if the programs represent a “balanced, comprehensive approach.” Through interviews with school personnel, observation of instruction, and examination of materials, they look to see if the program elements match the components listed in the Reading and...*
Language Arts Framework (P-562-565). Because providing a comprehensive program includes determining that students “master foundational skills as a gateway to using all forms of language as tools for thinking, learning and communicating,” assessment instruments are a necessary part of the overall school programs. Candidates’ knowledge of measurement issues are significant in deciding if students the school sites are given opportunities for developing to the level of skills targeted for their grade level—and if the appropriate instruments are used to determine their progress.

This class is not directly related to program assessment, but it does include a short research paper in which candidates continue to apply their knowledge of well-designed studies and utilize their evaluative skills in determining if research designs are strong and how to interpretive the results of studies.

RDG 525

Though program design is not the focus of this course, candidates read, discuss, and work with research studies, which inform the teaching of literacy to students of all ages and grades. The Research Article Critique, the Research Paper and the Presentation to colleagues give them opportunities to look at current research from a more professional perspective. This knowledge will influence their evaluation of existing and potential school programs.

Other that the fact that the critique of research articles is now included as Assignment #3 in RG 524, the information listed above for RDG 525 is still correct.

RDG 530

The requirement to carry out a Language Arts Program Evaluation at a school site requires candidates to use the content standards from the Framework as a basis to judge whether or not the program is sufficient for a particular grade level. They must integrate their knowledge of the content criteria with information on the programs the school implements in order to make this determination (T-724). Candidates’ continued work with the content standards and Framework will help them to become more proficient in their role as program evaluators.

This course requires candidates to make presentations on partial, basic, comprehensive, and intervention programs approved by the California Department of Education (found on the CDE website). They choose a program, identify its components, determine its soundness based on quality research, and make recommendations to colleagues on the most appropriate populations with which to use such programs. In this way, they demonstrate the ability to evaluate programs at site levels.
Standard 14
Areas of Study Related to Reading & Language Arts
(Specialist Level)
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Category 4: Program Design and Curriculum Standards

Standard 14: Areas of Study Related to Reading and Language Arts (Specialist Level)

Through critical examination of sound research and theoretical literature, each candidate in the program acquires an advanced professional perspective about how students learn to read; the structure of the English language, including phonology, morphology, and orthography; relationships between language, spelling, reading and writing; and psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing.

Through critical examination of sound research and theoretical literature, each candidate in the program acquires an advanced professional perspective about:

14A) how students learn to read

RDG 520

Readings

This course, which is based primarily on the Walker text, deals with every aspect of the reading process, including the concept of the “reading event,” which is affected by such variables as the task, the text, the reader’s background, the technique, and the context (Chapter 2, P-606). Walker recommends that teachers focus on the “whole act of reading,” which includes planning, mediating, enabling, and responding to students. She presents background on diagnostic teaching, citing ways to gather diagnostic data, formulating diagnostic hypotheses (which are similar to the scientific method presented in ED 504), and selection of strategies and materials to match the diagnostic profile.

The Walker text is designed to help candidates to widen their repertoire of strategies for all areas of literacy. Chapter 22 on instructional techniques can be divided into the categories of word recognition, comprehension, motivation, writing, and vocabulary (P-574). By having a cadre of techniques such as this, candidates can offer all students opportunities to become fluent comprehenders and composers. Many of the strategies are designed for beginning readers, so that phonemic awareness, phonics, and other word recognition skills are addressed.
Two main texts in RDG 520 focus on the reading process: the Tovani text and the Wood and Harmon text (Appendix 10). Tovani explores the questions that readers should ask themselves if they are to “read” with comprehension. Beyond the act of word recognition, they must set purposes for reading, acknowledge when confusion has set in and determine what “fix-it” strategies to use, ask questions as they read, and learn strategies for staying focused and seeking meaning (comprehension constructors).

The Wood and Harmon text presents different types of grouping arrangements to use as students learn to read, discusses participatory structures, and generally emphasizes the role of the instructor in setting the stage for the teaching of reading and writing.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The two tutorials which candidates engage in address the beginning reader, as well as the older, non-reader. With the beginning student, the process of learning how to read is emphasized; while with the older one, the filling in of “gaps” in the reading process is highlighted. A good deal of what we know about how readers learn to read comes from observing children who are proficient readers. Candidates then develop an “Instructional Profile” for the beginning reader and an “Intervention Profile” for the older non-reader.

Candidates teach one older reader with “severe” reading difficulties who still has not effectively learned to read. The Adolescent Research Paper, as well as the tutorial experience (including lesson plans, the Diagnostic Report, and the Literacy Profile) give them an opportunity to see how the “learning to read” process has similarities and differences from what an emergent reader (typically grades 1-3) experiences.

RDG 525

Readings

Candidates deepen their understanding of the reading process as they read primary research articles and readings from Issues and Trends in Literacy Education. Articles such as “What Readers Do: Young Children’s Ideas about the Nature of Reading” by Strommen and Mates (R-681) provides an intensive look at the process children engage in as they learn to read.

This course now includes fieldwork with a beginning, struggling reader in grades 1-3. The Nieto text ((Language, Culture, and Teaching) describes the many factors that can affect the process of learning to read, including language, culture, gender, background knowledge, and home/school environment.
Candidates address the issues of alphabet knowledge, concepts of print, phonemic awareness, phonics and other word recognition strategies, spelling, vocabulary, comprehension and writing as they work with their tutees who are not yet performing at grade level.

However, candidates now take a more sophisticated view of the process that children experience as they analyze the sociopolitical influences presented by Nieto and follow her recommendations for developing affirmation and solidarity in the instructional context.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

The fieldwork in this course includes work with a small group of proficient readers. Discussion with these students about how they learned to read will be beneficial to candidates as a way of validating what they know from research.

Also, many candidates choose to write their research papers on a topic that is related to how children learn to read. These papers are then shared with colleagues at the end of the class. Ideas for additional in-class studies are presented (and many candidates then pursue the master’s degree in reading, which involves carrying out these studies within the context of a graduate seminar).

The “learning to read” process is highlighted in the tutorials and the research paper on policies.

14B) the structure of the English language, including phonology, morphology, and orthography.

RDG 525

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Because RDG 525 is now the course in which candidates work with children in grades 1-3, the structure of the English language, including phonology, morphology, and orthography is primarily emphasized as part of the learning to read process. Candidates utilize assessments and instructional strategies from their wide repertoire as they return to work with an emergent reader/writer.
14C) relationships among language, spelling, reading, and writing

RDG 521

Readings

An important part of this class is the presentation of different genres of literature, to which teachers must expose students in order to cover all areas of the Reading and Language Arts Standards. Many of these genres contain narrative readings—but some of them primarily emphasize expository texts (such as Biography and Information Books). Because the Goforth text includes “learner response modes” to complement the teaching of each type of literature in Literature and the Learner, text structure is highlighted, and a variety of comprehension techniques is introduced within the discussion of each genre, which are highly engaging and interactive. Candidates see that when readers can identify the text structures in their reading, they can also use the same structures in their own writing.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Text analysis becomes an important prerequisite for candidates when they create Abbreviated Literary Links for books used with their fieldwork tutees. Part of the rationale for developing the Link in the first place is to design activities which emphasize the development and structure of the text, which make the reading more enjoyable and understandable for the student and also highlight the structures that students can use in their own writing development. The Link is also an appropriate context for focusing on comprehension because the connect-construct-create format emphasizes the meaning-making process in reading, as well as the appropriateness of including listening, speaking, reading, and writing into activities for struggling readers and writers.

RDG 530

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Lesson plans utilizing the SIOP Model build in reading-writing connections, plus opportunities for oral language development. Some candidates take the topic even further, pursuing the interdependence of reading-writing in their research papers. The idea of invented spelling is also addressed when candidates work with their small groups, as many ELL students are still in transitional stages of spelling. Ways to make writing “publishable,” including the use of Spell-check systems and electronic dictionaries, are discussed.
This is the course where candidates synthesize their knowledge from the program; during their review of course content, they reinforce the idea that the relationships among language, spelling, reading, and writing are interdependent. Having tutored seven different children by this time, candidates can see how one skill affects others, demonstrating a positive correlation and a “spread of effect.” This understanding is also assessed on the Reading Specialist Competency Exam at the conclusion of RDG 530.

14D) psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing

RDG 525

Readings

The Nieto text deals with learning, the social context, and multicultural education. Nieto defines “classroom culture” as being antithetical to some students’ perceptions of reality, based on the types of interactional styles and perspectives that they bring from their home contexts. She discusses ways in which teachers can begin to create learning communities that enfold all learners—and addresses the idea of institutional transformations that may need to occur in schools if all students are to have equal access.

Because candidates deal with intervention options in this course (and spend a considerable amount of time presenting published literacy programs which are approved by the California Department of Education), they must take into account the psychological and sociolinguistic issues that influence students as they develop literacy.

They read the Guiding Principles in the Framework which highlights the need for programs to address the full range of learners in the classroom, operating on the assumption that “virtually all students can learn to read.” In following these principles, Nieto’s generalizations are applied as the candidates discuss the need for effective instructional options and the conceptualization of “intervention.”

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

One of the first activities that candidates do in RDG 525 is a “gallery walk” around the classroom in which they make sentences out of the key terms from Nieto, Chapter 1 and 2 (R-641). During this experience, they not only reconstruct Nieto’s point related to the key terms, but they also add their own reflections to the poster that contains the key terms. As they circulate around the room, additional comments can be made by different people on the same posters. A class discussion to clarify and elaborate on the ideas then occurs. Key terms
include “stereotype stigma,” “language of dumb kids,” “learning failure created” (R-641-642).

In addition, the SIOP model contains interactional elements which help to support ELL students in becoming engaged in instruction. The authors devote Chapter 6 to a discussion of this “indicators of instruction related to interactions” (R-673). As candidates work within this model to address the needs of their fieldwork students, attention is paid to providing effective grouping configurations, wait time, and opportunities for interaction.

Candidates keep in mind the possible influences that Nieto presents as they develop their “policy positions” for their research papers and demonstrations. As they make an argument that is pro/con related to a particular educational policy, they must also attend to the psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing.

RDG 530

Readings

In this course, the text by Allington is used to highlight the particular types of barriers that older, struggling students face, including psychological factors that make reading a non-accepted activity by peers. Allington also focuses on aspects of literacy instruction that help these struggling readers to feel successful and to develop what he calls “thoughtful literacy” (T-754).

The Bean text (The Reading Specialist: Leadership for the classroom, School, and Community) offers guidelines for the creation of school needs assessments and the development and evaluation of literacy programs. In her discussions, she cautions educators to test the waters—keeping psychological and sociolinguistic influences in mind as programs are developed for students. Programs are not simply academic, but emerge from the needs of the learners, as well as the mandates of state standards.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

As candidates present published programs to their colleagues in RDG 530, they address the possible psychological and sociolinguistic aspects of reading and writing. For example, a disadvantage to some “older” learner intervention programs may be that the materials are too juvenile or are not reflective of students’ cultures, leading to dissatisfaction and a lack of engagement on the part of learners. Candidates are asked to discuss such issues during their presentations and the discussions with their colleagues about the programs.
Standard 15
Preparation for Meeting the Reading & Writing Needs of All Students
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Category 4: Program Design and Curriculum Standards

Standard 15: Preparation for Meeting the Reading and Writing Needs of All Students

The program provides theoretical and research-based skills and knowledge about how children from a variety of sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds become proficient readers. Within this context, the program includes study and instruction in the specific needs of students who are English language learners, students with reading difficulties, and students who are proficient readers and writers.

The program provides theoretical and research-based skills and knowledge about:

15A) how children from a variety of socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds become proficient readers

RDG 520

In Sandra Wilde’s text What’s a Schwa Sound, she addresses the fact that the sounds of English can be very difficult for students from different backgrounds and that language differences are not just geographic (P-614). Other topics in her book include the differences between a dialect and an accent and whether speaking “differently” will affect students’ writing and spelling.

In addition, candidates also talk about issues in the Tovani text (Session 8, 0-552) which relate to the range of acceptability that should exist when students make inferences. Depending on the cultural backgrounds that students come from, their interpretation of the same text may be quite different. Tovani sets forth guidelines for what teachers may expect to be acceptable, based on textual evidence.

The Tovani text introduces the concept that background knowledge influences the higher order critical thinking process in which learners engage. Candidates also talk about issues in this text which relate to the range of acceptability that should exist when students make inferences or engage in questioning techniques. Depending on the cultural backgrounds that students come from, their interpretation of the same text may be quite different. Tovani sets forth guidelines for what teachers may expect to be acceptable, based on textual evidence.

RDG 521
**Readings**

The literature presented in *Multicultural Voices* (a text devoted entirely to multicultural literature) and *Literature and the Learner* spans a large range of genres and includes writers from different cultural and language backgrounds. Candidates learn to tailor their instruction and to select their reading materials based on the skills, reading levels, and interests of the students with whom they are working.

The book entitled *Reading Magic* is required reading for this course, as well, and offers insights into “the magic of print, language, and general knowledge” that promotes students’ interests in reading by having teachers read aloud to them. Fox illustrates that working with diverse learners often involves making the match between what they can do and what they must learn to do—and that the first step is motivation and connections with interesting text that relates to them personally.

**Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice**

Candidates must offer appropriate and motivational literature to their tutees, who are reluctant readers from diverse backgrounds. The entire ten-hour fieldwork experience with students is devoted to providing experiences that will engage the learners in such a way as to encourage them to pursue more frequent reading behaviors, including independent reading outside of school. The experience itself is documented through the Dialogue Journal entries.

The Dialogue Journal allows candidates to communicate with their colleagues and instructor in order to provide and receive input regarding appropriate activities and materials to meet the identified needs of tutees.

**RDG 525**

In this course, candidates read an article entitled “Multicultural Diversity” by Anderson and Gunderson. In it, they discuss various ways of helping readers to make personal connections with what they are reading. Similarly, the article by Kaser and Short, “Exploring Culture Through Children’s Connections” emphasizes that background knowledge activation and development are integral to helping readers to understand text and to find authentic purposes for reading. As these authors point out, sharing such connections is a way of honoring students’ different cultural backgrounds. Candidates are encouraged to build in these kinds of background experiences in their instructional plans.
This is still the case in RDG 525.

Within this context, the program includes study and instruction in the specific needs of students:

15B) who are English Language Learners

RDG 521

Readings

In Literature and the Learner, Goforth includes a chapter on multicultural literature which reflects “parallel cultures.” She cites the benefits of having young people explore literature of parallel cultures, both for English learners and for English-Only students and provides instructional strategies for helping students to develop fluent reading. Literature reflecting different ethnic and language groups is presented, and issues related to stereotyping are also addressed.

Multicultural Voices in Contemporary Literature by Day is a compendium of multicultural readings, complete with author information, annotations, and instructional suggestions for helping students to approach these pieces successfully.

Non-readings/Assignments/Activities/Practice

Students are asked to discuss advantages and disadvantages with organizing literature in culture-specific and thematic arrangements. They explore the implications of choosing literature to reflect the language, ethnic, and cultural populations of students in their classes: learners can identify with the characters, set personal purposes for reading, and become more engaged in the reading, thereby being more successful with it. They also do an Evaluation of a Book for Bias, in which they analyze a book to determine if it is biased against a particular perspective (cultural, gender-related, etc.) in such a way that it conflicts with the effort to affirm diversity in the classroom.

RDG 525

The Echevarria et al book, which is based on the SIOP model, introduces the concept of structured sheltered lessons in a format which is more complex than the one candidates followed in RDG 518. Based on this text, they are asked to
explain ways that they are incorporating the support elements for English Language Learners into their fieldwork sessions. Thirty specific criteria are introduced and explained throughout the text—all of which are meant to be part of a well-planned set of lessons for ELL students. The criteria are incorporated into three larger units (preparation; instruction; and review and assessment).

Throughout the class, elements of the model are reviewed and demonstrated, and the Fieldwork Log that candidates fill out for their sessions contains abbreviated SIOP elements, as well (R-639-640). In addition, the SIOP criteria are used by the ULV Fieldwork Supervisor, who observes and evaluates two lessons which are implemented by each candidate.

_The Nieto text investigates the idea of multicultural education for all and the sense that language diversity is the norm; we speak in “many tongues.” Candidates draw from this perspective as they develop their policy paper and make a presentation to encourage district changes to meet the needs of English English learners, as well as English Only students._

**15C) who have reading difficulties**

**RDG 520**

This course provides opportunities for candidates to work intensively with a beginning reader, as well as an older, non-reader. The Tovani book is especially helpful in providing insights into the thinking of readers who are struggling—and his recommendations are practical and useful.

Candidates have the additional support of working with the non-reader’s teacher, who can provide background and history on the student, which might be important for the candidate to know in planning instruction for the tutorial sessions. In fact, the candidate meets three times with the student’s teacher in order to be certain that appropriate short-term objectives can be set for the student and to effect communication between the adults for the purpose of helping the student to meet the objectives (P-567-569).

The Walker text offers a great deal of support, as well, for the struggling reader. She differentiates between questions that teachers can ask students about print-processing or meaning-processing tasks and presents a wide variety of strategies related to comprehension and metacognition—areas of need for many non-readers. When candidates tape their videotape segments for the class, they must focus on a specific objective to be met and then provide an instructional excerpt that is designed to meet the objective (P-576).
This course provides opportunities for candidates to work intensively with an older student who has severe difficulties in reading and writing. The Tovani book is especially helpful in providing insights into the thinking of readers who are struggling—and the recommendations are practical and useful.

Candidates also have access to the tutee’s teacher, who can provide background and history on the student, which is important for the candidate to know in planning instruction for the tutorial sessions. Candidates also write an Adolescent Research Paper, in which they describe their perceptions from the tutorials and support them with research-based evidence, indicating that they can recognize the specific needs that older readers with difficulties face that are different from a younger learner.

Note: Changes in this paper will be made as of the fall of 2009, and the present one will become a Diversity Reflection paper (based on research), in which candidates identify influences (beyond culture and language) that affect the literacy development of older learners. (See the TaskSream rubric for this assignment in Appendix 21).

RDG 530

The main way in which RDG 530 helps candidates to identify appropriate support programs for non-readers is by presenting them with a wide range of published intervention programs which are available. The CDE downloaded list of state-approved programs has a number of annotated intervention program titles. As candidates present these programs during class sessions, they learn about many possible options for struggling readers.

In addition, since candidates present inservices to three groups (faculty, parents, and students), many choose to present test-wiseness or study skills workshops for older, struggling readers (middle school and high school). These inservices represent examples of good modeling, from which other colleagues can also learn a great deal.

This is still the case in RDG 530.

**15D) who are proficient readers and writers**

RDG 525

Candidates work with proficient readers and writers in this class. Though they work with beginning readers (not “struggling”) in RDG 520, the group of fieldwork students for this class is older (grades 4-12). The focus is on supporting their reading of content area materials.
Because two of the students in this group are ELL students, differentiated instruction is still necessary, to some degree. The SIOP model allows for some amount of differentiation and utilizes many devices to provide contextualization (linguistic and non-linguistic). The focus is on learning information about content area topics while supporting and developing students’ literacy skills, as well. The SIOP model provides for the integration of speaking, listening, reading, and writing—and ensures opportunities for scaffolding, as needed.

*This class now focuses on the beginning struggling reader. However, as candidates assess and plan instruction for their tutees, they keep in mind the characteristics of proficient readers and writers that they have learned in previous courses. The goal for the 1-3 grade tutees in this class is to support them in achieving proficiency before they move into the grades that focus on “reading to learn” rather than “learning to read.”*

**RDG 530**

Candidates review the “proficient reader/writer process” in-depth as they summarize their content knowledge from the program and prepare for the Reading Specialist Competency Exam (Appendix 23). They consider instruction that is appropriate for those who are proficient and recognize that learners will fall along a continuum (struggling through proficient) in their own classes and programs.
Standard 16
Advanced Clinical Experiences
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Category 5: Field Experience Standard

Standard 16: Advanced Clinical Experiences

Each candidate in the program completes advanced clinical experiences that relate to the candidate’s professional goals, enable the candidate to integrate theory and practice, and provide opportunities for the candidate to demonstrate and reinforce knowledge and skills that are embedded in the Program Design and Curriculum Standards. At the Reading and Language Arts Specialist level, clinical activities include intensive work with beginning readers and in-depth experience with students who have severe reading difficulties. The program places candidates where the clinical approaches and methods are consistent with a balanced, comprehensive program of literacy and language education. Institutional faculty and clinical faculty collaborate in program design and implementation.

Each candidate in the program complete advanced clinical experiences that:

16A) relate to the candidate’s professional goals

RDG 520

In RDG 520, the fieldwork experiences with a beginning reader and a non-reader allow candidates to achieve competency in working with students of different ages and levels of reading proficiency. The tutorial setting is representative of one kind of model which reading specialists follow in many schools.

See summary of 16A below.

RDG 525

In this course, the small-group fieldwork experience represents another type of model (small group, ability-based), and candidates are given opportunities to work with proficient readers. They are offered the support of the instructor (through the Fieldwork Seminar discussion portions of the class), as well as input and recommendations from their ULV Fieldwork Supervisor, who visits them three times.

See Summary of 16A below.
RDG 530

This class presents opportunities for candidates to do two projects which relate directly to the development of “reading specialist skills”: they present inservices to three public school audiences, and they evaluate published programs (T-716) and a school site literacy program (T-724). As they present their inservices, they also self-evaluate (based on a rubric they create in class, using the Garmston text) and ask their audiences to evaluate them (T-729-730). The ability to present information to audiences is a key role of the reading specialist and a skill that must be developed over time.

In addition, candidates learn about published programs (state-approved) and present them to their colleagues. As each program is described, colleagues make notes about whether or not it is “balanced and comprehensive” (T-716) and what instructional components it includes (T-717). This is the kind of presentation candidates will have to make to school staffs once they are hired as reading specialists.

Finally, they learn about the kinds of software that can be purchased to provide support for students in the area of literacy. Computer-assisted instructional options are available in some school learning labs or media centers, and specialists need to keep abreast of new materials as they are published. The text entitled Teaching Literacy Using Information Technology provides a series of articles that deals with ways to integrate CAI and the Internet into writing, reading, and language development (T-761).

See Summary of 16A below.

SUMMARY OF 16A:

Throughout the credential portion of the program, candidates have “clinical” experiences in working with a variety of learners who represent different ages and grades and who range from beginning through struggling (and severely struggling). Candidates do all of their tutorials within the Literacy Center, where they receive immediate feedback from their instructors and opportunities to discuss the tutorials each evening.

As reading specialists, they may work with individual students or small groups of learners whom they must assess and for whom they must provide appropriate and effective instruction. The thirty hours of fieldwork (combined with forty hours of fieldwork at the Certificate level) provides candidates with opportunities to move from the assessment process through the reporting of data, the planning
and implementation of appropriate instruction, and the creation of student profiles that are professional and accurate.

Candidates write reports (Diagnostic Report to Schools) that provide each tutee’s school with information about the process, the findings of the candidate, and the progress of the child during the tutorial. They also develop a Literacy Profile, which they present to the child’s parent or guardian during an end-of-tutorial conference session. These activities are examples of the duties that will be expected of reading specialists in schools.

16B) enable the candidate to integrate theory and practice

RDG 520

There is a direct correlation between the diagnostic assessment and instruction model that Walker presents and the kinds of planning and instruction that candidates must provide for their tutees in this course. The Fieldwork Journal focuses on identified areas of development (for the beginning reader) and areas of weakness (for the older non-reader) and asks candidates to list assessments, instructional goals, activities, and methods of evaluation for each session (P-571). At the end of each session, they then list the next goal, which emerges from the progress made during the tutorial. There is a “match” among all of these elements, as recommended by Walker.

Similarly, candidates are expected to “capture” this kind of match in their videotape segment (12-15 minutes) which they show to their colleagues. Classmates are asked to rate the video segment, based on the clarity of these connections (assessment/goal/instruction/evaluation), recognizing that this is the procedure they should follow when working as reading specialists with students (P-575).

See Summary of 16B below.

RDG 525

In this class, the small-group fieldwork experience is driven by the SIOP model, which is the sheltered-based structure used for instruction with a group of proficient readers (including two ELL students). The research presented by Echevarria, Vogt, and Short is immediately applied to the setting of goals for the group, based on the topics the students are learning about in their content-area classes.

See Summary of 16B below.
RDG 530

Theories of leadership and the philosophy underlying the implementation of Sustained Silent Reading in-school programs are translated immediately into practice in this class. The Pellicer book (T-768-769) introduces such issues as being true to one’s own belief system, ideas about when the sharing of “power” is important, caring about the “little things” related to students and staff, and what being a professional educator means. As candidates discuss these topics, they identify what they respect most about administrators with whom they have worked, and they set goals related to the kinds of leaders they want to become.

In terms of learning about SSR, candidates in RDG 530 become informed about the research which supports the practice of offering students regular and frequent in-school opportunities to read for pleasure (The SSR Handbook, T-770). They see how students who are not avid readers can become “hooked” on the reading habit by encouragement to read during school. This information can be used as part of their inservice presentation to faculty, parents, or students. In addition, they develop the knowledge-base they need to plan and implement a school-wide SSR program at a school site.

See Summary of 16B below.

SUMMARY OF 16B

The advanced clinical experiences in this program offer multiple opportunities to integrate theory and practice.

Every class requires reading that is research-based, and candidates must apply this information to their tutorials. Instructors review the lesson plans for each tutorial class on a weekly basis to ensure that candidates are considering the new information that is linked with the course as they assess and plan instruction for their tutees. Where candidates are not addressing the research-based reading, instructors provide feedback and suggestions.

As part of the additional fieldwork requirements for RDG 530, candidates make three inservice presentations: one to colleagues, one to students, and one to parents. These presentations must be instructionally sound and based on research. The same is true for the Literacy Conference Proposal that candidates write (and for their presentation, should they be accepted to present at a professional conference.)
16C) provide opportunities for the candidate to demonstrate and reinforce knowledge and skills that are embedded in the Program Design and Curriculum Standards

This Standard component can be addressed broadly, as the knowledge and skills that are addressed in the Design and Curriculum Standards (leadership, professional development, research and evaluation methods, areas related to reading and language arts, and meeting the needs of all students) are all brought to bear upon the experiences of working with students. In each fieldwork situation (tutorial or presentation/workshop), candidates are driven by a desire to operate as professionals and to utilize what they have learned in their coursework to provide appropriate, effective instruction for all learners.

The advanced, professional perspective is developed over the course of the program as candidates learn about measurement and research design, as they add to their ever-increasing repertoire of assessment and instructional strategies, as they read current research and learn about published programs (some of which are technologically-based), and as they refine the skills they need to interact successfully with parents, administrators, community members, and students—as leaders.

The above information is still accurate.

At the Reading and Language Arts Specialist level,

16D) clinical activities include intensive work with beginning readers and in-depth experience with students who have severe reading difficulty

RDG 520 includes work with older (adolescent) students who have severe reading difficulties; RDG 521 requires work with a struggling, reluctant reader; RDG 525 requires work with a beginning, struggling reader.

16E) placement of the candidates occurs at sites where the clinical approaches and methods are consistent with a balanced, comprehensive program of literacy and language education

RDG 520

A requirement of this course is that candidates do a “Literacy Philosophy Evaluation” of the two school site programs which are the contexts for working with the two identified fieldwork students (P-562-565). If it is discovered that a program does not meet the “balanced and comprehensive” criteria, (P-562-563), another site must be located for the fieldwork.
Candidates no longer do their tutorial fieldwork at schools. See Summary of 16E below.

RDG 525

In RDG 525/525F, one of the major responsibilities of the ULV Fieldwork Supervisor (R-637, # 1 and 2) is to visit the school where the group fieldwork experience is to occur and to determine, during the first visit to the campus, if the literacy program is “balanced and comprehensive.” Because the supervisor is required to “shadow” the class for a full semester (audit and do all of the required readings), (s)he is well-informed about what criteria need to be met.

Candidates no longer do their tutorial fieldwork at schools. See Summary of 16E below.

RDG 530

A part of candidates’ fieldwork in this course is to do a Language Arts Program Evaluation of one school site program (for a targeted grade level). As candidates carry out this evaluation, they must determine if the program is “balanced and comprehensive.” If it is not comprehensive, they must provide recommendations for supplementary components to be added and give a solid rationale for the suggestions (T-724). In this way, they operate as reading specialists would do in terms of designing school programs to meet state standards.

Candidate do not carry out their fieldwork requirements at schools, but they do make presentations to faculty, students, and parents at local school sites. However, when they choose the locations at which to present, they communicate clearly with the school administrators and specialists about the content of their presentations. All of the content (assessment/instruction) links with the knowledge developed in the program and is supported by research. If there is a potential theoretical or philosophical conflict, candidates choose different sites for the presentations.

SUMMARY OF 16E

Related to the importance of candidates’ placement at sites where the clinical approaches and methods are consistent with a balanced, comprehensive program of literacy and language education, there is no issue; all tutorials are carried out in the Literacy Center.
16F) institutional faculty and clinical faculty collaborate in program design and implementation

RDG 520

In this course, the Literacy Partners from the fieldwork school sites act as “clinical faculty.” Together with the candidate, they collaborate to determine what the tutorials (with a beginning and an older, non-reader) should consist of. In addition, these teachers make recommendations for possible materials to be used and strategies to consider.

Some of the school site faculty from local schools are on our ULV Reading Advisory Committee, which meets twice a year. As members, they participate in the design and implementation of fieldwork components and are respected and valued colleagues, whose participation we appreciate.

Please see Summary of 16F below.

RDG 525

Meetings with the ULV Fieldwork Supervisors are held regularly, both on and off-campus. Not only do they attend the RDG 525 class, but they are also in constant communication with the candidates’ instructors. During the fieldwork meetings, the supervisors are asked for input related to program design and practical issues related to implementation and the evaluation of candidates.

Please see Summary of 16F below.

SUMMARY OF 16F

There are no clinical faculty members related to the program. All program design and implementational procedures are developed by the institutional faculty who are instructors for the Credential courses.
Standard 17
Professional Leadership
Category 6: Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance

Standard 17: Professional Leadership

Each candidate demonstrates skills and knowledge that are needed to provide effective leadership in making program, curriculum, instructional and intervention decisions, and in providing successful staff development to assure the effective implementation of those decisions.

Each candidate demonstrates skills and knowledge that are needed:

17A) to provide effective leadership in making program, curriculum, instructional, and intervention decisions

RDG 520

As candidates work with their two designated tutees, they use assessment information, set goals, provide instruction, and evaluate progress. They also develop an Instructional Profile for the beginning reader and an Intervention Profile for the older, non-reader. These profiles include instructional recommendations, as well as ideas for the use of appropriate published intervention programs or other options (P-583 and 585).

Candidates now work with one designated tutee who has severe reading problems, but the level of expertise is much greater than it was during earlier courses at the certificate level. They use assessment information, set goals, provide instruction, and evaluate progress. Their Diagnostic Reports and Literacy Profiles—now created more thoroughly and with broader perspectives than in earlier courses—include instructional recommendations, as well as ideas for the use of appropriate published intervention programs or other options for tutees.

RDG 517

Because various genres and ways to present books within them are the focus of the Goforth text, candidates develop a wide repertoire of recommendations for book suggestions to help students to find independent reading materials that match their interests. Each chapter has a list of recommended books for each
genre, as well as notable award-winning books and authors. They also experience the reading of additional required children’s book within each genre, which are listed on the syllabus. These learnings will serve candidates when they are asked to recommend high quality books for literacy programs at school sites or within district.

The text entitled Multicultural Voices in Contemporary Literature contains information about various well-known authors of multicultural literature and provides a listing of the authors’ books. If students show an interest in the works of a particular author, candidates can help fieldwork students to select other books by him/her in order to encourage continued independent reading. Reading Specialist should have a wide knowledge of such books so that they can integrate them into programs.

The main goal of the class is to help candidates develop ways to motivate reluctant readers and encourage them to read independently. The information from both texts, as well as Reading Magic by Mem Fox, the assigned children’s books, and the class assignments and activities are designed to guide them in creating rich literature experiences for their fieldwork students, in particular, and for all students with whom they will work, in general.

RDG 525

In this course, candidates are wholly responsible for the design of lessons for their fieldwork group. Once they have identified the content objectives and the language objectives for their students, they utilize the SIOP Lesson Planning Guide to be certain that they include all of the sheltered “indicators,” which follow the criteria their fieldwork supervisor will use when their observed lessons are evaluated (R-652-655 and 656-659). Choices of program and lesson materials are determined by the candidates; and if intervention options are necessary, recommendations are made by the candidate, as well.

One of the RDG 525 requirements is that once during the class, each candidate becomes the Seminar Discussion Leader (see RDG 525 syllabus in Part II). The candidate is responsible for leading the class discussion on the assigned readings and encouraging colleagues to move to the application level by asking how the research can be translated into instructional implications. In this way, candidates become the “leaders” in discussing important literacy topics, just as they will be doing at their schools when making program, curriculum, instructional, and intervention recommendations to their colleagues at school sites.
RDG 530

The research, description and presentation of approved, published language arts programs (including identified intervention programs) and the Language Arts Program Evaluation at a school site illustrate that candidates can demonstrate effective leadership by making program-related decisions.

Candidates also submit the five conference evaluations that they have been working on throughout the program. These forms indicate that they attended professional conferences or workshops and, through reflection and critical analysis, determined the main learnings they derived and how successful the experiences were for them.

Finally, candidates are encouraged to join professional organizations such as the International Reading Association (T-731-32) and the Reading Specialists of California (T-735), as well as to use the Internet to locate publications related to literacy (e.g., CRA publications, T-733). Such participation ensures that candidates will stay current and can continue to provide effective leadership through their program, curricular, instructional, and intervention decisions.

RDG 530 is typically referred to as the “leadership” class because the requirements include activities in which candidates take more responsibility in guiding others in decision-making processes about instructional decisions. When candidates synthesize information from all courses in preparation for the Reading Specialist Competency Exam, they also make presentations to colleagues during which they include instructional recommendations based on research.

The research, description, and presentation of approved, published language arts programs (including identified intervention programs) illustrate that candidates can demonstrate effective leadership by making program-related decisions.

During class discussions of the assigned readings and through study guide responses, they also adopt the perspective of the “Reading Specialist” and speak to colleagues as if they were faculty members at their own school sites.

Candidates are also required to have attended five conference presentations in the area of literacy before they complete RDG 530. (They know about this when they enter the program.) In this way, they become accustomed to learning new information in their field on an ongoing basis so that they can remain updated as leaders and specialists at their schools.
Finally, candidates are encouraged to join professional organizations such as the International Reading Association, the California Reading Association, the California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, and Specialized Reading Professional (part of IRA). Such participation ensures that candidates will stay current and can continue to provide effective leadership through their program, curricular, instructional, and intervention decisions.

Candidates also include these professional affiliations on their Curriculum Vitae, which they develop in RDG 530 in preparation for specialist positions.

17B) to provide successful staff development to assure the effective implementation of those decisions

RDG 525

The Policy Implementation Paper and Presentation are designed with the goal in mind of observing candidates as professionals who are persuade audiences to adopt positions that are balanced and reflect current research and practice in the field of literacy.

RDG 530

The design of evaluation rubrics, based on information in The Presenter’s Fieldbook by Garmston (T-729-730) shows that candidates are developing their ability to make effective presentations. They consider elements such as how to present when they wish to ‘transform’; how to design and deliver effective presentations, and how to add ‘heart and punch’ through stories and anecdotes (T-758-759). The rubrics they create are then used by the candidates to self-evaluate their own inservice presentations and by their audiences to evaluate the success of their efforts.

The three inservice presentations (one to colleagues/teachers, one to students, and one to parents) are, in fact “staff development” activities in which candidates provide their expertise to schools. They receive support from institutional faculty (their instructors) ask they design presentations to meet the need(s) of their audiences in school contexts. They also develop evaluation rubrics which their audiences fill out to help them identify “soft spots” and strengths in their presentations. The presentations are followed by reflective responses to which their instructor offers feedback. In all cases, candidates are asked to remain true to the concept of balanced instruction and to present information and methodology that supports what they have learned in the program.

The Conference Proposal that they are required to write must also meet the criteria of being research-based and in line with a balanced literacy model.
Standard 18
Analysis and Application of Research & Evaluation
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Category 6: Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance

Standard 18: Analysis and Application of Research and Evaluation

Each candidate demonstrates the effective use of research as a basis for the analysis of program strengths, weaknesses, and overall success. Each candidate learns to analyze and apply current research in reading and language arts, and to evaluate instructional programs and published materials for decision-making purposes.

Each candidate:

18A) demonstrates the effective use of research for the analysis of program strengths, weaknesses, and overall success

ED 501

When candidates successfully complete the test interview activity in ED 501 (L-477), it shows that they are able to identify the role of testing in their jobs as reading specialists; that they understand how test results are used to evaluate programs and student success; that there are things that cannot be tested for (at least not very meaningfully); and that while computers have their uses in assessment, they cannot bring to the situation the same judgment and sensitivity that people can.

A satisfactory score on the midterm and final exams (L-484-489 and L-490-497) in this course also indicates that the candidate understands how to apply descriptive statistics to determine means, medians and modes in relating test information to audiences. When they learn about performance-based assessments such as portfolios, they realize, however, that test scores are only one indication of program success and that many types of assessments are needed to “triangulate” results.

Candidates also show that they can access research through the computer by participating in the Internet Work two-hour project (L-479), in which they collect data through a variety of web resources; they are then asked to turn in a one-
This course is now embedded into RDG 524.

ED 504

In this class, candidates demonstrate that they understand the various types of research carried out in educational contexts by participating in activities such as the “types of research” group work exercise (N-510) and the “classifying research by method” activity (N-511), as well as by doing a satisfactory job on the midterm and final exams (N523-528 and N-530-533).

When they consult research articles to determine the usefulness of a program, they must take into consideration issues related to reliability and validity, as well as issues of practicality. They can do this in a sophisticated manner after completing ED 504 satisfactorily.

This course is now embedded into RDG 524.

RDG 524

When candidates successfully complete the Buros test review (Assignment #1), they demonstrate that they are able to identify the role of testing in their jobs as reading specialists; that they understand how test results are used to evaluate programs and student success; that there are constructs that cannot be tested for (at least not very meaningfully); and that while computers have their uses in assessment, they cannot bring to the situation the same judgment and sensitivity that people can. Similarly, when they do a close analysis of a test/assessment used at school sites (either formal or informal), they also recognize influences that might lead to a lack of validity when evaluating school literacy programs (Assignment #2).

Assignment #3 (research article analysis) requires candidates to look for strong designs and thorough study components as prerequisites for identifying research as credible that might be chosen to support the selection/retention of programs for a district or school site.

RDG 525

In RDG 525, when candidates are asked to critique research articles and to write research “policy” papers, they demonstrate that they know what components to
look for in “good” research and can determine if a study is credible for use as a theoretical foundation upon which to analyze program strengths and weaknesses.

This is still the case for RDG 525 (see above). Additionally, candidates are asked to demonstrate a professional perspective when they present their support or reflection of a literacy policy based on research evidence, using the Creswell text (Research Design) as a guideline for the review of the literature. Their audience, a hypothetical Board of Education, ensures that they will present their recommendation about the policy in a professional way. (As of spring 2010, a TaskStream rubric will also be used to evaluate this policy presentation as a “technological” product; however, the rubric also includes the required components of research support (Appendix 22).

RDG 530

When candidates carry out the Language Arts Program Evaluation at a school site, they must determine whether the components represent a balanced, comprehensive curriculum; however, with the combined knowledge from ED 501 and 504, they could also design assessment instruments to judge program effectiveness, matched to the skills that they wish to be tested.

Candidates continue to synthesize information from all courses as they prepare for the Reading Specialist Competency Exam and carry out topic discussions during each session. The basic foundations of measurement and research from RDG 514 (certificate level) and RDG 524 are viewed as important considerations in program evaluation.

18B) learns to analyze and apply current research in reading and language arts and to evaluate instructional programs and published materials for decision-making purposes

ED 501

Candidates’ knowledge of assessment and measurement issues supports them in their evaluation of instructional programs and published materials.

This course is embedded in RDG 524.

ED 504

Their knowledge base related to literacy research also allows them to identify the theoretical propositions which underlie particular program components and to determine their appropriateness for a specific population of learners.
This course is embedded in RDG 524.

RDG 524

Candidates’ knowledge of measurement/assessment guidelines supports them in their evaluation of instructional programs and published materials. Their knowledge base related to literacy research also allows them to identify the theoretical propositions underlying particular program components and to determine their appropriateness for a specific population of learners.

RDG 525

The additional work with research that candidates are required to do for the Policy Implementation Paper gives them additional opportunities to analyze research studies to see if they are credible and should be used for making a case to support or refute a literacy policy.

RDG 530

Because of the wide variety of research articles that candidates have read (especially in RDG 525), in this class they have the ability to look at samples of published instructional programs contained on the CDE approved list (T-705-714) and recognize the research bases that support—or do not support—the specific components. During the presentations of the programs and throughout class discussions, candidates’ ability to identify and articulate these research bases is developed more fully.

