

IRA Assessment #3 – Content Area Literacy Project (IRA Standards 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.4, 5.3)

Description of the Assessment:

The Content Area Literacy Project is conducted during enrollment in ELED 501 – Content Area Reading. Normally, this is the second reading course in which candidates enroll.

The project is completed in three stages. The first is the project proposal that is submitted to the instructor for approval. Included in the proposal must be:

1. The content domain, area, and topic.
2. The length of the instructional period.
3. A description of the units/topics to be covered.
4. Grade level of the students.
5. Reading level of the materials.
6. Complete description of the class.

Secondly, the vocabulary and/or comprehension aspect of the project is developed and field-tested.

The third phase of the project is that sharing of the project with other certified teachers. This sharing permits the candidate to coach other professionals and/or paraprofessional in the implementation of a new teaching strategy.

The following material must also accompany the project:

1. An illustrative sketch of the classroom.
2. Inclusion of the materials used.
3. A listing of related websites.
4. Copies of materials related to the activity.
5. Answer keys
6. Samples of student work.
7. Any additional materials related to the project.

Some of the possible topics to be implemented and shared include word/concept maps, graphic organizers, semantic feature analysis activities, anticipation guides, denotation vs. connotation activities, QAR activities, double-entry journals, story impressions, paragraph frames, etc.

Alignment of the Assessment with the 2003 IRA Standards:

Standards 1, 2, 4, and 5 are addressed in this assessment. The purpose of this project is to see that candidates can effectively plan, implement, and share their project outcomes with

fellow educators. Since this is the second course in reading, there is a greater emphasis on the fact that these candidates should now be capable of working more closely with other professionals as they share their projects and refine their own teaching. Coaching is done across all three levels of coaching intensity.

Analysis of the Findings:

The present rubric is a newly edited version of the instrument although the intent of the rubric is the same as was used prior to the Spring 2007. To better match the course requirements, an edited assessment tool was created and tested. Initial feedback from candidates and instructor indicated that this new assessment was more valid for working with content area teachers. This latest version (Fall 2009) is a continual refinement that now permits more exact measurement of the seven identified IRA Standards.

Data Interpretation:

A higher percentage of our candidates achieved the *Exemplary* level of performance on the identified standards. Approximately a third of them reached the *Acceptable* level of performance. Eighty-three percent of the candidates reached the *Exemplary* level of writing. This last point is notable because coherent writing becomes increasingly important, as candidates are required to do more written work as they continue to take more advanced courses in the M.Ed. in Reading program.

SECTION IV – ASSESSMENT #3
Revised – Fall 2009
Rhode Island College
Content Area Literacy Project
Scoring Guide

Name _____

Date _____

Element	Unacceptable - 1	Acceptable - 2	Exemplary - 3	Score
<p>IRA Standard 1.4</p> <p>Candidates are able to determine if students are appropriately integrating the components (phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation) in fluent reading</p>	<p>Content domain, area, & topic are inappropriate. There is a poor description of the classroom setting. Focus of the unit and topic are poorly explained.</p>	<p>Content domain, area, & topic are acceptable. There is a good description of the classroom setting. The focus of the unit and topics are acceptable.</p>	<p>Content domain, area, & topic are acceptable. Excellent description of the classroom setting. The focus of the unit and the topics are clearly explained.</p>	
<p>IRA Standard 2.1</p> <p>Candidates support classroom teachers and</p>	<p>Poor description of content literacy activity. Activity has limited use in helping students master content area concepts. Content</p>	<p>Good description of content literacy activity. Activity can be used to help students master content area concepts.</p>	<p>Excellent description of content literacy activity. Activity will lead to students' mastery of content area concepts. There is a clear identification of content</p>	

<p>paraprofessionals in their use of instructional grouping options. They help teachers select appropriate options. They demonstrate the options and explain the evidence-based rationale for changing configurations to best meet the needs of all students.</p>	<p>concepts to be learned are inappropriate.</p>		<p>concepts to be mastered.</p>	
<p>IRA Standard 2.2 Candidates support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods including technology-based practices. They help teachers select appropriate options</p>	<p>Little or no information presented about an educational websites.</p>	<p>Website(s) identified and connection with unit of instruction is described.</p>	<p>Excellent choice of website(s) and clear description of hit it will be utilized.</p>	

<p>and explain the evidence-base for selecting practices to best meet the needs of all students. They demonstrate the options in their own teaching and in demonstration teaching.</p>				
<p>IRA Standard 2.3</p> <p>Candidates support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of curriculum materials. They help teachers select appropriate options and explain the evidence base for selecting practices to best meet the needs of all students. They demonstrate the options in their own teaching and in demonstration</p>	<p>Materials selected for instruction are inappropriate. Information presented in plan is disorganized and lacks specificity. There is little or no integration of reading/writing/listening/speaking skills.</p>	<p>Materials selected for instruction are acceptable. Information presented in plan is acceptable. There is good integration of reading/writing/listening/speaking skills.</p>	<p>Exemplary materials selected for instruction. Information found in plan is highly organized with activities presented in a logical order. There is an excellent integration of reading/writing/listening/speaking skills.</p>	

teaching.				
IRA Standard 1.4 Candidates are able to determine if students are appropriately integrating the components (phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation) in fluent reading	There is a poor description of what took place during instruction.	There is a good description of what took place during instruction.	There is an exemplary description of what took place during instruction.	
IRA Standard 4.4 Candidates use methods to effectively revise instructional plans to motivate all students. They assist classroom teachers in	Low level of analysis and reflection of field testing results.	Analysis and reflection of lessons results are acceptable.	High level of analysis and reflection of field testing results.	

