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Preconditions

In this document, the phrases “Reading and Literacy added Authorization” and “Reading Certificate” are used interchangeably. This document is a response to the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Preconditions and Standards. However, at the time the document was written, candidates were still being awarded the Reading Certificate.

Reading Certificate/Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Program

A program sponsor that operates a program for the Reading and Literacy Added authorization shall determine, prior to admission to the credential program, that each candidate possesses a valid California teaching credential, including an English learner authorization, requiring a bachelor’s degree and a professional preparation program, including student teaching or a clear, full-time designated subjects teaching credential, including an English learner authorization, provided that the holder also possesses a bachelor’s degree and has met the basic skills requirement, or its equivalent.

1. California State University East Bay (CSUEB) determines, prior to admission to the credential program, that each candidate possesses a valid California teaching credential, including an English learner authorization, requiring a bachelor's degree and a professional preparation program, including student teaching or a clear, full-time designated subjects teaching credential, including an English learner authorization, provided that the holder also possesses a bachelor’s degree and has met the basic skills requirement, or its equivalent. The Department Application (link) lists the following requirements:

Application Documents (In addition to this form)

- University Graduate Application & $55 application fee (Recent CSUEB graduates complete a Change of Graduate Objective in lieu of a University Application)
- Statement of Purpose
- Three letters of Recommendation
- One set of all official transcripts from all schools; 2 sets of official bachelor’s degree-bearing transcript (one will be sent to Graduate Admissions and one will be retained in department file)
- A copy of a valid Multiple Subject or Single Subject Credential
- Official CBEST score report (and a copy of the report along with a self-addressed envelope if they want their official scores returned)

A Commission-approved program shall determine, prior to recommending a candidate for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization, that the candidate has three years of teaching experience.
2. Candidates are permitted to enter the Graduate Reading Program directly from the Credential Program, however, they are informed prior to admission that they must complete three years of teaching experience before they can be recommended for the Reading Certificate/Reading and Literacy Added Authorization. The advisement PowerPoint demonstrates advisement of candidates regarding the three years of teaching experience requirement (link). Candidates are required to submit a form, documenting three years of teaching experience, signed by their district’s HR department in order to be recommended for the Reading Certificate/RLAA (link). Finally, the Graduate Reading Coordinator submits a Reading Certificate Completion Form to the Credential Office verifying that candidates have met all program requirements (link).
Organization of the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization and
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential Program Standards

Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Program Standards

Category A. Program Design

Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale, and Coordination

Category B. Curriculum and Fieldwork

Standard 2: Promoting a Culture of Literacy

Standard 3: Preparation to Teach Literacy to All Students through Assessment, Instruction and Appropriate Intervention

Standard 4: Integrating Curriculum through Fieldwork

Category C. Candidate Competence

Standard 5: Planning, Organizing, and Providing Literacy Instruction
### Category A. Program Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Narrative Describing How the Institution Meets the Standard—hyperlink to supporting documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The design of the program follows an explicit statement of program philosophy and purpose. It is based on a</td>
<td><strong>Relation to College Strategic Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Reading Certificate was developed within the Strategic Plan of the CSU East Bay College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sound rationale informed by current, confirmed, replicable and reliable research in literacy as referenced in the California Preschool Learning Foundations and Frameworks (Volume 1) and the California Reading/Language Arts Framework.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Strategic Plan includes the following mission statement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>To prepare collaborative leaders committed to professional excellence, social justice and democracy, who will influence a diverse and interconnected world.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the 2001 Strategic Plan, faculty approved a vision statement for CEAS:

> We will be a college exemplifying the ideals of social justice and democracy, distinguished by excellence in teaching and scholarship, vibrant programs, and graduates who are powerful forces in their communities.

Thus, the underlying theme for all programs in CEAS is: *preparing leaders committed to social justice and democracy.* The mission of the Department of Teacher Education is:

> To prepare teachers who are dedicated to the academic achievement of all students, and who demonstrate a commitment to lifelong, professional growth and school leadership. [http://www20.csueastbay.edu/ceas/departments/ted/index.html](http://www20.csueastbay.edu/ceas/departments/ted/index.html)

The Reading Certificate Program at CSUEB was developed within the framework of the CEAS Strategic Plan. Our program will help the college fulfill its mission, realize its vision, and operationalize its theme.