Throughout this course, candidates make presentations on published programs that have been approved by the California Department of Education (RDG 530 syllabus, Appendix 14). Samples of the programs are disseminated, along with an analysis of the program features, a discussion of its usability, an evaluation of its strength related to research support, and a statement about the ages and grade levels of students for whom these programs would be appropriate.

This requirement allows candidates to combine their knowledge of research with their extensive background in literacy development processes to determine if published programs are rigorously designed for their intended audiences and meet the demands of their own “categories”: partial, basic, comprehensive, and intervention. Candidates are then able to determine what combination of materials and programs are needed to meet state standards at identified grade levels at any given school site or within a district.
Standard 19
Advanced Professional Perspective
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Category 6: Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance

Standard 19: Advanced Professional Perspective

Each candidate demonstrates advanced understanding and application of effective reading and language arts instruction, intervention, curriculum, and program planning. Each candidate acquires an in-depth knowledge and understanding of specialized areas of study that influence and affect teaching and learning in the field of reading and language arts including, but not limited to, the structure of the English language and the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic foundations of professional practice.

Each candidate demonstrates:

19A) Advanced understanding and application of effective reading and language arts instruction, intervention, curriculum, and program planning

In RDG 520, RDG 525, and RDG 530, candidates must demonstrate that they can interact effectively with their fieldwork students and that they can outline and follow the assessment-instruction-evaluation process in a way which is positive for everyone. They must select materials which are appropriate, not only for each learner’s interests and reading levels, but also to meet the intended objectives established for the fieldwork sessions.

In all three of these classes, much less “direction” is provided than candidates experienced at the Reading Certificate level. At this point, they are relying much more extensively upon their solid knowledge base and their developing style and expertise with students, both in tutorial situations and in small groups.

Once the fieldwork experiences have been completed, candidates also have a wealth of knowledge about alternative intervention or instructional options that may be appropriate for the students, should they continue to need support. Their recommendations reflect their ability to make such decisions.

This is an accurate description of what is currently occurring at the credential level, especially related to RDG 520, RDG 521, RDG 525, and RDG 530.
Professional recommendations are made to the tutees’ schools (Diagnostic Report to Schools) and to the parents (Literacy Profile for Parents). More sophisticated reports are expected from candidates at this level, and the “voice” needs to be a professional, highly-informed one as information is disseminated to schools and parents.

Each candidate acquires an in-depth knowledge and understanding of specialized areas of study that influence and affect teaching and learning in the field of reading and language arts:

19B) including, but not limited to, the structure of the English language

In RDG 520 and RDG 525, candidates must demonstrate that they have a strong background in phonology, morphology, orthography, and the structure of the language. As they plan phonemic awareness lessons and word attack lessons (including phonics) for beginning readers—and as they address word attack skills (including structural analysis and phonics) and comprehension problems with struggling readers, they draw from this knowledge base. Their Fieldwork Journals, lesson plans, instructional and intervention profiles, and presentations to colleagues, (including videotape segments) demonstrate their facility with this linguistic information. Observations by the Fieldwork Supervisors in RDG 525 also validate their abilities.

The structure of the English language is emphasized in-depth in RDG 525 when candidates work with a struggling learner in grades 1-3. Candidates must demonstrate that they have a strong background in phonology, morphology, orthography, and the structure of the language. As they plan phonemic awareness lessons and word attack lessons (including phonics) for beginning readers—and as they address word attack skills (including structural analysis and phonics), they draw from this knowledge base. Their lesson plans, Diagnostic Reports and Literacy Profiles, and presentations to colleagues demonstrate their facility with this linguistic information.

Because candidates work with older students who have severe reading difficulties in RDG 520, more attention is typically paid to morphology (especially related to affixes, roots, and multi-syllabic words) and orthography than to phonology, in general, depending upon the needs of the tutee. Having taken four methods courses prior to RDG 520, candidates possess a more thorough understanding of the processes of learning to read and reading to learn. “Resistant reader characteristics” are contrasted with proficient reader strategies, and candidates continue to assess tutees in all areas. The Qualitative Reading Inventory 4 (QRI-4) is administered, and candidates set objectives for older students across the entire spectrum of skills—from phonics through comprehension, writing, and metacognition.
In RDG 530, candidates also review information about phonology, morphology, orthography, and the structure of the language as they synthesize content from previous courses in preparation for the Reading Specialist Competency Exam, which occurs after the conclusion of RDG 530.

19C) including, but not limited to, the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic foundations of professional practice

Candidates show that they are sensitive to the influences which affect language learning, especially those which are cultural, sociological, or political in nature. Their discussions of the Nieto book premises in RDG 525, as well as their positive interactions with ELL students during fieldwork sessions, demonstrate this development of perspective.

In addition, when candidates work with the older non-reader in RDG 520, they must evidence a unique understanding of the needs of older struggling readers, recognizing that the “language” of these students may not represent the language of the school “culture.” They may have disenfranchised themselves from established norms, as Nieto suggests, as a result of school failure. Candidates learn that they may need to be willing to devote the time necessary to developing a rapport with these students before effective instruction can take place. Such sensitivity is demonstrated in class discussions, study guides, reflections and Fieldwork Journals.

In all courses, candidates show that they are sensitive to the influences which affect language learning, especially those which are cultural, sociological, or political in nature.

In RDG 520, candidates develop a broader perspective on “diversity” beyond language, culture, and ethnicity. Working with older learners reveals the many factors (social, psychological, educational) that affect how long it will take for them to achieve proficiency in reading and writing.

Discussions about and study guide reflections on the Nieto book premises in RDG 525 on diversity and marginalization are key activities that support candidates in understanding the roles that social interactions, self-concept, and sense of learner efficacy play in literacy development. Ways of viewing the entire spectrum of “intervention” models are summarized, and candidates can determine whether tutorial instruction, small group work, or a published intervention program would be most appropriate for a given learner or set of learners.
Finally, in RDG 530, candidates also review information about sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic foundations as they synthesize content from previous courses in preparation for the Reading Specialist Competency Exam, which may contain an essay question on how these kinds of influence affect literacy development.
Standard 20
Meeting the Reading & Writing Needs of All Students
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Category 6: Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance

Standard 20: Meeting the Reading and Writing Needs of All Students

Each candidate demonstrates research-based knowledge and in-depth understanding of how students from a variety of sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds learn to read. Within this context, each candidate demonstrates a strong understanding of the specific needs of students who are English language learners, students with reading difficulties, and students who are proficient readers and writers.

Each candidate demonstrates research-based knowledge and in-depth understanding of:

20A) how students from a variety of socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn to read

Candidates demonstrate that they understand how learners from a variety of socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn to read when they are able to demonstrate the use of the SIOP model in their teaching. By focusing on the development of students’ background knowledge, carefully explaining and building new concepts, and providing connections between the reading materials and the students’ lives, they show that they understand what it takes for a reader to “make meaning.”

In addition, candidates’ responses to question #7 on the sample Reading and Language Arts Specialist Exam (V-774-775) indicates that they are well aware of the psychological and sociological aspects of literacy. When they address factors within the home and community that influence literacy acquisition, it becomes clear that they understand the complex process of learning to read and the different kinds of influences which can affect its development.

Throughout the program, candidates demonstrate that they understand how students from a variety of socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn to read as they tutor a variety of learners and share their perceptions with colleagues and instructors during presentations, class discussions, and Fieldwork Seminar
discussions. In RDG 521, they also use a Dialogue Journal to communicate with their instructor and colleagues on issues related to diverse students. During the assessment, planning, and instructional processes of the tutorials, by focusing on the development of students’ background knowledge, carefully explaining and building new concepts, and providing connections between the reading materials and the students’ lives, they show that they understand what it takes for a reader to construct meaning from text.

In addition, candidates’ preparation for (illustrated during class sessions) and responses to the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Exam indicate that they are well aware of the psychological and sociological aspects of literacy. When they address factors within the home, community, and educational contexts for students from different cultures, backgrounds, and age groups which influence literacy acquisition, it becomes clear that they understand the complex process of learning to read and the different kinds of influences which can affect its development.

At the end of the program, candidates are given an End of Program Candidate Competency Self-Evaluation; they evaluate their own competencies in understanding how students from a variety of socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds learn to read, especially in section 6. This competency is further (and more formally and thoroughly) assessed when candidates take the Reading Specialist Competency Exam.

Within this context, each candidate demonstrates a strong understanding of the specific needs of students:

**20B) who are English language learners; 20C) who have reading difficulties; and 20D) who are proficient readers and writers**

Throughout their tutorial experiences in the Credential portion of the program, candidates work with students from these groups. Demonstration of their understanding of specific needs occurs primarily with the satisfactory completion of the fieldwork.

In addition, Question #2, Question #3, and Question #8 on the sample Reading and Language Arts Specialist Exam (V-774-776) ask candidates to describe the processes associated with differentiated and appropriate instruction for these groups. Their informed and in-depth responses demonstrate their understanding of how to meet the specific needs of learners.

Finally, as classes proceed, candidates bring in personal and professional issues to share related to their work with students. The level of sensitivity they display,
along with their growth in knowledge and experience, is demonstrated whenever they participate in a class activity or discussion.

Throughout their tutorial experiences in the Credential portion of the program, candidates work with students from these groups. Demonstration of their understanding of specific needs occurs primarily with the satisfactory completion of the fieldwork and is tangibly demonstrated through lesson plans, Diagnostic Reports to Schools, and Literacy Profiles. In-depth descriptions of the nature of this “tutorial” fieldwork is provided in earlier portions of this document.

In addition, when candidates make presentations to colleagues, students, and parents at school sites (and write a proposal for a conference), they also indicate their knowledge of the specific needs of English learners, students with reading difficulties, and proficient readers and writers, as these presentations must be tailored to their audiences. If a candidate is accepted to present at t conference, California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) where the needs of English learners are taken into account; others may be accepted to present at the California Reading Association (CRA) Conference on struggling readers or simply on proficient readers who are progressing well but are still learning to read.)

As classes proceed, candidates bring in personal and professional issues to share related to their work with tutees who are from diverse groups and who represent different level of development in reading and writing. The level of sensitivity they display, along with their growth in knowledge and experience, is demonstrated whenever they participate in a class activity or discussion.

The essay questions on the Reading Specialist Competency Exam direct candidates to describe the processes associated with differentiated and appropriate instruction for these groups. Their informed and in-depth responses demonstrate a strong understanding of how to meet the specific needs of learners. (A TaskStream rubric is being developed for the exam, which will ensure the identification of content knowledge across cohorts in the program. It will be implemented in the fall of 2009. See Appendix 23.)
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Course Syllabi & Instructor Vitae
Course Syllabi
READING 510 (3 UNITS)
LITERACY INSTRUCTION AND METHODOLOGY
University of La Verne
Main Campus, Fall 2008
Wednesdays, 4:00-8:45, CRN 2545
Amber Rodriguez

Office Hours: Tuesday-Thursday: 12-3
Office Phone: (909) 593-3511 X4677
E-Mail: arodriguez@ulv.edu
Fax: (909) 392-2848

Course Description
This course is designed to provide the candidate with opportunities to translate literacy theory, research and assessment results into instructional practices that will effectively help English Only and ELL children to become proficient readers; to engage in and reflect upon these practices; and to develop professionally by sharing the ongoing results of these interactions and personal/professional reflections related to their effectiveness.

The fieldwork portion of this course, a ten-hour tutorial with a beginning reader (grades 1-3) offers participants authentic clinical experiences with children. During this time, they develop skills in the planning, delivery and evaluation of appropriate instructional activities related to word recognition, spelling, and oral language development, based on informal and formal literacy assessments.

Learning Outcomes
Students who take this course will:
• understand the theories and research underlying the process of becoming a proficient reader;

• implement a wide variety of instructional strategies for helping English-only and ELL students to become fluent readers;

• identify specific linguistic elements that relate to the proficient reader process; understand how phonemic awareness and morphological analysis contribute to rapid and accurate word recognition skills;

• teach students appropriate decoding/word attack skills, including phonics (analytic and synthetic), structural analysis, sight words, and context clue approaches;

• describe the developmental stages of spelling and be able to provide appropriate instructional activities for all students;

• develop a repertoire of knowledge related to extensive practice materials for reading, including big books, decodable texts, and predictable texts;
• explain the importance of ongoing assessment for all students (English Only and ELL), specifically related
to the processes of reading and writing;

• choose appropriate instructional models aligned with ongoing assessment and identified student needs;

• Demonstrate ability in planning and delivery of appropriate instructional activities and the use of related
materials;

• utilize existing assessment information in addition to implementing other appropriate formal and informal
assessment tools (including a comprehensive classroom reading inventory) to determine learners’ strengths
and areas of need;

• identify a variety of intervention models for struggling readers;

• implement effective oral language and vocabulary building strategies to support learners’ listening,
speaking, and reading development;

• develop beginning scaffolding strategies for working with English Language Learners, including how to
determine information about their cultural and language backgrounds and to support language and literacy
development;

• demonstrate the integration of theory and practice by planning and delivering effective instruction for
beginning readers.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria

• Punctuality and regular attendance in class, as well as full participation in each session (4 points are
deducted for each missed class hour); assigned readings of texts and handouts read prior to class
session (65 points)

*Ten Tutorial Sessions (1 hour and 15 minutes each)

In order to insure a high degree of professionalism, it is critical that all candidates arrive on time for
the tutorial sessions.

Chronic tardiness may result in an "incomplete" for the semester and a reassignment of the tutee to
another tutor for the balance of the term.

• Activity Demonstration (50 points)
• Study Guides (50 points)
• 6 Tutorial Lesson Plans with student work samples (120 points)
• Assessment Data Portfolio with protocols (60 points)
• Literacy Profile to Parents (30 points)
• Diagnostic Report to Schools (75 points)
• Presentation of Diagnostic Report data (25 points)
Grading Policies

THERE IS A 10% PENALTY FOR ANY ASSIGNMENT THAT IS SUBMITTED PAST THE DUE DATE. Any assignment submitted after the due date and before or during the next class period is counted one week late. Work will not be accepted later than two weeks. Work dropped off to the clinic needs to be signed and dated by the director or other school personnel.

Any one assignment that is not representative of graduate level quality (C+ or below) may be revised and resubmitted for a new grade. However, the highest grade that a revised paper or project may receive is 80% (a B-). Only one assignment may be revised during the semester.

Grades will be determined by percentages: 94-100%=A; 90-93.9%=A-; 87-89.9%=B+; 83-86.9%=B; 80-82.9%=B-; 77-79.9%=C+; 73-76.9%=C.

*Please note: If a student is absent more than 20% of the total number of hours, course credit in the class will be jeopardized, and (s)he will be required to repeat the course at another time. Missed tutorial time with the tutee (fewer than 10 hours) must be made up by the candidate in order to satisfy fieldwork requirements.

Incompletes

Please note that “incomplete” grades will be assigned ONLY in cases of emergency illness or other serious unexpected circumstances. Assignments turned in subsequent to the university term to fulfill “incomplete” requirements will receive late penalties, just as do late assignments submitted during the regular semester.

Required Texts for Use Throughout Program


Required Texts for RDG 510


Recommended Readings


Schedule of Topics, Assignments, and Exams

SESSION 1 (Sept. 10)

TOPIC: INTRODUCTION TO COURSE

Provide: RDG 510 syllabus
Introduce: class members
Experience: ice-breaker activity (52 alternatives to TV)
Share: personal “reading histories” of class members (positive and negative experiences)
Preview: Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) computerized assessment system
Skim: course activities, goals and objectives, and assignments
Analyze: academic honesty guidelines
Consider: CEOL dispositions
Introduce: Professional Development (PD) program requirements (five workshop/conference evaluations by completion of Reading 530)
Discuss: one-on-one tutoring process
Receive: information on assigned tutee
Examine: Reading Interest Survey (Garfield)
Present: Ekwall/Shanker Reading Inventory (ESRI)
Plan: assessments and activities for introductory tutorial session
Introduce: the reading process: the cognitive-constructivist view of reading: cognitive orientation, schema, constructivism, reader-response theory, sociocultural theory
Survey: Words Their Way (Brief Contents and Classroom Tools) and five stages of spelling development pp. 10-15

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Bring course books to class.

SESSION 2 (Sept. 17)

TOPIC: READING AND LEARNING TO READ

Present: ESRI subtests for administration to tutees, if appropriate
*Test 1: San Diego Quick Assessment
Discuss: ABC’s for English learners (See handout)
Analyze: four concepts that complement the cognitive-constructivist view
Consider: state-approved published intervention programs from CDE website
Discuss: necessary components of literacy curriculum: phonemic awareness (PA), phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and reader-response
Recognize: developmental nature of word study
Describe: five stages of spelling development
Survey: Literacy Center and preview instructional materials
Learn: how to write instructional objectives
Share: reflections on introductory tutorial process
Set: initial objectives for Session 3; determine assessments to give
Present: instructor-modeled strategy presentation
Choose: candidate-presented strategies for presentations (Words Their Way)

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 1, pp. 1-27
DUE: Words Their Way, pp. 1-24
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 3 (Sept. 24)

TOPIC: READING INSTRUCTION

Present: ESRI subtests for administration to tutees, if appropriate
*Test 2a (oral) 2b (silent), 2c (listening): Reading Passages Test
Analyze: traditional instructional principles: relevant tasks, active teaching, active learning, instruction vs. practice, sufficient and timely feedback, teaching for transfer
Analyze: constructivist/sociocultural perspectives on instruction
Trace: a brief history of reading in the United States
Determine: informal observations for assessing orthographic development (spelling)
Learn: selection and administration procedures for spelling inventories
Analyze: Figure 2-3 (Jake's feature guide for elementary spelling inventory) and Figure 2-4 (elementary spelling inventory classroom composite)
Show: examples of alphabet books, concept books, wordless picture books, and counting books
Survey: RDG 510 Candidate Competency Form (and procedure for self-evaluation)

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Academic Honesty Guidelines (with key words highlighted)
DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 2, pp. 28-53
DUE: Words Their Way, pp. 25-48
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
SESSION 4 (Oct. 1)

TOPIC: MOTIVATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Present: ESRI subtests for administration to tutees, if appropriate
     *Test 10: Reading Interests Survey
     *Test 4a: Quick Check for Basic Sight Words
     *Test 4b: Basic Sight Words
     *Test 4c: Basic Sight Word Phrases

Outline: steps for creating a literate environment: modeling, reading time, physical setting, materials, choice, and classroom climate

Discuss: influence of students' perceptions on performance

Consider: approaches to motivating students

Analyze: vignette on Nancy Masters

Determine: possible grouping formats and rationales

Reflect: on principles and practices for word study

Consider: organization of word study instruction

List: ten principles of word study instruction

Present: activities for emergent readers (colleague demonstrations) pp. 107-128
(two identified candidates to read ahead)

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 3, pp. 54-87

DUE: Words Their Way, pp. 49-85

DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 5 (Oct. 8)

TOPIC: EMERGENT LITERACY

Present: ESRI subtests for administration to tutees, if appropriate
     *Test 3a: Phonemic Awareness
     *Test 3b: Concepts About Print
     *Test 3c: Letter Knowledge

Define: phonemic awareness and alphabet recognition

Practice: phoneme awareness tasks

Contrast: phonemic awareness and phonics

Show: examples of predictable books

Focus: on instruction that facilitates growing literacy: literate environment, reading/ writing opportunities, listening/speaking opportunities

Analyze: a kindergarten scenario
Introduce: Gates-MacGinitie subtests for word recognition (red or orange)
Study: characteristics of the Emergent Stage of reading and spelling
Recognize: components of early literacy learning
Present: activities for emergent readers (colleague demonstrations) pp. 107-128

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 4, pp. 88-121
DUE: Words Their Way, pp. 86-128
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 6 (Oct. 15)

TOPIC: WORD RECOGNITION & WORD-STUDY INSTRUCTION

Present: ESRI subtests for administration to tutees, if appropriate
  *Test 5a-5i: Phonics
  *Test 8: El Paso Phonics Survey

Identify: processes of word-study instruction
Identify: five principles of word-study instruction
Describe: word recognition approaches: sight words, phonics, structural analysis
Administer: at least one word recognition subtest from Gates-MacGinitie (red or orange)
Begin: analysis of data from Gates-MacGinitie using Decoding Skills Analysis Sheet
Add: word recognition objective to lesson plan for tutee, based on Gates
Model: language experience approach
Demonstrate: shared reading activity
Begin: word wall with onsets and rimes
Do: decodable text activity
Describe: characteristics of Letter Name-Alphabetic Stage
Consider: word study routines and management for beginners in this stage
Present: activities for readers in the Letter Name-Alphabetic Stage (colleague demonstrations) pp. 153-168
Provide: overview of Diagnostic Report guidelines

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 5, pp. 122-148
DUE: Words Their Way, pp. 129-168
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
SESSION 7 (Oct. 22)

TOPIC: CONTINUED WORD-STUDY INSTRUCTION

Present: ESRI subtests for administration to tutees, if appropriate
  *Test 6a-6h: Structural Analysis
  *Test 7: Knowledge of Contractions
Continue: word recognition phases 2 and 3
Identify: suggested sequence of steps for word-study instruction
Highlight: importance of components of rimes—short vowels and final consonants
Contrast: blends vs. digraphs
Present: common spelling patterns (CVC, CVVC, CVCe, CCVC, VCe, VC)
Demonstrate: guided reading activity
Consider: advantages of reading frequently
Evaluate: classroom portrait—Jenna LeBlanc
Describe: characteristics of Within Word Pattern Stage
Consider: word study routines and management for transitional learners in this stage
Present: activities for readers in the Within Word Pattern Stage (colleague demonstrations) pp. 188-201
Continue: analysis of data from Gates-MacGinitie using Decoding Skills Analysis Sheet
Set: new objectives for tutees, based on data from Gates
Revisit: Diagnostic Report guidelines

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 5, pp. 149-169
DUE: Words Their Way, pp. 169-201
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 8 (Oct. 29)

TOPIC: FLUENCY

Continue: administration guidelines for ESRI subtests, as needed
Discuss: importance of fluency
Identify: eight generalizations about successful fluency instruction
Outline: approaches to building fluency: repeated reading, echo reading, tape-assisted reading, partner reading, choral reading, and readers theater/radio reading
Model: fluency assessments
Emphasize: importance of matching students and texts: reading proficiency and motivation, text difficulty and accessibility, and personal and professional knowledge
Describe: characteristics of Syllables and Affixes Stage
Consider: word study routines and management for intermediate learners in this stage
Present: activities for readers in the Syllables and Affixes Stage (colleague demonstrations) pp. 220-229

Begin: Literacy Profile for Parents—rough draft

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Rough draft of Assessment Data Sheet for instructor feedback
DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 6, pp. 170-203
DUE: Words Their Way, pp. 202-229
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 9 (Nov. 5)

TOPIC: VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT

Continue: administration guidelines for ESRI subtests, as needed
Discuss: the vocabulary-learning task
List: the word-learning tasks that students face
Describe: the process of selecting specific words to teach
Consider: instructional processes for different word-learning tasks
Model: semantic mapping and semantic feature analysis procedures
Describe: three strategies for independent vocabulary development: context clues, word parts, and dictionary use
Brainstorm: ways to foster word consciousness
Describe: characteristics of Derivational Relations Stage
Consider: word study routines and management for advanced learners in this stage
Present: activities for readers in the Derivational Relations Stage (colleague demonstrations) pp. 246-261
Contrast: differences between Literacy Profile and Diagnostic Report

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Literacy Profile for Parents
DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 7, pp. 204-233
DUE: Words Their Way, pp. 230-261
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
SESSION 10 (Nov. 12)

TOPIC: CREATING INSTRUCTIONAL PROFILES: ORAL AND WRITTEN

Present: instructional profiles to colleagues
Conduct: conferences with parents of tutees
Complete: on-line course evaluation

DUE: Diagnostic Report to Schools/Presentation
DUE: Candidate Competency Forms
DUE: On-Line Course Evaluation
DUE: Class Binder
READING CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS

Intellectual Commitment (RDG 525)
Seeks pathways for improvement in literacy education based on current research, advanced learning opportunities, and collaboration with colleagues, parents, and students.

Respectfulness (RDG 516)
Communicates expectations, professional/personal opinions, or philosophical perspectives and responds to requests, suggestions, and feedback in a reflective and appropriate manner.

Professionalism (RDG 514)
Demonstrates a strong commitment to literacy education and fulfills the role of a model and expert in an interactive, academic context.

Empathy (RDG 520)
Models patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others, showing an ability to understand the perspectives of others and help them to obtain educational goals.

Socio-Cultural Competence (RDG 518)
Shows acceptance of diversity in varying cultural perspectives and individual learning styles, and recognizes others’ contributions and strengths.

Responsibility (RDG 510)
Is accountable for actions, behaviors, and decisions related to academic roles and expectations and interpersonal relationships.

Commitment to Professional Development (RDG 530)
Exhibits dedication to professional growth in literacy education, seeking out leadership opportunities and maximizing expertise through educational options.

Ethical Behavior (RDG 524)
Maintains high standards for following the guidelines of honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and fairness, both personally and professionally.

Advocacy (RDG 521)
Is a supporter of students, parents, faculty, staff, and the profession. Uses knowledge of research and best practices to inform recommendations.
ACADEMIC HONESTY GUIDELINES

The University of La Verne embodies a tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious, scholarly effort and a scrupulous regard for the intellectual and academic contributions of others. Indeed, this tradition stands at the virtual foundation of most American institutions of higher learning. This implies that, more than just imparting knowledge and ideas, the University means to instill a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

ULV’s official statement on Academic Honesty is contained in the Rights and Responsibilities section of the current Catalog, and should be read and understood by each student in the University. The purpose of this communication is to provide additional information and guidance on several of the policy areas in order that there be no misunderstanding regarding the University’s position on academic honesty.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

In general, academic dishonesty falls into two major categories:

Cheating

- Copying or using crib notes in examinations, homework, lab assignments, or written products.
- Submitting papers done entirely or in part by another person.
- Giving to or getting exam answers from another student.

Plagiarism

- Representation of another person's words or ideas as your own by not properly citing them.

Cheating

Specific acts of cheating include at least the following:

a. Copying material from someone else’s work without footnoting this source.
b. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam.
c. Copying answers from a fellow student’s homework instead of doing the work independently.
d. “Padding” a bibliography with citations never read.
e. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
f. Submitting to an instructor a paper that was written all or in part by someone else.
g. Copying from someone’s test or exam paper with or without the person knowing it.
h. Working on the same homework with other students when the teacher does not allow it.
i. Writing a paper for another student.
j. Taking an exam for another student.
k. Having another student take an exam for you.
l. Using the same paper to fulfill requirements in two different courses without the instructor’s permission.
**Plagiarism**

While the majority of this list constitutes blatant cheating, a few (e.g. a, c, and d) involve the less clear work of plagiarism.

The plagiarist is the academic counterpart of the bank embezzler or the product mislabeler, and involves a student or scholar who leads the reader to believe that what is being read is the original work of the writer, when it is not. Sometimes, students of good will are guilty of plagiarism simply because they are not aware of the illegality of certain kinds of “borrowing” and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The range of possible plagiarism activities is a wide one, with the following major categories identified in decreasing order of severity.

a. Word-for-word copying of another’s writing, without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it with a footnote, both of which are necessary.

b. The mosaic, a random patchwork of readings and snatches of phrases that are woven into the text resulting in a collage of other people’s words and ideas, with the writer's sole contribution being the cement holding the pieces together.

c. The paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else's analysis or conclusions without acknowledgement of that other person's text or writings.

d. The apt term, in which a particular phrase so admirably expresses one's opinion that, either consciously or unconsciously, the term is adopted as one's personal contributions to scholarship.

Most students need only to guard against unintentional plagiarism. If more information is needed on the finer details of the subject, please see the sources listed below, or speak with your instructor.

**Summary**

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated at the University of La Verne. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the ultimate “loser” in cases of cheating or plagiarism is the student himself or herself, for whom the learning opportunity forfeited by such acts can never be regained. It is expected that each student at this University will understand and support the fundamental policy of academic honesty discussed above.
Course Description
This course focuses on the evaluation and instruction of the 4th-6th grade intermediate struggling reader and offers participants a wide variety of diagnostic and prescriptive techniques in reading. Candidates survey and critique formal and informal assessment tools, both published and teacher-made; during these experiences, they learn that evaluation is a process that is interwoven with reading on a daily basis, not simply an end product.

The fieldwork component gives participants an opportunity to assume the multifaceted roles and responsibilities of diagnosticians as they assess a 4th-6th grade intermediate struggling reader. Using a wide variety of evaluation tools, materials, and procedures, they plan an appropriate and effective instruction program for each, as suited to the student’s identified strengths and weaknesses. The fieldwork requirement is satisfied through a comprehensive 10-hour experience in which the participant works with the selected student on a one-to-one tutorial basis.

Learning Outcomes
Students who take this course will:

• Develop a wide range of informal and formal assessment strategies in order to evaluate the reading and writing skills of speakers of English and English Language Learners;

• Demonstrate ability to plan and deliver appropriate reading and writing instruction, based on the results of informal and formal assessment strategies;

• Utilize appropriate planning and delivery techniques for individuals, small groups, and whole class groups, as needed;

• Describe various ways to plan and deliver appropriate reading and writing instruction that takes into account the reading and writing needs of all students;
• Justify instructional plans for students, based on valid assessment information;

• Read and apply relevant research related to language, assessment, and evaluation;

• Identify specific assessment instruments as being valid and/or reliable;

• Recognize/justify when assessment instruments may be culturally/regionally biased;

• Assess the reading and writing ability of a 4th-6th grade intermediate struggling student;
  • Informal and formal assessment must be utilized, and all assessments must be age and grade appropriate
  • Based on the assessment results for this student, the candidate must develop and carry out an appropriate instructional plan

• Describe alternative ways of helping parents to become involved in their children's literacy development at school and in the home setting;

• Select and use appropriate literacy assessments for ELL students, based on current research about how L1 and L2 develop;

• Develop professionally by becoming familiar with well-known publishers and authors of testing.

**Course Requirements and Grading Criteria**

• Punctuality and regular attendance in class, as well as full participation in each session (4 points are deducted for each missed class hour); assigned readings of texts and handouts read prior to class session (65 points)

  *Ten Tutorial Sessions (1 hour and 15 minutes each)*

In order to insure a high degree of professionalism, it is critical that all candidates arrive on time for the tutorial sessions. Chronic tardiness may result in an “incomplete” for the semester and a reassignment of the tutee to another tutor for the balance of the term.

• Study Guides for reading assignments (45 points)

• Clinician's Summary Report #1 on the Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory for the case study student (60 points)

• Clinician's Summary Report #2 on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test for the case study student (60 points)

• Practitioner's Assessment Log (PAL)—8 full lesson plans, 10 points each (80 points)

• 1 Case Study Assessment Profile (70 points)
• Portfolio for the case study student (30 points)

• 1 Case Study Assessment Profile Presentation to class (15 points)

• Literacy Profile, including Parent Conference (25 points)

• Diagnostic Report for Schools (25 points)

Satisfactory Completion of Candidate Competency Form related to state standards and course objectives for RDG 514. In case of an unsatisfactory performance, an action plan will be carried out before the candidate may receive credit for the course (25 points)

Grading Policies

THERE IS A 10% PENALTY PER WEEK FOR ANY ASSIGNMENT THAT IS SUBMITTED PAST THE DUE DATE. Any assignment submitted after the due date and before or during the next class period is counted one week late. Work will not be accepted later than two weeks. Work dropped off to the clinic needs to be signed and dated by the director or other school personnel.

Any one assignment that is not representative of graduate level quality (C+ or below) may be revised and resubmitted for a new grade. However, the highest grade that a revised paper or project may receive is 80% (a B-). Only one assignment may be revised during the semester.

Grades will be determined by percentages: 94-100% = A; 90-93.9% = A-; 87-89.9% = B+; 83-86.9% = B; 80-82.9% = B-; 77-79.9% = C+; 73-76.9% = C.

*Please note: If a student is absent more than 20% of the total number of hours, course credit in the class will be jeopardized, and (s) he will be required to repeat the course at another time. Missed tutorial time with the tutee (fewer than 10 hours) must be made up by the candidate in order to satisfy fieldwork requirements.

Incompletes

Please note that "incomplete" grades will be assigned ONLY in cases of emergency illness or other serious unexpected circumstances. Assignments turned in subsequent to the university term to fulfill "incomplete" requirements will receive late penalties, just as do late assignments submitted during the regular semester.

Reading Texts for Use Throughout Program


Required Texts for RDG 514


Recommended Readings


Schedule of Topics, Assignments, and Exams

SESSION 1  (January 10)

TOPICS:  ASSESSMENT ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Provide:  RDG 514 course description
Introduce:  class members and share professional histories
Survey:  course goals and objectives
Skim:  course activities, fieldwork requirements, and assignments
Read:  information on assessment in the Reading/Language Arts Framework: in "Key to Curricular and Instructional Profiles," pp. 8-9 and "Goal and Key Components of Effective Language Arts Instruction," pp. 10-12
Read:  Content Standards in Chapter 3 of the framework
Consider:  variety of Interest Inventories to use with fieldwork students
Identify:  kinds of tests needed to provide instructional information related to Framework; formal versus informal and criterion-referenced versus norm-referenced
Introduce:  Roe and Burns Informal Reading Inventory
Carry out:  Word List administration from Burns and Roe to determine beginning passage level.
Do:  writing sample and interest inventory with tutee; record a tutee read-aloud.

FW SEM:  Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE:  No assignments for first session.
BUT:  Please bring your English/Language Arts Framework!

SESSION 2  (January 17)

TOPICS:  ASSESSING AND GUIDING READING INSTRUCTION

Discuss:  use of the IRI
Consider:  audience and purposes of IRI administration
Review:  background information on the IRI
Begin:  passage administration of Burns and Roe IRI with tutee
Focus on:  instant word lists (Fry)
Discuss:  issues related to purposes of standardized testing: advantages and disadvantages; analyze information from Kohn text
Share:  perspectives on current reading politics related to Kohn position
Define:  basic assessment terminology: raw score, derived scores (stanine, GE, percentile)
Begin:  initial passage administration from the IRI with tutee
Model:  scanning procedure for identification and recall of details
SESSION 3 (January 24)

TOPIC: INFORMAL ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

Identify: variety of informal assessment procedures, including IRI
Define: independent, instructional, frustration levels
Consider: when to administer an IRI; determine what information can be yielded
Review: how to obtain information from word lists for placement
Review: obtaining information from passages related to word recognition/comprehension
Determine: advantages/disadvantages to giving oral versus silent passages
Continue: administration of IRI passages with tutee.
Model: cloze procedure and discuss purposes/instructional objectives for using it

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps
DUE: Burns and Roe IRI, Introduction, pp. vii-21 (Stop at scoring/interpretation.)
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 4 (January 31)

TOPIC: INFORMAL READING INVENTORY/EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION

Consider: case studies for interpreting the IRI results
Review: purposes of using informal reading inventories
Analyze: Summary of Quantitative/Qualitative Analysis and other IRI worksheets
Interpret: sample case studies from IRI
Define: content reading (versus trade book or basal)
Emphasize: individualized instruction
Highlight: parent and other staff involvement in literacy instruction
Suggest: classroom environment components to support literacy
Identify: traits of literacy teacher effectiveness
Model: Herringbone procedure for determination of main ideas

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps
SESSION 5 (February 7)

TOPIC: ADDITIONAL INFORMAL ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

Contrast: criterion-referenced/objective-based tests versus norm-referenced tests
Consider: observation, interest inventories, discussions, interviews, word identification inventories (sight words/high frequency lists), think-alouds, portfolios
Identify: features of content reading inventories and contexts for their use
Define: authentic assessment
Recount: physical factors that affect school success
Model: Triple Read Procedure for main ideas and details

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

SESSION 6 (February 14)

TOPIC: FORMAL ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

Define: test terminology—raw scores, scale scores, grade equivalents, percentiles, stanines
Illustrate: excerpt from Gates norms manual; demonstrate how raw scores, scale scores, grade equivalents, percentiles, & stanines are interpreted and evaluated
Describe: norming process with samples of students; possible biases
Present: guidelines for CELDT test being given in California schools used for EL students as criteria for placement
Introduce: group versus individual tests
List: survey tests, diagnostic reading tests, achievement tests
Determine: what different types of tests can tell us
Do: Item Analysis for Gates-MacGinitie Test, utilizing "types of questions"
Model: sentence strip plus timeline strategy for determination of text sequence of events

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps
SESSION 7 (February 21)

TOPIC: ORGANIZING ASSESSMENT INFORMATION/INSTRUCTION

Consider: how to organize assessment information
Review: standard scores and how to interpret them
Discuss: effective teaching strategies
Identify: classroom management “musts”
Review: assessment accommodations for ELL students
Define: print awareness
Contrast: reliability and validity
Suggest: grouping options for instruction—advantages/disadvantages of formats
Consider: pros and cons of the eclectic approach
Begin: Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) administration for tutees
Begin: Gates MacGinitie comprehension subtests with tutees
Model: GRIP as an inferencing technique

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Collins and Cheek, Chapters 4 and 5, pp. 107-171
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 8 (February 28)

TOPIC: APPROACHES TO EFFECTIVE READING INSTRUCTION

Define: basal reader approach
Review: multi-sensory approach
Review: advantages of CAI
Evaluate: Directed Reading Activity (DRA) and Directed Learning Activity (DLA)
Continue: Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) administration for tutees
Continue: Gates MacGinitie comprehension subtests with tutees
Model: context clue procedures

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Collins and Cheek, Chapter 6, pp. 175-207
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
SESSION 9 (March 6)

TOPIC: EMERGENT LITERACY AND WORD IDENTIFICATION

Review: print awareness concepts
Discuss: elements of story structure, relationships between reading/writing
Analyze: elements of word recognition: sight words, phonic analysis, structural analysis, and context clues
Identify: phonic generalizations
Consider: characteristics of emergent writing
Complete: rough draft version of RDG 514 Candidate Competency Form
Model: PAVE vocabulary strategy

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Gates-MacGinitie Clinician's Summary Report #2
DUE: Collins and Cheek, Chapters 7 and 8, pp. 209-261
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 10 (March 13)

TOPIC: READING COMPREHENSION/STUDY SKILLS FOR ALL STUDENTS

Relate: taxonomies to comprehension
Emphasize: importance of explicit comprehension instruction
Highlight: the importance of developing schemata (background knowledge)
Discuss: importance of study skills, organizational skills, specialized study skills
Consider: elements of personal reading
Define: bibliotherapy
Analyze: motivational issues
Add: ideas for teaching special needs students
Discuss: physical, psychological, language challenges
Analyze: essential components of an effective reading program
Present: Diagnostic Reports and share insights about the tutorial process
Share: information with parents via a short conference approach

DUE: Collins and Cheek, Chapters 9-12 (jigsawed), pp. 263-360
DUE: Collins and Cheek, Chapter 13, pp. 365-369
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
DUE: Final Version of Candidate Competency Forms
DUE: Literacy Profile and Diagnostic Report for Schools
READING CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS

Intellectual Commitment (RDG 525)
Seeks pathways for improvement in literacy education based on current research, advanced learning opportunities, and collaboration with colleagues, parents, and students.

Respectfulness (RDG 516)
Communicates expectations, professional/personal opinions, or philosophical perspectives and responds to requests, suggestions, and feedback in a reflective and appropriate manner.

Professionalism (RDG 514)
Demonstrates a strong commitment to literacy education and fulfills the role of a model and expert in an interactive, academic context.

Empathy (RDG 520)
Models patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others, showing an ability to understand the perspectives of others and help them to obtain educational goals.

Socio-Cultural Competence (RDG 518)
Shows acceptance of diversity in varying cultural perspectives and individual learning styles, and recognizes others’ contributions and strengths.

Responsibility (RDG 510)
Is accountable for actions, behaviors, and decisions related to academic roles and expectations and interpersonal relationships.

Commitment to Professional Development (RDG 530)
 Exhibits dedication to professional growth in literacy education, seeking out leadership opportunities and maximizing expertise through educational options.

Ethical Behavior (RDG 524)
Maintains high standards for following the guidelines of honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and fairness, both personally and professionally.

Advocacy (RDG 521)
Is a supporter of students, parents, faculty, staff, and the profession. Uses knowledge of research and best practices to inform recommendations.
ACADEMIC HONESTY GUIDELINES

The University of La Verne embodies a tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious, scholarly effort and a scrupulous regard for the intellectual and academic contributions of others. Indeed, this tradition stands at the virtual foundation of most American institutions of higher learning. This implies that, more than just imparting knowledge and ideas, the University means to instill a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

ULV's official statement on Academic Honesty is contained in the Rights and Responsibilities section of the current Catalog, and should be read and understood by each student in the University. The purpose of this communication is to provide additional information and guidance on several of the policy areas in order that there be no misunderstanding regarding the University's position on academic honesty.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

In general, academic dishonesty falls into two major categories:

Cheating

- Copying or using crib notes in examinations, homework, lab assignments, or written products.
- Submitting papers done entirely or in part by another person.
- Giving to or getting exam answers from another student.

Plagiarism

- Representation of another person's words or ideas as your own by not properly citing them.

