

**IRA Assessment #7 – Action Research**  
(IRA Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 5.2, 5.3)

**Description of the Assessment:**

All candidates must plan and execute an action research project while enrolled in ELED 663: Seminar - Review of Reading Research. The research project must be an original work based on sound theory and best practices. Some examples of previous action research titles from candidates include the following:

*Modeling Writing to Improve Grade Four Students' Journal Writing*  
*A Study of Modeling Story Elements to Improve Children's Response to Literature*  
*A Comparison Study of Round Robin Reading Versus Silent Reading with Notetaking in Content Area Material*  
*A Historical Analysis of the Evolution of Black Children's Literature*  
*Designing a Self-Evaluation for a Writing Workshop*  
*Focused Instruction Using Children's Multi-Cultural Literature to Enhance Phonics Instruction*  
*Teacher's Perceptions of Pull-Out and In-Class Models for Supplemental Reading Programs*  
*The Use of Self-Selected Reading Materials by Students in Chapter I Reading Classes*  
*The In-Class Model of Instruction for Content Area Reading on the Secondary Level*  
*What Effect Cynthia Rylant Literature Has On Students' Attitudes On Reading*  
*Attitude Assessment of First and Second Grade Teachers Concerning the Use of the "Writing Workshop" Format for Teaching Children to Write*  
*Attitudes of Junior High School At-Risk Students in a Literature-Based Remedial Reading Program*  
*Using the Higher-Order Thinking Skills Program as an Alternative to Remedial Reading Instruction*  
*Using the Computer to Motivate Writing Within the Elementary Classroom*

The faculty member teaching the seminar must approve all candidate projects. An extensive literature review is done and then a plan for the implementation of the project is approved. Once the project has been concluded, a written report is produced. Candidates then share their findings with other candidates and teachers. In-class presentation must use some form of technology during the presentation to their peers. Typically, candidate-produced videos and PowerPoint presentations are used to augment the verbal presentation. Handouts must also be prepared for candidates and teachers.

This course is presently offered twice per year, during the fall semester and during the first summer session.

**Alignment of the Assessment with the 2003 IRA Standards:**

IRA Standards 1 and 5 are the focus of this assessment. Candidates are required to have extensive background knowledge of the content of reading and writing and must be able to share this information with co-workers and other professionals in a coaching situation.

**Analysis of the Findings:**

Since the Fall 2003, over 120 candidates have enrolled in this course and have been administered Assessment #7. Since candidates work closely with the professors in this course and since there are individual conferences to help candidates plan and prepare their field projects, there is usually a high degree of “Acceptable” performance.

Beginning with the Fall 2007 seminar, the Assessment #7 Data Chart was revised and a third category – *Exemplary* was added. This permitted greater discrimination in the work of our candidates. During the fall of 2009, the rubric was revised again to require all candidates to share the data from their research project with colleagues at their school sites, thus, requiring candidates to meet the coaching intensity requirement at the highest level, Level 3

**Data Interpretation:**

With the addition of the “Exemplary” category in the fall of 2007, we have been able to gain a broader and more comprehensive understanding of our candidates’ performance on this assessment.

**SECTION IV - Assessment #7**  
**Revised – Fall 2009**

**Action Research Project**  
**Scoring Guide**

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Element	Unacceptable - 1	Acceptable - 2	Exemplary - 3	Score
<p><b>IRA Standard 1.1</b></p> <p><b>Candidates refer to major theories in the foundational areas as they relate to reading. They can explain, compare, contrast, and critique the theories.</b></p>	<p>Minimal or no review of the literature.</p>	<p>Review of the literature shows a knowledgeable understanding of the reading/writing process.</p>	<p>Review of the literature is extensive and shows a thorough understanding of the reading/writing process.</p>	
<p><b>IRA Standard 1.2</b></p> <p><b>Candidates summarize seminal reading studies and articulate how these studies impacted reading instruction. They can recount historical developments in the history of reading.</b></p>	<p>No linkage or minimal linkage made between the literature review and the candidate's project.</p>	<p>Linkage made between the literature review and the candidate's project.</p>	<p>Exemplary job of linking pertinent literature with the candidate's project.</p>	

<p><b>IRA Standard 1.3</b></p> <p><b>Candidates identify, explain, compare, and contrast the theories and research in the areas of language-development and learning to read.</b></p>	<p>No mention of language development and/or reading development in the candidate's literature review.</p>	<p>Theories of language development and/or reading development articulated in the candidate's literature review.</p>	<p>Exemplary job of linking language development and/or reading development articulated in the candidate's literature review.</p>	
<p><b>IRA Standard 1.4</b></p> <p><b>Candidates are able to determine if students are appropriately integrating the components of reading in fluent reading.</b></p>	<p>Limited or no indication candidate understands the reading process and its major components.</p>	<p>Indication of knowledge of various facets of the reading process and how they influence the reading process.</p>	<p>Exemplary display of understanding of the reading process and shown by an extensive literature review.</p>	
<p><b>IRA Standard 5.2</b></p> <p><b>Candidates conduct professional study groups for paraprofessionals and teachers. They assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in identifying, planning, and implementing personal professional</b></p>	<p>Project is of marginal quality and/or fails to expand the candidate's and/or other's knowledge base.</p>	<p>Project is of sufficient quality to expand the candidate's and/or other's knowledge base.</p>	<p>Project is of high quality and expands the candidate's and/or other's knowledge base.</p>	