The Reading Program coordinator participates in the Unit Assessment and Accreditation Task Force, ensuring that the Reading
Program is fully integrated into college assessment activities. 2012 11-01-12 Unit Evaluation Report.docx

Relation to Department Mission

The Reading Certificate Program was designed to align with the mission of the Department of Teacher Education: To prepare teachers who are dedicated to the academic achievement of all students, and who demonstrate a commitment to life-long, professional growth and school leadership. Program faculty, working with the Advisory Council, defined the following core beliefs derived from the CEAS strategic plan and our department mission statement:

The Reading Program faculty, working with the Advisory Council, defined the following core beliefs derived from the CEAS strategic plan and our department mission statement found on the Teacher Education Graduate Programs website http://www20.csueastbay.edu/ceas/departments/ted/Masters%20Degree/reading/Reading%20Instruction%20index.html: The Reading Program is designed to provide advanced special preparation and competencies for teachers and enables graduates to work in districts to: Develop the skills and knowledge to diagnose reading difficulties and provide remediation that improves educational outcomes for diverse students. Become Literacy Leaders in their school and school districts, Practice the art of collaboration in their daily practice. Promote social justice and democracy in their schools and classrooms, and Engage in discerning reflection and become ethical professionals.

Student Learning Objectives

The following student learning objectives developed for the Reading Program demonstrate that the program is based on current, confirmed, replicable and reliable research in literacy:

Objective 1: Demonstrate a thorough understanding of theory and research on an effective culture of literacy for diverse prekindergarten through high school students, their families, and communities

Objective 2: Demonstrate knowledge of research-based instructional practices in each component of literacy and the ability to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for each component of literacy instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language development, reading and listening comprehension, and vocabulary development, and writing

Objective 3: Successfully plan and implement a balanced literacy environment, including the selection and use instructional materials,
technology, routines, and strategies that are appropriately aligned with students’ assessed language and literacy needs

Objective 4 (MS only): Complete an action research project in the field of literacy, including a review of the research literature, planning and implementing an instructional unit, and an analysis of student learning and research results.

Program Leadership

The Reading Certificate Program at CSUEB is coordinated by Dr. Shira Lubliner, a full professor in the department.

Among her duties are calling meetings of the Program Faculty and the Program Advisory Council. The Chair of the Department of Teacher Education is invited to attend these meetings. The Reading Certificate Program is part of the Department of Teacher Education, and the Program Coordinator reports to the Department Chair. All academic programs are approved by the faculty in the Department of Teacher Education and the Council of Chairs of CEAS. The Department Chair, in turn, reports to the Dean of CEAS, who has administrative responsibility over all credential programs at CSUEB.

The Program Coordinator meets regularly with the Department Chair to provide for the smooth operation of the program. The Program Coordinator recommends an annual schedule of classes and makes recommendations to the Chair if there is a need to hire part-time faculty.

Dr. Lubliner also teaches in Masters of Education with an Option in Curriculum programs. Her participation in both graduate programs provides an inter-disciplinary focus and allows for a seamless transition for our candidates from the Reading Certificate into the MS Program. The Advisory Boards of the Graduate Reading Program and the MS in Education with an Option in Curriculum Program meet together annually to consider issues of importance to both programs.

Dr. Lubliner works closely with candidates in the Reading Certificate and MS in Education, Option in Reading Instruction Programs. She conducts informational sessions for candidates prior to admission, evaluates candidates to determine if they meet admission requirements, accepts or rejects candidate applications, and serves as the candidates’ advisor throughout their time in the program. She also evaluates candidates’ completion of requirements for the Reading Certificate and the MS degree.

Faculty

Current Reading Program faculty include the following tenured CSUEB professors:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Document Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Shira Lubliner</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>Lubliner_Vita.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Linda Smetana</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>Smetana_Vita.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dana Grisham</td>
<td>Retired Full Professor</td>
<td>Grisham_Vita.doc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program faculty, the Program Coordinator, the Department Chair, and the Dean share responsibility for serving as advocates for the Certificate program within the institution, the education profession as a whole and local school community. For example, faculty members have close relationships with teachers, site administrators, and district administrators in the field. The superintendent of Pleasanton, our host district, is a graduate of our Educational Leadership Program.

The Department Chair advocates for the Program at the CEAS Council of Chairs and before University committees, especially the University’s Council on Teacher Education. Most program faculty and the Program Coordinator are active in local, state, and national professional organizations, most notably the California Reading Association, the International Reading Association, the National Literacy Conference, and the American Educational Research Association.