Acts of Academic Dishonesty

Specific acts of academic dishonesty include at least the following:

a. Copying material from someone else's work without footnoting this source.
b. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam.
c. Copying answers from a fellow student's homework instead of doing the work independently.
d. "Padding" a bibliography with citations never read.
e. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
f. Submitting to an instructor a paper that was written all or in part by someone else.
g. Copying from someone's test or exam paper with or without the person knowing it.
h. Working on the same homework with other students when the teacher does not allow it.
i. Writing a paper for another student.
j. Taking an exam for another student.
k. Having another student take an exam for you.
l. Using the same paper to fulfill requirements in two different courses without the instructor's permission.

While the majority of this list constitutes blatant cheating, a few (e.g. a, c, and d) involve the less clear work or plagiarism.
Plagiarism

The plagiarist is the academic counterpart of the bank embezzler or the product mislabeler, and involves a student or scholar who leads the reader to believe that what is being read is the original work of the writer, when it is not. Sometimes, students of good will are guilty of plagiarism simply because they are not aware of the illegality of certain kinds of "borrowing" and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The range of possible plagiarism activities is a wide one, with the following major categories identified in decreasing order of severity.

a. Word-for-word copying of another's writing, without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it with a footnote, both of which are necessary.

b. The mosaic, a random patchwork of readings and snatches of phrases that are woven into the text resulting in a collage of other people's words and ideas, with the writer's sole contribution being the cement holding the pieces together.

c. The paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else's analysis or conclusions without acknowledgement of that other person's text or writings.

d. The apt term, in which a particular phrase so admirably expresses one's opinion that, either consciously or unconsciously, the term is adopted as one's personal contributions to scholarship.

Most students need only to guard against unintentional plagiarism. If more information is needed on the finer details of the subject, please see the sources listed below, or speak with your instructor.

Summary

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated at the University of La Verne. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the ultimate "loser" in cases of cheating or plagiarism is the student himself or herself, for whom the learning opportunity forfeited by such acts can never be regained. It is expected that each student at this University will understand and support the fundamental policy of academic honesty discussed above.
READING 516 (3 UNITS)
Individualization of Reading Instruction
University of La Verne
Main Campus, Spring 2009
Tuesdays, 4:00-8:45, CRN 2848
Amber Rodriguez

Office Hours: Tuesday-Thursday: 12-3
Office Phone: (909) 593-3511 X4677
E-Mail: arodriguez@ulv.edu
Fax: (909) 392-2848

Course Description
This course is designed to assist candidates in assessing students’ needs and weaknesses (specifically) in the
areas of reading comprehension, critical thinking, and writing development), providing appropriate instruction,
and evaluating the effectiveness of this instruction.

Through a ten hour fieldwork experience with one child (a struggling intermediate reader in grades 4-8),
candidates utilize a variety of assessment tools and strategies to determine, implement, and evaluate
instruction to meet all students’ needs. The focus is upon individualization of instruction and the selection
and use of a variety of techniques which match students’ literacy profiles. Target areas of instruction include
writing, reading comprehension, metacognition, use of academic language, and development of background
knowledge, concept formation and vocabulary.

Learning Outcomes
Students who take this course will:

• Apply current research-based skills and knowledge about development of reading comprehension and
  writing;

• Utilize skills related to the development of students’ academic language, background knowledge, concept
  formation, and vocabulary;

• Describe the processes which lead to comprehending and composing; recognize the roles of academic
  language, background knowledge, concept formation, and vocabulary development as they related to the
  reading and writing of both narrative and expository texts;

• Contrast the differences between text analysis/comprehension/composition of narrative and expository
  texts and the demands they place upon readers and writers;

• Develop and apply strategies for teaching students to think critically and study efficiently (with a focus
  on inferencing, summarizing, predicting, questions, and clarifying);
• Promote independent reading of high quality books through the use of motivational strategies, access to appropriate texts, and a wide variety of genres;

• Implement specific strategies designed to support ELL students with the processes of reading and writing;

• Explain how listening, speaking, reading, and writing are interdependent processes that must be developed concurrently;

• Utilize current information from research to understand language and language development and to be able to evaluate learners’ strengths and weaknesses for the planning and delivering of appropriate instruction;

• Assess student writing and reading (linked to formal and informal assessment), and effectively plan, deliver, and evaluate instruction;

• Identify, implement, and recommend appropriate research-based intervention models, as appropriate to match students’ needs.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria

• Punctuality and regular attendance in class, as well as full participation in each session (4 points are deducted for each missed class hour); assigned readings of texts and handouts read prior to class session (65 points)

*Ten Tutorial Sessions (1 hour and 15 minutes each)

In order to insure a high degree of professionalism, it is critical that all candidates arrive on time for the tutorial sessions.

Chronic tardiness may result in an “incomplete” for the semester and a reassignment of the tutee to another tutor for the balance of the term.

• Study Guides for all texts (45 points)

• Administration of SDRT (Stanford Diagnostic) with Report (40 points)

• Parent Conference Simulation (20 points)

• Tutorial Lesson Plans completed for each tutorial session with specified goals, activities, and documentation of hours (120 points; 6 plans at 20 points each)

• Diagnostic Profile for tutee, including assessment data, plus all tutorial lesson plans; and Portfolio, including student work samples and Independent Reading Plans (100 points)

• Vocabulary Strategy Demonstration (60 points)
• Literacy Profile and communication with parent of a fieldwork student (25 points)

• Satisfactory Completion of RDG 516 Candidate Competency Form related to state standards and course objectives for RDG 516 (25 points)

**Grading Policies**

**THERE IS A 10% PENALTY PER WEEK FOR ANY ASSIGNMENT THAT IS SUBMITTED PAST THE DUE DATE.** Any assignment submitted after the due date and before or during the next class period is counted as one week late. Instructors have the option of not accepting work that is more than two weeks late.

Any one assignment that is not representative of graduate level (B- or below) may be revised and resubmitted for a new grade. However, the highest grade that a revised paper or project may receive is 85% (a B). **Only one assignment may be revised during the semester.**

Grades will be determined by percentages: 94-100%=A; 90-93%=A-; 87-89.9%=B+; 83-86.9%=B; 80-82.9=B-; 77-79.9%=C+; 73-76.9%=C.

If a student is absent more than 20% of the total number of course hours, credit in the class will be jeopardized, and (s)he will be required to repeat the course at another time. Any missed tutorial time with the tutee must be made up by the candidate in order to satisfy fieldwork requirements.

**Incompletes**

*Please note that "incomplete" grades will be assigned only in cases of emergency illness or other serious unexpected circumstances. Assignments turned in subsequent to the university term to fulfill "incomplete" requirements will receive late penalties, just as do late assignments submitted during the regular semester.**

**Required Texts for Use Throughout Program**


**Required Texts**


Recommended Readings


Schedule of Topics, Assignments, and Exams

SESSION 1 (March 24)

TOPIC: INTRODUCTION TO COURSE

Provide: Reading 516 course description
Introduce: class members
Survey: course goals, activities, and assignments
Review: Reading 510 and 514 objectives and tutorial experiences
Discuss: similarities and differences among good readers
Present: tutorial lesson plan format
Discuss: first night tutorial lessons (interest inventories, informal assessments)
Plan: assessments and activities for second tutorial lesson
Examine: English-language Arts Standards
Review: CEOL Dispositions
Discuss: academic honesty guidelines; do collaborative activity (Linear Arrays)
Demonstrate: DR-TA (Directed Reading-Thinking Activity)

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees:
instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration,
ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Bring course books (and binder) to class

SESSION 2 (March 31)

TOPIC: SCAFFOLDING STUDENTS' COMPREHENSION OF TEXT

Share: types of assessment information that can be gathered about
students from existing files or sources
Review: assessment tools learned in RDG 510 and RDG 514; brainstorm a list
and discuss appropriate uses of each; possible applications for tutees
Reflect: on classroom experiences in relation to the classroom vignette (21st Century)
Discuss: the roles of purpose, selection, and reader in planning a successful
reading experience
Show: beginning steps in administering the SDRT
Examine: individual procedures for fostering comprehension
Share: reflections on tutorial experience
Demonstrate: semantic feature analysis grid
Analyze: purpose for teaching vocabulary
Examine: concept of vocabulary within context
Consider: alternative ways to define unknown words
Present: guidelines for vocabulary demonstrations
Choose: candidate-presented vocabulary strategies for demonstration (Words, Words, Words)
Preview: Literacy Center materials

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 8, pp. 234-269
DUE: Words, Words, Words, Chapters 1-3, pp. 1-66
DUE: Assigned Study Guides (21st Century-Reflect and Apply, #s 1, 6, 7, & 12)

SESSION 3 (April 7)

TOPIC: TEACHING COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES

Share: reflections on tutorial experience
Discuss: characteristics of comprehension strategies
Examine: key comprehension strategies (prior knowledge, making inferences, summarizing, etc.)
Analyze: an approach to teaching comprehension strategies
Describe: word-rich classrooms
Consider: ways for students to demonstrate their knowledge of words and concepts
Preview: appendices in Words, Words, Words
Demonstrate: Cause/Effect
Review: guidelines for candidate vocabulary strategy demonstrations
Determine: processes for choosing appropriate level of SDRT

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 9, pp. 270-293
DUE: Words, Words, Words, Chapters 4 & 5, and Appendices A-E
DUE: Assigned Study Guides (21st Century-Reflect and Apply, #s 2 & 6)

SESSION 4 (April 14)

TOPIC: ENCOURAGING INDEPENDENT READING AND READER RESPONSE

Discuss: the purpose and benefits for independent reading
Consider: ways to respond to literature (reader response and literature circles)
Analyze: three frameworks that promote literature and reader response (book club, book club plus, and reading workshop)
Discuss: parent involvement in the reading process
Demonstrate: advance organizer
Share: reflections on tutorial
Continue: preview of Literacy Center materials
Present: Candidate Vocabulary Strategy Demonstrations
Discuss: behaviors and attitudes of apprehensive writers
Discuss: common writing characteristics of apprehensive writers
Emphasize: creating a writing environment in which apprehension can be reduced
Model: “Who am I?” strategy
Emphasize: the benefits of reading aloud
Highlight: applying the writing process in three middle and upper grades
Support: administration of SDRT tests to tutees
Survey: RDG 516 Candidate Competency Form (self-evaluation/instructor feedback)

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees:
instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration,
ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 10, pp. 294-312
DUE: Teaching Writing, Chapter 1, pp. 2-22
DUE: Assigned Study Guides (21st Century-Reflect and Apply, #2 & #3)

SESSION 5 (April 21)

TOPIC: FOSTERING HIGHER-ORDER THINKING AND DEEP UNDERSTANDING IN CONTENT AREAS

Discuss: approaches to higher-order thinking and deep understanding
Model: reciprocal teaching
Explain: purpose of the jigsaw technique (activity with comprehension article)
Share: reflections on tutorial
Demonstrate: anticipation guide
Present: Candidate Vocabulary Strategy Demonstrations
Begin: the writing process
Explain: the difference between extensive and reflexive writing
Model: stages of the writing process
Discuss: in-class collections
Share: Freedom Writer's Diary example
Discuss: SDRT early findings
Provide: overview of Diagnostic Report guidelines

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees:
instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration,
ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 11, pp. 330-355
DUE: Teaching Writing, Chapter 2, pp. 23-40
DUE: Assigned Study Guides (Teaching Writing)
SESSION 6 (April 28)

TOPIC: WRITING AND READING

Discuss: the reading and writing connection
Explain: the process approach to writing (prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing)
Describe: writing forms and purposes (note taking, brainstorming and quickwriting, semantic Mapping, Venn diagram, K-W-L, journals, reading logs, learning logs, double-entry journals, dialogue journals)
Present: types of writing to communicate (letters, biographies, reports)
Share: reflections on tutorial
Demonstrate: triple read
Present: Candidate Vocabulary Strategy Demonstrations
Highlight: planning for the writing workshop
Share: jigsaw strategies used for the writer's workshop
Evaluate: SDRT findings and start analysis of question types
Revisit: Diagnostic Report Guidelines
Review: RDG 516 Candidate Competency Form (and procedure for self-evaluation and Instructor feedback)

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test Report
DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 12, pp. 356-391
DUE: Teaching Writing, Chapter 3, pp. 41-58
DUE: Assigned Study Guides (21st Century-Reflect and Apply, #2 & #7)

SESSION 7 (May 5)

TOPIC: READING INSTRUCTION FOR ENGLISH-LANGUAGE LEARNERS

Share: classroom experiences in relation to the classroom vignette (21st Century Reading)
Discuss: challenges of learning to read in a second language
Explain: instructional principles for English-language learners
Consider: the set of techniques by Kamil and Bernhardt
Demonstrate: context clues
Share: reflections on tutorial
Present: Candidate Vocabulary Strategy Demonstrations
Introduce: the six-trait model
Emphasize: the common misapplications of the model as a means of testing
Highlight: the six-trait rubric
Stimulate: jigsaw six steps for effective teachers of writing
Do: SDRT in-class written report
Begin: Literacy Profile for Parents-rough draft

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 13, pp. 394-425
DUE: Teaching Writing, Chapter 7, pp. 121-143
DUE: Assigned Study Guides (21st Century-Reflect and Apply, #s 3, 4, & 5)

SESSION 8 (May 12)

TOPIC: CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT

Consider: the perspective on assessment taken by Graves, Juel, and Graves
Discuss: teacher-based strategies for assessment
Describe: assessment as inquiry
Discuss: purpose of rubrics (creating and scoring)
Evaluate: test-based strategies (basal reader tests, standardized tests)
Share: reflections on tutorial
Present: Candidate Vocabulary Strategy Demonstrations
Discuss: instructional resources available in the book
Emphasize: writing instruction for the ELL student
Share: jigsaw appendices
Continue: Literacy Profile for Parents
Prepare: profile and questions for parent conference simulation

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: 21st Century Reading, Chapter 14, pp. 426-473
DUE: Teaching Writing, Part III: pp. 145-160
DUE: Assigned Study Guides (21st Century-Reflect and Apply, #6 & #7)

SESSION 9 (May 19)

Present: informal information on Diagnostic Report
Review: progress of tutees
Conduct: PARENT CONFERENCE SIMULATIONS

DUE: CANDIDATE COMPETENCY FORM EVALUATION
DUE: TUTORIAL LESSON PLANS
DUE: DIAGNOSTIC REPORT
DUE: LITERACY PROFILE (FOR PARENTS)
READING CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS

Intellectual Commitment (RDG 525)
Seeks pathways for improvement in literacy education based on current research, advanced learning opportunities, and collaboration with colleagues, parents, and students.

Respectfulness (RDG 516)
Communicates expectations, professional/personal opinions, or philosophical perspectives and responds to requests, suggestions, and feedback in a reflective and appropriate manner.

Professionalism (RDG 514)
Demonstrates a strong commitment to literacy education and fulfills the role of a model and expert in an interactive, academic context.

Empathy (RDG 520)
Models patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others, showing an ability to understand the perspectives of others and help them to obtain educational goals.

Socio-Cultural Competence (RDG 518)
Shows acceptance of diversity in varying cultural perspectives and individual learning styles, and recognizes others’ contributions and strengths.

Responsibility (RDG 510)
Is accountable for actions, behaviors, and decisions related to academic roles and expectations and interpersonal relationships.

Commitment to Professional Development (RDG 530)
Exhibits dedication to professional growth in literacy education, seeking out leadership opportunities and maximizing expertise through educational options.

Ethical Behavior (RDG 524)
Maintains high standards for following the guidelines of honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and fairness, both personally and professionally.

Advocacy (RDG 521)
Is a supporter of students, parents, faculty, staff, and the profession. Uses knowledge of research and best practices to inform recommendations.
ACADEMIC HONESTY GUIDELINES

The University of La Verne embodies a tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious, scholarly effort and a scrupulous regard for the intellectual and academic contributions of others. Indeed, this tradition stands at the virtual foundation of most American institutions of higher learning. This implies that, more than just imparting knowledge and ideas, the University means to instill a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

ULV’s official statement on Academic Honesty is contained in the Rights and Responsibilities section of the current Catalog, and should be read and understood by each student in the University. The purpose of this communication is to provide additional information and guidance on several of the policy areas in order that there be no misunderstanding regarding the University’s position on academic honesty.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

In general, academic dishonesty falls into two major categories:

Cheating
  • Copying or using crib notes in examinations, homework, lab assignments, or written products.
  • Submitting papers done entirely or in part by another person.
  • Giving to or getting exam answers from another student.

Plagiarism
  • Representation of another person’s words or ideas as your own by not properly citing them.

Acts of Academic Dishonesty

Specific acts of academic dishonesty include at least the following:

a. Copying material from someone else's work without footnoting this source.
b. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam.
c. Copying answers from a fellow student’s homework instead of doing the work independently.
d. “Padding” a bibliography with citations never read.
e. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
f. Submitting to an instructor a paper that was written all or in part by someone else.
g. Copying from someone’s test or exam paper with or without the person knowing it.
h. Working on the same homework with other students when the teacher does not allow it.
i. Writing a paper for another student.
j. Taking an exam for another student.
k. Having another student take an exam for you.
l. Using the same paper to fulfill requirements in two different courses without the instructor's permission.

While the majority of this list constitutes blatant cheating, a few (e.g. a, c, and d) involve the less clear work or plagiarism.
Plagiarism

The plagiarist is the academic counterpart of the bank embezzler or the product mislabeler, and involves a student or scholar who leads the reader to believe that what is being read is the original work of the writer, when it is not. Sometimes, students of good will are guilty of plagiarism simply because they are not aware of the illegality of certain kinds of “borrowing” and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The range of possible plagiarism activities is a wide one, with the following major categories identified in decreasing order of severity.

a. Word-for-word copying of another's writing, without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it with a footnote, both of which are necessary.

b. The mosaic, a random patchwork of readings and snatches of phrases that are woven into the text resulting in a collage of other people's words and ideas, with the writer's sole contribution being the cement holding the pieces together.

c. The paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else's analysis or conclusions without acknowledgement of that other person's text or writings.

d. The apt term, in which a particular phrase so admirably expresses one's opinion that, either consciously or unconsciously, the term is adopted as one's personal contributions to scholarship.

Most students need only to guard against unintentional plagiarism. If more information is needed on the finer details of the subject, please see the sources listed below, or speak with your instructor.

Summary

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated at the University of La Verne. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the ultimate "loser" in cases of cheating or plagiarism is the student himself or herself, for whom the learning opportunity forfeited by such acts can never be regained. It is expected that each student at this University will understand and support the fundamental policy of academic honesty discussed above.
READING 518 (3 UNITS)
CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT AND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION
University of La Verne, Main Campus
Fall 2008
Thursday, 4-8:30 PM, CRN 1616
Ellen Trembley

Office Hours: Wednesday/Thursday (1-3:30) & by appointment
Office Phone: (909) 593-3511,X4624
E-Mail: pilgreen@ulv.edu
Fax: (909) 392-2848

Course Description
This course is designed to help candidates develop an understanding of primary (L1) and second (L2) language acquisition principles and processes and their relationship(s) to concept formation and literacy development. The course pursues the logical movement from language (listening/speaking) to reading and writing, including the many variables that contribute to successful experiences in the acquisition of language and the development of fluent literacy behaviors.

Specific strategies for the development of background knowledge, academic language, concept formation, and vocabulary are specifically addressed; and perspectives on developmental, linguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic influences are presented. Particular attention is paid to ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socioeconomic differences among learners.

The fieldwork portion of the course, a ten-hour tutorial with an early intermediate/intermediate level English Learner (Grades 2-8), offers candidates clinical experiences in which they focus on language and literacy development and broaden their understanding of the various influences that affect literacy learning.

Learning Outcomes
Students who take this course will:

• define and describe language, its history and evolutionary origins, and some of the similarities and differences among language;

• develop an understanding of (and be able to discuss) the phonology, morphology, orthography, syntax, and etymology of the English language and its variants and dialects;

• apply the developmental theories of cognitive development, language development, and second language acquisition, based on current research;

• be able to identify the kinds of cognitive and linguistic abilities that children bring to the task of learning to read, including specific linguistic characteristics of different cultures;
delineate the effects of interest, motivation, emotional maturity, and cultural differences on the task of learning to read;

• acquire and apply specific strategies for helping EL students to become fluent readers (ESL and SDAIE methodology);

• attain and utilize specific strategies for helping EL students to become competent comprehenders of written materials, with particular emphasis on academic language, background knowledge, concept, formation, and vocabulary;

• describe the psychological and sociolinguistic factors which influence second language acquisition and conveyance of meaning;

• analyze ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socioeconomic differences among learners and be sensitive to how such differences affect school learning;

• utilize current information from research to understand language and literacy development and to be able to evaluate learners' strengths and weaknesses;

• interact positively with an English learner in a tutorial context to make appropriate instructional decisions that will lead to effective support in reading and writing development;

• be able to communicate information about strengths, weaknesses, and progress to the teachers and parent(s) of students.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria

• Punctuality and regular attendance in class, as well as full participation in each session (4 points are deducted for each missed class hour); assigned readings of texts and handouts read prior to class session (65 points)

*Ten Tutorial Sessions (1 hour and 15 minutes each)

In order to insure a high degree of professionalism, it is critical that all candidates arrive on time for the tutorial sessions.

Chronic tardiness may result in an “incomplete” for the semester and a reassignment of the tutee to another tutor for the balance of the term.

• 6 ELD Session Plans (at 20 points each; 120 points)

• Study Guides for texts (40 points)

• Presentation of one strategy from Fifty Strategies text, to be presented as part of an “into, through, beyond” lesson format (50 points)
• Mini-literature review on one aspect of second language acquisition, 2-3 pages, using APA format (75 points)

• Presentation of the mini lit review findings to colleagues (25 points)

• Literacy Profile, including Parent Conference (25 points)

• Diagnostic Report for Schools (75 points)

• Satisfactory Completion of RDG 518 Candidate Competency Form, related to state standards and course objectives for RDG 518 (25 points)

Grading Policies

THERE IS A 10% PENALTY PER WEEK FOR ANY ASSIGNMENT THAT IS SUBMITTED PAST THE DUE DATE. Any assignment submitted after the due date and before or during the next class period is counted as one week late. Work will not be accepted later than two weeks. Work dropped off to the clinic needs to be signed and dated by the director or other school personnel.

Any one assignment that is not representative of graduate level quality (C+ or below) may be revised and resubmitted for a new grade. However, the highest grade that a revised paper or project may receive is 80% (a B-). Only one assignment may be revised during the semester.

Grades will be determined by percentages: 94-100% = A; 90-93.9% = A-; 87-89.9% = B+; 83-86.9% = B; 80-82.9 = B-; 77-79.9% = C+; 73-76.9% = C.

*Please note: If a student is absent more than 20% of the total number of course hours, credit in the class will be jeopardized, and (s) he will be required to repeat the course at another time. Missed tutorial time with the tutee (fewer than ten hours) must be made up by the candidate in order to satisfy fieldwork requirements.

Incomplete

"Incomplete" grades will be assigned ONLY in cases of emergency illness or other serious unexpected circumstances. Assignments turned in subsequent to the university term to fulfill "incomplete" requirements will receive late penalties, just as do late assignments submitted during the regular semester.

Required Texts for Use Throughout Program:


Required Texts:


Northern California Comprehensive Assistance Center. (2002). *A Map for Teaching and Assessing California’s English Language Development and English Language Arts: Standards for English Learners* (3rd Ed.). San Francisco, California: WestEd. (Optional for purchase; may check out.)


Recommended Readings:


California State Department of Education Division of Instructional Support and Bilingual Education. *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, California: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.


Schedule of Topics, Assignments, and Exams

SESSION 1 (September 11)

TOPIC: INTRODUCTION TO SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION THEORIES

Welcome: colleagues!
Peruse: syllabus— and highlight course goals, policies, and assignments
Review: Academic Honesty Guidelines
Reflect: on use of academic language with instructional strategies
Review: ABC’s for English Learners (see handout)
Consider: academic language terms -“secret” language of school
Present: Intro/through/beyond lesson with ABC elements
(Ira Sleeps Over with read-along tape: internal/external conflicts)
Determine: activities/assessments for session with tutees next week
Discuss: processes for getting to know EL tutees.
Analyze: Table 1.1 related to questions about culture
Share: beginning ideas for activities and first assessments. Familiarize selves with Table 1.1 for use next week, and write matching questions for age/grade of tutee.

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees:
   instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration,
   ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Bring all assigned texts to class!

SESSION 2 (September 18)

TOPIC: DEVELOPING A SUPPORTIVE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS

Identify: necessary "basic" information about new EL students
Consider: how cultural differences affect learning and teaching
Define: “culture” in the classroom context
Lay out: ideal classroom organizational structures for sociocultural interactions
Review: types of programs for English learners

Share: interactive classroom activities for English learners
Present: mini-lit review paper guidelines; consider possible topics
Continue: analysis of ELD Lesson Plan format
Reflect: on policy trends for the education of English learners
Share: initial meeting experiences with tutees.
Discuss: possible assessments to gain beginning information for lesson objectives
Present: overview of ELD Session Plan format
Describe: Table 1.1 applications to your tutee
Instructor: models a strategy presentation from 50 Strategies book (using an “into, through, beyond” format)

Sign up: for one strategy presentation from “Fifty Strategies.” Decide if this strategy should be the “into,” the “though,” or the “beyond” of a larger lesson context

Consider: options for research question for mini lit review

Discuss: Study Guide responses

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Peregoy and Boyle, Chapter 1, pages 1-28
DUE: Peregoy and Boyle, Chapter 11, pages 393-405
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 3 (September 25)

TOPIC: SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Summarize: three language acquisition theories—first and second languages

Discuss: processes and factors in L2 learning at school

Define: “dialect”

Identify: sociocultural, cognitive and personality factors in L2 acquisition

Contrast: differences between oral and written language development (BICS and CALP)

Review: barriers to L2 language acquisition

Discuss: 3 components of communicative competence

Share: ideas for instructional modifications for EL students

Consider: all assessment information available at this time (including CELDT test results)

Analyze: ELD standards as a way of beginning to target lesson objectives

Share: additional ideas for initial testing and objectives for tutee

Begin: strategy presentations from Fifty Strategies (into/through/beyond)

Discuss: Study Guide responses

Choose: research question for mini-literature review

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Peregoy and Boyle, Chapter 2, pages 33-71
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
SESSION 4 (October 2)

TOPIC: EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL ELD/SDAIE STRATEGIES

Share: ideas for classroom practices for ELD instruction
Define: SDAIE—and analyze characteristics
Discuss: types of possible group work and thematic instruction
Brainstorm: scaffolding techniques for ELD/SDAIE instruction
Consider: limitations of assessment of ELD instruction
Highlight: importance of providing a variety of scaffolding techniques
Continue: strategy presentations from Fifty Strategies
Conduct: peer evaluation (revision/editing) activities for research papers
Discuss: Study Guide responses
Share: examples of ELD Session Plans and discuss progress of tutees.
Determine: next tutorial objectives for tutees
Share: ideas for mini-research papers

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees:
instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration,
ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Peregoy and Boyle, Chapter 3, pages 72-114
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 5 (October 9)

TOPIC: ORAL LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN SLA

Identify: 8 types of language functions and corresponding classroom
Experiences (Table 4.1 in P and B)
Discuss: form, function, and social context in oral language use
Consider: oral language development—processes and strategies
Analyze: SOLOM (Fig. 4.2 in P and B) assessment tool for oral language
Continue: strategy presentations from Fifty Strategies
Present: mini lit review presentation guidelines
Discuss: Study Guide responses

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees:
instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration,
ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Peregoy and Boyle, Chapters 4, pages 115-151
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
SESSION 6 (October 16)

**TOPIC:** EMERGENT LITERACY AND VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT

- **Trace:** steps of early literacy development for EL students
- **Review:** spelling stages
- **Define:** “emergent literacy” (as contrasted with “reading readiness”)
- **Consider:** ways in which home environments nurture emergent literacy
- **List:** methods for supporting and evaluating emergent literacy
- **Emphasize:** importance of learning word part meanings
- **Discuss:** relationship between vocabulary and reading
- **Continue:** strategy presentations from Fifty Strategies

**FW SEM:** Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

**DUE:** Peregoy and Boyle, Chapters 5 and 6, 152-225
**DUE:** Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 7 (October 23)

**TOPIC:** PROCESS WRITING

- **Review:** research on L2 writing
- **Discuss:** advantages of process writing for L2 students
- **Identify:** strategies to assist L2 writers
- **Do:** rough draft versions of Literacy Profile and Diagnostic Report to Schools
- **Finish:** strategy presentations from Fifty Strategies
- **Discuss:** Study Guide responses

**FW SEM:** Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

**DUE:** Peregoy and Boyle, Chapter 7, pages 227-281
**DUE:** Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 8 (October 30)

**TOPIC:** READING ASSESSMENTS AND LITERACY INSTRUCTION

- **Discuss:** theoretical approaches to literacy assessment
- **Highlight:** importance of prior knowledge (schema) of English learners
- **Identify:** resources brought into classrooms by non-native speakers
Review: advantages of IRIs for identification of strengths/weaknesses
Review: methods for linking assessment and instruction
Demo: echo reading, shadow reading, shared reading, choral reading
View: CELDT test information/formatting
Survey: WestEd ELD and ELA Standards to pinpoint instructional goals
Continue: strategy presentations from Fifty Strategies

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Peregoy and Boyle, Chapter 8, pages 282-332
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 9 (November 6)

TOPIC: CONTENT READING AND WRITING: PREREADING, DURING, POSTREADING

Consider: concept of reading and writing across the curriculum
Outline: effects of text structure on comprehension and memory
Contrast: efferent versus aesthetic reading
List: typical text structures
Discuss: Study Guide responses
Share: tutorial information and receive feedback from colleagues and instructor.
Present: mini lit reviews
Review: process for completing the Literacy Profiles and Diagnostic Reports

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: MINI LITERATURE REVIEWS
DUE: Peregoy and Boyle, Chapters 9 and 10, pages 333-392
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 10 (November 13)

TOPIC: THE CRITICAL PERIOD HYPOTHESIS IN L1 and L2

View: Nova film on Genie: The Wild Child
Consider: the "critical period" hypothesis as it relates to Genie
Discuss: implications of the Genie research for language development theory
Conduct: Parent conferences related to tutorials
Share: results of parent conferences. Suggest ideas for improvement of the conferencing process.
DUE: LITERACY PROFILES AND DIAGNOSTIC REPORT TO SCHOOLS
DUE: Binders with Portfolios
DUE: Candidate Competency Forms
READING CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS

Intellectual Commitment (RDG 525)
Seeks pathways for improvement in literacy education based on current research, advanced learning opportunities, and collaboration with colleagues, parents, and students.

Respectfulness (RDG 516)
Communicates expectations, professional/personal opinions, or philosophical perspectives and responds to requests, suggestions, and feedback in a reflective and appropriate manner.

Professionalism (RDG 514)
Demonstrates a strong commitment to literacy education and fulfills the role of a model and expert in an interactive, academic context.

Empathy (RDG 520)
Models patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others, showing an ability to understand the perspectives of others and help them to obtain educational goals.

Socio-Cultural Competence (RDG 518)
Shows acceptance of diversity in varying cultural perspectives and individual learning styles, and recognizes others’ contributions and strengths.

Responsibility (RDG 510)
Is accountable for actions, behaviors, and decisions related to academic roles and expectations and interpersonal relationships.

Commitment to Professional Development (RDG 530)
Exhibits dedication to professional growth in literacy education, seeking out leadership opportunities and maximizing expertise through educational options.

Ethical Behavior (RDG 524)
Maintains high standards for following the guidelines of honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and fairness, both personally and professionally.

Advocacy (RDG 521)
Is a supporter of students, parents, faculty, staff, and the profession. Uses knowledge of research and best practices to inform recommendations.
ACADEMIC HONESTY GUIDELINES

The University of La Verne embodies a tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious, scholarly effort and a scrupulous regard for the intellectual and academic contributions of others. Indeed, this tradition stands at the virtual foundation of most American institutions of higher learning. This implies that, more than just imparting knowledge and ideas, the University means to instill a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

ULV’s official statement on Academic Honesty is contained in the Rights and Responsibilities section of the current Catalog, and should be read and understood by each student in the University. The purpose of this communication is to provide additional information and guidance on several of the policy areas in order that there be no misunderstanding regarding the University’s position on academic honesty.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

In general, academic dishonesty falls into two major categories:

Cheating

- Copying or using crib notes in examinations, homework, lab assignments, or written products.
- Submitting papers done entirely or in part by another person.
- Giving to or getting exam answers from another student.

Plagiarism

- Representation of another person's words or ideas as your own by not properly citing them.

Cheating

Specific acts of academic dishonesty include at least the following:

a. Copying material from someone else’s work without footnoting this source.
b. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam.
c. Copying answers from a fellow student’s homework instead of doing the work independently.
d. "Padding" a bibliography with citations never read.
e. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
f. Submitting to an instructor a paper that was written all or in part by someone else.
g. Copying from someone's test or exam paper with or without the person knowing it.
h. Working on the same homework with other students when the teacher does not allow it.
i. Writing a paper for another student.
j. Taking an exam for another student.
k. Having another student take an exam for you.
l. Using the same paper to fulfill requirements in two different courses without the instructor’s permission.

While the majority of this list constitutes blatant cheating, a few (e.g. a, c, and d) involve the less clear work or plagiarism.
**Plagiarism**

The plagiarist is the academic counterpart of the bank embezzler or the product mislabeler, and involves a student or scholar who leads the reader to believe that what is being read is the original work of the writer, when it is not. Sometimes, students of good will are guilty of plagiarism simply because they are not aware of the illegality of certain kinds of “borrowing” and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The range of possible plagiarism activities is a wide one, with the following major categories identified in decreasing order of severity.

a. Word-for-word copying of another's writing, without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it with a footnote, both of which are necessary.

b. The mosaic, a random patchwork of readings and snatches of phrases that are woven into the text resulting in a collage of other people's words and ideas, with the writer's sole contribution being the cement holding the pieces together.

c. The paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else's analysis or conclusions without acknowledgement of that other person's text or writings.

d. The apt term, in which a particular phrase so admirably expresses one's opinion that, either consciously or unconsciously, the term is adopted as one's personal contributions to scholarship.

Most students need only to guard against unintentional plagiarism. If more information is needed on the finer details of the subject, please see the sources listed below, or speak with your instructor.

**Summary**

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated at the University of La Verne. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the ultimate "loser" in cases of cheating or plagiarism is the student himself or herself, for whom the learning opportunity forfeited by such acts can never be regained. It is expected that each student at this University will understand and support the fundamental policy of academic honesty discussed above.
READING 520 (3 UNITS)
ADVANCED METHODS AND MATERIALS
University of La Verne
Main Campus, Fall 2008
Tuesdays, 4:00-8:45, CRN 1434
Dr. Marga Madhuri

Office Hours: Tues./Thurs. 1:00-3:45; Wed. 4-6:45 (or by appointment as needed)
Office Phone:  (909) 593-3511 X 4673
E-Mail: madhurim@ulv.edu (this is the best way to contact me)

Course Description:

This course offers candidates opportunities to develop advanced, professional perspectives on reading and language arts curriculum, instruction, and assessment for adolescent learners. A wide range of strategies within all areas of literacy (including spelling, vocabulary, comprehension, metacognition, study skills and writing) is highlighted through demonstration and modeling techniques.

The course content also emphasizes the relationships among language, spelling, reading, and writing, as well as the motivational issues that adolescents face as they develop their literacy skills. Candidates enhance their own repertoire of techniques to support students of all levels and further develop their abilities to make instructional decisions, based on research and assessment. During a ten-hour tutorial, candidates design and implement appropriate instructional lessons for one tutee, an adolescent learner in grades 7-12 who has severe reading difficulties.

Learning Outcomes:

Students who take this course will:

• develop an advanced professional perspective on reading and language arts curriculum, instruction, and assessment;

• demonstrate knowledge of relationships among theory, research, and practice;

• enhance their repertoire of instructional strategies in the areas of word recognition strategies, vocabulary, spelling, comprehension, writing, study skills, and metacognition;

• develop, through critical examination of sound research and theoretical literature, an advanced professional perspective about how students learn to read and motivational supports that can be provided to them as they strive to develop literacy skills;

• develop through critical examination of sound research and theoretical literature, an advanced professional perspective about the relationships among language, spelling, reading, and writing;
• review strategies for teaching writing, including pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, publishing, and assessment;
• examine, understand, and demonstrate knowledge of relationships among theory, research, practice, and decision-making;
• determine how the assessment process can be effectively integrated into the instructional process: before instruction, during instruction, and after instruction;
• enhance knowledge, skills, and experience in the use of intervention strategies to individualize instruction for learners with severe reading difficulties;
• interact effectively with an adolescent learner in a tutorial context and be able to communicate information about the student’s literacy development to parents and teachers.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria

• Punctuality and regular attendance in class, as well as full participation in each session (4 points are deducted for each missed class hour); assigned readings of texts and handouts read prior to class session (65 points)

*Ten Tutorial Sessions (1 hour and 15 minutes each)

In order to insure a high degree of professionalism, it is critical that all candidates arrive on time for the tutorial sessions.

Chronic tardiness may result in an “incomplete” for the semester and a reassignment of the tutee to another tutor for the balance of the term

• Six Lesson Plans 120 points
  (Plans are due at the beginning of each tutorial session)
• Study Guides on reading material 40 points
• QRI-4 Assessment Data & Report 30 points
• Adolescent Research Paper 75 points
• Literacy Profile and Parent Conferences 75 points
• Diagnostic Report to Schools 75 points
• Powerpoint Presentation on Adolescent Research Paper 25 points
• Satisfactory completion of RDG 520 Candidate Competency Form 25 points
  related to state standards and course objectives for RDG 520

THERE IS A 10% PENALTY PER WEEK FOR ANY ASSIGNMENT THAT IS SUBMITTED PAST THE DUE DATE. Any assignment submitted after the due date and before or during the next class period is counted one week late. Work will not be accepted later than two weeks. Work dropped off to the clinic needs to be signed and dated by the director or other school personnel.
Any one assignment that is not representative of graduate level quality (C+ or below) may be revised and resubmitted for a new grade. However, the highest grade that a revised paper or project may receive is 80% (a B-). Only one assignment may be revised during the semester.

Grades will be determined by percentages: 94-100% = A; 90-93.9% = A-; 87-89.9% = B+; 83-86.9% = B 80-82.9% = B-; 77-79.9% = C+; 73-76.9% = C.

*Please note: If a student is absent more than 20% of the total number of hours, course credit in the class will be jeopardized, and (s)he will be required to repeat the course at another time. Missed tutorial time with the tutee (fewer than 10 hours) must be made up by the candidate, under the supervision of the instructor, in order to satisfy fieldwork requirements.

**Incompletes**

Please note that “incomplete” grades will be assigned ONLY in cases of emergency illness or other serious unexpected circumstances. Assignments turned in subsequent to the university term to fulfill “incomplete” requirements will receive late penalties, just as do late assignments submitted during the regular semester.

**Required Texts for RDG 520**


**Required Texts for Use Throughout Program**


**Recommended Readings**


**Schedule of Topics and Assignments**

**SESSION 1 (Jan. 6)**

**TOPIC:** CHOOSING LITERACY ASSESSMENTS

Discuss: Introductions & course description
Examine: effectiveness of first activities and assessments
Discuss: current research in adolescent literacy (Moje et al article)
Examine: Effective literacy assessments (Wood & Harmon)
Present: Content Inventory (Wood & Harmon)
Present: Book and literacy histories form (Figure 1.1 in Tovani)
Introduce: the QRI-4 & Adolescent Research paper
Discuss: tutorial requirements for RDG 520. Analyze Tutorial Plan format; complete the first entry in class
Describe: tutee responses to first session, and share ideas for possible assessments and instruction
Share: Ideas for getting to know tutees
Survey: the RDG 520 Candidate Competency Form and procedure for self-evaluation and instructor feedback

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps
DUE: Bring assigned texts to class.
SESSION 2 (Jan. 13)

TOPIC: REFLECTIONS ON TEACHING STRUGGLING ADOLESCENT READERS

Discuss: Literacy, literacy practices, and content area reading
Share: experiences with teaching struggling middle school readers
Present: Redefining reading
Jigsaw: GRP, Exchange Compare Writing, Story Impressions, and Capsule Vocabulary (Wood & Harmon)
Discuss: Coping strategies of unsuccessful readers
Share: Research that you are reading for your adolescent paper
Examine: QRI-4 Report format and project overview
Discuss: Resistant readers
Share: Proficient reader strategies
Discuss: Reader characteristics that make texts inaccessible
Listen: Thoughtful Reading Video (tape 1 and activity)
Survey: Cramer Text-Discuss Writing Objectives for Tutees

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Wood and Harmon, Chapter 1, pp. 1-14; Chapter 3, pp. 26-36
DUE: Tovani, Chapter 1-2; pp. 1-21
DUE: Select: Ivey Article OR Tate Article
DUE: QRI-4 Sections 1-4, pp. 1-30

SESSION 3 (Jan. 20)

TOPIC: STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND POPULAR CULTURE

Define: Purpose for reading (access tools)
Illustrate: Marking text
Present: Comprehension constructors
Discuss: Importance of modeling
Share: Varied approaches to reading/retelling
Model: CLOZE and think alouds
Share: Double entry diaries (Tovani)
Examine: Uses of popular culture in the classroom
Present: Graphic novels
Introduce: Intervention Profile, due Session 10. Discuss components.
Discuss: Tutorial Plan procedures. Ask questions, as necessary.
Determine: possible assessments to use, in addition to the QRI-4.
FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps.