<b>development plans. They advocate to advance the professional research base to expand knowledge-based practices.</b>				
<b>IRA Standard 5.3</b> <b>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.</b>	Candidate is unable to link project to his/her own and/or other's teaching practices.	Candidate is able to link project to their own and/or other's teaching practices.	Candidate does an exemplary job of linking their project to their own and/or other's teaching practices.	
<b>Clear, concise, error-free written work</b>	Unclear writing style that is disorganized and contains numerous errors or conventions	Clear writing style that is organized and contains a limited number of errors or conventions	Exemplary writing style that is organized and contains a limited number of errors or conventions	
<b>American Psychological Association (APA) format</b>	Numerous errors in APA format	Assignment adequately contains most requirements in APA format.	Assignment carefully contains all assignment requirements	
			<b>Total Score</b>	

**Overall Performance Assessment:**

\_\_\_\_\_ ≤ 7

\_\_\_\_\_ 8 - 16

\_\_\_\_\_ 17 - 24

	<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>REVISION</b>	<b>PASS</b>	<b>PASS</b>

**Faculty member signature(s)**\_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION IV - Assessment #7

### Action Research Project Data Chart

IRA Standard Element	Semester/Year	% Unacceptable	% Acceptable	% Exemplary	Number of Candidates
<b>Standard 1.1.</b> <b>Demonstrate knowledge of psychological, sociological, and linguistic foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	33%	67%	6
	Summer 2009	9%	18%	73%	11
	Fall 2008	9%	23%	68%	22
	Fall 2007	0%	14%	86%	21
	Fall 2006	5%	95%	0%	21
	Fall 2005	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2004	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2003	0%	100%	0%	15
<b>Standard 1.2.</b> <b>Demonstrate knowledge of reading research and histories of reading</b>	Fall 2009	0%	33%	67%	6
	Summer 2009	9%	18%	73%	11
	Fall 2008	14%	23%	64%	22
	Fall 2007	10%	19%	71%	21
	Fall 2006	0%	100%	0%	21
	Fall 2005	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2004	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2003	0%	100%	0%	15
<b>Standard 1.3.</b> <b>Demonstrate knowledge of language development</b>	Fall 2009	0%	50%	50%	6
	Summer 2009	9%	18%	73%	11
	Fall 2008	0%	45%	55%	22
	Fall 2007	0%	19%	81%	21
	Fall 2006	0%	100%	0%	21

<b>and reading acquisition and the variations related to culture and linguistic diversity.</b>	Fall 2005	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2004	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2003	0%	100%	0%	15
<i>Standard 1.4.</i> <b>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.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	50%	50%	6
	Summer 2009	18%	18%	64%	11
	Fall 2008	0%	45%	55%	22
	Fall 2007	0%	19%	81%	21
	Fall 2006	5%	95%	0%	21
	Fall 2005	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2004	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2003	0%	100%	0%	15
<i>Standard 5.2.</i> <b>Continue to pursue the development of professional knowledge and</b>	Fall 2009	0%	50%	50%	6
	Summer 2009	18%	36%	46%	11
	Fall 2008	5%	50%	45%	22
	Fall 2007	0%	10%	90%	21
	Fall 2006	5%	95%	0%	21



<b>dispositions.</b>	Fall 2005	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2004	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2003	0%	100%	0%	15
<i>Standard 5.3.</i> <b>Work with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	50%	50%	6
	Summer 2009	9%	18%	73%	11
	Fall 2008	0%	55%	45%	22
	Fall 2007	0%	19%	81%	21
	Fall 2006	5%	95%	0%	21
	Fall 2005	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2004	0%	100%	0%	15
Fall 2003	0%	100%	0%	15	
<b>Follows assignment directions:</b> Section I Purpose Section II Literature Review Section III Research Question Section IV Action Research Plan (Method— Participants, Materials,	Fall 2009	NA	NA	NA	6
	Summer 2009	0%	27%	73%	11
	Fall 2008	0%	32%	68%	22
	Fall 2007	0%	33%	67%	21
	Fall 2006	0%	100%	0%	21
	Fall 2005	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2004	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2003	0%	100%	0%	15

Design & Procedure) Section V Results Section VI Discussion Section VII References Section VIII Appendices (Form was revised Fall 2009)					
<b>Clear, concise, error-free written work</b>	Fall 2009	0%	33%	67%	6
	Summer 2009	0%	27%	73%	11
	Fall 2008	14%	64%	36%	22
	Fall 2007	14%	43%	43%	21
	Fall 2006	10%	90%	0%	21
	Fall 2005	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2004	13%	87%	0%	15
Fall 2003	0%	100%	0%	15	
<b>American Psychological Association (APA) format</b>	Fall 2009	0%	33%	67%	6
	Summer 2009	18%	27%	55%	11
	Fall 2008	32%	50%	18%	22
	Fall 2007	10%	42%	48%	21
	Fall 2006	24%	76%	0%	21
	Fall 2005	0%	100%	0%	15
	Fall 2004	0%	100%	0%	15
Fall 2003	0%	100%	0%	15	

<b>Effective professional presentation of action research (Form was revised Summer 2009)</b>	Fall 2009	NA	NA	NA	6
	Summer 2009	NA	NA	NA	11
	Fall 2008	0%	18%	32%	22
	Fall 2007	0%	38%	62%	21
	Fall 2006	5%	95%	0%	21
	Fall 2005	6%	94%	0%	15
	Fall 2004	13%	87%	0%	15
Fall 2003	6%	94%	0%	15	