Grievances
The University provides specific procedures for addressing faculty, student, and staff grievances student-petition-for-a-fairness-hearing.pdf. Student grievances initially are addressed by faculty and almost all are resolved at this point. The Program Coordinator responds to student concerns about the operation of the program (i.e., scheduling of classes). Should grievances not resolved by the faculty or Coordinator be referred to the Department Chair, who works as a mediator, attempting to find solutions acceptable to all parties. Ultimately, students have a right to take a complaint to the University Fairness Committee who may, after consideration of the problem, impanel a three-person, impartial faculty committee to conduct a hearing (the faculty may not be from CEAS). Rulings of the Fairness Committee are final and binding on all parties.

Program Design
The Reading Certificate Program includes five four-unit courses that are completed in three quarters. Candidates typically enter the program in the summer and complete three courses during summer quarter. Candidates complete one Reading Certificate course in the fall and one course in the winter, completing the program at the end of winter quarter. Candidates for the Reading Certificate may also enter the program in the fall, completing the program at the end of the following summer quarter.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Syllabus Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TED 6230</td>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Research and Methods 1</td>
<td>4 units</td>
<td>Syllabus\TED6230_2013.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Review research; learn normal progression of literacy development relative to grade level standards; plan implement and assess research based literacy instruction including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and writing for pre-K and up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6253</td>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Research &amp; Methods 2</td>
<td>4 units</td>
<td>Syllabus\TED6253&amp;6220 2013.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Review research; plan, implement and assess research based literacy instruction including oral language, vocabulary and reading comprehension for pre-K and up; facilitate use of print media and digital resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6220</td>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Culture of Literacy: Focus on Diversity</td>
<td>4 units</td>
<td>Syllabus\TED6253&amp;6220.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Review research; develop a culture of literacy capitalizing on students’ diverse knowledge and skills; support second language development; plan, implement and assess instruction to students for diverse ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6231</td>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Assessment &amp; Intervention 1</td>
<td>4 units</td>
<td>Syllabus\TED6231_2013.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Review research; introduction to principles of formal and informal literacy-based assessments; learn to select, administer and evaluate assessment data for different audiences and purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6232</td>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Assessment &amp; Intervention 2</td>
<td>4 units</td>
<td>Syllabus\TED6232_2013.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review research; learn to assess, instruct and provide intervention for each component of research based literacy instruction; modify the curriculum to address specific needs of students; interpret and use assessment data to inform placement and intervention decisions. Prerequisite: TED 6231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading Comprehension Clinic**

Summer quarter includes a Reading Comprehension Clinic, held weekly for 90 minutes between TED 6253 and TED 6220. Candidates work one-on-one with struggling upper grade readers (grades 4<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup>), assessing, designing remediation, and instructing students under the direction of Dr. Lubliner. A substantial number of the Clinic students are English learners, providing the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>It begins at a point beyond the preparation received by the preservice teacher and prepares the candidate for more advanced learning in the Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential program, described in Standards 6 through 10. It includes the content of the RICA content specifications but with a deeper, richer level of understanding, a firmer grasp of the literacy research behind the content specifications, and more sophisticated knowledge of instructional strategies and approaches.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Reading Program courses extend RICA content to provide advanced learning beyond pre-service literacy preparation. In each course candidates probe deeply into current research literature as evidenced by course syllabi (links) and the following catalogue descriptions of the Reading Certificate courses (link). Additionally, candidates examine best practices in each literacy topic and complete field experiences to demonstrate mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In TED 6230</strong></td>
<td>candidates review the research; learn the normal progression of literacy development relative to grade level standards; plan implement and assess research based literacy instruction including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and writing for pre-K and up. Research6230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In TED 6253</strong></td>
<td>candidates review the research; plan, implement and assess research based literacy instruction including oral language, vocabulary, writing, and reading comprehension for pre-K and up; facilitate use of print media and digital resources. Research6253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In TED 6220</strong></td>
<td>candidates learn to develop a culture of literacy capitalizing on students’ diverse knowledge and skills; support second language development; plan, implement and assess instruction to students for diverse ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic groups. Research6220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In TED 6231</strong></td>
<td>candidates review the research; examine principles of formal and informal literacy-based assessments; learn to select, administer and evaluate assessment data for different audiences and purposes. Syllabus\TED6231_2013.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In TED 6232</strong></td>
<td>candidates review the research; learn to assess, instruct and provide intervention for each component of research based literacy instruction; modify the curriculum to address specific needs of students; interpret and use assessment data to inform placement and intervention decisions. Research6232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3</strong></td>
<td>The program provides multiple opportunities for candidates to learn and demonstrate the skills required by Standard 5 in Category C: candidates with opportunities to modify instruction to meet the needs of struggling readers who are English learners. Clinic Information for Parents_2013.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates are provided with multiple opportunities to learn and demonstrate skills in instruction and assessment. Each course in the Reading Certificate Program requires candidates to complete a field experience. Candidates are assessed on their ability to meet RLAA standards in each of these field experiences. The following is a list of field experiences that candidates complete in each of their courses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TED 6230 Fluency Lesson Plan</strong></td>
<td>Project FieldExp6230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment of Candidate Competence