DUE: Tovani, Ch. 3, pp. 23-34
DUE: QRI-4 Sections 5-8, pp. 31-63
DUE: Article on Popular Culture TBA
DUE: Study Guide #1

SESSION 4 (Jan. 27)

TOPIC: VOCABULARY INSTRUCTION

Share: Teacher beliefs about reading and vocabulary
Discuss: Role of monitoring
Jigsaw: Various vocabulary strategies for adolescents—e.g. VSS, Vocabulary Graphic Organizer and Personal Vocabulary Journal (Wood & Harmon)
Examine: Graphic organizers that define concept relationships (Wood & Harmon)
Present: Introduction to literature circles
Discuss: Situations when text becomes inaccessible to students
Watch: Thoughtful Reading Video (Tape 2 and activities)
Discuss: Continue exploration of QRI-4 administration. Discuss beginning results from early QRI-4 assessments with tutees.
Analyze: RDG 520 Candidate Competency Form (and procedure for self-evaluation and instructor feedback).

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps.

DUE: Tovani, Ch. 4, pp. 35-48
DUE: Article on Vocabulary/Academic Language TBA
DUE: QRI-4 Sections 9-12, pp. 64-99
DUE: Intervention Strategies text, Ch. 8, pp. 103-116
DUE: Study Guide #2

SESSION 5 (Feb. 3)

TOPIC: MOTIVATION & LITERACY SUCCESS

Discuss: Reasons for lack of reading motivation
Model: Zooming in and Zooming Out and List-Group-Label and Write strategies to “fix up” confusion
Present: QRI-4 Report
Discuss: Requirements for Adolescent Practices Activity
Share: information from QRI-4 testing.
Review: Intervention Profile requirements, due Session 9.

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Wood & Harmon, Ch. 6, pp. 51-60
DUE: Tovani, Ch. 5, pp. 49-61
DUE: Walker et al Article
DUE: QRI-4 Sections 12-15, pp. 100-120
DUE: Study Guide #2

SESSION 6 (Feb. 10)

TOPIC: “ON EVERY PAGE SOMEONE GETS KILLED!” BOOK CONVERSATIONS YOU DON’T HEAR IN SCHOOL

Share: Personal knowledge or personal experience
Discuss: IEPC and Guided Imagery (Wood & Harmon)
Discuss: How to make content meaningful?
Model: Making connections
Share: personal experiences with reluctant readers and school reading
Watch: Thoughtful Reading Video (Tape 3 and activities)
Present: Informally share assessment results.

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Worthy Article
DUE: Daniels Article on Lit. Circles
DUE: Wood & Harmon, Ch. 7, pp. 61-68
DUE: Tovani, Ch. 6, pp. 63-78
DUE: Study Guide #3

SESSION 7 (Feb. 17)

TOPIC: COPING STRATEGIES OF UNSUCCESSFUL READERS

Share: Strategies that we see in our classrooms
Discuss: Why develop coping strategies?
Present: Group Investigation Approach
Examine: Research that supports your Adolescent Research Paper
Share: elements of your Diagnostic Report
FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees:
instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration,
ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Tovani, Ch. 7, pp. 79-95
DUE: Intervention Strategies text Ch. 12, pp. 161-177

SESSION 8 (Feb 24)

TOPIC: WRITE ALL ABOUT IT

Define: Reluctant reader
Discuss: Voluntary reading
Share: Strategies from Walker Text (Opinion Proof Approaches and Summarization)
Discuss: Value of retelling (verbal rehearsal)
Examine: Sequential Summary Writing Approach (Wood & Harmon)
Discuss: Questioning the Author
Model: Question Answer Relationships
Discuss: Concept of seen and unseen text
Examine: Hierarchical Summary Writing and Magnet Summaries (Wood and Harmon)
Jigsaw: What works on pages 104-105 (Tovani)
Review: Candidate Competency Forms are reviewed by instructor; action plans are determined if necessary.
Clarify: Intervention Profile and Presentation guidelines, due Session 10.

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees:
instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration,
ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Download from ProQuest:
DUE: Tovani, Chapter 8-9, Pages 97-111
DUE: Worthy Article
DUE: Intervention Strategies text, Ch. 9, pp. 119-128, Ch. 10 (part only!), pp. 129-139
DUE: Study Guide #4

SESSION 9 (Mar. 3)

TOPIC: NARRATIVE READING STRATEGIES

Share: Reading Guides
Discuss: Talking Drawings
Model: Reader's Theater
Examine: Data collection process for Diagnostic Report
Review: Rough draft of Literacy Profile and Diagnostic Report to Schools
Discuss: Presentations on Diagnostic Report

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Wood & Harmon, Ch. 10, pp. 80-94, Ch. 16, pp. 142-147

SESSION 10 (Mar.10)

TOPIC: SYNTHESIZING DIAGNOSTIC INFORMATION FOR INSTRUCTION

Present: findings from Adolescent Paper
DUE: Adolescent Research Paper
DUE: Final version of Candidate Competency Form Evaluation
DUE: Diagnostic Report
DUE: Literacy Profile
READING CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS

Intellectual Commitment (RDG 525)
Seeks pathways for improvement in literacy education based on current research, advanced learning opportunities, and collaboration with colleagues, parents, and students.

Respectfulness (RDG 516)
Communicates expectations, professional/personal opinions, or philosophical perspectives and responds to requests, suggestions, and feedback in a reflective and appropriate manner.

Professionalism (RDG 514)
Demonstrates a strong commitment to literacy education and fulfills the role of a model and expert in an interactive, academic context.

Empathy (RDG 520)
Models patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others, showing an ability to understand the perspectives of others and help them to obtain educational goals.

Socio-Cultural Competence (RDG 518)
Shows acceptance of diversity in varying cultural perspectives and individual learning styles, and recognizes others’ contributions and strengths.

Responsibility (RDG 510)
Is accountable for actions, behaviors, and decisions related to academic roles and expectations and interpersonal relationships.

Commitment to Professional Development (RDG 530)
Exhibits dedication to professional growth in literacy education, seeking out leadership opportunities and maximizing expertise through educational options.

Ethical Behavior (RDG 524)
Maintains high standards for following the guidelines of honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and fairness, both personally and professionally.

Advocacy (RDG 521)
Is a supporter of students, parents, faculty, staff, and the profession. Uses knowledge of research and best practices to inform recommendations.
Academic Honesty Guidelines

The University of La Verne embodies a tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious, scholarly effort and a scrupulous regard for the intellectual and academic contributions of others. Indeed, this tradition stands at the virtual foundation of most American institutions of higher learning. This implies that, more than just imparting knowledge and ideas, the University means to instill a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

ULV’s official statement on Academic Honesty is contained in the Rights and Responsibilities section of the current Catalog, and should be read and understood by each student in the University. The purpose of this communication is to provide additional information and guidance on several of the policy areas in order that there be no misunderstanding regarding the University’s position on academic honesty.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

In general, academic dishonesty falls into two major categories:

Cheating
- Copying or using crib notes in examinations, homework, lab assignments, or written products.
- Submitting papers done entirely or in part by another person.
- Giving to or getting exam answers from another student.

Plagiarism
- Representation of another person’s words or ideas as your own by not properly citing them.

Acts of Academic Dishonesty

Specific acts of academic dishonesty include at least the following:

a. Copying material from someone else’s work without footnoting this source.
b. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam.
c. Copying answers from a fellow student’s homework instead of doing the work independently.
d. "Padding" a bibliography with citations never read.
e. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
f. Submitting to an instructor a paper that was written all or in part by someone else.
g. Copying from someone’s test or exam paper with or without the person knowing it.
h. Working on the same homework with other students when the teacher does not allow it.
i. Writing a paper for another student.
j. Taking an exam for another student.
k. Having another student take an exam for you.
l. Using the same paper to fulfill requirements in two different courses without the instructor’s permission.

While the majority of this list constitutes blatant cheating, a few (e.g. a, c, and d) involve the less clear work or plagiarism.
Plagiarism

The plagiarist is the academic counterpart of the bank embezzler or the product mislabeler, and involves a student or scholar who leads the reader to believe that what is being read is the original work of the writer, when it is not. Sometimes, students of good will are guilty of plagiarism simply because they are not aware of the illegality of certain kinds of “borrowing” and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The range of possible plagiarism activities is a wide one, with the following major categories identified in decreasing order of severity.

a. Word-for-word copying of another’s writing, without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it with a footnote, both of which are necessary.
b. The mosaic, a random patchwork of readings and snatches of phrases that are woven into the text resulting in a collage of other people’s words and ideas, with the writer’s sole contribution being the cement holding the pieces together.
c. The paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else’s analysis or conclusions without acknowledgement of that other person’s text or writings.
d. The apt term, in which a particular phrase so admirably expresses one’s opinion that, either consciously or unconsciously, the term is adopted as one’s personal contributions to scholarship.

Most students need only to guard against unintentional plagiarism. If more information is needed on the finer details of the subject, please see the sources listed below, or speak with your instructor.

Summary

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated at the University of La Verne. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the ultimate “loser” in cases of cheating or plagiarism is the student himself or herself, for whom the learning opportunity forfeited by such acts can never be regained. It is expected that each student at this University will understand and support the fundamental policy of academic honesty discussed above.
READING 521 (3 UNITS)
LITERATURE AND LITERACY
University of La Verne, Main Campus
Summer 2008
Wednesdays, 4:00 - 8:30 pm, CRN 1673
Monica MacAuley

Office Hours: By appointment
Office Phone: (909) 314-2780
Messages: (909) 593-3511, X4660
Fax: (909) 392-2848
E-Mail: mmacauleys@verizon.net

Course Description
This course (3 units) focuses on the study of classic and contemporary literature for children and adolescents; its relationship to social values and aesthetic standards; the evaluation of literature and literature curricula used within classrooms and school libraries; and the instructional strategies and presentational methods used to stimulate personalized and creative responses to literature. As a wide variety of genres and literary elements are introduced, candidates learn specific ways to guide and support developing readers as they engage in the study of literature and to encourage them to read independently as they progress toward the goal of becoming lifelong readers. Notable authors and award-winning books, as well as current research in the field of children's literature, are presented.

The clinical fieldwork portion of the course gives candidates the opportunity to work with a 3-8th grade struggling "reluctant" reader so that they can develop their ability to present a wide variety of literary genres and elements to children who need motivational support in the area of reading. As participants work within their school fieldwork setting with the students, they also have the experience of doing an informal evaluation of the literature curriculum in that setting, based on guidelines presented in class.

Learning Outcomes
Students who take this course will:

• implement specific instructional strategies for helping English-only and ELL students to engage in the study of literature with high levels of comprehension and appreciation;

• critically examine literature books for children, using a variety of instruments for the selection/evaluation of quality books in various genres;

• develop effective instructional and motivational techniques for presenting literature to children;

• learn about the history of children's literature and become familiar with classic and contemporary books of yesterday and today;

• examine a wide range of genres from which literature can be drawn for readers of all ages and grade levels;
select and evaluate well-written multicultural books, matching selections to students' needs and interests;

identify specific verbal and visual modes of presentation and responses and practice using them;

have opportunities for personal reflection related to the teaching of literature;

synthesize research in the area of children's literature; define trends in the historical progression of children's books;

develop resources for the attainment of high quality literature;

hone skills for communicating with parents and other teachers;

begin participation in professional organizations such as IRA and NCTE.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria

- Punctuality and regular attendance in class, as well as full participation in each session (4 points are deducted for each missed class hour); assigned readings of texts and handouts read prior to class session (65 points)

*Ten Tutorial Sessions (1 hour and 15 minutes each)*

In order to insure a high degree of professionalism, it is critical that all candidate arrive on time for the tutorial sessions.

Chronic tardiness may result in an “incomplete” for the semester and a reassignment of the tutee to another tutor for the balance of the term.

- 6 Tutorial Lesson plans with student work samples (120 points)
- Dialogue Journal—2 "formal" submissions (10 each; 20 points)
- Sharing of a favorite picture book (15 points)
- Verbal or visual presentation of literature (30 points)
- Abbreviated Literary Link (65 points)
- Study Guides for Goforth text (55 points)
- Evaluation of a quality book--any genre (40 points)
- Evaluation of a book for bias (40 points)
- Literacy Profile, including Parent Conference (25 points)
- Satisfactory Completion of Candidate Competency Form related to state standards and course objectives for RDG 517 (25 points)

**Grading Policies**

**THERE IS A 10% PENALTY PER WEEK FOR ANY ASSIGNMENT THAT IS SUBMITTED PAST THE DUE DATE.** Any assignment submitted after the due date and before or during the next class period is counted as one week late. An assignment that is more than three weeks late cannot be accepted.

Any one assignment that is not representative of graduate level quality (C- or below) may be revised and resubmitted for a new grade. However, the highest grade that a revised paper or project may receive is 80% (a B-). **Only one assignment may be revised during the semester.**

Grades will be determined by percentages: 94-100% = A; 90-93.9% = A-; 87-89.9% = B+; 83-86.9% = B; 80-82.9 = B-; 77-79.9% = C+; 73-76.9% = C.

*Please note: If a student is absent more than 20% of the total number of hours course credit in the class will be jeopardized, and (s)he will be required to repeat the course at another time. Missed tutorial time with the tutee must be made up by the candidate in order to satisfy fieldwork requirements.*

**Incompletes**

Please note that “incomplete” grades will be assigned ONLY in cases of emergency illness or other serious unexpected circumstances. Assignments turned in subsequent to the university term to fulfill “incomplete” requirements will receive late penalties, just as do late assignments submitted during the regular semester.

**Required Texts for Use Throughout Program**


**Required Texts for RDG 517**


Required Children's Books for RDG 517

David Weisner (1991)  
Keiko Kasza (1997)  
Mary Pope Osborne (1992)  
Will and Mary Pope Osborne (2000)  
Avi (1995)  
Gary Paulsen (1989)  
Gary Soto (1993)  
Kalli Dakos (1990)  
Jerry Stanley (1992)

Tuesday  
Don't Laugh, Joel  
Rough Faced Girl  
Dinosaurs Before Dark  
Research Guide #1: Dinosaurs  
Poppy  
The Voyage of the Frog  
Local News  
If You're Not Here, Please Raise Your Hand: Poems About School  
Children of the Dust Bowl

Recommended Readings


California Department of Education. (2003). Recommended readings in literature, kindergarten through grade eight. Sacramento, California: Language Arts and Foreign Languages Unit and the Bureau of Publications: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (1990). Recommended readings in literature, grades nine through twelve. Sacramento, California: Language Arts and Foreign Languages Unit and the Bureau of Publications: California Department of Education.


Schedule of Topics, Assignments, and Exams

SESSION 1 (Jun.4)

TOPIC: LITERACY PREFERENCES AND INTERESTS

Provide: ED 517 course description
Introduce: class members
Survey: course goals and objectives
Review: types of books (predictable, decodable, trade, picture)
Discuss: definition of children's literature; identify conventions found in quality literature
Preview: literary forms and structures, genres, and conventions; fiction and non-fiction elements in literature
Discuss: publishing trends
Analyze: Young People's Literary Preferences (Table 1.2)
Do: in small groups, jigsaw developmental characteristics that influence readers' literary preferences: language, social, and cognitive development, birth to 14 years

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Goforth, Chapter 1, pages 2-27
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
SESSION 2 (Jun. 11)

TOPIC: THE LITERARY TRANSACTION PROCESS

Discuss: sources for book selections and specific book awards
Identify: roles and characteristics of successful literature teachers
Discuss: importance and description of a literature-rich environment
Sketch: possible ideal physical arrangements of classrooms, including a classroom library and listening/writing centers
Review: theories of learning and development: instructional implications
Discuss: visual and verbal literary response modes (Table 2.9)
Model: ways to assess literary growth: teacher checklists and parent questionnaires
Present: Literary Link format (Appendix E)

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Goforth, Chapter 2, pages 28-64
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 3 (Jun. 18)

TOPIC: USING PICTURE BOOKS

Discuss: history of books with pictures
Classify: books with pictures: wordless books, picture books and picture storybooks, illustrated books, concept books, informational storybooks, photo essays, and information books
Present: samples of picture books from all categories
Review: artistic characteristics of picture books; students add examples, in addition to those given in text
Brainstorm: other book titles that represent various artistic styles in juvenile picture books
Analyze: verbal and visual characteristics of picture books: painting, drawing, collage, photography, and graphic techniques
Demo: instructional strategies and literary responses to highlight the art in picture books
Discuss: role of teacher and artistic and preferences of young people
Model: ways to present books with pictures, using Tuesday and Don't Laugh, Joe!

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Goforth, Chapter 8, pages 257-306
DUE: Tuesday
Don't Laugh, Joel
DUE: SHARING OF A FAVORITE PICTURE BOOK; classify it and relate it to artistic preferences of young people (in text)
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 4 (Jun. 25)

TOPIC A: ORAL AND VISUAL PRESENTATIONS OF LITERATURE

Discuss: benefits of verbal presentations of literature; techniques for presenting literature orally: book talks, book discussions, reading aloud, storytelling, using drama with literature
Model: book talk procedure
Review: visual presentations of literature such as chalk talks, comparison charts, flip charts, literary ladders, mobiles, flannel/felt/magnetic boards
Discuss: benefits of using AV media; ways to present literature through audiovisual media and technology; criteria for previewing and selecting AV productions to present literature
Evaluate: uses of TV and literature; uses of computers and literature; bring in examples of shows and software that students are currently using or which are available

TOPIC B: BIOGRAPHY AND INFORMATION BOOKS

Define: nonfiction literature
Discuss: distinctive characteristics of nonfiction literature
Classify: subgenres of nonfiction literature: biography/autobiography and information books
Evaluate: various learner response modes for biographies/autobiographies
Present: types of information books: survey books; concept books; experiment/activity/question-answer books; encyclopedias and almanacs
Present: notable titles of information books; add class favorites
Review: guidelines for selecting quality biographies/autobiographies and information books
Model: techniques and strategies for presenting quality biography and information books, using Children of the Dust Bowl

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Goforth, Chapter 6, pp. 168-206
DUE: Children of the Dust Bowl
DUE: Goforth, Chapter 10, pp. 340-378
DUE: Assigned Study Guide
SESSION 5 (Jul. 2)

TOPIC A:  FOLK LITERATURE

Define:  folk literature

Review:  subgenres of folk literature:  poetry format (Mother Goose, ballads, epics); prose format (myths, legends, tall tales, folktales, fairy tales; jests and anecdotes, novelle, animal tales

Apply:  criteria for choosing folk literature selections to books brought in by class members and the instructor

Present:  notable titles of folk literature; add class favorites

Evaluate:  various learner response modes for folk literature; share ideas related to classroom appropriateness, practicality

Review:  guidelines for selecting quality folk literature

Model:  techniques and strategies for presenting folk literature, using The Rough Faced Girl

TOPIC B:  FANTASY

Define:  fantasy literature

Discuss:  distinctive characteristics of fantasy literature (theme, plot, characterization, style, setting)

Classify:  4 subgenres of fantasy literature:  literary fairy tales, low fantasy, high fantasy, science fiction

Present:  notable titles of fantasy books; add favorites

Discuss:  concerns and benefits of using fantasy literature; apply to class members' own teaching experiences

Review:  guidelines for selecting quality fantasy literature

Model:  techniques and strategies for presenting fantasy literature, using Poppy and Dinosaurs Before Dark

Start:  ABBREVIATED LITERARY LINK (for a book used with fieldwork students)

FW SEM:  Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE:  Goforth, Chapter 3, pp. 66-104
DUE:  The Rough-Faced Girl
DUE:  VERBAL OR VISUAL PRESENTATION OF LITERATURE
DUE:  Goforth, Chapter 4, pp. 105-137
DUE:  Poppy
DUE:  Dinosaurs Before Dark (with Research Guide)
DUE:  Dialogue Journal Submission #1
DUE:  Assigned Study Guides
SESSION 6 (Jul. 9)

TOPIC: REALISTIC FICTION

Define: realistic fiction
Discuss: distinctive characteristics of fantasy literature (theme, plot, characterization, style, setting)
Classify: subgenres of realistic fiction: historical and contemporary
Discuss: categories of realistic fiction: historical, literary, thematic
Evaluate: various learner response modes for realistic fiction: share Ideas related to classroom appropriateness, practicality
Present: notable titles of realistic fiction: add favorites
Apply: criteria for selection of quality realistic fiction to books brought in by the class members and the instructor
Review: guidelines for selecting of quality realistic fiction
Model: techniques and strategies for presenting realistic fiction, using Voyage of the Frog

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Goforth, Chapter 5, pp. 138-165
DUE: Voyage of the Frog
DUE: ABBREVIATED LITERARY LINK
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 7 (Jul. 16)

TOPIC A: APPROACHES TO LITERARY STUDY

Discuss: historical development of literary study and literary theories
Consider: approaches to literary studies: pure literature approach, literature-based language arts approach, and literature across the curriculum approach: benefits and instructional components
Analyzing: Reflection Guides for each of the three approaches: evaluation of literature curricula using a checklist assessment
Define: role of the school media specialist, parents and guardians
Examine: appropriate ways for administrative personnel to assess the literature curriculum on a school-wide basis
Discuss: Fox insights about reading aloud to students

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

74
DUE: Goforth, Chapter 11, pages 379-420  
DUE: Fox, pages 1-73  
DUE: EVALUATION OF A QUALITY BOOK (ANY GENRE OF CHOICE); use Goforth text guidelines for specific genres  
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 8 (Jul. 23)

TOPIC A: MULTICULTURAL VOICES: REKNEWED AUTHORS

Discuss: importance of evaluating children’s books for bias: keeping a pluralistic perspective  
Share: stories of authors from various backgrounds and their published works  
Add: favorite multicultural books from class members’ experiences  
Use: Local News as class model for the pluralistic perspective  
Continue: discussing Fox ideas

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Multicultural Voices (Day): Skim the entire book  
DUE: Local News (Soto)  
DUE: Fox, pp. 74-158  
DUE: DIALOGUE JOURNAL (SUBMISSION #2)  
DUE: RdG 517 Candidate Competency Forms (filled out by candidate first)

SESSION 9 (Jul. 30)

TOPIC: MULTICULTURAL LITERATURE

Define: multicultural literature as any literary genres that authentically depict the diversity of society by realistically portraying the unique lifestyles and heritage of all social, cultural, and ethnic groups”; this literature takes into account ethnic, cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, gender, and religious differences  
Discuss: benefits to be gained from exploring multicultural literature  
Model: techniques and strategies for presenting multicultural literature  
Review: guidelines for selecting quality multicultural literature  
Discuss: advantages and disadvantages with organizing literature in culture-specific and thematic arrangements  
Determine: goals for using multicultural literature; start with text statements and add class ideas
Model: techniques and strategies for presenting multicultural literature; includes visual and verbal learner response modes; use Local News as basis for demonstration

Trace: historical development of multicultural literature

Consider: literature reflecting specific ethnic groups and notable authors

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Goforth, Chapter 9, pp. 307-338
DUE: Goforth, Chapter 12, pp. 421-451
DUE: EVALUATION OF A CHILDREN’S BOOK FOR BIAS
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 10 (Aug. 6)

TOPIC A: Young Adult (YA) Literature

Define: "young adult"

Discuss: history and distinctive characteristics of YA literature

Classify: new and old forms of YA literature

Discuss: trends in YA publishing

Share: own YA literary experiences

TOPIC B: POETRY

Define: poetry

Discuss: distinctive characteristics of poetry

Classify: types of poetry: narrative, lyric, humorous, and nonsense

Discuss: poetic elements: content, sounds, rhythm, word choices, rhyme

Discuss: benefits of using poetry; apply to class members’ own teaching experiences

Present: notable poets and titles of poetry books; have class members add favorites

Review: guidelines for selecting poems and poetry books

Model: techniques and strategies for presenting poetry: desirable Verbal and nonverbal qualities; points to consider when orally reading poetry and when directing choral speaking of poetry; use If You’re Not Here, Please Raise Your Hand as a model

DUE: Chapter 7, pp. 207-256
DUE: If You’re Not Here, Please Raise Your Hand
DUE: Resubmit Dialogue Journals and lesson plans
DUE: Literacy Profiles and Diagnostic Report to Schools
READING CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS

Intellectual Commitment (RDG 525)
Seeks pathways for improvement in literacy education based on current research, advanced learning opportunities, and collaboration with colleagues, parents, and students.

Respectfulness (RDG 516)
Communicates expectations, professional/personal opinions, or philosophical perspectives and responds to requests, suggestions, and feedback in a reflective and appropriate manner.

Professionalism (RDG 514)
Demonstrates a strong commitment to literacy education and fulfills the role of a model and expert in an interactive, academic context.

Empathy (RDG 520)
Models patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others, showing an ability to understand the perspectives of others and help them to obtain educational goals.

Socio-Cultural Competence (RDG 518)
Shows acceptance of diversity in varying cultural perspectives and individual learning styles, and recognizes others’ contributions and strengths.

Responsibility (RDG 510)
Is accountable for actions, behaviors, and decisions related to academic roles and expectations and interpersonal relationships.

Commitment to Professional Development (RDG 530)
Exhibits dedication to professional growth in literacy education, seeking out leadership opportunities and maximizing expertise through educational options.

Ethical Behavior (RDG 524)
Maintains high standards for following the guidelines of honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and fairness, both personally and professionally.

Advocacy (RDG 521)
Is a supporter of students, parents, faculty, staff, and the profession. Uses knowledge of research and best practices to inform recommendations.
Academic Honesty Guidelines

The University of La Verne embodies a tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious, scholarly effort and a scrupulous regard for the intellectual and academic contributions of others. Indeed, this tradition stands at the virtual foundation of most American institutions of higher learning. This implies that, more than just imparting knowledge and ideas, the University means to instill a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

ULV's official statement on Academic Honesty is contained in the Rights and Responsibilities section of the current Catalog, and should be read and understood by each student in the University. The purpose of this communication is to provide additional information and guidance on several of the policy areas in order that there be no misunderstanding regarding the University's position on academic honesty.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

In general, academic dishonesty falls into two major categories:

Cheating
- Copying or using crib notes in examinations, homework, lab assignments, or written products.
- Submitting papers done entirely or in part by another person.
- Giving to or getting exam answers from another student.

Plagiarism
- Representation of another person's words or ideas as your own by not properly citing them.

Acts of Academic Dishonesty

Specific acts of academic dishonesty include at least the following:

a. Copying material from someone else's work without footnoting this source.
b. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam.
c. Copying answers from a fellow student's homework instead of doing the work independently.
d. "Padding" a bibliography with citations never read.
e. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
f. Submitting to an instructor a paper that was written all or in part by someone else.
g. Copying from someone's test or exam paper with or without the person knowing it.
h. Working on the same homework with other students when the teacher does not allow it.
i. Writing a paper for another student.
j. Taking an exam for another student.
k. Having another student take an exam for you.
l. Using the same paper to fulfill requirements in two different courses without the instructor's permission.

While the majority of this list constitutes blatant cheating, a few (e.g. a, c, and d) involve the less clear work or plagiarism.
**Plagiarism**

The plagiarist is the academic counterpart of the bank embezzler or the product mislabeler, and involves a student or scholar who leads the reader to believe that what is being read is the original work of the writer, when it is not. Sometimes, students of good will are guilty of plagiarism simply because they are not aware of the illegality of certain kinds of "borrowing" and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The range of possible plagiarism activities is a wide one, with the following major categories identified in decreasing order of severity.

a. Word-for-word copying of another's writing, without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it with a footnote, **both** of which are necessary.

b. The mosaic, a random patchwork of readings and snatches of phrases that are woven into the text resulting in a collage of other people's words and ideas, with the writer's sole contribution being the cement holding the pieces together.

c. The paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else's analysis or conclusions without acknowledgement of that other person's text or writings.

d. The apt term, in which a particular phrase so admirably expresses one's opinion that, either consciously or unconsciously, the term is adopted as one's personal contributions to scholarship.

Most students need only to guard against unintentional plagiarism. If more information is needed on the finer details of the subject, please see the sources listed below, or speak with your instructor.

**Summary**

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated at the University of La Verne. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the ultimate "loser" in cases of cheating or plagiarism is the student himself or herself, for whom the learning opportunity forfeited by such acts can never be regained. It is expected that each student at this University will understand and support the fundamental policy of academic honesty discussed above.
Reading 524 (3 UNITS)
EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND RESEARCH METHODS
University of La Verne
Main Campus, Spring 2009
Mondays, 4:00-8:00 pm, CRN 2847
Sonja M. Lopez

Office Hours: by appointment
Phone: 909.591.3511 ext. 4370
Messages: (909) 593-3511, X4660
Fax: (909) 392-2848
Email: slopez8@ulv.edu

Course Description
This course presents basic principles of assessment as they relate to student educational accomplishment—qualitative & quantitative—and the construction and evaluation of educational tests. It also provides an overview of the process of writing and presenting of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods of research.

Learning Outcomes
Students who take this course will:

• Discuss the applications and limitations of different types of educational testing, and their application in decision-making

• Examine various evaluative perspectives, and related information gathering methods and tools

• Interpret and communicate test results

• Apply the principles of test selection and use

• Discuss, review and evaluate contemporary testing programs and issues

• Discuss, review, interpret, communicate and evaluate testing methods and instruments, including qualitative, quantitative, portfolios, aptitude, record review, observations, interviews, interest surveys and graduation proficiency tests

• Understand/discuss the link between curriculum, testing and evaluation

• Describe the advantages and disadvantages in using assessments to make educational decisions in a diverse pupil population

• Use assessment data to support decision making for the purpose of understanding, evaluating, planning, and promoting positive pupil performance, program outcomes, and school climate development

• Compare/contrast three approaches to research—qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods.
• Apply the process of research from the beginning steps of philosophical assumptions to the writing and presenting of research.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria

Students are expected to:

• Punctuality and regular attendance in class, as well as full participation in each session (4 points are deducted for each missed class hour); assigned readings of texts and handouts read prior to class session (65 points)
• Statistics Exam (65 points)
• Research Design Exam (75 points)
• Buros Test Review (50 points)
• Test Analysis (50 points)
• Research Article Analysis (50 points)
• In Class Presentations (60 points)
• On-Line Quizzes / Study Guides (Miller & Linn Ch. 1 - 5) (50 points)
• Candidate Competency Form (25 points)

Grading Policies

THERE IS A 10% PENALTY FOR ANY ASSIGNMENT THAT IS SUBMITTED PAST THE DUE DATE. Any assignment submitted after the due date and before or during the next class period is counted one week late. Work will not be accepted later than two weeks. Work dropped off to the clinic needs to be signed and dated by the director or other school personnel.

Any one assignment that is not representative of graduate level quality (C+ or below) may be revised and resubmitted for a new grade. However, the highest grade that a revised paper or project may receive is 80% (a B-). Only one assignment may be revised during the semester.

Grades will be determined by percentages: 94-100%=A; 90-93.9%=A-; 87-89.9%=B+; 83-86.9%=B; 80-82.9%=B-; 77-79.9%=C+; 73-76.9%=C.

*Please note: If a student is absent more than 20% of the total number of hours, course credit in the class will be jeopardized, and (s)he will be required to repeat the course at another time. Missed tutorial time with the tutee (fewer than 10 hours) must be made up by the candidate in order to satisfy fieldwork requirements.

Incompletes

Please note that "incomplete" grades will be assigned ONLY in cases of emergency illness or other serious unexpected circumstances. Assignments turned in subsequent to the university term to fulfill "incomplete" requirements will receive late penalties, just as do late assignments submitted during the regular semester.
Required Texts for Use Throughout Program


Required Texts for RDG 524


Recommended Readings


Schedule of Topics, Assignments, and Exams

SESSION 1 (Mar. 23)

TOPIC: INTRODUCTION TO COURSE

Provide: RDG 524 syllabus
Introduce: class members
Share: personal experiences with conducting research
Share: comfort level with calculating math problems
Share: personal experiences with testing
Skim: course activities, goals and objectives, and assignments
Consider: the role of measurement and assessment in teaching
Present: factors that make tests and assessments appealing to educational policy makers
Examine: effects of testing on students
Discuss: fairness of tests to minorities and gender fairness

DUE: Bring course books to class

SESSION 2 (Mar. 30)

TOPIC: INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Discuss: Terminology associated with testing
Examine: the role of measurement and assessment in teaching
Consider: the general principles of assessment
Examine: the process of identifying instructional goals
Discuss: levels of assessment
Consider: how to assess intended learning outcomes and the use of results
Discuss: various types of assessment
Compare: NRT vs. CRT
Contrast: Learning experience and learning outcome
Consider: levels of educational objectives (Bloom’s)
Analyze: how to state a clear objective and outcome

DUE: Linn & Miller, Chapter 1
DUE: Assigned Study Guide

SESSION 3 (Apr. 6)

TOPIC: VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Present: concepts of validity and reliability
Discuss: nature of validity
Consider: the affects of validity in assessment
Analyze: the relevance of construct validity
Examine: factors that influence validity
Discuss: nature of reliability
Presents: possible methods for estimating reliability
Discuss: the importance of interrater consistency
Examine: factors that influence reliability
Contrast: the demand of high reliability with when low reliability is tolerable
Consider: the need for both validity and reliability in assessment

DUE: Linn & Miller, Chapter 2
DUE: Assignment #1
DUE: Assigned Study Guide

SESSION 4 (April 13)

TOPIC: CLASSROOM TESTS AND ASSESSMENTS

Present: the basic steps in classroom testing and assessment
Present: the basic types of classroom tests and assessments
Examine: the various specifications when creating an assessment
Consider: the checklist on pg. 145 in Linn & Miller
Analyze: types and items and tasks and how to determine when each is most appropriate
Compare: advantages of objective tests and performance assessments
Jigsaw: types of simple forms of objective test items
Present: types of multiple choice items
Examine: the limitations of multiple-choice tests

DUE: Linn & Miller, Chapters 3 & 4
DUE: Assigned Study Guide

SESSION 5 (Apr. 20)

TOPIC: MEASURING COMPLEX ACHIEVEMENT

Define: the Interpretive Exercise
Discuss: the advantages and disadvantages of the Interpretive Exercise
Examine: forms and uses of essay questions
Discuss: the advantages and disadvantages of essay questions
Share: sample essay questions from your classroom
Share: writing rubrics used in your classroom
Jigsaw: types of Performance-Based Assessments
Examine: the advantages and limitations of performance assessments
Consider: the principles of effective rating
Share: personal experiences with the use of portfolios
Examine: the effectiveness of portfolio use as an assessment
SESSION 6 (Apr. 27)

TOPIC: INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH METHODS

Contrast: experimental vs. non-experimental studies
Define: operational definitions of variables
Consider: the role of theory in research
Define: quantitative vs. qualitative research
Introduce: reasons for reviewing literature
Discuss: how to organize a literature review

DUE: Patten, Research Methods, 3-42
DUE: Linn & Miller, Chapters 7 & 8
DUE: Assigned Study Guide

SESSION 7 (May 4)

TOPIC: SAMPLING AND INSTRUMENTATION

Introduce: methods of sampling
Consider: importance of sample size
Review: validity and reliability
Identify: measures of optimum and typical performance
Discuss: possible questions about exam
Review: past objectives and topics

DUE: ASSIGNMENT #3
DUE: Patten, Research Methods, 43-86
DUE: Assigned Study Guide

SESSION 8 (May 11)

TOPIC: EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Identify: threats to internal and external validity
Summarize: true experimental designs
Discuss: concepts of pre-experimental and quasi-experimental design
Recognize: instances of confounding in experiments
Introduce: the null hypothesis
Contrast: descriptive and inferential statistics
Review: shapes of distributions, mean, median, and mode
Interpret: information from standard deviations
Introduce: the t-test
Define: practical significance of results

DUE: Patten, Research Methods, 87-132
DUE: Assigned Study Guide

SESSION 9 (May 18)

TOPIC: QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Discuss: sampling procedures in qualitative research
Consider: types of measurement and limitations
Analyze: quality control issues in qualitative research
Outline: steps for preparing a research report
Identify: report structure, introduction, and literature review
Model: process for describing participants, instrumentation, and reporting of results
Skim: Appendix A: electronic databases for locating literature

DUE: Patten, Research Methods, 149-178
DUE: EXAM #2
DUE: Assigned Study Guide

SESSION 10 (May 25)

TOPIC: TASKSTREAM

Complete: posting assignments on Taskstream
Describe: advantages and disadvantages of electronic data systems
Report: on Taskstream experience
Recommend: changes in rubric
Present: Taskstream data
READING CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS

Intellectual Commitment (RDG 525)
Seeks pathways for improvement in literacy education based on current research, advanced learning opportunities, and collaboration with colleagues, parents, and students.

Respectfulness (RDG 516)
Communicates expectations, professional/personal opinions, or philosophical perspectives and responds to requests, suggestions, and feedback in a reflective and appropriate manner.

Professionalism (RDG 514)
Demonstrates a strong commitment to literacy education and fulfills the role of a model and expert in an interactive, academic context.

Empathy (RDG 520)
Models patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others, showing an ability to understand the perspectives of others and help them to obtain educational goals.

Socio-Cultural Competence (RDG 518)
Shows acceptance of diversity in varying cultural perspectives and individual learning styles, and recognizes others’ contributions and strengths.

Responsibility (RDG 510)
Is accountable for actions, behaviors, and decisions related to academic roles and expectations and interpersonal relationships.

Commitment to Professional Development (RDG 530)
Exhibits dedication to professional growth in literacy education, seeking out leadership opportunities and maximizing expertise through educational options.

Ethical Behavior (RDG 524)
Maintains high standards for following the guidelines of honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and fairness, both personally and professionally.

Advocacy (RDG 521)
Is a supporter of students, parents, faculty, staff, and the profession. Uses knowledge of research and best practices to inform recommendations.
Academic Honesty Guidelines

The University of La Verne embodies a tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious, scholarly effort and a scrupulous regard for the intellectual and academic contributions of others. Indeed, this tradition stands at the virtual foundation of most American institutions of higher learning. This implies that, more than just imparting knowledge and ideas, the University means to instill a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

ULV's official statement on Academic Honesty is contained in the Rights and Responsibilities section of the current Catalog, and should be read and understood by each student in the University. The purpose of this communication is to provide additional information and guidance on several of the policy areas in order that there be no misunderstanding regarding the University's position on academic honesty.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

In general, academic dishonesty falls into two major categories:

Cheating

- Copying or using crib notes in examinations, homework, lab assignments, or written products.
- Submitting papers done entirely or in part by another person.
- Giving to or getting exam answers from another student.

Plagiarism

- Representation of another person's words or ideas as your own by not properly citing them.

Cheating

Specific acts of cheating include at least the following:

a. Copying material from someone else's work without footnoting this source.
b. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam.
c. Copying answers from a fellow student's homework instead of doing the work independently.
d. "Padding" a bibliography with citations never read.
e. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
f. Submitting to an instructor a paper that was written all or in part by someone else.
g. Copying from someone's test or exam paper with or without the person knowing it.
h. Working on the same homework with other students when the teacher does not allow it.
i. Writing a paper for another student.
j. Taking an exam for another student.
k. Having another student take an exam for you.
l. Using the same paper to fulfill requirements in two different courses without the instructor's permission.
**Plagiarism**

While the majority of this list constitutes blatant cheating, a few (e.g. a, c, and d) involve the less clear work of plagiarism.

The plagiarist is the academic counterpart of the bank embezzler or the product mislabeler, and involves a student or scholar who leads the reader to believe that what is being read is the original work of the writer, when it is not. Sometimes, students of good will are guilty of plagiarism simply because they are not aware of the illegality of certain kinds of “borrowing” and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The range of possible plagiarism activities is a wide one, with the following major categories identified in decreasing order of severity.

a. Word-for-word copying of another’s writing, without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it with a footnote, both of which are necessary.

b. The mosaic, a random patchwork of readings and snatches of phrases that are woven into the text resulting in a collage of other people’s words and ideas, with the writer's sole contribution being the cement holding the pieces together.

c. The paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else's analysis or conclusions without acknowledgement of that other person's text or writings.

d. The apt term, in which a particular phrase so admirably expresses one's opinion that, either consciously or unconsciously, the term is adopted as one's personal contributions to scholarship.

Most students need only to guard against unintentional plagiarism. If more information is needed on the finer details of the subject, please see the sources listed below, or speak with your instructor.

