

IRA Assessment #6 – Practicum Coaching
(IRA Standards 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3)

Description of the Assessment:

Instituted for the first time during the Summer Session of 2006, the Practicum Coaching has become a valuable part of the M.Ed. in Reading at . The coaching takes place as part of the ELED 629: Reading Clinic. Each candidate is required to be both a presenter as well as a participant in the coaching practicum.

The coaching episode begins with the candidate videotaping some aspect of his/her teaching. Each candidate works with a team of other experienced teachers. Typically, there are four to five teachers on a team. Each teacher is responsible for two students during the clinic. Combined, there are eight to ten students and four or five teachers on a team. The videotape can be of a candidate teaching one or more students. During a read aloud, for example, an entire group may be videotaped. During word work, however, maybe one or two students may be working on a similar skill and comprise the population being taped.

Once the videotape has been made, the candidate meets with other candidate/teachers and completes the following form and answers the following questions:

**ELED 629 – SUMMER LITERACY CLINIC
COACHING TUNING PROTOCOL**

Name of Candidate _____

Name of Facilitator _____

Participants' Names

Date _____ Grade Level _____

Question to Be Explored:

Steps in the Tuning Protocol

- 1. Introduction.** What is the purpose of this activity? How does it work? What am I attempting to explore?
- 2. Teacher Presentation.** Who is the candidate? What aspect of teaching is being explored? What is the context for the work? What question(s) does the presenter want the participants to address?
- 3. Examination of Candidate Work.** In what form is the work? What does the video suggest? Is there paper documentation that needs to be explored?
- 4. Clarifying Questions.** What additional information do the participants want from the presenter?
- 5. Reflection.** Warm feedback followed by cool feedback. “I wonder?” questions. How do the participants want to respond to the presenter’s question? What recommendations do the participants want to make? **Presenter remains silent during this section.**
- 6. Reaction.** What is the presenter’s response to what he/she has heard? **Participants remain silent during this section.**
- 7. Debriefing.** How well did the process work? How helpful was it? What did we do well? What could we do better?

REACTION: THE MEANINGFUL AND DOABLE (The Presenter)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

WHAT’S NEXT?

INSTRUCTION

1. What was done?
2. What resulted?

NEXT STEPS

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Once the protocol is completed, candidates/teachers in the group complete a Debriefing Sheet that provides recommendations for the presenter.

All candidates are required to submit a copy of their videotape along with the Coaching Protocol form. The entire experience has been observed and scored, using the attached rubric, by the faculty member(s) overseeing the clinic.

Alignment of the Assessment with the 2003 IRA Standards:

The focus of this assessment is primarily on Standards 1, 2, and 5. We expect our candidates to have a sound theoretical knowledge of the reading process, to be able to plan effective instruction using appropriate practices, approaches, methods, and materials. In addition to being expert teachers, they must be able to work effectively with other educators and they, collectively, fine-tune their instruction. Candidates are expected to perform at all three levels of the coaching intensity matrix.

Analysis of the Findings:

The coaching component of our assessment system was instituted for the first time during the Summer 2006. Roughly ninety percent of our candidates reach the “Exemplary” level of performance. The coaching process is modeled for all candidates before they are expected to implement their own tuning protocol.

Data Interpretation:

The coaching component of our program was instituted at about the same time IRA issued a Position Statement in their publication *The Role and Qualifications of the Reading Coach in the United States*. We have long recognized the important functions a reading coach plays in literacy education. During the 2008-2009 academic year, one of our junior faculty members drew up plans to add a Coaching Course to our M.Ed. in Reading program. The course was to be taught during the Summer Session of 2009. Unfortunately, a lucrative job offer was made to this faculty member and she accepted the offer. The Reading faculty has been approved to hire a replacement faculty member for this individual. It is our hope that this new faculty member will renew the effort to implement this new coaching course.

**SECTION IV - Assessment #6
Revised – Fall 2009**

**Coaching/Tuning Protocol
Scoring Guide**

Name _____ Date _____

Element	Unacceptable – 1	Acceptable – 2	Exemplary – 3	Score
<p align="center">IRA Standard 1.1</p> <p>Candidates refer to major theories in the foundation areas they relate to reading. They can explain, compare, contrast, and critique the theories.</p>	Candidate is unable to explain the theory surrounding the reading lesson	Candidate explains the theory surrounding the reading lesson	Candidate does an exemplary job explaining the theory surrounding the reading lesson	
<p align="center">IRA Standard 1.3</p> <p>Candidates identify, explain, compare, and contrast the theories and research in the areas of language development and learning to read.</p>	Candidate is unable to adequately explain students' integration of reading components	Candidate is able to adequately explain students' integration of reading components	Candidate does an exemplary job of explaining students' integration of reading components	
<p align="center">IRA Standard 2.1</p> <p>Candidates support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in their use of instructional</p>	Candidate fails to follow the tuning protocol in the evaluation of the videotaped lesson	Candidate follows the tuning protocol in the evaluation of videotaped lesson	Candidate does an exemplary job of following and embellishing the tuning protocol in the evaluation of the videotaped lesson	