It includes a planned process of comprehensive coursework, field experiences and candidate assessments that prepares candidates to teach all of California’s diverse learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates must obtain access to a primary level (K-3) student, <strong>develop and implement three</strong> lesson plans designed to promote and enhance fluency for this student. For each lesson created, candidates will <strong>create an original artifact that</strong> can be used to enhance the lesson.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TED6220 Diversity Clinical Field Experience</strong>  FieldExp6220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates plan and implement lessons for one or more English learners (ELs) in the Summer Reading Clinic (4th-8th). The students must be designated English language learners (ELs) by their school district at a level less than proficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TED 6253 Comprehension Clinical Field Experience</strong>  FieldExp6253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and implement a five-lesson unit focusing on reading comprehension, to one or more of the students in the Summer Reading Clinic (4th-8th grade).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TED 6231 Two Assessment Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will complete two in depth analyses of students’ literacy skills, including an assessment battery, classroom observations, and a report to parents and teachers regarding student literacy needs.  Syllabus\TED6231_2013.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TED 6232 Intervention Project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates implement a Reading/Language Arts intervention plan with one student based on the results of an IRI (expository) and phonics survey or case study from last quarter. Intervention will take place for a minimum of 10 hours over the course of the quarter.  FieldExp6232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.4 The program addresses the processes of admission, advising, program evaluation and improvement, as well as its coordination and communication with the PreK-12 public schools for field experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The majority of prospective Reading candidates eventually earn the Reading Certificate <em>and</em> the Masters of Science Degree in Education, Option in Reading Instruction. Therefore, all Reading Certificate candidates apply directly to the Masters Degree in Education, Option in Reading Instruction. Candidates have the option of completing the Reading Certificate at the end of the five-course sequence or continuing on to the MS with the addition of three more classes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSUEB graduates apply for the program by filing a Change of Graduation Objective form. CSUEB graduates are automatically admitted if they meet the prerequisites listed below (all applicants). Prospective students who are <strong>not</strong> CSUEB graduates follow these admission procedures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) A University application, which requires transcripts of all undergraduate and post-baccalaureate coursework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(b) A Department Graduate Studies Application which includes a Personal Data Statement. The Personal Data Statement asks prospective candidates to summarize their professional background, professional objectives, and personal background (link).

c) A copy of a valid California Multiple Subject Teaching or Single Subject Teaching Credential.

All GRP applicants (CSUEB graduates and graduates of other universities) follow admission procedures consistent with University and Department criteria for admission to graduate programs, and are as follows:

(1) An earned baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution of higher education

(2) A grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 on all undergraduate/upper division and post-baccalaureate coursework. University policy allows programs to admit, conditionally, applicants with GPAs from 2.5 to 2.99 on the last 90 units of coursework attempted. Conditional admission is at the discretion of the Program Coordinator, who takes into account a number of factors including: (a) a GPA above 3.0 in the most recent coursework the candidate completed, (b) justifiable circumstances which led a student to have a low GPA for a certain period, and (c) consistent excellence as a classroom teacher. In the Department of Teacher Education, almost all conditionally admitted students successfully complete their graduate studies. Flexibility with the entry GPA requirement is one factor that helped the Department diversify its graduate student population. Conditionally admitted candidates must achieve a GPA of 3.0 with no Ds or Fs during their first 12 units in the program.

(3) A valid California Multiple Subject Teaching or Single Subject Teaching Credential.