**Summary**

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated at the University of La Verne. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the ultimate "loser" in cases of cheating or plagiarism is the student himself or herself, for whom the learning opportunity forfeited by such acts can never be regained. It is expected that each student at this University will understand and support the fundamental policy of academic honesty discussed above.
READING 525 (4 UNITS)
READING RESEARCH, THEORY, AND PROCESS
University of La Verne
Main Campus, Summer 2008
Tuesdays, 4:00-8:30
Dr. Janice Pilgreen

Office Hours: MTW 1:00-4:00
Office Phone: (909) 593-3511 X4624
Office Fax: (909) 392-2848
E-mail: pilgreen@ulv.edu

Course Description
This course provides an in-depth advanced study of the teaching of reading as a thinking and problem-solving process. Based on current research from highly-respected and valid sources, the course content focuses on current reading policy and theoretical underpinnings of reading as a constructive act. Strategies for supporting students whose literacy levels span a wide developmental continuum are discussed, and special considerations involved in providing optimal literacy programs for EO students are highlighted.

The fieldwork portion of the course (10 fieldwork hours) gives participants the opportunity to work with one struggling reader in grades K-3. During this time, they develop skills in the planning, delivery, and evaluation of appropriate instructional activities related to comprehension, vocabulary, writing, and motivation, based on informal and formal literacy assessments.

Learning Outcomes
Students who take this course will:

• Implement appropriate instructional strategies for helping English-only and ESL students to become proficient readers;

• Perceive and discuss reading as a thinking and problem-solving process;

• Reflect on the influence of maturation, schemata, and environment upon reading;

• View content area reading as materials with specific, identifiable structures that contain specialized and technical vocabulary;

• Describe current reading policy and make recommendations for change

• Clarify ways in which speaking, listening, reading, and writing are interconnected;

• Participate in in-depth clinical experiences that relate to the candidate’s professional goals and which offer opportunities for integration of theory and practice and provide ways for the candidate to demonstrate and reinforce knowledge and skills that are embedded in the Program Design and Curriculum Standards;
• Analyze and apply current research in reading and language arts and demonstrate the effective use of research as a basis for the analysis of program strengths, weaknesses, and overall success;

• Acquire an in-depth knowledge and understanding of specialized areas of study that influence and affect teaching and learning in the field of reading;

• Demonstrate research-based knowledge and in-depth understanding of how students from a variety of sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds learn to read.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria (500 points)

• Punctuality and regular attendance in class, as well as full participation in each session (4 points are deducted for each missed class hour); assigned readings of texts and handouts read prior to class session (65 points)

*Ten Tutorial Sessions (1 hour and 15 minutes each)

In order to insure a high degree of professionalism, it is critical that all candidate arrive on time for the tutorial sessions.

Chronic tardiness may result in an “incomplete” for the semester and a reassignment of the tutee to another tutor for the balance of the term.

• 6 Tutorial Lesson Plans with student work samples (120 points)

• Policy Implementation Paper (100 points)

• Policy Simulation Power point Presentation (50 points)

• Study Guides (55 points)

• Seminar Discussion Leader (60 points)

• Literacy Profile, including Parent Conference (25 points)

• Satisfactory Completion of RDG 525 Candidate Competency Form related to state standards and course objectives (25 points)

Grading Policies

THERE IS A 10% PENALTY PER WEEK FOR ANY ASSIGNMENT THAT IS SUBMITTED PAST THE DUE DATE. Any assignment submitted after the due date or during the next class period is counted as one week late. Work will not be accepted later than two weeks. Work dropped off to the clinic needs to be signed and dated by the director or other school personnel.
Any one assignment that is not representative of graduate level quality (C+ or below) may be revised and resubmitted for a new grade. However, the highest grade that a revised paper or project may receive is 80% (a B-). Only one assignment may be revised during the semester.

Grades will be determined by percentages: 94-100%=A; 90-93.9%=A-; 87-89.9%=B+; 83-86.9%=B; 80-82.9=B; 77-79.9%=C+; 73-76.9%=C.

Please note: if a student is absent more than 20% of the total number of course hours, course credit in the class will be jeopardized, and (s)he may be required to repeat the course at another time. Any missed tutorial time with the tutee (fewer than 10 hours) must be made up by the candidate in order to satisfy fieldwork requirements.

Incompletes

Please note that “incomplete” grades will be assigned ONLY in cases of emergency illness or other serious unexpected circumstances. Assignments turned in subsequent to the university term to fulfill “Incomplete” requirements will receive late penalties, just as do late assignments submitted during the regular semester.

Required Texts for Use Throughout Program:


Required Texts for RDG 525


Articles downloaded from ProQuest (see syllabus dates)

Recommended Readings


**Schedule of Topics, Assignments, and Exams**

**SESSION 1 (JUNE 3)**

**TOPIC:** TEACHING PHONICS

Provide: ED 525 course description

Introduce: class members

Survey: course goals, objectives, assignments, and projects

Present: Notebook Tabs

Discuss: Article on National Reading Panel Report

Compare: reading inventories

Start: discussion of APA (mini lesson)

Identify: a research question/problem

Discuss: Response Journal Assignment for Nieto reading (see handout)

Present: policy implementation assignment

Present: library research skills (presentation by ULV library staff)
Introduce: TPRI Inventory
Discuss: interest inventories
Present: lesson plan design

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps


SESSION 2 (JUNE 10)

TOPIC: READING LITERACY EDUCATION

Discuss: introduction of a literature review
Define: a research problem/purpose statement
Share: course readings
Explain: APA mini lesson
Practice: citations using APA handbook
Review: APA format in variety of readings
Discuss: Literacy programs used at school sites
Contrast: Literacy programs by grade level
Share: Results of interest inventories

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Download from ProQuest:
DUE: Research Design, Chapter 5, pages 87-104
DUE: Research Design, Chapter 4, pgs 73-86
DUE: Assigned Study Guides

SESSION 3 (JUNE 17)

TOPIC: READING POLICIES

Define: multicultural education
Discuss: seven primary characteristics of multicultural education
Define: transforming action
Discuss: Nieto terms, chapter 1
Share: experiences with diversity in your own classroom
Review: 21st Century text, chapter 1
Outline: history of reading timeline on chart paper
Identify: purpose statement of literature review
Discuss: the purpose statement
Model: APA mini lesson
Share: a reading strategy that you used with your tutee

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Ruddell, M. (2002). Reading In California (obtain from instructor)
DUE: 5 references for Policy Implementation Paper
DUE: Nieto, Chapter 1, pages 27-50
DUE: Research Design, Chapter 2, pages 27-48
DUE: Assigned Study Guide

SESSION 4 (JUNE 24)

TOPIC: CURRENT NCLB PERSPECTIVES

Discuss: how students' cultural and linguistic diversity can be used as an asset in the service of their learning
Define: “culture”
Consider: the effects to educational change being thought of as a “technical process of managerial efficiency”
Define: sociopolitical context
Examine: the three implications of cultural differences for education reform
Discuss: Nieto terms, Chapter 2
Define: problem of the policy paper
Examine: strategies for inquiry
Continue: timeline
Practice: writing references in APA format
Review: reference lists in various texts
Model: APA mini lesson
Share: instructional goals for fieldwork student
Analyze: Candidate Competency form
FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps


DUE: Nieto Chapter 2, pages 51-77
DUE: Research Design, Chapter 1, pages 3-26
DUE: Outline for Policy Implementation Paper
DUE: Assigned Study Guide

SESSION 5 (JULY 1)

TOPIC: PUBLIC LAW 107-110-READING FIRST

Share: how teachers and schools can approach linguistic diversity in order to teach language minority students to high levels of achievement

Consider: the five principles needed to reconceptualize how we view language diversity

Discuss: Nieto terms, Chapter 3

Share: Journal reflections from Nieto

Discuss: how to write a research question

Model: examples of written proposals

Examine: methods of research

Share: sample of annotated bibliography card (see handout)

Share: writing tips

Practice: eliminating insignificant words in lit review

Share: concerns with APA format

Consider: voice, tense, and “fat”

Model: APA mini lesson

Discuss: how fieldwork experiences may be related to research

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Legislative Readings will be distributed by professor in Session 4
DUE: Nieto, Chapter 3, pages 79-100
DUE: Research Design, Chapter 3, pages 49-70
DUE: Policy Implementation Paper Rough Draft #1
DUE: Assigned Study Guide
SESSION 6 (JULY 8)

TOPIC: READING RESEARCH

Consider: Nieto's question “What does it mean to become an American?”
Discuss: Nieto terms, Chapter 4
Share: progress on Lit Review
Review: qualitative/quantitative methods
Answer: role of the researcher
Discuss: data collection and data analysis
Examine: survey design
Define: population and samples
Dissect: sample abstract (how to write the lit review)
Conference: with instructor on rough draft
Model: APA mini lesson
Discuss: tutorial lesson plan progression
Share: strategies that you are using with your tutee to construct meaning

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Nieto, Chapter 4, pgs. 101-117
DUE: Research Design, Chapters 9-10, pages 153-207
DUE: Policy Implementation Paper Working Rough Draft #2
DUE: Assigned Study Guide

SESSION 7 (JULY 15)

TOPIC: POLICY TRANSFORMATION

Define: transformation
Discuss: why we should listen to students
Consider: the three policies and practices outlined in Nieto and the students’ views about them
Define: multicultural education as being “arrogance reduction”
Discuss: Nieto terms, Chapter 5
Share: Journal reflections from Nieto
Share: Policy Implementation Paper Draft #3 (peer editing)
FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Download article from ProQuest:
DUE: Nieto, Chapter 5, pages 119-161

SESSION 8 (JULY 22)

TOPIC: CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE

Discuss: the five guidelines teachers can use to approach writing with their language minority students
Consider: what can teachers learn from the Maya Indian government-sponsored training course
Define: what it means for students to explore their words and worlds
Discuss: Nieto terms, Chapter 6

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Download article from ProQuest:
DUE: Nieto, Chapter 6, pages 163-177
DUE: Rough Draft of Policy paper for Peer Edit/Revision
DUE: RDG 525 CANDIDATE COMPETENCY FORMS (filled out by candidate first with rationales)
DUE: Nieto, Chapter 10, pages 255-276

SESSION 9 JULY 29

TOPIC: CONTENT SYNTHESIS

Present: Policy simulations

DUE: Portfolio (work completed by tutee)
DUE: Diagnostic Report
DUE: Literacy Profile
DUE: POLICY SIMULATION PRESENTATIONS (POWERPOINT)
READING CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS

Intellectual Commitment (RDG 525)
Seeks pathways for improvement in literacy education based on current research, advanced learning opportunities, and collaboration with colleagues, parents, and students.

Respectfulness (RDG 516)
Communicates expectations, professional/personal opinions, or philosophical perspectives and responds to requests, suggestions, and feedback in a reflective and appropriate manner.

Professionalism (RDG 514)
Demonstrates a strong commitment to literacy education and fulfills the role of a model and expert in an interactive, academic context.

Empathy (RDG 520)
Models patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others, showing an ability to understand the perspectives of others and help them to obtain educational goals.

Socio-Cultural Competence (RDG 518)
Shows acceptance of diversity in varying cultural perspectives and individual learning styles, and recognizes others’ contributions and strengths.

Responsibility (RDG 510)
Is accountable for actions, behaviors, and decisions related to academic roles and expectations and interpersonal relationships.

Commitment to Professional Development (RDG 530)
Exhibits dedication to professional growth in literacy education, seeking out leadership opportunities and maximizing expertise through educational options.

Ethical Behavior (RDG 524)
Maintains high standards for following the guidelines of honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and fairness, both personally and professionally.

Advocacy (RDG 521)
Is a supporter of students, parents, faculty, staff, and the profession. Uses knowledge of research and best practices to inform recommendations.
Academic Honesty Guidelines

The University of La Verne embodies a tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious, scholarly effort and a scrupulous regard for the intellectual and academic contributions of others. Indeed, this tradition stands at the virtual foundation of most American institutions of higher learning. This implies that, more than just imparting knowledge and ideas, the University means to instill a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

ULV's official statement on Academic Honesty is contained in the Rights and Responsibilities section of the current Catalog, and should be read and understood by each student in the University. The purpose of this communication is to provide additional information and guidance on several of the policy areas in order that there be no misunderstanding regarding the University's position on academic honesty.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

In general, academic dishonesty falls into two major categories:

Cheating
• Copying or using crib notes in examinations, homework, lab assignments, or written products.
• Submitting papers done entirely or in part by another person.
• Giving to or getting exam answers from another student.

Plagiarism
• Representation of another person's words or ideas as your own by not properly citing them.

Acts of Academic Dishonesty

Specific acts of academic dishonesty include at least the following:

a. Copying material from someone else's work without footnoting this source.
b. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam.
c. Copying answers from a fellow student's homework instead of doing the work independently.
d. "Padding" a bibliography with citations never read.
e. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
f. Submitting to an instructor a paper that was written all or in part by someone else.
g. Copying from someone's test or exam paper with or without the person knowing it.
h. Working on the same homework with other students when the teacher does not allow it.
i. Writing a paper for another student.
j. Taking an exam for another student.
k. Having another student take an exam for you.
l. Using the same paper to fulfill requirements in two different courses without the instructor's permission.

While the majority of this list constitutes blatant cheating, a few (e.g. a, c, and d) involve the less clear work or plagiarism.
**Plagiarism**

The plagiarist is the academic counterpart of the bank embezzler or the product mislparer, and involves a student or scholar who leads the reader to believe that what is being read is the original work of the writer, when it is not. Sometimes, students of good will are guilty of plagiarism simply because they are not aware of the illegality of certain kinds of “borrowing” and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The range of possible plagiarism activities is a wide one, with the following major categories identified in decreasing order of severity.

a. Word-for-word copying of another's writing, without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it with a footnote, both of which are necessary.

b. The mosaic, a random patchwork of readings and snatches of phrases that are woven into the text resulting in a collage of other people's words and ideas, with the writer's sole contribution being the cement holding the pieces together.

c. The paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else's analysis or conclusions without acknowledgement of that other person's text or writings.

d. The apt term, in which a particular phrase so admirably expresses one's opinion that, either consciously or unconsciously, the term is adopted as one's personal contributions to scholarship.

Most students need only to guard against unintentional plagiarism. If more information is needed on the finer details of the subject, please see the sources listed below, or speak with your instructor.

**Summary**

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated at the University of La Verne. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the ultimate “loser” in cases of cheating or plagiarism is the student himself or herself, for whom the learning opportunity forfeited by such acts can never be regained. It is expected that each student at this University will understand and support the fundamental policy of academic honesty discussed above.
READING 530 (3 UNITS)
Reading Specialist Leadership
University of La Verne
Main Campus, Fall, 2008
Saturdays, 8:30-3:30 PM, CRN 2510
Julie Prestsater

Office Hours: Monday, Wednesday (2-3:30) & by appointment
Office Phone: (909) 593-3511, X4660 for appointments
E-Mail: julie_prestsater@hotmail.com
Fax: (909) 392-2848

Course Description
This course, 3 units (45 class hours) provides reading specialist candidates with opportunities to learn how to develop effective leadership skills; act as agents of change in their schools and districts; and work constructively with students, peers, parents, and other educationally-oriented personnel and community members. The course focuses on making programmatic, curriculum, instructional, and intervention decisions and on strengthening candidate profiles as teacher-leaders.

A primary goal is for candidates to learn ways to ensure effective implementation of all parts of school or district program design. Participants are encouraged to join professional associations; asked to develop curriculum vitae to expand career options; and required to attend conferences in order to remain informed and current with methodologically-sound research and its application to classroom practice.

Course Goals and Objectives
Students who take this course will be able to:

• Implement and evaluate language arts programs;

• Act as agents of change in order to modify curriculum based on program evaluation results;

• Work constructively with students, peers, parents, administrators, and other district/county office personnel and community members;

• Plan, present, and evaluate inservice programs and other staff development activities for teachers;

• Model effective teaching strategies for teachers and colleagues;

• Participate in professional activities and organizations relating to ongoing professional development;

• Use appropriate resources, including computer and video technologies;

• Describe methodologically sound research and its application to classroom practice;
• Address/interpret emerging findings in the literature related to literacy education;

• Develop knowledge and skills and local program evaluation methods that enable the candidate to generate reliable information about local program strengths, weaknesses, and effectiveness;

• Apply research-based knowledge and skills to discussions and program evaluations;

• Practice consultation and interpersonal communication skills;

• Provide effective leadership in making program, curriculum, instructional, and intervention designs;

• Evaluate instructional programs and published materials for decision-making purposes;

• Provide successful staff development to ensure the effective implementation of program, curriculum, instructional, and intervention designs.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria:

• Punctuality/regular attendance in class and full participation in each session, with assigned readings of texts/handouts done prior to each meeting; 2 points are deducted for each missed hour of class time (65 points)

• Topic analysis and development for RS Competency Exam (35 points)

• Three proposals for presentations to students, parents, and colleagues (15 points each: 45 points)

• One inservice presentation to students and self/audience evaluations (25 points)

• One inservice presentation to parents and self/audience evaluations (25 points)

• One inservice presentation to colleagues and self/audience evaluations (25 points)

• Description/presentation of 1 approved language arts program: partial, basic, comprehensive, or intervention (40 points)

• Development of a professional Curriculum Vitae, or CV (50 points)

• Assigned Reflections/Study Guides for required readings (50 points)

• Completion of five (5) Conference Evaluations, initially begun in RDG 510 (50 points)

• Conference Proposal for paper presentation, workshop, or poster session (65 points)

• RDG 530 Candidate Competency Form (25 points)
**Grading Policies**

THERE IS A 10% PENALTY FOR ANY ASSIGNMENT THAT IS SUBMITTED PAST THE DUE DATE. Any assignment submitted after the due date and within one week of the due date is counted as one week late. An assignment that is more than two weeks late cannot be accepted.

Any one assignment that is not representative of graduate level quality (C+ or below) may be revised and resubmitted for a new grade. However, the highest grade that a revised paper or project may receive is 85% (a B). **Only one assignment** may be revised during the semester.

Grades will be determined by percentages: 94-100%=A; 90-93.9%=A-; 87-89.9%=B+; 83-86.9%=B; 80-82.9%=B-; 77-79.9%=C+; 73-76.9%=C.

If a candidate is absent more than 20% of the total number of course hours (9 hours out of 45), credit in the class will be jeopardized, and (s)he may be required to repeat the course.

**Incompletes**

Please note that “incompletes” will be assigned ONLY in cases of emergency illness or other serious, unexpected circumstances. Assignments turned in subsequent to the university term to fulfill “incomplete” requirements will receive late penalties, just as do late assignments submitted during the regular semester.

**Required Texts for Use Throughout Program**


**Required Texts for Class**


Recommended Readings


Schedule of Topics, Assignments, and Exams

SESSION 1 (September 13)

TOPIC: INTRODUCTION TO COURSE

Provide: ED 530 course description
Introduce: class members
Survey: course activities, goals and objectives, and assignments
Define: the idea of a “leader” in a classroom, school, and community context
Think about: how leaders can share power in positive ways
Read/discuss: IRA Position Statement: Teaching All Children to Read: The Roles of the Reading Specialist (2000), Appendix A of the Bean text
Monitor: conference attendance throughout the program; 5 workshop or conference evaluations are due at the end of this class (begun at the outset of the program)
Survey: state-adopted reading program list (from CDE website)
Choose: one state-adopted reading program to review and present (See Annotated List of AB 2519 Language Arts Adopted Programs.)
Present: Membership form(s) for International Reading Association (IRA), for California Reading Association (CRA) and other literacy organizations
Skim: the Reading 530 Candidate Competency Form (and procedure for self-evaluation and instructor feedback); modify with candidate input
Discuss: format/guidelines for Reading Specialist Competency Exam
Present: topics (1-8) for Reading Specialist Competency Exam
Choose: individual topics to research for Reading Specialist Competency Exam
Survey: Dispositions

DUE: Bring Bean, Pellicer, and Pilgreen texts to class
DUE: CONFERENCE PROPOSAL—CATESOL Regional

SESSION 2 (September 27)

TOPIC A: INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES OF THE READING SPECIALIST

Begin: presentations on state-adopted reading programs
Emphasize: need for leaders to be responsible, perceptive, and caring
Continue: comprehensive analysis of state ELA Framework
Discuss: role of specialists in compensatory programs and in exemplary schools
Discuss: approaches to collaboration
Focus on: in-class versus pull-out models of reading instruction
Start: creation of CV from original resume format
Begin: comprehensive analysis of state ELA Framework
DUE: Pellicer, pp. 1-127 with Reflections
DUE: Reflections from Pellicer text through page 127
   (Highlight important ideas in chapters. Write directly on these pages as part of the reflection process.)
DUE: Bean, Chapters 1 and 2, Pages 1-37
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
DUE: Bring to class: Reading and Language Arts Framework

TOPIC B: THE READING SPECIALIST AS LEADER

Suggest: steps for transforming schools/role of the leaders
Define: "professional educators"
Consider: how to develop a new reading program
Reflect on: the culture of the school and classrooms
Analyze: scenarios in Bean, Chapter 3 (Yvonne, Greg, Brenda)
Discuss: process for program evaluation
Define: leadership—and identify characteristics/qualifications of leaders
Discuss: format/guidelines for Reading Competency Examination
Present: RS topic information—2 topics

DUE: Bean, Chapters 3 and 4, Pages 38-78
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
DUE: ONE conference evaluation

SESSION 3 (October 11)

TOPIC A: COACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Continue: presentations on state-adopted programs
Share: additional information to be included in a vitae
Highlight: importance of professional development (by specialists) for teachers
Identify: guidelines for supporting effective professional development programs
List: characteristics of successful literacy coaches (coaches as experts)
Analyze: Table 6.2 (Bean, pages 106-111) and suggest methods for providing feedback
Read: RDG 530 Candidate Competency Form (and procedure for self-evaluation and instructor feedback); clarification/elaboration provided, as needed
Present: ideas for state conference proposals to colleagues; receive feedback
Continue: creation of current CV
Share: ideas for Presentation Proposals 1-3 to students, parents, & colleagues

DUE: Pellicer, pp. 129-186 with Reflections
DUE: Bean, Chapters 5 and 6, Pages 79-118
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
TOPIC B: DEVELOPING/ASSESSING A SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

Outline: how to develop a school reading program
Identify: potential obstacles
Include: curricular components, materials selection, and technology
Emphasize: importance of knowledge about state/federal guidelines/initiatives
List: principles and limitations of program assessment
Present: RS topic information—2 topics

DUE: Bean, Chapters 7 and 8, Pages 119-148
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
DUE: ONE conference evaluation

SESSION 4 (October 25)

TOPIC A: SCHOOL, COMMUNITY, AND FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS

Continue: presentations on state-adopted reading programs
Share: ideas for personal stories for presentations; developing a personal style
Continue: presentations on state-adopted reading programs
Continue: sharing of information on selected topics for RS Competency Exam
Discuss: importance of involvement with community agencies
Consider: effective ways of increasing parent and family participation
Present: RS topic information—1 topic

DUE: Bean, Chapter 9, Pages 149-166
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
DUE: EVALUATION FOR ONE PRESENTATION #1 TO STUDENTS, PARENTS, OR COLLEAGUES

TOPIC B: GRANT PROPOSALS AND LEGISLATION GUIDELINES

Brainstorm: funding sources for schools
Determine: ways of writing successful proposals for grants
Highlight: reading specialists as lifelong learners
Emphasize: need to stay current with school-related legislation
Share: Presentation Proposals #2 and #3
Present: RS topic information—2 topics

DUE: Bean, Chapters 10 and 11, Pages 167-187
DUE: Assigned Study Guides
DUE: ONE conference evaluation
SESSION 5 (November 1)

TOPIC A: RESULTS OF STUDIES ON NEW LEADERS

Continue: sharing of information on selected topics for RS Competency Exam
Share: Presentation Evaluation #1 results for students, parents, or colleagues
Review of: Candidate Competency Forms by instructor; action plans are determined, if needed
Present: RS topic information—1 topic

DUE: EVALUATION FOR PRESENTATION #2 TO STUDENTS, PARENTS, OR COLLEAGUES

TOPIC B: THE SPECIALIST WHO MAKES A DIFFERENCE

Complete: presentations on state-adopted reading programs
Define: concept of being a "model" for other teachers/administrators
Consider: ways to experiment with new ideas and take risks
Cite: methods for nurturing competence, trust, and collaboration
Present: RS topic information—1 topic

DUE: Pilgreen, Chapters 1-3, pp. 1-30
DUE: TWO conference evaluations

SESSION 6 (November 15)

TOPIC: BENEFITS OF INDEPENDENT READING AND READING ALOUD

Discuss: implementation issues related to SSR in targeted classrooms versus whole-school
Review: research on Sustained Silent Reading programs
Analyze: 8 components for effective free reading programs
Discuss: types of free reading programs at different grade levels
Finish: sharing of information on selected topics for RS Competency Exam
Emphasize: benefits of involvement in professional organizations
View: Jim Trelease's video for teachers and parents: The Read-Aloud Handbook
Review: benefits of reading aloud to students at K-12 levels
Examine: challenges of developing entire staff buy-in and providing an appropriate and conducive environment and access to books
Consider: additional sources for book titles, series titles, reading incentives, magazines, and newspapers
Share: finalized professional vitaea developed by classmates

DUE: Pilgreen, Chapter 5, pp. 42-70; skim Chapter 6, pp. 71-102
DUE: 5 CONFERENCE EVALUATIONS
DUE: FINAL VERSION OF CANDIDATE COMPETENCY FORMS
DUE: COURSE/INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS
READING SPECIALIST COMPETENCY EXAMINATION (Essay format, approximately three hours): will be given on last class session or another date determined by Judy Morris, RCA Director of Reading, or Jan Pilgreen, Program Chair of Reading.

READING SPECIALIST COMPETENCY EXAMINATION
(Essay format, approximately four hours)
Proctored by:
Judy Morris, RCA Director of Reading,
or
Jan Pilgreen, Program Chair of Reading
Bring laptops/thumb drives to print
8:30 AM-1 PM—Saturday, December 13
READING CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS

Intellectual Commitment (RDG 525)
Seeks pathways for improvement in literacy education based on current research, advanced learning opportunities, and collaboration with colleagues, parents, and students.

Respectfulness (RDG 516)
Communicates expectations, professional/personal opinions, or philosophical perspectives and responds to requests, suggestions, and feedback in a reflective and appropriate manner.

Professionalism (RDG 514)
Demonstrates a strong commitment to literacy education and fulfills the role of a model and expert in an interactive, academic context.

Empathy (RDG 520)
Models patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others, showing an ability to understand the perspectives of others and help them to obtain educational goals.

Socio-Cultural Competence (RDG 518)
Shows acceptance of diversity in varying cultural perspectives and individual learning styles, and recognizes others’ contributions and strengths.

Responsibility (RDG 510)
Is accountable for actions, behaviors, and decisions related to academic roles and expectations and interpersonal relationships.

Commitment to Professional Development (RDG 530)
Exhibits dedication to professional growth in literacy education, seeking out leadership opportunities and maximizing expertise through educational options.

Ethical Behavior (RDG 524)
Maintains high standards for following the guidelines of honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and fairness, both personally and professionally.

Advocacy (RDG 521)
Is a supporter of students, parents, faculty, staff, and the profession. Uses knowledge of research and best practices to inform recommendations.
Academic Honesty Guidelines

The University of La Verne embodies a tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious, scholarly effort and a scrupulous regard for the intellectual and academic contributions of others. Indeed, this tradition stands at the virtual foundation of most American institutions of higher learning. This implies that, more than just imparting knowledge and ideas, the University means to instill a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

ULV’s official statement on Academic Honesty is contained in the Rights and Responsibilities section of the current Catalog, and should be read and understood by each student in the University. The purpose of this communication is to provide additional information and guidance on several of the policy areas in order that there be no misunderstanding regarding the University’s position on academic honesty.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

In general, academic dishonesty falls into two major categories:

Cheating
- Copying or using crib notes in examinations, homework, lab assignments, or written products.
- Submitting papers done entirely or in part by another person.
- Giving to or getting exam answers from another student.

Plagiarism
- Representation of another person's words or ideas as your own by not properly citing them.

Acts of Academic Dishonesty

Specific acts of academic dishonesty include at least the following:

a. Copying material from someone else's work without footnoting this source.
b. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam.
c. Copying answers from a fellow student's homework instead of doing the work independently.
d. "Padding" a bibliography with citations never read.
e. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
f. Submitting to an instructor a paper that was written all or in part by someone else.
g. Copying from someone's test or exam paper with or without the person knowing it.
h. Working on the same homework with other students when the teacher does not allow it.
i. Writing a paper for another student.
j. Taking an exam for another student.
k. Having another student take an exam for you.
l. Using the same paper to fulfill requirements in two different courses without the instructor’s permission.

While the majority of this list constitutes blatant cheating, a few (e.g. a, c, and d) involve the less clear work or plagiarism.
Plagiarism

The plagiarist is the academic counterpart of the bank embezzler or the product mislabeled, and involves a student or scholar who leads the reader to believe that what is being read is the original work of the writer, when it is not. Sometimes, students of good will are guilty of plagiarism simply because they are not aware of the illegality of certain kinds of “borrowing” and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The range of possible plagiarism activities is a wide one, with the following major categories identified in decreasing order of severity.

a. Word-for-word copying of another’s writing, without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it with a footnote, both of which are necessary.

b. The mosaic, a random patchwork of readings and snatches of phrases that are woven into the text resulting in a collage of other people’s words and ideas, with the writer’s sole contribution being the cement holding the pieces together.

c. The paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else’s analysis or conclusions without acknowledgement of that other person’s text or writings.

d. The apt term, in which a particular phrase so admirably expresses one’s opinion that, either consciously or unconsciously, the term is adopted as one’s personal contributions to scholarship.

Most students need only to guard against unintentional plagiarism. If more information is needed on the finer details of the subject, please see the sources listed below, or speak with your instructor.

Summary

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated at the University of La Verne. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the ultimate “loser” in cases of cheating or plagiarism is the student himself or herself, for whom the learning opportunity forfeited by such acts can never be regained. It is expected that each student at this University will understand and support the fundamental policy of academic honesty discussed above.
Instructor Vitae
SONJA M. LOPEZ
707 W Promontory Drive Newport Beach CA 92660 USA sonjalopez@hotmail.com 310.980.3120

ACADEMIC PREPARATION

2009 Doctorate in Education University of Southern California
Concentration: Teacher Education in Multicultural Societies
Focus Areas: International Education & Language and Literacy Education
Dissertation Title: International Education for All: Implementation and Interpretation of the International Baccalaureate Organization’s Primary Years Program within a California Urban Elementary School
1995 Masters of Arts in Education Claremont Graduate University
1993 Bachelor of Arts in Sociology University of California at Santa Barbara

CREDENTIALS & CERTIFICATES

2008 Teacher Performance Assessment Lead Trainer State of California
2006 Teacher Performance Assessor Certificate - Task 1, 2, 3 & 4 State of California
2006 Reading Specialist Certificate State of California
2003 ESL in the Mainstream Certificate South Australia Department of Education and Training
2001 Primary Years Program Certificate International Baccalaureate Organization
1997 Microcomputers for Educators Certificate University of California at Riverside
1995 CLAD Multi-Subject Teaching Credential State of California

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Assistant Professor & Assessment Coordinator 2007 – 2009 Through University of La Verne:
- Coordinated all College of Education and Organizational Leadership assessment policies and procedures.
- Lead all assessment preparations for joint National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing accreditation visit.
- Developed a unit-wide assessment system, for department’s 12 graduate programs, through Taskstream.
- Liaison between national, state, institutional, university, and department units in regards assessment and accreditation.

Research Project Lead 2006 - 2007 Through Claremont Graduate University’s Indian Hill Institute:
- Lead team of four researchers on a one-year project on a mixed-methods study of an urban school district’s high performing schools
- Created protocol specific to project’s research design.
- Coordinated the collection and analysis of qualitative research including observations, interviews, and focus groups of administrators, teachers, parents and students.
- Served as liaison between research institute director, research team, and school administration through continuous planning of meetings, creating of agenda and timelines, and email correspondence.
- Collaborated with Institute Director on the report write up and proposal to the Spencer Foundation

**Teaching Performance Assessment Assessor & Trainer** 2006 - 2007  
*On behalf of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and through Loyola Marymount University’s School of Education:*
- Graded Teacher Performance Assessments Tasks through Taskstream and LiveText on-line data assessment systems.

**Faculty Advisor** 2006 - 2007  
*Through Claremont Graduate University’s Teacher Education Program:*
- Faculty lead and trainer on California Commission on Teacher Education's Performance Assessments
- Observed teacher interns throughout their first year as a full time classroom teacher, providing feedback, assistance, and curricular support.
- Conducted methodology lecture, language acquisition training sessions, and advisory meetings.
- Provided directions and support for Masters ethnographic narrative, California Commission on Teacher Education’s Teacher Performance Assessments, and multiple authentic assessments.

**Student Teacher Coordinator** 2004 - 2006  
*Through University of Southern California’s Rossier School of Education’s Teacher Education Department:*
- Placed and supervised student teachers during their semester long fieldwork placement in local elementary classrooms.
- Served as a liaison between the university faculty, classroom teacher, and student teachers.
- Observed each student teacher teaching a complete lesson, a minimum of one time per week, and provided written feedback in response to this observation.
- Held a weekly one-hour, research to practice seminar with group of student teachers at each elementary school site.
- Maintained and coordinated with classroom teacher and student teacher the documentation of the California Teacher Performance Expectations and reviewed these documents with student teachers at midterm and semester’s end.
- Participated in monthly Coordinator Meetings, orientations, and classroom teacher workshops.
Graduate Teaching Assistant  
2004 - 2006
Through University of Southern California’s Rossier School of Education’s Teacher Education Department:

- Conducted the fieldwork component of course in literacy methodology.
- Served as liaison between the course’s professors, school principal, classroom teachers, and pre-student teachers.
- Developed relationships with local elementary schools and identified literacy-rich classrooms for student placement.
- Planned and conducted weekly seminars that reinforced literacy strategies presented in methods course.
- Supervised up to twenty pre-student teachers, including the observation and feedback of two literacy lessons per student.
- Organized required paperwork including verification of California Teacher Performance Expectations, E-folio, and Blackboard online course requirements.

Literacy Program Graduate Coordinator  
2005 - 2006
Through University of Southern California’s Joint Educational Project:

- Acted as a liaison between the university; the Literacy One program and ReadersPlus program; and the five elementary schools in which the programs operate.
- Arranged and presented parent information sessions for Literacy One.
- Recruited, hired, and trained credentialed teachers and undergraduate teaching assistants.
- Managed documentation, reports, and proposals as required.
- Developed and conducted literacy, math, and interdisciplinary workshops for program’s 60 undergraduate tutors including an Around the World literature and internet project based unit.
- Engaged in site visits to each of the five schools to ensure program quality;
- Helped to develop, collect, and create materials which would improve student efforts to tutor/teach community youngsters.

Volunteer Language Program Teacher  
2004 - 2006
Through University of Southern California’s Office of International Students’ Spouse English Language Program:

- Taught weekly English Language Development course to up to fifteen international students.
- Created interactive, project orientated curriculum that developed language while sharing American culture and customs.
- Participated in Language Program’s special events including excursions to local historical and cultural sites.
PROFESSIONAL HONORS, AWARDS & ACTIVITIES

- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing – Board of Institutional Reviewer
- U.L.V. University-Wide Assessment Committee – Capstone Project Assessment Reviewer
- Southern California Consortium on International Education – U.L.V. Faculty Representative
- Marquis Who’s Who in America, in American Women & in the World
- Carnegie Foundation Stanford & Nashville Conferences – U.S.C. Graduate Student Representative
- U.S.C. MAT Program’s Teacher Credential Concentration Think Tank – U.S.C. Alumni/Graduate Student Representative
- U.S.C. Ed.D Program’s Teacher Education Concentration Restructuring – U.S.C. Graduate Student Researcher & Representative
- U.S.C. New Faculty Search Committee – Graduate Student Representative
- Comparative & International Education Society New Scholars Committee Co-Chair
- Comparative & International Education Society New Scholar
- Holmes Scholar Alumni Board of Directors Representative
- Holmes Scholar Board of Directors Western Region Representative
- Holmes Scholar Leadership Institute Fellow – National Fellow
- Holmes Scholar Fellow – U.S.C. Chapter
- Phi Delta Kappa – U.S.C. Chapter
- U.S.C. Graduate and Professional Student Senate Senator
- U.S.C. Educational Graduate Organization Board Member
- U.S.C. International Scholars Committee Board Member
- U.S.C. European Student Association Board Member
- U.S.C. Turkish Student Association Board Member

GUEST LECTURER

- University of Southern California’s Ed.D Program – Pedagogy & Research in Teacher Education
- University of Southern California’s Ed.D Program – Curriculum & Cultural Pluralism
- University of La Verne’s Liberal Arts Program – Intercultural Learning Course
- University of La Verne’s Mosaic Cultural Institute – Latino Student Retreat
- University of La Verne’s International & Study Abroad Program – Teaching Abroad Workshop

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

- American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education
  - Imagine the Possibilities: International Education in US Elementary Schools 2009
- Alliance of International Education
  - Examining Turkish Education’s Role in Possible European Union Entry 2008
  - On Seni Sonra: Panel on How Enka Okullari Contributed to Turkish Educational Systemic Change
- The Holmes Partnership
  - New Visions for Educational Policy Development: Facilitating Partnerships Among Education Stakeholders 2008
  - Pathway to the Doctorate: Hispanic Holmes Scholars’ Perspectives
American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education 2008
- Deans’ Panel on Diversity in Leadership within Teacher Education
- The Quality of Teach for America Teachers and their Impact on Culturally Diverse, Urban, and Special Education Students
- New Visions for Educational Policy Development: Facilitating Partnerships Among Education Stakeholders
- Pathway to the Doctorate: Hispanic Holmes Scholars’ Perspectives

Comparative and International Education Society 2008
- The Changing Face of Turkish Primary Education
- New Scholars’ Workshop Discussant and Facilitator

American Association of Educational Research 2008
- A Discussion with Lee Shulman on Collaborative Change Through Reflexivity in Practice: The Role of Doctoral Students in Transforming the Education Doctorate
- Dean’s Panel on Diversity in Leadership in Teacher Education
- The Preparation of Teacher Educators: Meeting the Challenge of Teacher Preparation for Diverse Populations

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning’s Project on the Educational Doctorate 2007
- Enhancing the Educational Doctorate: University of Southern California’s Restructuring of its Doctoral Programs

The Holmes Partnership 2007
- Perspectives of Holmes Scholars on the Summer Scholars Leadership Institute: The World is Flat and Education’s Future Role and Responsibilities
- Creating Capital: the Importance of Pipeline Programs in California

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education 2007
- Teaching & Learning: Perspectives on Professional International Collaborations

Comparative and International Education Society 2007
- International Education within a Public Urban Elementary School Context: Fact Not Fiction
- New Scholar Workshop

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE IN K-12

Literacy Instructor (Grades 9-12) 2003 - 2007
Riverside City College Riverside, California
Within Upward Bound’s high school to college preparation program:
- Created semester long literacy unit based on Dembo’s (2000) text ‘Motivation and Learning Strategies for College Success: A Self-Management Approach.’
- Incorporated information on transferable high school coursework, the importance of test taking, defining college majors and connecting them to future employment, examining and comparing college catalogues, and the next step graduate school.
- Designed an internet based at-home study guide.

International Teacher (Grade 1) 2001 - 2003
International School of Frankfurt Frankfurt, Germany
Within international community representing over 100 nations:
- Engaged in deeper understanding of the teaching/learning process through research on pedagogy of International Baccalaureate Organization’s Primary Years Program.
- Developed six trans-disciplinary units of study based on real-life, globally transferable, guiding questions that encourage student inquiry and international connections.
- Facilitated student involvement in portfolio development, goal setting, and reflection.
- Created supplementary materials, assessments, and rubrics using Microsoft Word, PowerPoint, Photo Editor, Photo Shop, and Excel.
- Aligned multiple measurements of assessment including criterion-referenced benchmarks based on student development throughout units and throughout grade levels.

**International Teacher (Grade 1)** 1999 - 2001  
American Overseas School of Rome  
Rome, Italy  
Within multinational, multilingual traditional school:  
- Implemented a dynamic and challenging curriculum that included a study of Rome and Italy.
- Researched and visited Reggio Emilia schools and incorporated methodologies into classroom practice.

**Teacher Trainer (Grades P-3)** 1997 - 1999  
Enka Okullari  
Istanbul, Turkey  
Within pioneering Turkish bilingual educational experiment during its first two years:  
- Initiated and implemented a vibrant English Language Program with focus on language development through art, song, dance, and storytelling.
- Cooperatively planned yearly curriculum including project based, thematic units, weekly, and daily lessons with team of three Turkish teachers.
- Prepared and presented teacher workshops based on American teaching methodologies such as Math Their Way, Great Experiences in Math & Science, and Wright Group Balanced Literacy.

**Teacher (Multi-grade 1-3)** 1994 - 1997  
La Granada Elementary School  
Riverside, California  
Within a multi-ethnic, economically disadvantaged school:  
- Served as grade level chairperson and member of school leadership team.
- Developed and implemented lessons and techniques to best suit multi-grade classroom and Limited English Proficient student population.
- Participated in over one hundred hours of professional development conferences.
- Facilitated a community of self-directed learners using a variety of grouping and classroom centers.
- Instructed classes using team teaching concept, curriculum specialists, classroom aides, and parent volunteers.