<p>designing programs that will intrinsically and extrinsically motivate students. They demonstrate those techniques and they can articulate the research base that grounds their practice.</p>				
<p>IRA Standard 5.3</p> <p>Candidates positively and constructively provide an evaluation of their own or other’s teaching practices. They assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals as they strive to improve their practice.</p>	<p>Few or no references made to students’ work samples.</p>	<p>Some references made to students’ work samples.</p>	<p>Numerous references made to students’ work samples.</p>	
<p>Format of Paper</p>	<p>Format of paper is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Format of paper is acceptable.</p>	<p>Format of paper is exemplary.</p>	
<p>Writing Style</p>	<p>Writing style is poor.</p>	<p>Writing style is acceptable.</p>	<p>Writing style is exemplary.</p>	
<p>Mechanics</p>	<p>Numerous errors in grammar, spelling, and mechanics.</p>	<p>Few errors in grammar, spelling, and mechanics.</p>	<p>No errors in grammar, spelling, and mechanics.</p>	

			Total Score	
--	--	--	--------------------	--

Overall Performance

Assessment:

_____ =<10
Unacceptable
REVISION

_____ 11-24
Acceptable
PASS

_____ 25-30
Exemplary
PASS

Faculty member signature(s) _____

**SECTION IV Assessment #3
Rhode Island College
M. Ed. Reading Program
Content Area Literacy Project Data Chart**

IRA Standard Element	Semester/Year	% Unacceptable	% Acceptable	% Exemplary	Number of Candidates
Standard 1.4. Demonstrate knowledge of the major components of reading (phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation) and how they are integrated in fluent reading.	Fall 2009	0%	25%	75%	8
	Spring 2009	0%	18%	82%	11
	Spring 2008	0%	10%	84%	12
	Fall 2007	0%	16%	90%	10
	Summer 2007	0%	50%	50%	12
	Spring 2007	8%	33%	58%	12
	(This is a new rubric developed in the Fall Semester of 2006 and implemented in the Spring Semester of 2007.)				
Standard 2.1. Use instructional grouping options (individual, small-group, whole-class, and computer based) as appropriate for accomplishing given purposes.	Fall 2009	0%	13%	87%	8
	Spring 2009	Rubric Revised	Rubric Revised	Rubric Revised	Rubric Revised
	Spring 2008	0%	24%	86%	12
	Fall 2007	0%	10%	90%	10
	Summer 2007	0%	42%	58%	12
	Spring 2007	8%	33%	58%	12
Standard 2.2. Use a	Fall 2009	13%	0%	87%	8

wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices, for learners at differing stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	Spring 2009	0%	64%	36%	11
	Spring 2008	0%	32%	68%	12
	Fall 2007	0%	10%	90%	10
	Summer 2007	0%	8%	92%	12
	Spring 2007	8%	33%	58%	12
<i>Standard 2.3. Use a wide range of curriculum materials in effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.</i>	Fall 2009	0%	0%	100%	8
	Spring 2009	0%	9%	91%	11
	Spring 2008	0%	24%	76%	12
	Fall 2007	0%	40%	60%	10
	Summer 2007	0%	8%	92%	12
Spring 2007	8%	42%	50%	12	
<i>Standard 4.2. Use a large supply of books, technology-based information, and non-print materials</i>	Fall 2009	0%	13%	87%	8
	Spring 2009	0%	0%	100%	11
	Spring 2008	0%	48%	52%	12
	Fall 2007	0%	40%	60%	10
	Summer 2007	0%	8%	92%	12
Spring 2007	8%	42%	50%	12	

representing multiple levels, broad interests, cultures and linguistic backgrounds.					
Standard 4.3. Model reading and writing enthusiastically as valued life-long activities. (Eliminated for Fall 2009)	Fall 2009 Spring 2009 Spring 2008 Fall 2007 Summer 2007 Spring 2007	Rubric Revised Rubric Revised 0% 0% 0% 8%	Rubric Revised Rubric Revised 16% 90% 8% 42%	Rubric Revised Rubric Revised 84% 10% 92% 50%	Rubric Revised Rubric Revised 12 10 12 12
Standard 4.4. Motivate learners to be life-long readers.	Fall 2009 Spring 2009 Spring 2008 Fall 2007 Summer 2007 Spring 2007	0% Rubric Revised 0% 0% 0% 8%	13% Rubric Revised 16% 90% 8% 25%	87% Rubric Revised 84% 10% 92% 67%	8 Rubric Revised 12 10 12 12
Standard 5.3 Candidates Positively and constructively provide an evaluation of their own or other's teaching practices. They assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals as	Fall 2009	0%	13%	87%	8

they strive to improve their practices. (Newly added for Fall 2009)					
Format of Paper (Newly added for Fall 2009)	Fall 2009	0%	0%	100%	8
Writing Style (Newly added for Fall 2009)	Fall 2009	0%	0%	100%	8
Mechanics (Newly added for Fall 2009)	Fall 2009	0%	0%	100%	8
Clear, concise, error-free written work (Eliminated for Fall 2009)	Spring 2009	9%	9%	82%	11
	Spring 2008	0%	16%	84%	12
	Fall 2007	20%	10%	70%	10
	Summer 2007	0%	8%	92%	12
	Spring 2007	8%	8%	83%	12