(4) Satisfaction of the University Writing Skills requirement. The requirement may be met by (a) satisfying the requirement as an undergraduate at CSU East Bay, (b) previously satisfying the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement at another CSU campus, (c) achieving at an appropriate level on a basic skills test, like CBEST, or (d) passing the University’s Writing Skills Test.

(5) Demonstrated potential to become a leader in reading and language arts curriculum and instruction. This potential can be established by a review of the candidate’s previous academic record, Personal Data Statement, teaching experience, and response to questions during the admission interview.

(6) Appropriate dispositions that demonstrate an interest in serving children and adolescents from diverse ethnicity, family income status, and challenging condition. Program faculty feel that an integral part of being an effective leader in the field is having a sensitivity to the needs of all our K-12 students. Evidence of this sensitivity can be established by a prospective candidate’s Personal Data Statement, teaching experience, and response to questions during the admission interview. The Department of Teacher Education’s Graduate Secretary verifies that all admission documents have been submitted (link). The Program Coordinator and Program faculty review those documents, conduct the admission interviews, and makes admission
recommendations to the Department Chair.

Admission criteria and procedures are described and made available to prospective candidates in a number of ways. The Program Coordinator is available each week to meet personally with prospective candidates. The Department of Teacher Education’s Graduate Secretary has staff responsibility for the program and is highly skilled. She answers prospective candidate’s procedural questions. A single-page information sheet is available to prospective candidates (link).

California State University, East Bay serves one of the most diverse regions in the United States. It is important that our credential programs have candidates who reflect the ethnic diversity of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. To accomplish that goal, the following policies will be implemented: (1) Conditional admission will increase the number of candidates from underrepresented groups, (2) Program design will allow candidates to complete all program requirements while teaching full-time, (3) Program faculty will personally promote the program to candidates in our Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs, especially those program cohorts taking classes in areas with majority “minority” populations (East Bay Unified, Oakland Unified and West Contra Costa Unified School Districts). Further, it is important that all candidates in the Program have an interest in serving all students. To meet this end, an admission requirement to the program is an interest in serving children and adolescents from diverse ethnicity, family income status, and challenging condition.

The Reading Certificate Program is co-sponsored with the Pleasanton Unified School District. PUSD publicizes the program to its teachers, provides classroom space for Reading courses, and helps to recruit children for the Summer Reading Comprehension Clinic that is part of TED 6253 (link). Results of Clinic student assessments are reported directly to the PUSD superintendent.

*See Preconditions for links to admission documents

---

**Category B. Curriculum and Fieldwork**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 2: Promoting a Culture of Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1</strong> The program provides opportunities for candidates to review current research on elements of an effective culture of literacy at the classroom, school, district, and community levels, including the clear and strategic use of reading, writing, listening, and speaking throughout the day, across a variety of contexts using narrative, expository and other texts, and developing online and offline reading and writing skills to meet the diverse needs of students, and the effective implementation of the adopted curriculum including the use of peer coaching and professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2</strong> acknowledging the language and literacy experiences of the individual child, classroom, school, district, and This topic is particularly emphasized in TED 6220, where candidates learn to develop a culture of literacy capitalizing on students’ diverse knowledge and skills; support second language development; plan, implement and assess instruction to students for diverse ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic groups (link to syllabus). Candidates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program provides opportunities for candidates to review current research on the role of a culture of literacy for:
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| Community, honoring and capitalizing on students’ diverse knowledge, skills, abilities, and backgrounds to engage students, their families, and the community in the acquisition of English literacy skills; | complete the Native Language Report in TED 6220, working in groups to examine the seven most common languages spoken by students in California schools. Candidates identify language features, cultural uniqueness, and challenges faced by students in each language group as they acquire English literacy skills. NatLangRpt6220

Candidates also examine the role of language in the acquisition of literacy skills by reading their textbook, *Breaking Through: Effective Instruction and Assessment for Reaching English Learners*.

In TED 6253 candidates view a PowerPoint on the Culture of Literacy and write a paper discussing how they honor students’ diverse knowledge, skills, abilities, and backgrounds. CultLit6253 |

2.3 Developing a strong, coherent, and shared vision of a culture of literacy that aligns resources to support high academic expectations for student achievement in reading and literacy; | This topic is discussed throughout the Reading Program.

In TED 6253 candidates view a PowerPoint on the Culture of Literacy and write a paper discussing how they support high academic expectation in terms of student literacy. High academic expectations are also discussed in a PowerPoint (Lecture Notes 5).