**Student Teacher (Multi-grade K-3)** 1994  
Euclid Elementary School  
Ontario, California  
Within a multi-grade classroom:  
- Applied theories learned from coursework and implemented them in classroom.
Gathered strategies from Master Teacher on differentiation and organization of a multi-grade classroom.
-created curricula based on trip to Australia and curricular framework provided through self-initiated meeting with representative of the Australian Department of Education.

Peer Coordinator (Grade 7-12)  1991 - 1993
California Student Opportunity & Access Program  Santa Barbara, California
Through California Student Opportunity & Access Program:
- Provided support and motivation to students from backgrounds underrepresented in colleges and universities.
- Organized and conducted Career Information Days, “What’s college?” information sessions, and after school tutorials.
- Advised students on college entrance requirements, transferable courses, high school schedules, financial aid, and outreach programs.
- Trained, scheduled, and supervised five student staff members.
- Coordinated events with Project Director, college administrators, and junior high school administrators.

Teacher’s Assistant (Grade K)  1989 - 1993
Santa Barbara Open Alternative School  Santa Barbara, California
Within parent-teacher cooperative community:
- Instructed small groups of students in hands-on reading and mathematics activities.
- Gained understanding of the role of the teacher and informally prepared to become one.

Swim Instructor & Lifeguard  1985 - 1995
YMCA, Recreation Departments, Summer Camps  Throughout United States
Within the extremes of disadvantages and advantaged contexts:
- Taught all levels of Red Cross swimming courses including lifeguarding and CPR.
- Honed ability to teach all ages and abilities.
- Realized the power of the teaching/learning process.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES ATTENDED
- International Baccalaureate Organization  Primary Years Program Conference
- Center for Education in an International Context  Interpreting International Education Conference
- European Council of International Schools  Cross Cultural Think Tank
- European Council of International Schools  Annual Conference
- Mediterranean Association of International Schools  Annual Conference
- Rome International Schools Association  Annual Conference
- Istanbul International Schools Association  Annual Conference
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION & TRAVEL EXPERIENCE

Extensive overland travel research and planning with focus on comparative education throughout: Eastern & Western Europe, Middle East, North Africa, Asia, Australia & Central America

ADDITIONAL TRAINING IN K-12

Participated in workshops in the following teaching techniques: Spencer Kagan’s Cooperative Learning, Larry Ainsworth Unpacking the Standards, Marzano’s Classroom Instruction That Works, Wright Group Whole Language, McCracken Language Arts, Project Read Phonics, Mathland, Math Their Way, Math a Way of Thinking, Marcy Cook Math, David Kirby Math, Project AIMS, Berkley Hall of Science’s Great Explorations in Math & Science, Multiple Intelligences, Positive Discipline Techniques, Classroom Centers, Multi-Age Classrooms, Alternative Assessments, & Portfolios

PUBLICATIONS & JOURNAL REVIEWS

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Policy Brief 2008
SAGE Publications
Learning to Teach the World: Preparing Globally Competent Teachers
- Contributed to publication
EDUCATION

Masters of Education (M.Ed.) Reading  
University of La Verne  
2005

Bachelors Degree (BA) in Liberal Studies (Cum Laude)  
University of La Verne  
1995

Associates Degree (AA) in General Education  
Mount San Antonio Community College  
1993

CREDENTIAL/CERTIFICATES

Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential  
University of La Verne  
2004

Reading Certificate  
University of La Verne  
2004

Professional Clear Multiple Subject - Teaching Credential  
University of LaVerne  
1997

CLAD Certificate  
University of San Diego  
2004

G.L.A.D. (Guided Language Acquisition Design) Certified  
Trainer of Trainers  
2008

EMPLOYMENT

University of LaVerne, La Verne, CA  
Adjunct Instructor - RDG 521  
2004 - present
Upland Unified School District, Upland, CA 1996 - present

Cabrillo Elementary School
First Grade Teacher (9/96 - 6/00)
Summer School Teacher 1/2 Combination (6/98 - 7/98)
Summer School Teacher 3rd Grade (6/99-7/99)
Fifth Grade Teacher (9/00 - 6/01)
Reading Specialist (9/01 - 6/06)

District Office
Staff Developer - Professional Development Center (9/06 - to present)

LEADERSHIP

Beginning Teacher Support Assessment (B.T.S.A.) 2001 - to present
English Language Advisory Committee (E.L.A.C.) Cabrillo Elementary, 2001-2006
District Literacy Leader Liaison, 2001 - 2006
Document Writer, Title 1 High Achieving School Application, Cabrillo Elementary, 2004
Leadership Committee, Cabrillo Elementary, 2001 - 2006
Literacy Committee Facilitator, Cabrillo Elementary, 2001 - 2006
Grant Writer - Staff Development Houghton Mifflin Language Arts Adoption, March, 2009

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


*Writing Motivation: The Key To Writing Success,* Keynote Speaker, Cabrillo/Peppertree Elementary Writing Conference, Upland Unified School District, January, 2005.


STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND INSERVICES


Literacy Link - Comprehension Strategies: Context Clues and Short Answer Responses, Cabrillo Elementary, Grades 2-6, January, 2006.

Pause, Prompt, and Praise - Parent/Student Reading Strategy, Parent Education Night, Cabrillo Elementary, August, 2005.

Kindergarten Reading and Writing Link, Upland Unified School District School Board Meeting, April, 2004.


AFFILIATIONS
California Elementary Education Association, 2004 - to present
California Reading Association, 2003 - to present
International Reading Association, 2001 - to present
California Teachers Association, 1996 - to present
National Education Association, 1996 - to present
Upland Teachers Association, 1996 - to present
Marga Madhuri, Ph.D.

1151 Raymond Avenue #302   Home: 818.956.8306
Glendale, CA  91201     Office: 909.593.3511 X4673

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Claremont Graduate University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td><em>Claremont, California</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy in Education, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>California State University, Los Angeles</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Los Angeles, California</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Arts Degree in Education, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option in Reading; Received honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>University of Michigan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ann Arbor, Michigan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts Degree, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major: English Literature; Minor: Chemistry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Credentials | California Reading Language Arts Specialist |
|            | California Language Development Specialist |
|            | California Single Subject Teaching |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Experience</th>
<th>Associate Professor 7/02-Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>University of La Verne, La Verne, California</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Education and Organizational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses Taught: Education 462 &amp; 464, beginning literacy; Education 466, literacy for single subject candidates; Education 480, Children’s Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead instructor for EDUC 466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjunct Professor 2/99 – 5/02</th>
<th><em>California State University, Los Angeles</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charter School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Taught: Educ 427, Using Children’s Literature in the Elementary Classroom; Educ 549, Teaching Literacy in Multicultural Classrooms; Educ 528, Issues and Trends in Children’s Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Teacher, Secondary Language Arts 9/89 - 6/02</th>
<th><em>Glendale Unified School District</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rosemont Middle School, La Crescenta, CA</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for teaching 7th &amp; 8th grade Language Arts, English as a Second Language, and Drama.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised student teachers.</td>
<td><em>Selected Accomplishments:</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher of the Year, 1993
Conceptualized/developed/implemented Interdisciplinary Team Program
Initiated/organized/chaired annual school Renaissance Faire
Member of Blue Ribbon Committee co-writing application; School earned National Blue Ribbon Award

Scholarship

Dissertation:

Peer–Reviewed Publications:


Peer-Reviewed Presentations:

Madhuri, M. (2008, December). “I changed the font and got a better score”: Middle school teachers and students reflect on automated writing evaluation software. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL.


Madhuri, M. (2003, October). Creating analytical awareness through the use of traditional literature. Presentation for the California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Pomona, CA.

Professional Presentations


**Professional Memberships**
- International Reading Association
- National Council for the Teaching of English
- National Reading Conference
- American Educational Research Association

**Awards**
- Hsiao Min Wang Award
- Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, CA
- Distinguished Teacher in Residence
- California State University, Los Angeles

**Interests**
- Health/fitness, reading and the outdoors
EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA (USC)
Ph.D., Education (Specialization in Curriculum/Teaching), Language, Learning, & Literacy, 1994

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING, CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Language Development Specialist (LDS) Certificate, 1993

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE
Administrative Credential Program, 1982-1983

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES (UCLA)
•Master of Education (Reading), 1977
•Ryan Reading Specialist Credential, 1977
•Ryan Single Subject English Credential, 1974 (Mabel Wilson Richards Fellow)
•Bachelor of Arts, English, 1973 (Magna Cum Laude, Phi Beta Kappa)

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Full Professor, Education Department, College of Education and Organizational Leadership, University of La Verne, 2004-present

Associate Professor, Education Department, College of Education and Organizational Leadership, University of La Verne, 2001-2004 (tenured 2003)

Assistant Professor, Education Department, University of La Verne, 1997-2001

English Teacher, English as a Second Language (ESL) Teacher, Reading Specialist Glendale High School, Glendale Unified School District, 1984-1997

English Teacher, Clark Junior High School, Glendale Unified School District, 1980-1984

Teacher Specialist, Title 1 Program, Roosevelt Junior High School, Glendale Unified School District, 1978-1980

Teacher of English and Reading, Roosevelt Junior High School, Glendale Unified School District, 1975-1978
**Adjunct Roles**

**Adjunct Instructor**, Graduate Program theory/methods courses for the Reading M.Ed. and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, University of La Verne, 1995-1996

**Adjunct Instructor**, Teaching of Reading for K-8 (Multiple Subject) and 6-12 (Single Subject) Teachers, Teacher Education Program, University of La Verne, 1994-1996

**Adjunct Instructor**, Elementary Reading Methods, California State University (CSLA), Los Angeles, 1995

**Adjunct Instructor**, Teaching of Reading/Writing, University of Southern California (USC), 1991-1992

**Teaching Assistant**, Teaching of Reading/Writing, University of Southern California (USC), 1991

**Adult Education Instructor**, English and English as a Second Language (ESL), Glendale Community College District, 1979-1982

**SERVICE**

**Service to the University**

**Reading Program Chair**, Department of Education, College of Education and Organizational Leadership, Graduate Reading Program, 2000-present

**Literacy Center Director**, Graduate Reading Program, 2001-present

**Assessment Committee Member**, College of Education and Organizational Leadership, CCTC/NCATE accreditation processes, 2008

**Presenter**, Faculty Research and Professional Activity Day, *Comprehension and Motivational Gains for ULV Literacy Center Children*, 2007

**Assessment Committee Co-Chair**, College of Education and Organizational Leadership, CCTC/NCATE accreditation processes, 2005-2007

**Presenter**, Faculty Book Day, *Supporting English learners: Developing academic language in the content area classroom*, 2007

**Faculty Research Committee Member**, University of La Verne, 2006-present

**Presenter**, Faculty Research and Professional Activity Day: *Supporting English Learners: Explicit Teaching of the Language of School*, 2006

**Presenter**, Faculty Research Lecture Series, *Program Evaluation Research Study for the ULV Literacy Center—A Matched Pairs Design*, 2005

**Presenter**, Faculty Research and Professional Activity Day, *Developing CALP: Boosting Reading Comprehension for English Learners*, 2005

**Steering Committee Member**, Department of Education, College of Education and Organizational Leadership, 2003-2005
Presenter, Faculty Research and Professional Activity Day, Program Evaluation Model: Preliminary Reading Achievement and Motivation Trends for ULV Literacy Center Children, 2004

Graduate Academic Policy Committee Member, 2002-2004

Graduate Appeals Committee Member, 1999-2002

Convocation Speaker, How to Recognize ‘Boo Radley’ Moments (An Expanded Definition of Literacy), 2001

“Excellence in Writing” Committee Member, 2000-2001

University Council Member, 2000-2001

Assessment Committee Member (Arts and Sciences/Education), 1999-2001

Presenter, Academic Orientation Day, workshop for incoming freshmen at ULV, How to Match Reading Strategies to Different Purposes for Reading, 2000

Presenter, Academic Orientation Day, workshop for incoming freshmen at ULV, Content Area Reading Strategies for College Success, 1999

ULV Program Writer, Reading Certificate/Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs, approved for the University of La Verne by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), 2000

Reading Program Director, Department of Education, Graduate Reading Program, University of La Verne, 1997-2000

ULV Program Writer, Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA), approved for the University of La Verne by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), 1998

Service to the Community

Developer/Instructor, Study Skills Class, offered to community upper-grade students, ULV Literacy Center, Summer Terms, 2007-08

Speaker, Kiwanis Club of Claremont, presentation on ULV Literacy Center and Community Support Services, Claremont, CA, 2006

Director, Fall Festival of Reading (community families), ULV Literacy Center, La Verne, CA, 2006

Speaker, American Association of University Women (AAUW), presentation on ULV Literacy Center and Community Support Services, La Verne, CA, 2004

Speaker, Rotary Club of La Verne, presentation on ULV Literacy Center and Community Support, La Verne, CA, 2004

Director of Partnership with Healthy Start, ULV Literacy Center and Claremont Unified School District, tutoring for Healthy Start children, Claremont, CA, 2004

Keynote Speaker, No Teacher Left Behind: Reaching Toward the Future, BTSA/Induction Colloquium, Walnut Valley Consortium, Covina, CA, 2003

Director of Claremont High School/University of La Verne Collaboration, Content Area Literacy Training for High School Students (Comprehension/Test-taking), Claremont High School, Claremont, CA, 2002
Participant, Read Across America, Mountain View Elementary School, Claremont Unified School District, Claremont, CA, 2002

Participant, Read-in, Emerson Elementary School, Garvey School District, 2001

Service to Other Institutions

Fieldwork Supervising Teacher, Teacher Education Program, Credential Candidates, University of Southern California, 1992-1993

Master Teacher, Teacher Education Programs, Credential Candidates from Point Loma/Occidental/USC, Glendale Unified School District, 1976-1992

Co-Developer/Scoring Trainer, Reading and Writing Proficiency Examinations, Glendale Unified School District, 1976-1992

Chair, English Department, Glendale High School, Glendale Unified School District, 1986-1988


Chair, Reading Curriculum Study Committee (CSC), Glendale Unified School District, 1984-1986

Author and Coordinator, Title I and School Improvement Programs (SIP), Roosevelt Junior High School, Glendale Unified School District, 1978-1980

Coordinator, Title IV-B Reading Project, Roosevelt Junior High School, Glendale Unified School District, 1978-1980

Chair, English/Reading Department, Roosevelt Junior High School, Glendale Unified School District, 1976-1978

Additional Contributions to the Field


Reviewer, Divisions H and K conference proposals for 2009 Annual Meeting (San Diego, CA), American Educational Research Association (AERA), 2008

Reviewer, Silvaroli Classroom Reading Inventory, McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 2000 and 2004

Executive Board, Reading Specialists of California, Southern Zone Representative, 2002-2003


Reviewer, Burns and Roe Informal Reading Inventory, Houghton-Mifflin Publishing Company, 2001
PUBLICATIONS


CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

International Reading Association (IRA) Annual Convention, Phoenix, AZ, 2009, *Comprehension Support for Secondary English Learners Through Explicit, Scaffolded Instruction and Academic Language Development (Institute 11)*

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) Annual Convention, San Antonio, TX, 2008, *Using Explicit, Scaffolded Reading Comprehension Instruction to Develop Academic Language Proficiency for Upper-Grade English Language Learners*

International Reading Association (IRA) Annual Convention, Atlanta, GA, 2008, *Literacy Gains for Struggling Readers in Grades 4-10 Through Explicit Comprehension Strategies and Motivational Techniques*

California Association for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) Conference, San Diego, CA, 2007, *Teaching Explicit Text Structures for Developing Reading and Writing*

International Reading Association (IRA) Annual Convention, Chicago, IL, 2006, *Developing Academic Language with English Learners*

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Conference, Tampa, FL, 2006, *Developing Academic Language to Boost Reading Comprehension*

North Carolina State University ESL Symposium, Raleigh, North Carolina, 2006, *Teaching the Secret Language of School to Help English Learners Strengthen Reading Comprehension*


California Association for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) Conference, Los Angeles, CA, 2005, *Strategies to Boost Reading Comprehension for Secondary English Learners*

California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) Conference, Regional Level, Long Beach, CA, 2005, *Strategies to Boost Reading Comprehension for Upper Grade English Learners*

Washington Organization of Reading Development (WORD) Conference, Everett, WA, 2005, *Developing CALP: Boosting Reading Comprehension for English learners*


California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) Conference) Pasadena, CA, 2003, *Content Area Literacy: Missing Links for Intermediate ELL Students*

California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) Conference, Regional Level, Pomona, CA, 2003, *The Power of Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) for Secondary English Learners: Guidelines for Implementation*


International Reading Association (IRA) Annual Convention, San Francisco, CA, 2002, *Developing Effective SSR Programs to Boost Comprehension and Motivation for English Language Learners*

Secondary Social Studies Literacy Conference, Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA, 2002, *FACTS for Social Studies Teachers: How to Teach Content Area Literacy Strategies*

California Association of Teachers of English (CATE) Conference, Sacramento, CA, 2000, *Sustained Silent Reading in the Middle/Upper Grades: Eight Factors for Success*

California Reading Association (CRA) Conference, San Jose, CA, 2000, *Integrating Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum*

Sixth Annual Teacher Leadership Conference, La Verne, CA, 2000, *How to Organize and Manage a Sustained Silent Reading Program*

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Conference, Seattle, WA, 1998, *Strategies for Connecting Reading and Writing (ACE)*

Chancellor's Conference on Composition and Literature, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, 1997, *Sustained Silent Reading in the Secondary Classroom*

Third Annual Teacher Leadership Conference, University of La Verne, La Verne, CA, 1997, *Inviting Students to Join the Literacy Club*

12th Annual Achieving Schools Conference, Long Beach, CA, 1996, *A Showcase Practice Title I Developmental Reading Program*

California Reading Association (CRA) Convention, Anaheim, CA, 1995, *Utilizing Title I Funds Effectively: Implementing a Three-Way Developmental Reading Program Based on Current Literacy Research and Practices*

International Reading Association (IRA) Annual Convention, Anaheim, CA, 1995, *Attaining Outstanding Results with Free Voluntary Reading for Secondary ELD Students*

California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) Conference, San Diego, CA, 1994, *Achieving Simply Smashing Results with Sustained Silent Reading*

California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE) Conference, San Jose, CA, 1994, *Language and Literacy Research: Studies of Free Voluntary Reading*


California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) Conference, Monterey, CA, 1993, *Reading/Writing Revision Strategies: Tools for ESL Students*

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Conference, Atlanta, GA, 1993, *Revision Strategies for ESL Students*

California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) Conference, Long Beach, CA, 1992, *Reading/Writing Revision Strategies: A Toolbox for ESL Students*

International Reading Association (IRA) Annual Convention, Orlando, FL, 1992, *Helping Students Come to Know: Thematic Teaching Across Different Modes of Communication*

California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) Conference, Regional Level, San Fernando, CA, 1991, *Refocusing: Really Writing Right*
LITERACY WORKSHOPS

California Elementary Education Association (CEEA) & Staff Development Resources (SDR)

*Revving up the Test-taking Skills of English Learners and Struggling Readers:* Cleveland, Ohio; Cincinnati, Ohio; Dallas, Texas; and Houston, Texas, 2008

*Reading Skills and Test-taking Strategies for English Learners and Struggling Readers:* Sacramento, CA; San Francisco, CA; Anaheim, CA; and Pomona, CA, 2007-08


- Glendale Unified SD
- Los Angeles Unified SD
- La Canada Unified SD
- Lawndale Elementary SD
- Covina-Valley Unified SD
- Temple City Unified SD
- Glendora Unified SD
- West Covina Unified SD
- Azusa Unified SD
- Burbank Unified SD
- Walnut Valley Unified SD
- Fullerton Joint Union High SD
- Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified SD
- Orange Unified SD
- Ramona City Unified SD
- San Diego Unified SD
- Coachella Valley Unified SD
- Perris Union High SD
- Central School District
- Rialto School District
- Colton Joint Unified SD
- Chino Valley Unified SD
- Upland Unified SD
- San Bernardino City Unified SD
- Chaffey Unified SD
- Inyo County Office of ED
- San Bernardino County Office of ED
- Los Angeles County Office of ED

**International Studies Projects**

- Textbook Literacy Institute, Grades 5-12, Inland Empire Consortium for International Studies, 2004-present
- Center for Active Learning in International Studies, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 2000-05
- Claremont International Studies Education Project, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California, 2002
- Inland Empire Consortium for International Studies Project, Rancho Cucamonga, California, 2001-03

**Out-of-State Presentations**

- Community Education Partners NW, Alternative School, Orange County Public Schools, Orlando, Florida, 2004
- Green River High School, Sweetwater County Wyoming School District 2, Green River, Wyoming, 2004
- Richards High School, Community HS District, Oaklawn, Illinois, 2000-04
PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

International Reading Association (IRA), 1985-present
CA Professors of Reading/Language Arts, IRA Special Interest, 2002-present
Specialized Reading Professionals, IRA Special Interest, 2002-present
History of Reading, Special Interest Council of IRA, 2002-present
International Dyslexia Association, 2001-present
Organization of Teacher Educators in Reading (OTER), 2000-present
California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), 1993-2004
Phi Delta Kappa, University of Southern California Chapter, 1992-present
California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL), 1991-present
Los Angeles Reading Association, 1990-present
California Reading Association (CRA), 1990-present
American Educational Research Association (AERA), 1989-2005
Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), 1989-present

TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS

Capability with Blackboard, Microsoft Word, PowerPoint, and Excel programs

Ability to use Task Stream data analysis/assessment system

Experience using Smart Carts, document cameras, soundproof observation booths with CD applications

Experience with Computer-based assessments (e.g., Scholastic Reading Inventory) and instructional programs (e.g., Tumbleweed, Comic Life, Inspiration) for struggling learners

HONORS AND AWARDS

Distinguished Professor Award, College of Education and Organizational Leadership, University of La Verne, 2007

Excellence in Teaching Award (Graduate Faculty), University of La Verne, 2001

California State Teachers of the Year District Nominee and L.A. County Finalist, Glendale Unified School District, 1997

Golden Apple Award: Outstanding Teacher of ESL Students, Glendale Kiwanis Club, Glendale, CA, 1994

Teacher of the Year, Glendale High School, Glendale Unified SD, 1994

CATESOL Rick Sullivan Award, 1993

Employee Recognition Award, Glendale Unified SD, 1989

Teacher of the Year, Glendale High School, Glendale Unified SD, 1988

Teacher of the Year, Clark Junior High School, Glendale Unified SD, 1984

REFERENCES

References are available upon request
Julie Ann Prestsater  
(909) 865-7223  
660 Alta Drive  
Pomona, CA 91767  
 julie_prestsater@hotmail.com

DEGREES

UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE, La Verne, CA  
Master of Education in Reading, 2008  
Course Work Included:  
- Literacy Assessment & Diagnosis  
- Literature & Literacy  
- Literacy Instruction & Methodology  
- Individualization of Literacy Instruction  
- Reading Research, Theory, and Process  
- Reading Specialist Leadership  
- Advanced Methods and Materials

Bachelor of Science in Organizational Management, 2003

CREDENTIALS/CERTIFICATES

UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE, La Verne, CA  
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential (K-12), 2008  
Reading Certificate, 2008  
Preliminary Single Subject Credential, Geosciences, 2005

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

CHAFFEY HIGH SCHOOL, Chaffey Joint Union High School District, Ontario, CA  
Reading, 2007- present  
Renaissance Advisor/Teacher, 2004-2007

UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE, La Verne, California  
Education 466 Introduction to the Teaching of Reading for Single Subject Candidates, Spring 2008  
Reading 530 Reading Specialist Leadership, Shadower, Fall 2008  
Reading 598 Graduate Seminar, Winter 2009  
Reading 514 Literacy Assessment and Diagnosis, Winter 2009  
Reading 516 Individualization of Literacy Instruction, Spring 2009

CHAFFEY COLLEGE, Rancho Cucamonga, CA
Reading 550 Reading Improvement, 2007-2008
Reading 450 Advanced Reading, 2007-2008

LEADERSHIP/CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Writing Across the Curriculum, 2008 to present, English department liaison
University of La Verne Reading Advisory Committee, 2007, Member
READ 180 National Summer Institute, 2007, Participant
The Best of the Best in Young Adult Literature, 2006, Participant
4th Annual West Coast Effective Schools Conference, 2006, Participant
Dr. Maria Montano-Harmon Workshop, 2004, Participant
Writing Across the Curriculum, 2004, Participant

CONFERENCE/WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS

“Book Talks: Motivating Students to Take Advantage of SSR,” for high school students, Ontario, CA, 2007
“Using an Advance Organizer to Teach Expository Text Structures and Vocabulary in the Content-Area Classroom,” for high school science teachers, Ontario, CA, 2007

AFFILIATIONS

International Reading Association (IRA)
California Reading Association (CRA)
California Association of Teachers of English as a Second Language (CATESOL)
National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)

HONORS AND AWARDS

Rose Hills Grant Scholarship Recipient, University of La Verne, 2005
Amber Sheree Rodriguez  
142 West Ninth Street  
Claremont, CA 91711  
(909) 625-1805  
arodriguez@ulv.edu

Education

Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Anticipated Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Education</td>
<td>Claremont Graduate University</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education, Reading</td>
<td>University of La Verne</td>
<td>May 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts, Education</td>
<td>Claremont Graduate University</td>
<td>May 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>University of La Verne</td>
<td>May 1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credentials and Certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credential</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential</td>
<td>University of La Verne</td>
<td>May 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Professional Multiple Subject Teaching Credential</td>
<td>Claremont Graduate University</td>
<td>August 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosscultural Language and Academic Development Certificate</td>
<td>Claremont Graduate University</td>
<td>August 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career-Related Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor of Education</td>
<td>University of La Verne</td>
<td>July 1, 2003 - present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Student Teacher Supervisor</td>
<td>University of La Verne</td>
<td>September 1, 2004 – present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Coordinator, Teacher Education</td>
<td>University of La Verne, RCA</td>
<td>July 1, 2003 – July 1, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After-School Reading Tutor</strong></td>
<td>Mountain View Elementary</td>
<td>January 3, 2005 – May 10, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjunct Faculty</strong></td>
<td>University of La Verne</td>
<td>September 1, 2001 – July 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary School Teacher</strong></td>
<td>Mountain View Elementary</td>
<td>September 1, 1997 – June 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Tutor</strong></td>
<td>University of La Verne</td>
<td>April 1, 2002 – May 15, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-Time Reading Instructor</strong></td>
<td>Chaffey College</td>
<td>September 2000 – August 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Reading Lab Director</strong></td>
<td>Chaffey College</td>
<td>June 2001 – August 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Inservices and Presentations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conference Presenter</strong></td>
<td>National Center for Family Literacy</td>
<td>March 2, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conference Presenter</strong></td>
<td>International Reading Association (IRA- Regional)</td>
<td>December 8, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parent Perceptions: Family Involvement and Literacy**

Orlando, FL

**Helping English-language Learners Develop Academic Language Proficiency Through Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction**

Nashville, TN
Conference Presenter
National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)
Using Explicit, Scaffolded Reading Comprehension Instruction to Develop Academic Language Proficiency For Upper-Grade English Language Learners
San Antonio, TX

Conference Presenter
California Reading Association (CRA)
Traveling Through Literature: A Home-School Partnership (Results of a Parent Study)
Sacramento, California

Conference Presenter
California Reading Association (CRA)
Traveling Through Literature: A Home-School Partnership
San Jose, California

RICA Reader
Reading Instruction Competence Assessment
National Evaluation Systems (NES)
Sacramento, California

Consultant
Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension
Hodge Elementary
Azusa Unified School District
Azusa, CA
Service to the University and the Community

University of La Verne

WASC Steering Committee
(Western Association of Schools and Colleges)  
January 17, 2007 – present

NCATE Assessment Committee
(National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education)  
October 3, 2006 – present

UGAP Committee
(Undergraduate Academic Policies)  
September 2004 – October 2008

Reading Advisory Board
(Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential)  
April 2003 – present

Alumni Representative  
September 2003 – present

ULV Preview Day Speaker  
November 2007
November 2005
November 2001

ULV Freshmen/Parent Orientation:
Faculty Panel  
July and August 2007

Faculty and Alumni Featured Speaker:
Iota Delta Sorority Scholarship Banquet  
May 5, 2007

Collaborative Partnership:
ULV Literacy Center and Mrs. Nelson’s Book Store, Community Book Event  
November 2006

Literacy Center Fall Festival:  
In Partnership With Starbucks  
October 2005

Family Literacy Conference Committee  
June 2005 – December 2005
**Mountain View Elementary (Claremont, CA)**

Conducted parent survey: “1st and 6th grade Parent Perceptions on Family Literacy” March 2008

Developed and implemented “Family Literacy Nights” October 2006

Conducted parent survey: “Family Literacy” September 2005

**Professional Affiliations**

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) May 2008 - present

Specialized Reading Professionals (Subgroup): International Reading Association (IRA) September 2007 – present

National Center for Family Literacy July 2007 - present

California Reading Association (CRA) October 2001 – present

International Reading Association (IRA) October 2001 – present

Pi Lambda Theta
International Honor Society
and Professional Association in Education June 6, 1998 – present
Ellen Tremblay  
(909)397-8607 home  
(909)706-7576 cell  
1578 N. Caswell Avenue  
Pomona, CA 91767  
ertremblay@msn.com

**Degrees**

University of La Verne  
**M.Ed. in Reading**, 2008  
- Course Work Included:  
  - Literacy Assessment and Diagnosis  
  - Individualization of Literacy Instruction  
  - Reading Research, Theory, and Process  
  - Reading Specialist Leadership  
  - English Language Learner Literacy Instruction  
  - 80 hours K-12 tutor University of La Verne Literacy Center  

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
**B.A. Liberal Studies**, 1994  
*Minor degrees, Spanish, English, Dance*

**Credentials/Certificates**

*Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential (K-12), University of La Verne, 2008*  
*Reading Certificate, University of La Verne, 2008*  
*Multiple Subject Professional Clear Credential with BCLAD emphasis in Spanish, California State University, Fullerton, 1999*

**Teaching Experience**

*English Literacy/Reading Teacher, Chaffey High School, Chaffey Joint Union High School District, January 2009 - present*

*Eighth grade language arts, science, and reading improvement teacher, Sierra Vista Middle School, Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, August - December, 2008*

*Seventh grade summer school intervention teacher, Sierra Vista Middle School, Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, 2008*

*Third, fourth, and fifth grade teacher, Sparks Elementary School, Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, 1998-2008*

*Third, fourth, and fifth grade after school and summer school intervention, Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, 1999-2006*

*Dance teacher (modern, ballet, hip hop), Sparks Elementary School, Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, 2000-2003*
**Leadership/ Curriculum Development**

*Site Governance Coordinator*, Sierra Vista Middle School, Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, September - December, 2008  
*Chairperson*, School Site Council, Sparks Elementary, Hacienda La Puente Unified School District (HLPUSD) 2006-2008  
*School Site Council Member*, Sparks Elementary, Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, 2004-2008  
*Leadership Team*, Sparks Elementary, Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, 1999-2005  
*Professional Development Institute: K-6 Reading Results*, California Reading and Literature Project, 2000-2002

**Workshop/Conference Presentations**

“*Writing That’s Fun in the EL Classroom,*” California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) State Conference, Pasadena, 2009  
“*Create Comfort, Create Success: Modeled Writing for EL’s,*” California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) Regional Conference, BIOLA University, 2008  
“*On the Road to Academic Success: Sentence Frames for ELLs,*” California Teachers of English to Speaker of Other Languages (CATESOL) State Conference, Sacramento, 2008  

**Affiliations**

National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE), 2007-present  
California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL), 2006-present  
International Reading Association (IRA), 2005-present

**Honors and Awards**

*Teaching Excellence Award*, Sparks Elementary School, Hacienda la Puente Unified School District, 2006  
*Rose Hills Scholarship Recipient*, University of La Verne, 2005  
*Cum laude graduate*, California State University, Pomona, June, 1994
Part III
Biennial Report &
Assessment Documentation
Section 1: Biennial Report 2008

1. Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program—Specific Contextual Information

General information to help reviewers understand the program, the context in which it operates including the number of candidates and completers or graduates, and what has changed significantly since the Commission approved the current program document.

Please note that italicized font indicates changes made since the Biennial Report was submitted.

General Program Information

The Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program (with the Reading Certificate embedded as the first five classes) is delivered to candidates within the University of La Verne Literacy Center. In the Center, candidates take 12 classes (5 which are designed to meet Standards 1-11, and the other 7 which are designed to meet Standards 12-20). Eight of the classes require ten hours each of intensive one-on-one tutoring with children. This tutoring process is overseen by university professors who offer immediate feedback tailored to the needs of the candidates and their tutees. Tutees consist of children from the community (within a 30 mile radius) in grades 1-12 who are recommended by their schools as needing additional support in reading and writing. They include English learners and special needs students.

The program requirements were changed from 11 courses (33 units) to 9 courses (27 units), as the result of the need to ensure that candidates could file for their Certificates and/or Credentials by the fall of each school year. Now the Certificate program includes RDG 510, RDG 514, RDG 516 and 518, while the Credential program includes RDG 520, RDG 521, RDG 524, RDG 525, and RDG 530.

Since the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential at ULV was re-approved by CCTC in 2001 (new document), one class was added at the certificate level (RDG 516) to focus more fully on the reading comprehension/metacognition process and another was added at the credential level (RDG 522) to provide candidates with specific training on how to modify instruction for special needs learners. Though these elements were originally part of the overall program, as the courses progressed, instructors felt that they were not covered as thoroughly as necessary, so in 2002 the decision was made to expand the course requirements.

RDG 516 has been thoroughly integrated into the Certificate program, as planned. However, the input provided by candidates who took RDG 522 indicated that they felt the knowledge could be embedded into other courses and not lose its significance, rather than having the course be 3 units. By 2008, the last RDG 522 course was taught. Instead, the instructor for the course is going to serve as consultant for the program and present four separate
“workshops” for candidates. The point is to support them as they work with special needs students, teaching them about modifications for literacy.

As these courses were added, we also made a concerted effort to determine how to move our program to a facility that would better support practitioners in their development as specialists and leaders. Envisioning soundproof observation booths that could serve as opportunities for videotaping and candidate/parent observations, we wrote a grant to the Parson’s Foundation for the money ($100,000) to expand our center and add such a system. In addition, we appealed to our department to fund a full-time coordinator to be the liaison between schools and our center and to assist us in upgrading the building targeted for the new center. Successful in 2003, we moved to our new, larger facility and put in the observation booths. They now serve as the basis for strategy demonstrations and lesson analyses within our classes.

A substantial change that began to occur in 2005 was the “teaching out” of the off-campus program. Due to the difficulty of finding qualified instructors who held master’s degrees and had experience in classrooms as reading specialists, it was decided that offering only a main campus program was the correct path to pursue. Many of our closer off-campus cohorts (Long Beach, Whittier) contained potential candidates who were willing to commute to the main campus for the program. By the summer of 2007, all of the cohorts finished the program (with 99% of the candidates as completers for the credential), and the program was only offered on the main campus as of the next fall.

Another change was considered as candidates took the EDUC 501 (Educational Assessment) and EDUC 504 (Educational Research/Design) courses with other master’s candidates across multiple programs and provided evaluative feedback to us about the efficacy and applications of the courses.

We began to see that the information provided in these courses (to cross-discipline candidates) was too generic. Instructors felt that practitioners in literacy should be exposed to authentic examples within the assessment and research processes that reflected the kind of data and designs they would be dealing with as reading specialists.

As a result, beginning with a spring decision in 2004, we began training our own professors to teach these classes and changed the content to more accurately reflect assessment and research in the area of literacy.

In the spring of 2009, we combined the elements of these two courses into a new class (RDG 524, Applied Literacy Research and Assessment) which expands the content presented in RDG 514 at the Certificate level and connects logically to RDG 525 at the Credential level.)

As a consequence of course evaluations showing that candidates wanted a more direct link between use of research and their “real lives” in their developing roles as specialists, in Fall 2005 we added simulation components to several classes, specifically RDG 516 and 525. Using research from various databases and the literature reviews that evolved from it, candidates were asked to engage in “specialist/parent conference” simulations and
“specialist/board of education policy proposal presentation” simulations. We also now ask candidates to analyze literacy studies in RDG 525 so that they can see how research and assessment information can directly inform instructional practices.

The University of La Verne has always asked candidates to take an end-of-program Reading Specialist Competency Exam. However, though eight areas of content have been consistently identified as the basis for the exam, at some points along the way throughout the years, on the day of the exam, candidates were allowed to choose which five questions (from the overall eight) they wanted to answer.

In the spring of 2006, the issue of “in-depth content knowledge” was presented to the Reading Advisory Committee, and the decision was made to rotate the questions from administration to administration, requiring that students prepare for all eight topics and not be given choices during the exam. Instead, as of fall of 2006, candidates were required to answer five specific questions (out of eight) chosen by reading program professors, without including any element of candidate choice. In this way, we can now assume that they should be equally prepared on any topic and not simply choose questions based on their areas of strength.

A recent change that has taken place at the end of the credential program is a strengthening of the emphasis on leadership and professionalism. Not only do candidates have to make presentations to colleagues, parents, and students (not their own) and to attend five conferences related to reading and writing (both original requirements of the program), but they have to write a proposal to present at a literacy conference. Added as a requirement in the fall of 2007 as a further push to “authenticate” program requirements, candidates are taught how to write conference proposals, submit them, and then practice for the presentations. More than 90% of the candidates have actually followed through with their actual presentations at such conferences as CRA and CATESOL.

Finally, in response to candidates’ requests for more resources in the areas of word recognition and writing, in the fall of 2008 a new book was adopted as a basic text for incoming candidates in the RDG 510 class. We feel that it is not only useful to candidates in terms of content, but that it is also a way for them to get the “big picture” underlying the philosophy of teaching reading. Managing several texts at once is appropriate at the graduate level, but having one that helps to synthesize content from all of the standards is ideal. We have supplementary materials, as well.

The total number of completers since 2001 was 23 (old document prior to 2001) and 44 (new document, approved 2001) in the main campus program and 63 in the off-campus program.
Program Specific Candidate Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site(s)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates</th>
<th>Number of Completers (students who filed a credential application 2007-2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document

- Please include a bulleted list of changes and the approximate date changes were initiated.

- Fall of 2001—RDG 516 ((Individualization of Literacy Instruction—Comprehension, Vocabulary and Writing Development) added immediately in 2001

- Fall of 2002—Decision (supported by our Reading Advisory Committee) to add RDG RDG 522 (Literacy Instruction for Special Needs Learners)

- Summer of 2003—Expanded Literacy Center by moving to a larger facility with more space for tutoring and classes; added observation booths funded by Parsons Foundation to serve as instructional demonstration opportunities; strengthened all “modeling” components within the program, especially in tutorial classes

- Spring of 2004—Decision made to connect assessment/research more specifically to literacy examples, scenarios, authentic contexts by hiring literacy instructors to teach EDUC 501/504 rather than university “professors of education”

- Fall of 2005—Simulation activities added to coursework to emphasize links between research and real-life applications (RDG 516 and RDG 525)

- Spring of 2006—Changed requirements for Reading Specialist Competency Exam, eliminating candidate choice of questions on exam day based on the philosophy that they should be equally prepared for any of the eight topics

- Fall of 2007—Added requirement to write and submit a conference proposal as a way of learning to contribute to the professional literacy community (RDG 530)

- Fall of 2008—inclusion of a basic foundational text in response to students’ suggestions to add an additional resource in writing and word recognition (RDG 510)
• Spring of 2009; integrated EDUC 501 and 504 into RDG 524, a transition class between RDG 514 and RDG 525

• Spring of 2009; dropped RDG 522 as a full course; embedded content into 4 workshops designed to be given at strategic points throughout the Certificate and Credential

2. Candidate Assessment/Performance & Program Effectiveness Information

The program submits information on how candidate and program completer performance are assessed and a summary of the data. The length of this section depends on the size of the program and how the data is reported. The information and data submitted in this section will be used as the basis for the analysis and action plan submitted in Sections III and IV.