<p>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>IRA Standard 2.2</p> <p>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 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>Candidate fails to videotape lesson</p>	<p>Candidate videotapes lesson</p>	<p>Candidate videotapes lesson and provide brief written description of goals</p>	
<p>IRA Standard 2.3</p> <p>Candidates support classroom teachers and</p>	<p>Candidate fails to support other teachers in the evaluation of the videotaped lesson</p>	<p>Candidate adequately supports other teachers in evaluation of the videotaped lesson</p>	<p>Candidate nurtures and supports other teachers in the evaluation of the videotaped lesson</p>	

<p>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 teaching.</p>				
<p>IRA Standard 5.1 Candidates articulate the theories related to the connections between teaching dispositions and student achievement.</p>	<p>Candidate fails to adequately support theoretical discussion during viewing of the videotaped lesson.</p>	<p>Candidate is able to adequately support theoretical discussion during viewing of the videotaped lesson</p>	<p>Candidate supports and embellishes discussion related to the theoretical discussion of the videotaped lesson</p>	
<p>IRA Standard 5.2 Candidates conduct professional study groups for paraprofessionals and teachers. They assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in identifying, planning, and implementing personal professional development plans. They advocate to</p>	<p>Candidate fails to contribute to discussion of professional development for videotaped teacher</p>	<p>Candidate contributes to discussion of professional development for videotaped teacher</p>	<p>Candidate is articulate and contributes to the discussion of professional development for videotaped teacher</p>	

advance the professional research base to expand knowledge-based practices.				
IRA Standard 5.3 Candidates positively and constructively provide an evaluation of their own or other's teaching practices. They assist classroom teachers and professionals as they strive to improve their practice.	Candidate is unable or unwilling to provide constructive evaluation of videotaped lesson	Candidate is able to provide constructive evaluation of videotaped lesson	Candidate is able to provide unique and valuable evaluation of videotaped lesson	
			Total Score	

Overall Performance

Assessment:

____ ≤ 7
Unacceptable

____ 8 - 16
Acceptable

____ 17 - 24
Exemplary

Recommendation:

REVISION

PASS

PASS

Faculty member signature(s) _____

SECTION IV - Assessment #6

**Coaching/Tuning Protocol
Data Chart**

IRA Standard Element	Semester/Year	% Unacceptable	% Acceptable	% Exemplary	Number of Candidates
<i>Standard 1.1</i> Refers to major theories and can explain, compare, contrast and critique the theories.	Summer 2009	0%	40%	60%	15
	Summer 2008	3%	32%	65%	28
	Summer 2007	0%	0%	100%	31
	Summer 2006	5%	5%	90%	20
<i>Standard 1.3</i> Candidates are able to determine if students integrate the varying components of reading.	Summer 2009	0%	20%	80%	15
	Summer 2008	0%	32%	68%	28
	Summer 2007	0%	0%	100%	31
	Summer 2006	5%	5%	90%	20
<i>Standard 2.1</i> Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in their use of instructional grouping options.	Summer 2009	0%	13%	87%	15
	Summer 2008	0%	0%	100%	28
	Summer 2007	0%	0%	100%	31
	Summer 2006	5%	5%	90%	20
<i>Standard 2.2</i> Support classroom	Summer 2009	0%	0%	100%	15
	Summer 2008	0%	0%	100%	28
	Summer 2007	0%	0%	100%	31

teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of instructional practices and serve as models.	Summer 2006	5%	5%	90%	20
<i>Standard 2.3</i> Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of curriculum materials and serve as models.	Summer 2009	0%	13%	87%	15
	Summer 2008	0%	3%	97%	28
	Summer 2007	0%	0%	100%	31
	Summer 2006	5%	5%	90%	20
<i>Standard 5.1</i> Articulate theories between teacher dispositions and student achievement.	Summer 2009	0%	33%	67%	15
	Summer 2008	0%	10%	90%	28
	Summer 2007	0%	0%	100%	31
	Summer 2006	5%	5%	90%	20
<i>Standard 5.2</i> Conduct professional study groups for teachers and paraprofessionals.	Summer 2009	0%	27%	73%	15
	Summer 2008	0%	0%	100%	28
	Summer 2007	0%	0%	100%	31
	Summer 2006	5%	5%	90%	20
<i>Standard 5.3</i> Evaluate their own or other's teaching	Summer 2009	0%	13%	87%	15
	Summer 2008	0%	3%	97%	28
	Summer 2007	0%	0%	100%	31

practices.	Summer 2006	5%	5%	90%	20
-------------------	-------------	----	----	-----	----