High expectations for English learners are discussed in TED 6220. A PowerPoint discuss is held demonstrating the extent to which low expectations in vocabulary development limit student success. Additionally, candidates are required to read *Reparable Harm* in TED 6230 (Olson, 2011) and discuss the problem of long-term English learners. LongTermEL6230

The textbook for TED 6220 (*Breaking Through: Effective Instruction and Assessment for Reaching English Learners*) emphasizes the importance of high academic expectations throughout the book. |

2.4 and fostering students’ independence, engagement, motivation, and positive attitude towards reading, and development of a lifelong habit of reading and writing for pleasure and information. | In TED 6253 candidates administer a reading interest inventory to their Summer Reading Clinic students and engage in reading activities designed to foster a positive attitude toward reading. FieldExp6253

Candidates are observed during Clinic and are evaluated on student engagement. Clinic Observation Rubric.docx

Additionally, candidates in TED 6253 read a chapter in their textbooks titled *New Insights on Motivation in the Literacy Classroom* (16). In TED 6253 candidates also view a Culture of Literacy PowerPoint and write a paper, discussing how they increase students’ motivation to read.

In TED 6231 candidates conduct an informal interview with a student, examining the issue of interest and motivation. Interest6231 |
### Standard 3: Preparation to Teach Literacy to All Students through Assessment, Instruction and Appropriate Intervention

**3.1** The program provides opportunities for candidates to review and analyze current, confirmed, reliable and replicable quantitative and qualitative research pertaining to language and literacy instruction and how that research is reflected in the contents of the *California Preschool Learning Foundations and Frameworks* (Volume 1) and the *California Reading/Language Arts Framework*. Candidates review current research in each course. There is a particular emphasis on the standards in TED 6253 as evidenced in the course objective 1: “Demonstrate a thorough understanding of theory and research on elements of an effective culture of literacy, how that research is reflected in the contents of the *California Preschool Learning Foundations and Frameworks* (Volume 1) and the *California Reading/Language Arts Framework.*” Since the adoption of the Common Core State Standards, candidates now examine these standards rather than the old *California Reading/Language Arts Framework*.

Candidates demonstrate their understanding of the *California Preschool Learning Foundations and Frameworks* and *California’s Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts* by completing a Sequence of the Standards assignment in TED 6253.

**3.2** The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn how to assess, instruct, and provide intervention, if needed, for each component of research-based literacy instruction, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2a oral language development,</th>
<th>Candidates learn how to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for oral language development in TED 6253. Candidates conduct an oral language assessment of their Clinic students prior to beginning to the QRI to determine the extent to which dialect might interact with oral reading skills. [FieldExp6253 Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx](FieldExp6253 Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2b word analysis,</td>
<td>Candidates learn how to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for word analysis in TED 6230. Candidates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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conduct a case study of a beginning reader who has been identified by the classroom teacher as having significant difficulty in learning to read and write. Candidates prepare an assessment report based on data gathered from the following assessments:

Yopp-Singer Test of Phonemic Segmentation, Fry Sight Word Test, the Informal Phonics Survey, and Qualitative Reading Inventory.

Additionally, candidates complete the Word Recognition/Fluency Assessments and Fluency Assessment Discussion assignment, administering, analyzing and writing up the following assessments:

- Two (2) Passage Based Fluency Assessments using *Multidimensional Fluency Scale*
  - Dibels (U. Oregon)
  - District passages
  - Benchmark passages
- Two (2) High Frequency Word Assessments (K-3)
  - Dolch, San Diego Quick, Fry
- One (1) Phonics Assessment
  - District based
  - Dibels (U. Oregon)
  - Names Test
- One (1) *Concepts About Print* Assessment (K-1st)
  - Basic Reading Inventory
  - Marie Clay Observational Assessment
  - Dibels (U. Oregon)
- District based assessment

**3.2c fluency,**

Candidates learn how to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for fluency in TED 6230. Candidates work with a primary level (K-3) student, develop and implement three lesson plans designed to promote and enhance fluency for this student. Candidates evaluate the student’s fluency using the Multi-dimensional Fluency Scale.