What key assessments are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for a credential? Please identify specific tool(s) used to assess candidate and program completers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition Point</th>
<th>Key Assessments</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
<td>Total GPA from last 60 units of undergraduate coursework; grad GPA factored in for borderline cases</td>
<td>Transcripts and computed GPA's from ULV Graduate Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letters of Recommendation</td>
<td>3 letters required from candidates' professors/coworkers; averaged scores on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being high</td>
<td>Rubric (1-4) with 8 categories, including intellectual ability, maturity, leadership potential, ability to work well with others, written/oral skills, openness to diversity and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of Purpose/Interview</td>
<td>Rationale for interest in program and commitment to literacy and leadership in the field; introduction to dispositions</td>
<td>Written essay describing development of interest in literacy, background, motivation for specializing; Includes focus on same elements as listed in rubric for letters of recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Lesson Plans each for four different courses (510, 514, 516, 518) with emphases on 5 discrete elements</td>
<td>Lesson plans; separate scores for assessment, planning, knowledge, diversity, and evaluation</td>
<td>Rubrics (1-4) for each discrete component on the lesson plans, totaled and then averaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic Reports for the same four courses (510, 514, 516, and 518)</td>
<td>Content knowledge presented summatively in a professional format to provide schools with information about tutees</td>
<td>Rubric (1-4) used for areas of assessment, planning, and knowledge as a total score; Demonstration of ability to analyze and identify students’ strengths and weaknesses and to provide effective instruction/further recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Technology Development: Discussion Board in RDG 520</td>
<td>Ability to take blackboard applications further by using discussion board</td>
<td>Rubric (1-4) for evaluation of content during discussions and weighted for consistency, level of thoughtfulness, and frequency of responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Development: Powerpoint presentation for policy simulation in RDG 525</td>
<td>Development of a powerpoint presentation to use with simulated “Board of Education” members for proposal of policy change</td>
<td>Rubric (1-4) with powerpoint presentation as a product, along with reflections on the process/recommendations for modifications of presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Development: Creation of a Strategy Demonstration CD</td>
<td>Use of Observation Booth technology to create a lesson for demonstration, record it on a CD, and introduce the lesson strategy to colleagues</td>
<td>Rubric (1-4) with CD as a product, along with reflections on the process/recommendations for modifications of lesson presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Evaluation of Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Reading Specialist Competency Exam</td>
<td>Essay exam with possible scores of 80-100 (passing) translated into 1-4 rubric; assessment of overall content knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>End of Program Self-Evaluations by Candidates</td>
<td>Use of synthesized Candidate Competency Forms to target 8 discrete areas: assessment, planning, knowledge, diversity, technology, research, program evaluation, and professional development/leadership</td>
<td>Candidate survey (Self-Evaluation), including all 8 major elements of course-by-course Candidate Competency Forms; analytic rubric with discrete scores, then totaled average with overall rating (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Evaluations of Candidates</td>
<td>Summarized version of end of program Self-Evaluation for employers of matriculated candidates</td>
<td>Employer survey, including the 8 discrete areas of the self-evaluation; analytic rubric with discrete scores, then totaled average with overall rating (1-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Summaries—Prior to Program Entrance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>GPA Cohort 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Collection Process** | (1) Applications  
(2) Letters of Recommendation  
(3) Statements of Purpose |
| **Data Summary** | (1) Mean = 3.3 with SD 0.4  
(2) Mean = 3.8 with SD 0.2  
(3) Mean = 2.8 with SD 0.8 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>GPA Cohort 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Collection Process** | (1) Applications  
(2) Letters of Recommendation  
(3) Statements of Purpose |
| **Data Summary** | (1) Mean = 3.0 with SD 0.6  
(2) Mean = 3.9 with SD 0.2  
(3) Mean = 3.4 with SD 0.6 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>GPA Cohort 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Collection Process** | (1) Applications  
(2) Letters of Recommendation  
(3) Statements of Purpose |
| **Data Summary** | (1) Mean = 3.1 with SD 0.5  
(2) Mean = 3.8 with SD 0.1  
(3) Mean = 3.3 with SD 0.6 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>GPA Cohort 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Collection Process** | (1) Applications  
(2) Letters of Recommendation  
(3) Statements of Purpose |
| **Data Summary** | (1) Mean = 3.4 with SD 0.5  
(2) Mean = 3.8 with SD 0.3  
(3) Mean = 3.0 with SD 0.7 |
### Data Summaries for Key Assessment 1 (Knowledge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Collection Process</th>
<th>Data Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) End of program self-evaluations (surveys) Cohort 2005  
(2) End of program employer evaluations Cohort 2005  
(3) Reading Specialist Competency Exam Cohort 2005 | (1) Total scores and analysis of 9 areas within written surveys  
(2) Total scores and analysis of 9 areas within employer surveys  
(3) Scores of 1-20 on five content-based essay questions | (1) “total scores” mean = 3.6 with SD 0.4  
(2) “total scores” mean = 3.8 with SD 0.3  
(3) Mean = 3.4 with conversion from raw scores to a rubric (1-4) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Collection Process</th>
<th>Data Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) Lesson Plans RDG 518 Cohort 2006  
(2) Diagnostic Report RDG 518 Cohort 2006 | (1) Analysis of 3 Lesson Plans (Total Scores)  
(2) Analysis of Diagnostic Reports—culmination of RDG 518 | (1) Mean = 3.6 with SD 0.2  
(2) Mean = 3.7 with SD 0.3 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Collection Process</th>
<th>Data Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) 3 Lesson Plans RDG 518 Cohort 2007  
(2) “Knowledge” component RDG 518 Lesson Plans Cohort 2007  
(3) “Evaluation” component RDG 518 Lesson Plans Cohort 2007  
(4) Diagnostic Report RDG 518 Cohort 2007 | (1) Analysis of 3 Lesson Plans (Total Scores)  
(2) Analysis of “knowledge” component of lesson plans  
(3) Analysis of “evaluation” components of lesson plans  
(4) Analysis of Diagnostic Reports—culmination of RDG 518 | (1) Mean = 3.6 with SD 0.4 (Totals)  
(2) Mean = 3.6 with SD 0.4  
(3) Mean = 3.6 with SD .04  
(4) Mean = 3.6 with SD 0.4 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Collection Process</th>
<th>Data Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) 3 Lesson Plans RDG 510 Cohort 2008  
(2) “Knowledge” component RDG 510 Lesson Plans Cohort 08  
(3) “Evaluation” component RDG 510 Lesson plans Cohort 08  
(3) Diagnostic Report RDG 510 Cohort 2008 | | |
| Collection Process | (1) Analysis of 3 Lesson Plans (Total Scores)  
|                     | (2) Analysis of “knowledge” component of lesson plans  
|                     | (3) Analysis of “evaluation” component of lesson plans  
|                     | (4) Analysis of Diagnostic Reports—culmination of RDG 510 |
| Data Summary        | (1) Mean = 3.9 with SD 0.2 (Totals)  
|                     | (2) Mean = 3.9 with SD 0.2  
|                     | (3) Mean = 3.9 with SD 0.2  
|                     | (4) Mean = Not yet available |

### Data Summaries for Key Assessment 2 (Planning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>3 Lesson Plans RDG 518 Cohort 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Process</td>
<td>Planning component of RDG 518 lesson plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary</td>
<td>Mean = 3.6 with SD 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>3 Lesson Plans RDG 510 Cohort 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Process</td>
<td>Planning component of RDG 510 lesson plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary</td>
<td>Mean = 3.9 with SD 0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Summaries for Key Assessment 3 (Assessment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>3 Lesson Plans RDG 518 Cohort 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Process</td>
<td>Assessment component of RDG 518 lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary</td>
<td>Mean = 3.5 with SD 0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>3 Lesson Plans RDG 510 Cohort 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Process</td>
<td>Assessment component of RDG 510 lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary</td>
<td>Mean = 3.9 with SD 0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Summaries for Key Assessment 4 (Diversity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>3 Lesson Plans RDG 518 Cohort 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Process</td>
<td>Diversity component related to focus of RDG 518 (English learners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary</td>
<td>Mean = 3.8 with SD 0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>3 Lesson Plans RDG 510 Cohort 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Process</td>
<td>Diversity component related to focus of RDG 510 (individualizing for learners’ styles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary</td>
<td>Mean = 3.9 with SD 0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Summaries for Key Assessment 5 Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>(1) Technology (Powerpoint presentation) RDG 525 Cohort 2005 (2) Strategy Demonstration CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Process</td>
<td>(1) Class rubrics developed by candidates/professors (2) Strategy Demonstration CD rubric developed by colleagues and professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary</td>
<td>(1) Mean = 3.5 with 0.3 SD (2) Mean = 3.8 with 0.3 SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>(1) Technology (Powerpoint presentation) RDG 525 Cohort 2006 (2) Strategy Demonstration CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Process</td>
<td>(1) Class rubrics developed by candidates/professors (2) Strategy Demonstration CD rubric developed by colleagues and professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary</td>
<td>(1) Mean = 3.7 with 0.5 SD (2) Mean = 3.9 with 0.2 SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Effectiveness

- Which of the identified key assessments are used to ascertain program effectiveness as it relates to candidate competence? Are any other assessments used? Please identify specific tool(s) used to assess candidates and program completers?

All of the above key assessments are used to ascertain program effectiveness as it relates to candidate competence. Additional assessments include the following:

Candidate Competency Forms are filled out by candidates at the end of each course in the program; they include the major objectives for each class, linked to credential standards. There is also an open-ended component in which candidates make program recommendations as they look at what they perceive to be their own strengths and weaknesses.

Literacy Profiles are written by each candidate in each tutorial class for the purpose of sharing diagnostic and instructional information with parents at the end of a ten-week period. The focus is on academic language, accuracy, and professional communication.

Strategy Demonstrations are presented by candidates in RDG 510, RDG 516, and RDG 518, indicating competencies in carrying out appropriate instructional plans based on assessment and knowledge of underlying theoretical premises for choice of strategies.

Tutorial Observations are carried out by professors who teach tutorial classes in the credential program. Candidates are analyzed for their ability to carry out appropriate assessments and implement effective lessons that are tailored to the tutees’ needs and matched to state standards.

Study Guides are required related to the assigned reading for each course; as candidates participate in class activities, the connection between the research content presented in the reading and practical applications is emphasized.

Assessment Reports are due in classes (RDG 514, RDG 516, and RDG 520) where full-scale formalized assessments are given such as the SDRT and Gates-MacGinitie and a wide variety of informal reading inventories (Ekwall-Shanker, Roe and Burns, QRI-4). Protocols are required, along with analyzed data and implications for instruction.

Research Papers are required in RDG 518, RDG 520, and RDG 525. They represent facility with choosing valid and credible research, including literature reviews using APA guidelines.

Candidates continue to demonstrate their knowledge of tests/measurements and research methods (EDUC 524) along with related content knowledge from specific areas of literacy.
3. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

Each program provides an analysis of the information provided in Section II. Please do not introduce new types of data in this section. Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analysis of the data. What does the analysis of the data demonstrate about: a) candidate competence and b) program effectiveness?

Analysis of Key Assessment 1 (Knowledge)

Lesson plans are a primary way to determine candidate competence overall and in terms of “knowledge” and “evaluation.” Growth should certainly be an objective over time, but the 3.6 mean in these two areas for Cohort 2007 and the 3.9 mean in these two areas for Cohort 2008 indicate that candidates are successfully demonstrating knowledge of program content. There is no major concern related to program effectiveness shown through lesson plan scores.

A second determinant of knowledge is the scores on the Diagnostic Reports. Scores for Cohort 2006 and 2007 were similar, with means of 3.7 and 3.6, respectively; and again, scores for Cohort 2008 were even higher (as we saw in the lesson plans), with a mean of 3.9. At this time, content knowledge does not appear to be an area of concern; in fact, there appears to be more successful teaching of content knowledge with the most recent cohort than with previous ones.

The Reading Specialist Competency Exam is used summatively to indicate level of candidates’ knowledge related to program objectives in 8 major content areas. Scores from Cohort 2005 ranged from 3.2 to 3.9, with a mean of 3.4, which is somewhat lower than the scores representing the day-to-day formative use of lesson plans and the Diagnostic Reports. A better analysis can be made if the 8 categories are individually computed and analyzed, which is the direction that needs to be taken with the next administration of the exam for Cohort 2006.

Similarly, end-of-program self-evaluations (surveys) for Cohort 2005 match comparatively with scores for lesson plans and diagnostic reports, with a mean of 3.6, indicating that candidates’ perceptions of their own knowledge within 9 areas is approximately the same as what we judge them to be. Content knowledge is not a major area for improvement, in general. However, these 9 areas also need to be individually computed and analyzed in the future.

Finally, Employer Evaluations of candidates who have matriculated are even higher than the self-evaluations of the candidates; employers returned favorable reports of hires from the ULV program with a mean of 3.8 for overall content knowledge. With the next group, we will be able to see if the areas with higher scores within the instrument are the same as those for the self-evaluations. If discrepancies exist, they will help us to determine more specific areas of need related to knowledge for programmatic development/modifications.
Analysis of Key Assessment 2 (Planning)

Planning for instruction is a major component of the tutorial process, and there is a separate section with a related rubric on each lesson plan. Cohort 2007 had a mean of 3.6 for planning (with a range of 2.7-4.0) while Cohort 2008 had a mean of 3.9 (with a range of 3.3-4.0) indicating that students in the most recent cohort are doing better in this area. Perhaps the increased focus on specific areas of the lesson planning process has resulted in higher scores. There is no urgent need to modify program elements in the area of planning at this time.

Analysis of Key Assessment 3 (Assessment)

Aside from being a primary focus of two of the courses in the program, RDG 514 and EDUC 501, student assessment is also part of the ongoing lesson planning process in which student objectives must be matched to assessment results, and the assessments chosen must be appropriate instruments that are accurately administered. For Cohort 2007, the mean was 3.5 (with a range of 2.7-4.0), showing a slightly lower mean and a greater standard deviation (0.6) than for the other areas. This indicates that assessment is a weaker area for some candidates than others and may be an area for improvement programmatically. Cohort 2008, however, earned a mean of 3.9 (with a range of 3.5-4.0). This may be because they are fairly new program candidates and haven’t yet been faced with more difficult assessments to come later in their coursework—or they could maintain their achievement over time. In any case, assessment is an area to consider for possible program modifications.

Analysis of Key Assessment 4 (Diversity)

Though the emphasis on diversity and providing access to the core curriculum for all students is not new, it had not been specifically a lesson plan component until it was presented to Cohort 2007. The mean was 3.8 (with a range of 3.3-4.0) one of the higher means and smaller ranges for this group, and it indicates that candidates are able to take the information they receive from the program to modify instruction for all children’s needs. Depending upon the course, these modifications may differ (from an English learner to a child identified with a specific learning disability). In addition, motivational levels, primary language and linguistic ability, and varying background schema also impact student learning. Such modifications must be explicitly described in each lesson plan. Cohort 2008, once again, had a mean of 3.9 (with a range of 3.3-4.0), so the groups are very similar. No specific emphasis on diversity needs to be made programmatically at this time with one exception noted below.

Through the Candidate Competency Forms, candidates indicated that they feel less competent choosing modifications for special needs learners than for English learners. They feel that one class (RDG 522—teaching literacy strategies to special needs learners) is helpful to them, but they also feel they need more support along the way. Program modifications related to embedding this knowledge throughout the coursework should be considered.
Analysis of Key Assessment 5 (Technology)

So far, two cohorts have been evaluated based on their use of technology in the program. Using the requirements of powerpoint presentations and the creation of strategy demonstration CD's, Cohort 2005 had a mean of 3.5 for the powerpoint presentation (with a range of 2.8-4.0) and a mean of 3.8 (with a range of 3.2-4.0) for the strategy demonstration CD. Given the low end of the range and the lower mean for this group than for some other areas, technology appears to be an area that bears consideration for improvement. Cohort 2006 did better, however, with means of 3.7 (range of 2.8-4.0) and 3.9 (range of 3.2-4.0) for the powerpoint presentation and strategy demonstration, respectively. This may be due to a stronger emphasis on technology in the candidates’ schools of employment, however, and not completely to our program support.

On the end-of-program evaluations (surveys) and the Candidate Competency Forms for RDG 530, candidates indicated a continuing need for support in the area of technology. We have also added a blackboard component with discussion board requirements for upcoming groups, so more incoming data will provide us with additional information about our need to address the programmatic component of technology.

4. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate/Program Performance

Programs indicate how they use the data from assessment and analysis of that data to improve candidate performance and the program. If proposed changes are being made, please link the proposed changes to the data that support that modification as related to the appropriate Program and/or Common Standard(s).
# Program Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made</th>
<th>Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment: Lesson Plans RDG 510, 514, 516, 518; “Assessment” sections</td>
<td>More focus on modeling process of aligning assessments with objectives for tutees; have candidates share examples for more demonstration opportunities</td>
<td>Standard 11: Assessment, Evaluation, Instruction: assessment of each student leading to appropriate instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity: Candidate Competency Form feedback and ranges on “Diversity” sections of lesson plans with scores as low as 3.3</td>
<td>Integration of information about children with specific learning disabilities earlier in the program; higher level of ongoing support along the way; broader perspective on “diversity” beyond language and culture</td>
<td>Standard 15: Reading and Writing Needs of All Students: individual differences of diverse learners (adaptations and modifications, including the special needs student); factors that influence literacy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology: powerpoint presentation scores and End-of-Program self-evaluations (surveys); supported by Candidate Competency Form for RDG 530</td>
<td>Continue to upgrade technology in the literacy center and to require use of technological resources for presenting information to professional groups: Blackboard, Powerpoint, Smart Board, TaskStream</td>
<td>Standard 12: Leadership Skills and Professional Development: use of technology for professional purposes to ensure effective instruction and serve as role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Evaluation: Comments from candidates about need to link EDUC 501 and EDUC 504 with authentic school practices; scores on End-of-Program self-evaluations (surveys)</td>
<td>Emphasize relationships between tests/measurements and research leading to school decision-making; consider adding scenarios for analysis based on larger number of literacy studies; alignment of RDG 514, RDG 524, and RDG 525</td>
<td>Standard 13: Research and Evaluation Methodology: research-based needs assessments leading to curricular decisions; analysis of current research in literacy (not simply “education”) for selection of programs and materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2: Alignment of Key Assessments with State Standards

We are slowly initiating Key Assessments in the Reading Certificate/Credential Program that will serve as transition points for candidates. Some of the Key Assessments listed below have not yet been implemented, but are being put into place so that aggregation of data can occur. In stepping back to analyze the assessment tools described in the Biennial Report, we can now make the following comments and recommendations:

Key Assessments

Knowledge

In the area of knowledge, which relates to Standards 4,5,6,7,9, and 11 at the Certificate level and Standards 13-20 at the Credential level, a more structured method of assessment needs to be utilized. In particular, the Reading Specialist Competency Exam should be evaluated using a TaskStream rubric. In this way, we can better analyze which content areas need more support and aggregate the data over time. Such a rubric has been created and will be used for the December 2009 exam. (See Appendix 23).

The lesson plans and Diagnostic Reports and Literacy Profiles will continue to be used formatively, along with the Candidate Competency Forms and End-of Program Candidate Self-Evaluation and Employer Evaluation of Candidate Competencies.

Candidates who just returned their End-of-Program Evaluations indicated that areas of weakness appear to be writing instruction, the connection between research and authentic practices, and technology. We will provide this most recent data for the next Biennial Report in 2010. In the meantime, we are adding more information on writing to the program and purchasing materials for the instruction of writing. We are also requiring candidates to use Blackboard, TaskStream, Smart Carts, and Smart Boards for 2009 in addition to the Observation Booth videotaping capabilities. We have already taken steps to scaffold the “research” process across the RDG 514-524-525 continuum, merging EDUC 501 and 504 into RDG 524 and offering more literacy research for analysis.

Planning

After embedding the element of planning into the lesson plans for all tutorial classes, we realized that a separate rubric (with more clearly delineated criteria) would tell us more specifically and sensitively what aspects of planning should be strengthened. Therefore, we developed a TaskStream rubric (Appendix 19) to be used for RDG 518. In this way, candidates can receive additional assistance before they finish the Certificate portion of the Program. We will still informally analyze all the planning components of the lesson plans in RDG 510, 514, and 516, as well. (Planning sections of the lesson plans and Diagnostic Reports in RDG 520, 521, and 525 at the Credential level will also be reviewed.)
Though planning was not clearly an area of need as determined by the assessments we used up until now, we should be able to analyze this competency better in the future using the rubric. This competency relates to Standards 4 and 5 most specifically but also to Standards 2, 3 and 6 at the Certificate level in terms of integrating appropriate content into instructional planning.

**Assessment**

Similar to the rubric for planning is a TaskStream rubric for assessment, to be used during RDG 514 (Appendix 19). This area showed up as weaker than others even when specific criteria was not clearly stated for the assessment section on the lesson plan, so we recognize that more attention to the area—and an instrument that is more analytical to assess it—would be in order. We will still informally analyze all the planning components of the lesson plans in RDG 510, 514, and 516, as well, at the Certificate level. (Assessment sections of the lesson plans and Diagnostic Reports in RDG 520, 521, and 525 at the credential level will also be reviewed.) This competency relates to Standards 4 and 5 most specifically but also to standards 2, 3, and 6 at the Certificate level in terms of integrating appropriate instructional content into the assessment process.

**Diversity**

As an area of significance in reading instruction, the ability to work effectively with students from diverse backgrounds is one that deserves stringent evaluation. A portion of each lesson plan now contains a response area for candidates to make connections between what they learn about working with learners who are diverse and their tutorials and/or own classroom situations. A culminating activity for which we have developed a TaskStream rubric (Appendix 21) is a Diversity Reflection that candidates write as a way to synthesize all the information from previous courses and the RDG 520 texts to offer a more in-depth perspective on diversity. As they work with adolescent learners who have severe learning difficulties in RDG 520, they bring to bear sociopolitical, instructional, and psychological influences.

Though “diversity” was not revealed as a serious area of need, candidates did identify that they still felt “inexpert” at working with special needs learners. We are hoping that the inclusion of the four workshops on special needs learners presented by a consultant (to replace one course) will enable them to feel more supported across the program.

Also, we expect to see a broader, more sophisticated view of “diversity” at this point in the program (beyond culture and language) and feel that this rubric will help us to determine if candidates hold such a perspective by the time they take RDG 520.

Diversity will also be assessed as part of “knowledge” on the Reading Specialist Competency Exam and informally analyzed on the Candidate Competency Forms, the End-of-Program Candidate Self-Evaluations, the Employer Evaluations, and observations during presentations and tutorials.
This competency relates to Standards 9 and 10 at the Certificate level but is evaluated mainly during RDG 520 as a response to Standard 15. The ability to work well with diverse learners is also reflected in Standards 14, 15, 16, 19, and 20 as candidates assess students, develop lesson plans and reports, and do workshop presentations.

Technology

Though not identified specifically as an area related to leadership, current instructional approaches necessarily include the development of competencies in technology as a major requirement of the teaching professional. We are viewing the ability to use technology in teaching as a required competency, especially for those who specialize in literacy and will be mentors for other professionals and instructors for students.

As an emerging finding from the Candidate Competency Forms, the End-of-Program Self Evaluations, and observations during class, technology became identified as an area that needs additional strengthening in the program. The TaskStream rubric developed for this competency links with RDG 525, the course in which candidates do their Policy Research Papers and Presentations using Powerpoint and a Smart Cart (Appendix 22).

Other technological applications will also be analyzed throughout the program such as the Vocabulary Demonstration Lesson (videotaped in the Observation booths during RDG 516), the interactive Blackboard assignments for study guides, and the developing use of the Smart Board and Document Camera which we have just acquired for the program. This competency relates to Standard 12, in particular—but also Standards 14 and 15 in terms of integrating technology with language arts instruction for all students.

Common Considerations

With the move toward the use of rubrics on TaskStream, concerns arise as to the validity and reliability of the assessments. Issues such as rubric development, training information for instructors and candidates, and calibration activities will be addressed.

Rubrics

The rubrics were developed through collaboration among institutional faculty members, and it is believed that they have content validity. However, it will take time to see if the rubrics yield reliable information. At this time, faculty feel that the new instruments will be more sensitive to specific aspects of the content focus (e.g., the different processes involved in effective “assessment” such as appropriateness of assessment instruments, variety of instruments, interpretation of assessment data, selection of appropriate instruments, and a clear relationship between assessment data and instructional options).
Training Information

Faculty who teach the courses containing TaskStream rubrics were involved in the design of the rubrics. They will still need to be continuously involved in training about how to interpret the language of the criteria and how to evaluate candidate work in a consistent and fair way. Faculty have participated in training sessions about how to be the “evaluators” for the candidates and they refer to technological “jings” as a way to refresh themselves on how to use TaskStream, supporting candidates in the process, as well. Such training will become less necessary over time for most (with the exception of new faculty members) although it is probable that rubrics may need to be changed as they are implemented and soft spots emerge. However, calibration activities will need to be ongoing.

Calibration Activities

Calibration activities will occur for all faculty once each term during program meetings, using the rubrics for identified key assessments that will be used for that term. All faculty will participate in “norming” sessions using benchmark papers from previous groups that represent scores of 1 through 4, regardless of whether or not they teach the class for which the rubric was designed. If norming sessions reveal problems with inter-rater reliability, then the rubrics will be re-examined and perhaps revised.

Section 3: Assessment of Data for Program Improvement

Data is assessed primarily through the use of rubrics for the key assessments. The RDG 514 rubric for assessment is used in the second Certificate course, while the RDG 518 rubric for planning is used in the fourth Certificate course. Candidates should perform well enough on these assessments (a 2.5 or higher) to move on to the Credential level of the program. Candidates should also have maintained a B average in all certificate coursework before applying for the Reading Certificate and continuing on to the Credential level of the program.

The RDG 520 rubric for diversity is used in the fifth course (the first Credential level course); the RDG 525 rubric for technology is used in the eighth course (the second to last Credential level course); and the rubric for knowledge is used in RDG 530, reflecting the Reading Specialist Competency Exam. Candidates should perform well enough on these assessments (a 2.5 or higher) in order to be considered eligible for the credential. Candidates should also have maintained a B average in all Credential coursework before being able to apply for their Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential.

In the future, other assessments will be added aside from these rubrics (and in addition to the other informal processes of evaluation described in Sections 1 and 2). It is anticipated that electronic portfolios may be created as key assessments for other standards in the program.
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Appendix 1
(Coursework for Certificate/ Credential)
Master of Education in Reading (M.Ed.)

This advanced degree program for education professionals integrates theory and practice to enhance knowledge and skills applicable to the area of reading.

Admission Requirements

Admission to the graduate degree program requires the following:

- A bachelor’s degree from a regionally accredited college or university
- A GPA of 3.0 or above for the last 60 semester hours of undergraduate study, and a GPA of 3.0 or above for any graduate work
- Successful completion of application requirements including an interview with the program chair
- Credit in a Commission-approved teaching of reading course

Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

These programs offer theoretical foundations and practical application opportunities for professional educators who want to develop their skills and knowledge in the area of reading education.

Additional Admission Requirements

Certificate and Credential students must provide verification of the following:

- Possession of a preliminary teaching credential issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- Letter from school district indicating length of employment

Program Requirements

Students in La Verne’s reading program must maintain at least a 3.0 grade point average. All degree coursework must be completed within five years of registration as a graduate student. To accommodate students’ professional schedules and personal needs, courses are offered in late afternoons and evenings. All students must have Internet access.
University of La Verne
College of Education and Organizational Leadership

Courses

Reading Certificate (12 semester units)
RDG 510  Literacy Instruction & Methodology (3)
RDG 514  Literacy Assessment & Diagnosis (3)
RDG 516  Individualization of Literacy Instruction (3)
RDG 518  Concept Development / Language Acquisition (3)

Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential (15 semester units in addition to the Reading Certificate courses)
RDG 520  Advanced Methods & Materials (3)
RDG 521  Literature & Literacy (3)
RDG 524  Applied Literacy Research & Assessment (3)
RDG 525  Reading Research, Theory, & Process (3)
RDG 530  Reading Specialist Leadership (3)

M.Ed. Reading (3 more semester units upon completing the requirements for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential)
RDG 598  Development of Reading Intervention Programs (3)

The full program is 30 semester hours.

Transfer Credit

Up to six semester hours of credit may be transferred from an accredited university or college to the University of La Verne's graduate degree program if:

- the units were acceptable as graduate degree coursework in the transferring school
- the units are applicable to the chosen degree program at the University of La Verne, and
- a grade of "B" or better was earned for the units, and the coursework was taken from an accredited institution within five years prior to transfer to the University of La Verne.
Appendix 2
(Tutorial Requirements)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Fall Term 1</th>
<th>Winter Term 2</th>
<th>Spring Term 3</th>
<th>Summer Term 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510 T</td>
<td>514 T</td>
<td>516 T</td>
<td>518 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>520 T</td>
<td>521 T</td>
<td>525 T</td>
<td>530 NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>524 NT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>598 NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NT = No Tutorial Required
# TUTORIAL REQUIREMENTS

## CERTIFICATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG 510</td>
<td>Beginning Reader, Grades 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 514</td>
<td>Intermediate Struggling Reader, Grades 4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 516</td>
<td>Intermediate Struggling Reader, Grades 4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 518</td>
<td>Early Intermediate/Intermediate English Learner, Grades 2-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CREDENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG 520</td>
<td>Adolescent with severe reading difficulties, Grades 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 521</td>
<td>Intermediate Struggling “Reluctant” Reader, Grades 3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG 525</td>
<td>Struggling Beginning Reader, Grades 1-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3
(CCTC 2001 Approval)
July 30, 2001

Dr. Thomas C. McGuire, Chair, Education Department
University of La Verne
1950 Third Street
La Verne, CA 91750

Dear Dr. McGuire:

The Commission's Reading Panel reviewed your submission for the Reading Certificate Program earlier this month and are recommending approval of your program to the Committee on Accreditation (COA). The COA will be meeting in Sacramento on August 20, 2001 and the recommended approval of your program will be placed on the COA consent calendar. We do not anticipate any problem regarding the approval of your program. The Reading Panel wishes to thank you for the preparation of a quality program and for your responsiveness to the Reading Standards.

If you should have any questions regarding the approval or implementation of the program please do not hesitate to contact me while I serve as consultant for the Reading Panel.

Congratulations and my very best to you,

Philip A. Fitch, Consultant
University of La Verne Revised Proposal
July 2001, Reading Panel Review
Recommended for Approval to the Committee on Accreditation

The reading panel recently reviewed your revised proposal for initial accreditation of a Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential program based on the Commission’s 1998 Standards. The panel commends you on the program design which provides the depth of knowledge and competence of the content standards. The addition of Course 516 strengthens the knowledge base of candidates in regards to Standards 2 and 3. The additional hours have enabled you to increase attention to assessment of English Only and English Language Learners in both courses, which lays the foundation for Course 514 - Literacy Assessment and Diagnosis.

The committee commends your proposal to reinstate the on-campus reading clinic and your commitment to field-based education through the development of off-campus reading programs. The Regional Reading Coordinator increases capacity to provide a high-quality supervised experience for candidates. Programmatic elements such as standard collections of instructional and assessment materials at each site contributes to consistency across clinical sites.

**Standard 1 - Program Design**
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

**Standard 2 - Developing Fluent Reading**
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

**Standard 3 - Comprehension and Study Skills**
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

**Standard 4 - Instruction Based on Assessment**
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

**Standard 5 - Intervention**
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

**Standard 7 - Field Experiences**
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

**Standard 8 - Application of Research Based and Theoretical Foundations**
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.
Standard 9 - Curriculum and Instructional Practices
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

Standard 10 - Cross-cultural Practices
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

Standard 11 - Assessment, Evaluation, and Instruction
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

Standard 16 - Advanced Clinical Experiences
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

Professional Comment: There is a need to ensure that specialist candidates have intensive experiences working with students with "severe" reading difficulties at either the elementary or middle/secondary levels. "Struggling older readers" (Course 525) and "older, non-readers" (Course 520) may or may not have severe reading difficulties.

Standard 19 - Advanced Professional Perspective
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.

Standard 20 - Meeting the Reading and Writing Needs of All Students
The panel finds narrative and evidence that this Standard is met.
Appendix 4
(Literacy Center Development /Description)
The University of La Verne Literacy Center

The Center

The ULV Literacy Center, located on the corner of Second Street and E Street, is in the heart of the university campus. As part of the College of Education and Organizational Leadership, we provide an intensive graduate program in reading for current teachers who wish to specialize in the teaching of literacy by earning a Reading Certificate, a Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, and a Reading M.Ed. (or any combination of the three).

Our candidates, highly motivated and hard-working teachers, are required to do 70 hours of fieldwork in order to meet state standards set by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) in reading. Fortunately, built into the graduate program model is the literacy center to which children from the local community can come to receive free tutoring services. As we train our candidates in the center, providing immediate feedback as they work with struggling readers and writers, the candidates help the children with reading/writing development in grades 1-12.

The children—our tutees—typically read at least two years below grade level, which makes achievement in school a real task for them. Research tells us that the earlier a child receives intervention, the more likely that (s)he will be able to jump the hurdle to grade level proficiency. It is important for children to see themselves as readers and writers and to feel that there are specific tools that they can learn to become learners who can—and do—read and write. Our candidates provide these tools for them, modeling and demonstrating how they work while the children learn to use them independently.

Our Goals

Since we opened our doors in 2001, we have served more than 850 children who may not otherwise have had the benefit of support. Our services are provided on a one-to-one basis (one candidate to one tutee), and instruction is personalized for each child. Parents are highly involved in the process, and communication with the schools and the children’s teachers is paramount. Instruction includes word recognition, fluency, comprehension, vocabulary and writing development. Weaknesses are targeted and strengths are built upon.

Twice during each term, we offer parent education workshops that take place for the parents as the children are being tutored. We provide strategies for them to use with their children at home so that they can continue to build on the instructional practices that we offer in the center.

Just recently, we completed a two-year study to see how much growth children in the literacy center make, on the average, in one ten-week term. We were astounded and gratified when the data revealed that our children are making one full year’s worth of growth in reading per term,
while children in the regular school system (without benefit of tutoring) are making about two months’ growth for the same period of time. We are heading into a second round of the study starting in the fall of 2008.

University and Center Mission/Vision

The University of La Verne is committed to a mission that affirms a positive and rewarding life for its students by emphasizing the core values of academic excellence, values orientation, diversity, lifelong learning, and community service. Students are encouraged to become reflective about personal, professional and societal values and to experience the responsibilities and rewards of serving the community. The university Literacy Center provides challenging and rewarding educational opportunities for a diverse student body and assures academic excellence for children of all ages and backgrounds.

Core Values

ULV has four core values that promote a positive and rewarding life for candidates, tutees, and their families: reflection about personal, professional, and societal values; understanding and appreciation for diversity of cultures; lifelong learning through critical thinking, accessing of information, and preparation for career advancement and personal growth; and community service experience related to the responsibilities and rewards of serving humankind.

Community Ethnicity

1% American Indian or Alaska Native
7% Asian or Pacific Islander
9% Black or African American
47% Hispanic or Latino
33% White or Caucasian
3% Other/Unspecified

Demographic Groups

The ULV Literacy Center works with at-risk, struggling, reluctant readers and English language learners - children from ages 5 - 18 and their parents:

50% - Economically underprivileged, transient or homeless children and adults, and many are on the Federal Lunch Program; 30% English language learners or non-English speaking & high school students reading at least 3 years below grade level; 20% Other
State-of-the-Art Technology

Through a grant from the Parsons Foundation, the Literacy Center has three observation booths with one-glass and soundproofing. These booths are used for testing students, for privacy, and for videotaping demonstration lessons in reading and writing which are then shown to the candidates in the reading program as a part of their own instruction. The videotapes also highlight the importance of having candidates contribute to the knowledge base of new, incoming candidates, who will learn from the more experienced candidates who present via videotaping.

Partnerships with Foundations

To date, we have received grants and donations from philanthropic organizations that support literacy. They include Verizon Wireless, Starbucks, the Parsons Foundation, the Rose Hills Foundation, the Ahmanson Foundation, local Kiwanis and Rotary groups, Circle of Friends members from the university, and many university alumni.

Literacy Center Study

We carried out a study with our ULV Literacy Center children as experimental subjects and local school children as the control group in order to see, at least preliminarily, if our children in the center were making stronger gains than the children who did not have the benefit of ULV tutoring.

Research Questions

Given the numerous hours devoted to the tutorial process, not only by the candidates, administrators, and faculty, but also by the children and their families, we knew we should be able to demonstrate that children made enough growth to merit the numerous hours devoted to instruction. Therefore, we asked four basic research questions:

• Did the motivational level of the experimental group improve more than the motivational level of the control group at the end of ten weeks?

• Did the comprehension level of the experimental group improve more than the comprehension level of the control group at the end of ten weeks?

• Were there correlations between gains in motivation to read and gains in comprehension at the end of ten weeks?

• Was the time spent tutoring children one-on-one for ten weeks in the Literacy Center worth the end results in motivation and comprehension gains for parents, children, faculty, and center candidates and administrators?
Research Base

The literature tells us that explicit comprehension instruction that includes specific, modeled strategies for active engagement, repetition over time of the use of these strategies, and opportunities for scaffolding (easier to harder, shorter to longer, contextualized to de-contextualized) results in more effective and efficient growth in literacy competency. (See attached list of references.) It is also clear that motivation to read independently and frequently plays a role in how quickly students progress in reading, writing, spelling, grammar, and vocabulary.

Since the role of the Literacy Center is to provide effective, personalized tutoring for children from the local community, the time spent during the tutorial sessions must be used to focus on what the students need most (areas of weakness) and utilize time in as efficient a manner as possible. Therefore, we adhere to research-based practices, based on the current literature in the field.

Research design

In order to determine if the time spent tutoring children in the University of La Verne Literacy Center is worth the energy and resources expended, we used a pretest-posttest design with matched controls. Four groups of center cohorts (totaling 66 children in all) were linked with “matched,” or similar, cohorts in the public schools to see if one hour of tutoring a week, for ten weeks (over and above the instruction received in their own language arts programs at their schools) would yield positive results for the center children. (Total n = 132)

Participants

Experimental group participants were composed of four different groups of children who received tutoring services during four separate but corresponding cycles of fall, winter, spring, and fall (2006-07). Each cycle was comprised of a ten-week term, and the study took place across a total time span of about twelve months. All children in the Literacy Center were identified as reading one to two years below grade level.

The control group was created by “matching” the center children on a number of variables including grade, gender, age, SES, and primary language so that these variables could be controlled for. All control group children were identified by their teachers as reading at least one to two years below grade level based on school test scores.

In addition, control group children in grades 1-6 attended schools that mandated the use of California published language arts programs: Open Court by McGraw-Hill and Houghton-Mifflin. In this way, some degree of control could be exerted over the kinds of programs in which children participated for purposes of comparison with the experimental group.
**Instrumentation**

The assessments chosen for the study included a Motivation to Read Profile developed by Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, and Mazzoni (1997). At the start of the ten-week cycle, both experimental and control group participants were given the Motivation to Read Profile as a pretest. The students answered twenty multiple choice questions, resulting in two scores: one for “self-concept as a reader” and one for perceived “value of reading.” Each area (self concept, or SC and value of reading, or V) yielded a possible score of 40, resulting in a Full Survey, or FS, possible raw score of 80.

In addition, in order to determine comprehension levels for each child, an assessment process was constructed which included the administration of the Burns and Roe Informal Reading Inventory, followed by the comprehension subtest of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (SDRT). The purpose of giving the Burns and Roe first was to identify each child’s approximate independent and instructional reading levels so that an appropriate out-of-level SDRT could be administered. Raw scores were then converted into derived scores, showing students’ reading grade levels (grade equivalencies, or GE) for pre-test purposes.

Once the control group children (affectionately termed the “clones” due to their point by point matches with the experimental children), were tested, they were left alone for ten instructional weeks, at which time the test administrators returned to the schools to post-test, using the same measures. Where an alternate form of the SDRT was available, it was chosen in lieu of the original form in the hope of avoiding pretest effects.

**Data Collection Procedures**

All of the test administrators were well-trained reading specialist candidates who had taken at least three classes in the graduate reading program, including a specific course on assessment and testing. They were provided with explicit guidance about how to administer the Motivation to Read Profile, the Burns and Roe IRI, and the SDRT. Procedures were standardized, and parents of all children signed a release with the understanding that they would receive all assessment data from the testing for their child.

Each candidate in the reading program was asked to pretest and posttest one child from the local school system in order to determine typical reading growth in the schools (comprehension and motivation to read) without the benefit of one-on-one tutoring. Also, these same candidates were asked to pretest and posttest one child in the Literacy Center and to work with that child for a period of ten weeks once a week for an hour and fifteen minutes of tutoring. For each tutor, the child in the local school was specifically not the match for the child in the center to whom he was assigned.
Methods of Analysis

The most efficient manner of computing results from the data was to use variations of ANOVA and a multiple regression analysis to determine whether the results were significant and which factors contributed most to the independent variables. (For example, is there any pattern to how the boys scored versus girls? To how the English learners scored versus the English Only children?) A correlational procedure was also carried out to see if there was any solid relationship between growth in motivation to read and growth in comprehension.

To answer the question about gains in motivation, the data indicated a significant effect \( (t (65) = 3.56, p < .001) \), indicating more growth in motivation for the experimental group than for the control group (as based on a motivation survey). This includes both areas of self-concept and value of reading.

To answer the question about gains in reading comprehension, the data indicated a significant effect for comprehension \( (t (65) = 2.56, p < .01) \), translating into one full year of reading growth in a ten-week period for the experimental group and only 2 months of growth for the control group.

To answer the question about correlations between motivation and comprehension, there were no correlations found, but this could be due to the short length of time of instruction; the hope would be that as students grow in comprehension, their motivation to read would also increase or vice-versa.

Finally, to answer the question about whether or not it is worthwhile to tutor students for ten weeks, the data indicated that it is, in fact, in the best interests of the Literacy Center and the community to have students tutored in the center.
How does it happen?

The Literacy Center is funded largely through grants and donations. We have formed relationships with several groups including the following:

- Starbucks Foundation
- Rose Hills Foundation
- Ahmanson Foundation
- Verizon Foundation
- Parsons Foundation

These are all important members of our family here at the Literacy Center, and we thank them for their generous contributions.

For donor information, or to find out how you can help the Literacy Center, please contact Denise Gutierrez at (909) 593-3511 x4689.

University of La Verne

Literacy Center
Information Brochure

UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE

1950 Third Street
La Verne, CA 91750

Janie E. Stahly
Literacy Center Coordinator
909-593-3511 x4660
Fax: 909-392-2848

http://www.ulv.edu/litclinic
Parent Education Classes

In addition to tutoring services, the Literacy Center also offers Parent Education classes to the parents of current tutees.

Our Parent Education classes are designed to help the parents of struggling readers. We offer suggestions for working with the child at home to continue the progress started in our program here at the Center. In addition to reading support, the Parent Education classes often provide suggestions for writing activities as well.

Parents have the opportunity to request topics of interest for the sessions. The classes are led by graduates of our program, and are held twice each term.

Frequently Asked Questions

The Literacy Center provides one-on-one specialized instruction for students who are struggling in reading. Through open lines of communication with the tutee’s school, we establish an individualized reading program targeted to meet the tutee’s specific needs.

WHO ARE YOUR TUTEES?
The Literacy Center services students in grades 1-12 who are at least two years below grade level in reading. We accept English Language Learners who are at the Intermediate level and above (with the exception of RDG 518). Students who receive special education services are accepted only for designated sessions.

WHO ARE YOUR TUTORS?
The Literacy Center tutors are candidates in our Reading Specialist Certificate/Credential or Masters in Reading programs. They are all credentialed teachers.

HOW DOES IT WORK?
Tutoring sessions are held once a week from 4:00 – 5:15 p.m. in the Literacy Center at ULV. Each term lasts for ten weeks. We have terms that run each spring, summer, fall, and winter.

WHAT DOES IT COST?
There is a one-time, non-refundable fee of $55 per tutee, per term. This fee covers the cost of materials, postage, reading incentives, and snacks for the tutees.

HOW DO I SIGN UP?
We currently have a waiting list of approximately 50 students. However, a new term with specific selection criteria begins every ten weeks. To be added to the waiting list you will need your student’s teacher or principal to fill out our recommendation form (call to request form). You will be notified as soon as space becomes available.

Session Specifics

The tutee criteria for each session is determined based on the courses offered to our candidates. The following are descriptions of the students serviced by the candidates in each course, as well as the terms during which each course is generally offered:

RDG 510: Grades 1-3, Beginning Reader (fall term)
RDG 514: Grades 4-6, Intermediate Struggling Reader (winter term)
RDG 516: Grades 4-6, Intermediate Struggling Reader (spring term)
RDG 518: Grades 3-8, ELL (Early Intermediate or Intermediate English Learners only (summer term)
RDG 520: Grades 7-12, Adolescent with severe reading difficulties (fall term)
RDG 521: Grades 3-8, Intermediate Struggling "Reluctant" Reader (winter term)
RDG 525: Grades 1-3, Beginning Struggling Reader (summer term)
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READING CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONS

Intellectual Commitment (RDG 525)
Seeks pathways for improvement in literacy education based on current research, advanced learning opportunities, and collaboration with colleagues, parents, and students.

Respectfulness (RDG 516)
Communicates expectations, professional/personal opinions, or philosophical perspectives and responds to requests, suggestions, and feedback in a reflective and appropriate manner.

Professionalism (RDG 514)
Demonstrates a strong commitment to literacy education and fulfills the role of a model and expert in an interactive, academic context.

Empathy (RDG 520)
Models patience, flexibility, and compassion in working with others, showing an ability to understand the perspectives of others and help them to obtain educational goals.

Socio-Cultural Competence (RDG 518)
Shows acceptance of diversity in varying cultural perspectives and individual learning styles, and recognizes others' contributions and strengths.

Responsibility (RDG 510)
Is accountable for actions, behaviors, and decisions related to academic roles and expectations and interpersonal relationships.

Commitment to Professional Development (RDG 530)
Exhibits dedication to professional growth in literacy education, seeking out leadership opportunities and maximizing expertise through educational options.

Ethical Behavior (RDG 524)
Maintains high standards for following the guidelines of honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and fairness, both personally and professionally.

Advocacy (RDG 521)
Is a supporter of students, parents, faculty, staff, and the profession. Uses knowledge of research and best practices to inform recommendations.
Appendix 15
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READING 522 (3 UNITS)
LITERACY INSTRUCTION FOR SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS
University of La Verne
Main Campus, Spring Term, 2008
Wednesdays, 4-8:30 PM, CRN 2827
Instructor: Kathy Mionske, M.S.

Office Hours: 3:30-4:00 Wednesdays
Office Phone: (909) 593-3511, X4660 for messages only
E-Mail: kmionske2@msn.com
Fax: (909) 392-2848

Course Description

This course is designed to provide information to general education teachers and reading specialist candidates related to students with specific learning disabilities. Candidates will be informed of state and federal laws and regulations pertaining to special education students and become familiar with the different aspects of learning disabilities, including processing disorders that underlie the learning difficulties. The intent of the course is to enable candidates to develop instructional strategies and modification techniques in order to meet the special needs of these particular students.

The fieldwork portion of the course, ten tutorial sessions with a special education student who is in grades 3-8 and is reading at least two years below grade level, offers participants authentic clinical experiences with children with special needs. During this time, they develop skills in the planning, delivery, and evaluation of appropriate instructional activities linked to specific skills that correlate with the individualized program (I.E.P.) designed for their learning disabled students.

Course Goals and Objectives

Students who take this course will:

- design an instructional lesson that will coordinate with a learning disabled student’s Individualized Education Plan;

- become familiar with the state and federal laws regarding special education students;
- learn about the different types of learning disabilities and become familiar with the vocabulary of special education;

- recognize the cognitive and perceptual problems of learning disabled students;

- identify intervention strategies to use with learning disabled students;

- utilize appropriate software programs to support students in their reading and writing activities to meet specific IEP and clinic goals;

- become acquainted with specific research about effective methodology for learning disabled students.

**Course Requirements and Grading Criteria**

- Punctuality and regular attendance in class, as well as full participation in each session (4 points are deducted for each missed class hour); assigned readings of texts and handouts read prior to class session (65 points)

  **Ten Tutorial Sessions (1 hour and 15 minutes each)**

  In order to insure a high degree of professionalism, it is critical that all candidates arrive on time for the tutorial sessions.

  Chronic tardiness may result in an “incomplete” for the semester and a reassignment of the tutee to another tutor for the balance of the term

- Reflection on previous special education experiences (20 points)

- 8 Special education session plans (80 points/10 each)

- Reflection responses for chapter readings, including *My 13th Winter*, (60 points)

- Strategy lesson demonstration (50 points)

- Notebook organized with handouts (50)
· Diagnostic Report including Presentation to class (100 points/written format; 25 points oral)

· Literacy Profile, including Parent Conference (25 points)

· Diagnostic Report to Schools (25 points)

· Satisfactory Completion of Candidate Competency Form related to state standards and course objectives for RDG 522 (25 points)

**Grading Policies**

THERE IS A 10% PENALTY FOR ANY ASSIGNMENT THAT IS SUBMITTED PAST THE DUE DATE. Any assignment submitted after the due date and before or during the next class period is counted one week late. Work will not be accepted later than two weeks. Work dropped off to the clinic needs to be signed and dated by the director or other school personnel.

Any one assignment that is not representative of graduate level quality (C+ or below) may be revised and resubmitted for a new grade. However, the highest grade that a revised paper or project may receive is 80% (a B-). **Only one assignment** may be revised during the semester.

Grades will be determined by percentages:  94-100%=A; 90-93.9%=A-; 87-89.9%=B+; 83-86.9%=B; 80-82.9%=B-; 77-79.9%=C+; 73-76.9%=C.

*Please note: If a student is absent more than 20% of the total number of hours, course credit in the class will be jeopardized, and (s)he will be required to repeat the course at another time. Missed tutorial time with the tutee (fewer than 10 hours) must be made up by the candidate in order to satisfy fieldwork requirements.*

**Incompletes**

Please note that “incomplete” grades will be assigned ONLY in cases of emergency illness or other serious unexpected circumstances. Assignments turned in subsequent to the university term to fulfill “incomplete” requirements will receive late penalties, just as do late assignments submitted during the regular semester.

**Required Texts for Use Throughout Program**

Required Texts for RDG 522


Recommended Readings


**Schedule of Topics, Assignments, and Exams**

**SESSION 1 (March 26)**

**TOPIC:** FOUNDATIONS OF LEARNING DISABILITIES

Introduction: class members; do overview of syllabus

Skim: Reinforcer Survey handout (for tutee)

Complete: Facts and Fables Survey

Read: Terminology/Glossary handout

Receive: Initial handouts for Notebook

Watch: video entitled "F.A.T. City"

Choose: one reading strategy for demonstration to class (based on list from Walker text, provided in class); modifications will be added and emphasized

Demo: cloze procedure for recall of details in reading passages (Walker text)

Demo: paired reading (Walker text)

Discuss: IEPs-- starting analyses for work with tutees

**FW SEM:** Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

**DUE:** *Reflection on Special Education Experience (see guidelines)*

**SESSION 2 (April 2)**

**TOPIC:** ASSESSMENT AND TEACHING

Discuss: accommodations/modifications (handout)

Highlight: standardized assessment: Woodcock Johnson III (activity)
Analyze: sample I.E.P.
Read: Learning Styles Inventory
Review: assessment concepts (see Gates-MacGinitie manuals)
Consider: interpretation of assessments
Review: examples of different profiles
Discuss: "The Reading Initiative" (jigsaw)
Begin: Reading strategy demonstrations; include ideas for modification
Demo: Directed Reading Thinking Activity (Walker text)
Demo: Experience-Text-Relationship (Walker text)

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Learner, Chapter 1, pp. 1-23; 28-39
DUE: Reflection responses 1, 3, 5 (for discussion)
DUE: Lerner, Chapter 2 pp. 44-88
DUE: Reflection responses 4, 5, and 6 (for discussion)
DUE: Special Education Session Plan #1

SESSION 3 (April 9)

TOPIC: GENERAL EDUCATION/SPECIAL EDUCATION COLLABORATION

Define: Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD)
Discuss: Inclusion---The Current Phase
Consider: Section 504 Students and General Education
Interpret: No Child Left Behind and Special Education
Analyze: Case Study Examples
Administer: Gates-MacGinitie Survey Test
Do: "Copy Me" activity (see handout)
Continue: Reading strategy demonstrations; include ideas for modification
Demo: Herringbone Technique (Walker text)
Demo: Other graphic organizers for use with reading/writing (Walker text)
Demo: Say Something (Walker text)
FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Lerner, Chapters 3, pp.111-124
DUE: Reflection Responses 4 and 6 (for discussion)
DUE: Special Education Session Plan #2

SESSION 4 (April 16)

TOPIC: THEORIES OF LEARNING/PROCESSING DISORDERS

Identify: different processing Disorders
Engage in: simulations of Processing Disorders
Continue: Reading strategy demonstrations; include ideas for modification
Demo: Journal Writing (Walker text)
Demo: Think Aloud Approach (Walker text)
Introduce: Guest Speaker (school psychologist)
Interpret: findings from Gates-MacGinitie Survey Test

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Lerner, Chapter 5 pp. 169-191
DUE: Reflection responses 2,4,7 (for discussion)
DUE: Special Education Session Plan #3

SESSION 5 (April 23)

TOPIC: ATTENTION DEFICIT DISORDERS

Define: Attention Deficit Disorders
Read: "A Parent's Story" for group discussion
Do: distraction activity (Chaotic Computing)
Discuss: ADDHD characteristics
Continue: Reading strategy demonstrations; include ideas for modification
Demo: Language Experience Approach (Walker text)
Demo: Literature Circles (Walker text)
FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Lerner, Chapter 6 pp. 196-215
DUE: Reflection responses 1, 2, 3, 4 (for discussion)
DUE: Special Education Session Plan #4

SESSION 6 (April 30)

TOPIC: YOUNG CHILDREN AND LEARNING DISABILITIES

Read: “Assessment To Help Struggling Young Readers: The Early Warning Signs of a Reading Problem,” by Hall
Discuss: major points of the article by Hall
View: video, entitled “Last One Picked/First One Picked On”
Discuss: implications of the video
Continue: Reading strategy demonstrations; include ideas for modification
Demo: Making Words (Walker text)
Demo: Word Sorts (Walker text)
Demo: Contextual Processing--context clues (Walker text)
Begin: discussion with tutee about future aspirations (job/vocation); informal interview to take place next week about specifics

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Lerner, Chapter 7, pp. 229-262
DUE: Reflection responses 2 and 4 (for discussion)
DUE: Special Education Session Plan #5
SESSION 7 (May 7)

TOPIC: ADOLESCENTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

Discuss: “When Older Students Can’t Read” (handout)
View: video, entitled “When the Chips Are Down”
Share: Ideas from the video and connections to readings
Summarize: transition services (and future trends)
Analyze: a transition plan
Predict: impact of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)
Contrast: reading in the content areas with emergent literacy procedures
Demo: Generative Reciprocal Inference Procedure (Walker text)
Demo: Prediction Logs (Walker text)
Discuss: Study questions/answers for My Thirteenth Winter
Interview: tutee about future aspirations (job, vocation, etc.)

FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Lerner, Chapter 8, pp. 267-290
DUE: Reflection responses 1, 2, 3, 4 (for discussion)
DUE: Special Education Session Plan #6
DUE: Study questions/answers for My Thirteenth Winter, pp. 1-64
DUE: 1/2 Case Study Presentations

SESSION 8 (May 14)

TOPIC: ORAL LANGUAGE: LISTENING AND SPEAKING

Review: Elkonin Boxes for phonemic awareness
Highlight: types of oral language activities
Discuss: Study questions/answers for My Thirteenth Winter, pp. 65-132
Continue: Reading strategy demonstrations; include ideas for modification
Demo: Readers’ Theater (Walker text)
Demo: ReQuest (Walker text)
Find/present: information on job/vocation requirements to tutee; add tutees' responses
Discuss: Case Study Presentations/implications
Finish: filling out Candidate Competency Forms

DUE: 1/2 Case Study Presentations
DUE: Candidate Competency Forms
DUE: Literacy Profiles And Diagnostic Report To Schools
DUE: Lerner, Chapter 10, pp. 324-368
DUE: Reflection responses 1 and 2 (for discussion)
DUE: Study questions/answers for My Thirteenth Winter, Pages 65-132
DUE: Special Education Session Plan #7

SESSION 9 (May 21)

TOPIC: WRITTEN LANGUAGE; WRITTEN EXPRESSION AND SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR

Jigsaw: articles on Asperger's Syndrome and autism
Finish: reading strategy demonstrations; include ideas for modification
Demo: Triple Read Outline (Walker text)
Demo: Feature Analysis Grid (Walker text)
Discuss: Study questions/answers for My Thirteenth Winter, pp. 65-132; emphasize connections between this book and personal experiences with children who have specific learning disabilities (text to self connections)
Do: Case Study Presentations (1/2, selection by lottery)
Read: “Top Five Emotional Difficulties"
Relate: top five difficulties to tutees' situations
FW SEM: Opportunities after tutorial sessions related to assessment and instruction of tutees: instructor feedback and clarification, candidate sharing and collaboration, ideas/suggestions for lesson modifications and next tutorial steps

DUE: Lerner, Chapter 12, pp. 438-472
DUE: Reflection responses 3, 4, 5, 6
DUE: Lerner, Chapter 14, pp. 518-542
DUE: Reflection responses 1, 2, 3 (for discussion)
DUE: Study questions/answers for My Thirteenth Winter, Pages 133-end
DUE: Special Education Session Plan # 8
Academic Honesty Guidelines

The University of La Verne embodies a tradition of learning and scholarship that stresses conscientious, scholarly effort and a scrupulous regard for the intellectual and academic contributions of others. Indeed, this tradition stands at the virtual foundation of most American institutions of higher learning. This implies that, more than just imparting knowledge and ideas, the University means to instill a sense of integrity about academic work in its students.

ULV’s official statement on Academic Honesty is contained in the Rights and Responsibilities section of the current Catalog, and should be read and understood by each student in the University. The purpose of this communication is to provide additional information and guidance on several of the policy areas in order that there be no misunderstanding regarding the University’s position on academic honesty.

Types of Academic Dishonesty

In general, academic dishonesty falls into two major categories:

Cheating
- Copying or using crib notes in examinations, homework, lab assignments, or written products.
- Submitting papers done entirely or in part by another person.
- Giving to or getting exam answers from another student.

Plagiarism
- Representation of another person’s words or ideas as your own by not properly citing them.

Acts of Academic Dishonesty

Specific acts of academic dishonesty include at least the following:

a. Copying material from someone else’s work without footnoting this source.
b. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam.
c. Copying answers from a fellow student’s homework instead of doing the work independently.
d. “Padding” a bibliography with citations never read.
e. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
f. Submitting to an instructor a paper that was written all or in part by someone else.
g. Copying from someone’s test or exam paper with or without the person knowing it.
h. Working on the same homework with other students when the teacher does not allow it.
i. Writing a paper for another student.
j. Taking an exam for another student.
k. Having another student take an exam for you.
l. Using the same paper to fulfill requirements in two different courses without the instructor’s permission.

While the majority of this list constitutes blatant cheating, a few (e.g. a, c, and d) involve the less clear work or plagiarism.
The plagiarist is the academic counterpart of the bank embezzler or the product mislabeler, and involves a student or scholar who leads the reader to believe that what is being read is the original work of the writer, when it is not. Sometimes, students of good will are guilty of plagiarism simply because they are not aware of the illegality of certain kinds of “borrowing” and of the procedures for correct identification of materials other than those gained through independent research and reflection.

The range of possible plagiarism activities is a wide one, with the following major categories identified in decreasing order of severity.

a. Word-for-word copying of another's writing, without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and identifying it with a footnote, both of which are necessary.

b. The mosaic, a random patchwork of readings and snatches of phrases that are woven into the text resulting in a collage of other people’s words and ideas, with the writer's sole contribution being the cement holding the pieces together.

c. The paraphrase, an abbreviated (and often skillfully prepared) restatement of someone else’s analysis or conclusions without acknowledgement of that other person’s text or writings.

d. The apt term, in which a particular phrase so admirably expresses one's opinion that, either consciously or unconsciously, the term is adopted as one’s personal contributions to scholarship.

Most students need only to guard against unintentional plagiarism. If more information is needed on the finer details of the subject, please see the sources listed below, or speak with your instructor.

Summary

Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated at the University of La Verne. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the ultimate “loser” in cases of cheating or plagiarism is the student himself or herself, for whom the learning opportunity forfeited by such acts can never be regained. It is expected that each student at this University will understand and support the fundamental policy of academic honesty discussed above.
Appendix 16
(RDG 510 Sample)
Lesson Plan Format
Reading 510
Tutorial Lesson Plan

Candidate’s Name ____________________  Tutee________________

Grade _________ Age_________ L1____________ L2______________

Tutorial Date ___________________  Meeting # __________

Assessment (1  2  3  4)

Assessment Information To Guide Objectives

A.

B.

C.

Planning (1  2  3  4)

Lesson Plan Objectives

A.

B.

C.
Required Lesson Materials

Standards Matched to Objectives

A.

B.

C.

Knowledge (1 2 3 4)

Predicted Lesson Plan Steps
### Actual Lesson Plan Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity (1 2 3 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Student Modifications—Applications from 21st Century (Graves, 2007)**
Evaluation (1 2 3 4)

Evaluate and Reflect

- Appropriateness of Objective 1 2 3 4 5
- Appropriate Reading Level 1 2 3 4 5
- Pacing 1 2 3 4 5
- Engagement 1 2 3 4 5
- Overall Appraisal of Lesson Success 1 2 3 4 5

Put an asterisk by one area for improvement and provide suggestions:

Disposition: Responsibility

______/20

Instructor Comments:
Appendix 17
(Diagnostic Report & Literacy Profile)
District: __________________ School: ___________ Teacher: ___________
Child’s Name: __________________ Grade: __________________
Reading Candidate: ________ Term: ________ Year: ________

**Diagnostic Report for Schools**

**Word Recognition/ Fluency**
(sight words, phonics, structural analysis, context clues)

Assessments:

Results/Findings:

**Instructional Objectives:**

Strategies:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Findings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Findings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Equivalency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for next instructional steps:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Tutor ______________________
School ____________________
District ____________________

**Literacy Profile**

Name ________________________ Age ______ Grade ______

Student's interest:

Assessments given:

Student's strengths and weaknesses:

Recommendations for further instruction:

Additional comments:

White—Parent Copy   Yellow—Candidate Copy   Pink—Tutee File
Appendix 18
(Candidate Competency Form)
**Candidate Competency Documentation**

Candidate demonstrates the ability to:

1. Learn specific assessments procedures for determining literacy and language skill levels of (Standards 4,5,7,8,9,10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Only students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Learn various ways to plan and deliver appropriate instruction that takes into account the needs of all students in the areas of (Standards 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Be able to justify instructional plans for students, based on valid and appropriate assessment information. (Standards 4,5,7,8,9,10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments are valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments are appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Read and apply relevant research/information related to (Standards 2,4,5,6,7,8,9):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/Literacy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Recognize when assessments instruments may be (Standards 4,7,8,9):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culturally biased</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regionally biased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Learn various ways of helping parents to become involved in their children's literacy development (Standards 8,9,10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At school</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the home setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Develop professionally by becoming familiar with well-known publishers and authors of testing materials. (Standards 6,7,8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal reading inventories</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading survey tests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic reading tests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 19
(Taskstream Rubric for Assessment RDG 514)
# RDG 514 Lesson Plan/Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Present</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of assessment instruments</td>
<td>Instruments do not reflect emergent literacy behaviors</td>
<td>Instruments are chosen to reflect emergent literacy behaviors in only one area: PA, concepts about print, spelling, word recognition, and beginning writing</td>
<td>Instruments are chosen to reflect emergent literacy behaviors in two areas: PA, concepts about print, spelling, word recognition, and beginning writing</td>
<td>Instruments are chosen to reflect emergent literacy behaviors in at least three areas: PA, concepts about print, spelling, word recognition, and beginning writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of assessment instruments</td>
<td>Inclusion of only one instrument that assesses only reading or writing</td>
<td>Inclusion of multiple instruments that assess only reading or writing</td>
<td>Inclusion of only formal or informal instruments to assess reading/writing</td>
<td>Inclusion of both formal and informal instruments to assess reading/writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of assessment data</td>
<td>Severely limited analysis of assessment data; results may not be included at all</td>
<td>Partial or inconclusive analysis of assessment data; results are generally implied</td>
<td>Sufficient analysis of assessment data; results are generally stated</td>
<td>Thorough, sensitive, and accurate analysis of assessment data; results are specifically stated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of assessment instruments</td>
<td>Does not take into account variables such as child’s grade, age, primary and second language(s) and background knowledge</td>
<td>Minimally takes into account some variables such as including child’s grade, age, primary and second language(s) and background knowledge</td>
<td>Satisfactorily takes into account most variables such as child’s grade, age, primary and second language(s) and background knowledge</td>
<td>Strongly takes into account all variables including child’s grade, age, primary and second language(s), and background knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between assessment data and instructional options</td>
<td>Assessment data cannot clearly be translated into instructional options</td>
<td>Assessment data may not be easily translated into separate instructional options</td>
<td>Assessment data can be easily translated into two separate instructional options</td>
<td>Assessment data can be clearly and easily translated into three separate instructional options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 20
(Taskstream Rubric for Planning RDG 518)
# RDG 518 Lesson Plan/Planning Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Information</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
<th>Emergent</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment information is missing or unclear; may have fewer than three sources of data</td>
<td>Assessment information is generally described and includes at least three sources of data; may not list identified &quot;results&quot;</td>
<td>Assessment information is specifically described and includes at least three sources of data with identified &quot;results&quot;</td>
<td>Assessment information is specifically described (within at least two instructional areas) and includes three sources of data with identified &quot;results&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Objectives do not show what students will be able to do as a result of the lesson; may not be related to standards</td>
<td>Objectives do not provide a clear sense of what students will be able to do as a result of the lesson. Some of the objectives may not be related to standards.</td>
<td>Objectives provide sense of what students will be able to do as a result of the lesson. Most of the objectives are related to standards.</td>
<td>Objectives provide a clear sense of what students be able to do as a result of the lesson. All objectives are clearly and closely related to standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link between assessments and objectives</td>
<td>Objectives may be poorly written; may not be linked with assessment data</td>
<td>Objectives are appropriately written; may not be linked clearly with assessment data</td>
<td>Three appropriately written objectives are generally linked with assessment data</td>
<td>Three appropriately written objectives (in at least two instructional areas) are specifically linked with all assessment data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of instructional strategies and activities in plan</td>
<td>Strategies are unrelated to objectives. Many strategies and activities are extraneous and irrelevant. No attempt is made to individualize activities for learning styles or strengths.</td>
<td>Strategies are related to objectives. No attempt is made to individualize activities for learning styles or strengths.</td>
<td>Strategies are clearly related to objectives. Attempts are made to individualize activities for learning styles or strengths.</td>
<td>Strategies are clearly related to objectives and are based on individualized learning styles or strengths.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources/materials for lesson</td>
<td>Resources needed for lesson are not included</td>
<td>Resources needed for lesson are included in plan;</td>
<td>Resources needed for lesson are included in plan</td>
<td>Resources needed for lesson are included in plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 21
(Taskstream Rubric for Diversity RDG 520)
## RDG 520 Reflection Paper/Diversity Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>not present</th>
<th>emergent</th>
<th>competent</th>
<th>exceptional</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concept of diversity is approached in a superficial and unmeaningful way</td>
<td>Concept of diversity is narrowly defined to include culture, language, &amp; ethnicity; may not take other factors into account</td>
<td>Concept of diversity is defined to include culture, language, &amp; ethnicity; includes at least two other factors such as SES, gender, educational contexts, and learning styles</td>
<td>Concept of diversity is defined broadly and sensitively; includes culture, language, &amp; ethnicity, as well as SES, gender, educational contexts, and learning styles</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of information</td>
<td>Does not utilize multiple sources; may not include research from course readings/assignments</td>
<td>Utilizes more than one source; includes some research from course readings/assignments</td>
<td>Utilizes a variety of sources; includes related research from course readings/assignments</td>
<td>Utilizes a wide variety of sources; includes significant and relevant research from course readings/assignments</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study approach</td>
<td>Paper perspective is not based on tutorial with tutee who has severe reading/writing problems</td>
<td>Paper perspective is based loosely on tutorial with tutee who has severe reading/writing problems</td>
<td>Paper perspective is based generally on tutorial with tutee who has severe reading/writing problems</td>
<td>Paper perspective is based primarily on tutorial with tutee who has severe reading/writing problems</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influences/factors</td>
<td>Factors related to diversity are not analyzed</td>
<td>Factors related to diversity are analyzed in limited fashion</td>
<td>Factors related to diversity are analyzed thoughtfully</td>
<td>All factors related to diversity are analyzed fully and perceptively</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research underpinnings</td>
<td>Research is not included to support case study issues and findings</td>
<td>Research is included to support some case study issues and findings</td>
<td>Relevant research is included to support major case study issues and findings</td>
<td>Relevant, key research is integrated seamlessly into discussion of major case study issues and findings</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[http://mac.taskstream.com/mac/rubric/print.asp?qyz=EoE6jCFU00JT0PSPbLE&xyzy=kthgfjzphlzjzbzn&rld=amh1c_zlf7e_zbzd&ticker=23](http://mac.taskstream.com/mac/rubric/print.asp?qyz=EoE6jCFU00JT0PSPbLE&xyzy=kthgfjzphlzjzbzn&rld=amh1c_zlf7e_zbzd&ticker=23)
Appendix 22
(Taskstream Rubric for Technology RDG 525)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy and Stance</th>
<th>not present</th>
<th>emergent</th>
<th>competent</th>
<th>exceptional</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of policy and presenter stance is unclear; may not be addressed during the first two presentation slides</td>
<td>Nature of policy and presenter stance is general; may not be addressed during the first two presentation slides</td>
<td>Nature of policy and presenter stance is clearly represented by a thesis in the first two slides; points are relevant but possibly unstructured</td>
<td>Nature of policy and presenter stance is strongly represented by a clear thesis; points are logical and effectively expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Organization             | Supporting content is disconnected and unclear; may lack connection with presenter’s stance | Supporting content for presenter’s stance is not cohesive; transitions may lack clarity or precision | Supporting content is organized logically and matches presenter’s stance; more precision with transitions may be needed | Development of presenter’s stance is clear through use of specific and appropriate examples; transitions are clear and create a succinct and even flow | | |

| Thoroughness and Relevance of Research | Research cited is inadequate (fewer than four citations and possibly no Reference Page); may not be relevant to policy and stance | Research cited is limited (fewer than four citations but with a Reference Page) yet relevant to policy and stance | Research cited is sufficient (including at least four citations and Reference Page) and generally relevant to policy and stance | Research cited is substantial (including at least five citations and Reference Page) and strongly relevant to policy and stance | | |

<p>| Creativity and Interpretation | Shows no originality of presented material; possibly repetitive and dryly factual in nature | Shows little originality of presented material/interpretation; may be accurate but not engaging | Shows some apparent originality of presented material/interpretation; is generally appealing and engaging | Shows exceptional originality of presented material/interpretation; is artistic, stimulating, and impactful | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technological Applications/Clarity</th>
<th>Slides are laid out in a disorganized fashion and are difficult to read; may include simplistic images, too much text, many vocal interrupters, small font, or pacing flaws</th>
<th>Slides are laid out in a reasonably organized fashion, are understandable, include relevant images, have some bullet points in place of text; may have many vocal interrupters, small font, or pacing weaknesses</th>
<th>Slides are clearly laid out, are easy to read, include interesting images, have many bullet points in place of text, large font, and adequate pacing; may have 1-2 vocal interrupters</th>
<th>Slides are logically laid out, are easy to read, include eye-catching images, have mostly bullet points in place of text, large font, no vocal interrupters, and good pacing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APA Guidelines</td>
<td>Citations and references do not follow correct APA format; includes more than 6 errors</td>
<td>Citations and references mostly follow correct APA format with 3-6 errors</td>
<td>Citations and references generally follow correct APA format with only 1 or 2 errors</td>
<td>Citations and references completely follow correct APA format with no errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive Power</td>
<td>May not reveal an adequate sense of the audience or argue in a convincing manner for the policy adoption or rejection</td>
<td>Reveals an adequate sense of the audience; appears &quot;matter of fact&quot; in presenting the argument for the policy adoption or rejection</td>
<td>Reveals a sense of the audience and is satisfactorily convincing in the argument for the policy adoption or rejection</td>
<td>Reveals a strong sense of audience, is effectively persuasive, demonstrates passion for the policy adoption or rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Length and Time Frame</td>
<td>Presentation includes fewer than 10 slides; may fall severely outside of prescribed time frame</td>
<td>Presentation includes only 10-13 slides; may fall outside of prescribed time frame</td>
<td>Presentation falls within two minutes (high or low) of prescribed time frame with 14 or more slides</td>
<td>Presentation falls within prescribed time frame with 14 or more slides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 23
(Taskstream Rubric for Knowledge-Competency Exam after RDG 530)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>topic components</th>
<th>not present</th>
<th>emergent</th>
<th>competent</th>
<th>exceptional</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>command of content</td>
<td>response does not include components of prompt</td>
<td>response includes some components of prompt</td>
<td>response includes most components of prompt</td>
<td>response includes all components of prompt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(topic)</td>
<td>(topic)</td>
<td>(topic)</td>
<td>(topic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accuracy of information</td>
<td>does not demonstrate knowledge of the content</td>
<td>demonstrates minimal knowledge of the content</td>
<td>demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the</td>
<td>demonstrates strong knowledge of the content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information</td>
<td>information</td>
<td>content</td>
<td>information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support/development</td>
<td>information in the response is not factually</td>
<td>some information</td>
<td>most of the information in the response is</td>
<td>all information in the response is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accurate</td>
<td>factually accurate</td>
<td>factually accurate</td>
<td>factually accurate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td>support for major points is lacking; response is</td>
<td>supports major points are adequate; response</td>
<td>includes appropriate applications of</td>
<td>includes insightful applications of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undeveloped</td>
<td>is minimally developed</td>
<td>educational theory/research</td>
<td>educational theory/research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional perspective</td>
<td>response does not indicate sense of</td>
<td>response indicates some sense of</td>
<td>response indicates distinct sense of</td>
<td>response indicates sophisticated,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professionalism within the field</td>
<td>professionalism within the field; may</td>
<td>professionalism in the field, including</td>
<td>strong sense of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>include mostly common vocabulary</td>
<td>use of some technical vocabulary</td>
<td>professionalism in the field, including</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>frequent use of technical vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 24
(End of Program Competencies-Candidate Self Evaluations)
### WORD RECOGNITION/FLUENCY

**1. Reading Specialist is able to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand how the awareness of graphemes, phonemes, and morphemes contribute to the development of the proficient reader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match students' stages of spelling to appropriate orthographic instructional activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students appropriate decoding and word attack skills, including phonics, structural analysis, sight words, and context clues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strategy development in fluency with a focus on automaticity, pacing, accuracy, and prosody.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMPREHENSION/VOCABULARY

**2. Reading Specialist is able to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider the differences between text analysis/comprehension of narrative and expository texts and the demands they place upon readers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize a wide variety of instructional strategies and texts to help ALL students develop comprehension and metacognitive skills in reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students become competent comprehenders of written material, with particular emphases on academic language, background knowledge, and concept formation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement effective vocabulary building strategies to support learners' developmental levels and build background knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WRITING

3. Reading Specialist is able to:

| Utilize strategies for teaching each stage of the writing process (pre-writing, writing, revision/editing, publishing). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Design and implement appropriate rubrics (holistic/analytic) matched to instructional goals. |  |  |  |  |
| Individualize instruction for students' strengths and weaknesses. |  |  |  |  |

### ASSESSMENT

4. Reading Specialist is able to:

| Use informal and formal assessment procedures for determining literacy and language skills of learners (including special needs students, English learners, and struggling early or intermediate level readers). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Utilize ongoing formative and summative assessments to guide the planning, implementation, and evaluation of literacy instruction. |  |  |  |  |
| Recognize when assessment instruments may be culturally and/or regionally biased or inappropriate for special needs students. |  |  |  |  |
| Demonstrate familiarity with well-known publishers and authors of testing materials by maintaining file of valid and reliable assessment resources. |  |  |  |  |
### PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Reading Specialist is able to:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate various ways to match assessment data to lesson objectives, plan and deliver appropriate instruction for all students, including those with special needs and English learners, based on informal and formal assessments, in the areas of reading comprehension, word recognition/fluency, writing, and vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate various ways of helping parents become involved in their children’s literacy development at school and in the home setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ability to integrate literacy theory and practice through the development of lesson plans and generalizations to site-based curriculum planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Reading Specialist is able to:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be sensitive to the psychological, emotional, and physical characteristics of all students (including special needs learners, English learners, and struggling readers/writers) and develop a repertoire of approaches and modifications of instruction to support students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be responsive to diversity among learners and how school learning is affected by ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socioeconomic differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize a wide variety of ESL and sheltered (SDAIE) strategies to help contextualize and scaffold instruction to meet the needs of all English learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate research-based knowledge and in-depth understanding of how students from a variety of sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds learn to read.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine a wide range of literacy genres, including multi-cultural books for readers of all ages, grade levels, and cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TECHNOLOGY

**7. Reading Specialist is able to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use observation booth recording opportunities to demonstrate model lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use PowerPoint presentations as part of major projects requirements for courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate Blackboard capabilities into course assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize appropriate literacy software programs and sources to support curriculum development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access research databases for research purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESEARCH EVALUATION AND APPLICATION

**8. Reading Specialist is able to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit in-depth knowledge and understanding of current research that influences the teaching of reading and its application to classroom practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply relevant research for all learners, including special needs and English learners, in relation to language, literacy assessment, and evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LEADERSHIP/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

| 9. Reading Specialist is able to:                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Demonstrate effective interpersonal consultation, communication, and collaborative skills with classroom teachers, students, peers, parents, administrators, and other community members. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Display familiarity with a variety of intervention models for struggling readers including pull-out, small group, one-on-one, published, individualized, whole-class, and computer based formats. |  |  |  |  |
| Provide effective leadership through program, curriculum, instructional, and intervention decisions based on valid and reliable research; conduct staff development presentations as appropriate. |  |  |  |  |
| Participate in professional activities and organizations relating to ongoing professional development. |  |  |  |  |

### OVERALL SELF-EVALUATION

| 10. Reading Specialist is able to:                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Consider effectiveness of program preparation in determining sense of personal and professional development as a reading specialist. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Appendix 25
(End of Program Competencies- Employers)
# READING SPECIALIST COMPETENCIES

**Specialist is able to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## I. WORD RECOGNITION/FLUENCY

- Match learners’ developmental stages to appropriate spelling instruction.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4
- Teach students appropriate decoding and word attack skills.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4
- Support fluency reading: automaticity, accuracy, and pacing.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4

## II. COMPREHENSION/VOCABULARY

- Help students become confident comprehenders of a variety of texts.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4
- Implement effective vocabulary building strategies.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4

## III. WRITING

- Utilize strategies for teaching stages of the writing process.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4
- Utilize appropriate writing rubrics for assessment of writing.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4

## IV. ASSESSMENT

- Utilize informal and formal assessment procedures for determining literacy and language skills of learners.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4
- Utilize assessment results, formatively and summatively.:
  - a. to guide the implementation of literacy instruction.  
    1 | 2 | 3 | 4
  - b. to evaluate the effectiveness of literacy instruction.  
    1 | 2 | 3 | 4

## V. PLANNING

- Demonstrate ability to match assessment data to lesson objectives/standards.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4
- Plan and deliver appropriate literacy instruction matched to objectives/standards.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4
- Encourage parents to get involved in student’s literacy development.  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4

## VI. DIVERSITY

- Be responsive to the psychological, emotional, and physical characteristics of all learners (including special needs learners, English learners, struggling readers/writers).  
  1 | 2 | 3 | 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrate a repertoire of instructional approaches and modifications to support students.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII. TECHNOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize appropriate technological support to implement effective literacy instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIII. RESEARCH EVALUATION AND APPLICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply relevant research in reading and writing to classroom practice and curriculum development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IX. LEADERSHIP/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate effective interpersonal consultation, communication, and collaborative skills with students, faculty/administrators, and community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in activities and organizations related to ongoing professional development in the field of literacy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X. OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF LITERACY SPECIALIST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 26
(Independent Reading Forms)
Recreational Reading

Name: ___________________ Week Of: __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Pages Read From</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Response or Prediction</th>
<th>Stamp/Parent's Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading Responses

1. I like what I just read because...

2. The last thing that happened in the story was...

3. So far, the bad guy in this story is _____ because...

4. Today I learned something new. I learned that...

5. In the next part of my book, I think that _____ will probably happen.

6. I like what this character did because (or BUT)...

7. The main character is like _____ because...

8. I didn’t understand what I read today because...

9. I will share this story with _____ because...

   10. What made this story funny was...

   11. If I could be a person from this story, I would be _____ because...

   12. The reading is getting exciting because...

   13. This story is important to me because...

   14. If I could, I would change the part about...

   15. I did/did not like the ending to the story because...

   16. YOUR OWN RESPONSE...
Reading Responses

1. I like what I just read because...
2. The last event that occurred in the story was...
3. The part I read today was mostly about one character. This character is a(n) ______ kind of person.
4. So far, the antagonist (bad guy) in this story seems to be...
5. Today I learned something new. I learned that...
6. The newspaper or magazine article that I read was about...
7. In the next part of my book, I predict that _____ will probably happen.
8. A prediction that I made earlier turned out to be right. I predicted that _____ would happen.
9. I’m not sure that I really like this magazine yet. The reason I am unsure is that...
10. I was surprised by what I read today. I thought it would be about _____, but it was about _____ instead.
11. I would like to read more articles like the one I just read. Next time I might choose an article about _____.
12. I would recommend this book or article to students who...
13. I admire what this character did because (or BUT)...
14. One new idea I learned is...
15. The main character so far seems to be _____ because...
16. I didn’t understand what I read today because...
17. I will share this article/book with _____ because...
18. The reason I chose this book or article was because...
19. What I read today was fiction/nonfiction. I know this because...
20. What made this book/article funny was...
21. If I were the author, I would add...
22. If I could be a person from this story, I would be _____ because...
23. What I read doesn’t make sense because...
24. A person who has a problem like mine to solve is _____ because...
25. The reading is getting exciting because...
26. This story is important to me because...
27. If I could, I would change the part about...
28. I enjoy _____ in this story.
29. I did/did not like the ending to the story because...
30. YOUR OWN RESPONSE...