**3.2d vocabulary development,**

Candidates learn how to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for vocabulary in TED 6253. Candidates view a PowerPoint on vocabulary.
Candidates discuss vocabulary assessment and administer the Comprehensive Vocabulary Test (aligned to the QRI) and the Five Minute Vocabulary test to their Clinic students. [Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx](Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx)

The second session of the Summer Reading Clinic is devoted to teaching vocabulary clarifying strategies based on the Clarifying Cue Card (Lubliner 2008, 2011). Candidates teach their students how to monitor texts for unknown words and how to use clarifying strategies to make sense of these words in context.

In TED 6220 candidates examine ELD standards in vocabulary and discuss the special needs of English learners. A PowerPoint on vocabulary is provided, discussing research and methods of instruction. Candidates provide vocabulary instruction to English learners in the Summer Reading Clinic.

| 3.2e listening and reading comprehension, | Candidates learn how to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for listening and reading comprehension in TED 6253. Candidates assess reading and listening comprehension of their Clinic students during the Summer Reading Clinic. Numerous PowerPoint lectures cover a variety of comprehension methods, including reciprocal teaching, Questioning the Author, QAR, text genre, SQ3R and other methods.

Candidates teach reading comprehension skills to their Clinic students including self-generated main idea questioning, text genre, summarizing, and QAR. [Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx](Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx) |
|---|---|

| 3.2f written language development, | Candidates learn how to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for written language development in TED 6253. A PowerPoint presentation provides an overview of writing instruction and candidates use a rubric to score the writing proficiency of their Clinic students. [Writing6253](Writing6253) [Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx](Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx)

In TED 6230 candidates conduct a Writing Assignment, responding to a video of writing instruction for primary grade students. Candidates also collect and analyze a writing sample from a primary grade student they are tutoring and explain how they will strengthen the student’s writing skills. [Writing6230](Writing6230)

In TED 6220 candidates examine writing development of children in a variety of cultures (PowerPoint Lecture Notes 7). Candidates examine ELD writing standards and learn to modify writing instruction for English learners in the Clinic.

In TED 6231 candidates analyze a writing sample and evaluate a student’s production of written language, based on rubric. [Writing6231](Writing6231) |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2g</td>
<td>and to develop the skills needed to modify curriculum to address the specific needs of diverse groups of students, including but not limited to struggling students, English learners, gifted and talented students, and students with special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates learn how to modify the curriculum to address the specific needs of diverse learners, including students with disabilities and GATE students in TED 6231 and TED 6232. Candidates learn to address the needs of struggling readers in TED 6253, particularly through work with students in the Summer Reading Clinic. EL6253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates learn to modify the curriculum to address the specific needs of English learners in TED 6220. For example, during the Summer Reading Clinic candidates develop an instructional unit for Clinic students who are English learners. EL6220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates also learn about the needs of English learners from the textbook <em>Breaking Through: Effective Instruction and Assessment for Reaching English Learners</em> (Calderon, 2012).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn the normal progression of complexity for each component of literacy, as explicated in the Foundations/Standards and their Frameworks, the expected stages and patterns in students’ development including early and adolescent literacy, the implications of delays or differences in students’ literacy development relative to grade level standards, and when such delays/differences warrant further assessment, differentiated instruction and intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates examine the normal progression of literacy as explicated in the foundations/standards in all courses. In TED 6253 candidates complete a Sequence of the Standards assignment. The assignment requires them to examine reading comprehension and vocabulary standards in the preschool foundations and the Common Core State Standards at each grade level. Candidates then write a paper discussing the progression of the standards and noting the challenging expectations at specific grade levels. SeqStand6253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates also learn about the expected stages and differences in literacy development in the following chapters in their textbook: <em>Comprehension Instruction in Action: The Elementary Classroom; 18) Comprehension Instruction in Action: The Secondary Classroom; 19) Comprehension Instruction in Action: The At-Risk Student; 20) Comprehension Instruction for English Learners.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In TED 6231 candidates complete a Site Based Analysis of assessment data, identifying students who will most likely need some intervention such as re-teaching, additional practice or mastery instruction. Additionally, candidates must determine which students might need tier 2 interventions and identify the focus of the intervention. Classdata6231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In TED 6232 candidates design and implement an intervention plan for a struggling student. Syllabus\TED6232_2013.doc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn instructional sequences and routines that develop and accelerate students’ language and literacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates learn how to accelerate students’ language and literacy learning, including RTI in all of their Reading Program courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| In TED 6253 candidates work with a struggling student in the Summer Reading Clinic, providing instruction in
 literacy learning, including RtI, and how to maximize students’ literacy development by using the reciprocal relationships among the components of a research-based literacy program, reading comprehension and fluency, writing, language and vocabulary.  

Candidates learn about the reciprocal relationships between the components of a research-based literacy program through their textbook, in chapters such as *Improving Reading Comprehension through Writing* (15).

In TED 6220 candidates work with EL students in the Summer Reading Clinic, providing instruction in reading comprehension and fluency, writing, language and vocabulary. FieldExp6220

They also read chapter 10 in their textbook for TED 6220: *Response to Intervention for English Learners*.

In TED 6230 candidates design and implement research-based fluency lesson plans for primary level students. FieldExp6230

In TED 6231 candidates complete a Site Based Analysis of assessment data, identifying students who will most likely need some intervention such as re-teaching, additional practice or mastery instruction. Additionally, candidates must determine which students might need tier 2 interventions and identify the focus of the intervention. Classdata6231

In TED 6232 candidates design and implement an intervention plan for a struggling student. Additionally, candidates conduct an Intervention Program Review, examining the research base and effectiveness of a method used for RTI. Intervention6232

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5 as well as methods to incorporate information literacy skills into classroom activities in which students learn to access, evaluate, use and integrate information and ideas found in print, media, and digital resources enabling them to function in a knowledge-based economy and technologically-oriented society.... (California Model School Library Standards for Students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| In TED 6253 candidates examine the *Model School Library Standards for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* and discuss expectations for each grade level in the Sequence of the Standards assignment. SeqStand6253

Information literacy skills are covered in the textbook chapters 22, 23, 24 (see information provided in Standard 2.1 for more information.)

In Lecture 7 in TED 6253 the new literacies are discussed in detail. Candidates examine the research on digital learning, explore reading websites, and conduct a webquest during class.

Candidates also include digital resources in work with their Clinic student. FieldExp6253 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.6 The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn the types and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates examine assessments in each course in the Reading Program. In TED 6253, for example, a PowerPoint discussion of reading comprehension assessment is provided (slides 21-31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Uses of Assessments Across the Continuum of Literacy Skill Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses of assessments across the continuum of literacy skill components, including informal and curriculum-embedded assessments, and reliable and valid norm-referenced and criterion-based assessments that are used for formative and summative purposes, such as, screening, diagnosis, placement, and progress monitoring.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates discuss use of informal reading inventories, based on the QRI, a required textbook for the course. Candidates are required to administer a battery of assessments to their Clinic students including the QRI reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension, a comprehensive vocabulary assessment, the five-minute vocabulary test (a measure of oral language), and an argumentative writing assessment. <strong>Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx</strong> Candidates are required to administer pretests and posttests in comprehension and to analyze results in the Reading Comprehension Field Experience Report. <strong>FieldExp6253</strong> In TED 6231 candidates complete two assessment reports, administering a battery of assessments to students in primary and upper grades. Candidates examine assessment data at a school site and write a school wide data analysis report. Additionally candidates complete a Standardized Reading Assessment Instrument Evaluation and Implementation assignment. <strong>Classdata6231</strong>  <strong>StandardizedAssess6231</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.7 The Program Provides Opportunities for Candidates to Learn the Differences and Relationships Between the Skills Needed for Assessing and Supporting Students’ Literacy Development and Those Necessary for Promoting Language Acquisition and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.7 The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn the differences and relationships between the skills needed for assessing and supporting students’ literacy development and those necessary for promoting language acquisition and development in order to know when a student may be struggling with a language acquisition problem rather than a reading problem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Ted 6220 candidates examine language acquisition through readings in the textbook, work with EL Clinic students, and lecture discussions. Chapter 6 in the Textbook, <em>Effective Teaching for ELs and All Students: Vocabulary, Reading, and Writing Within All Subjects</em> deals with the issue of language acquisition and literacy development. Chapter 9, <em>Common Instructional Assessment for English Learners: A Whole School Effort</em>, is also helpful to candidates in learning to assess and support English learners. Lectures delivered during the third sessions of TED 6253 and TED 6220 are aligned, focusing on language and vocabulary development for English-only students and English learners. These lectures are designed to provide candidates with a lens to differentiate between language acquisition and reading difficulties. In TED 6230 candidates read <em>Reparable Harm</em> (Olson) and discuss issues of language acquisition and methods to prevent students from becoming long-term English learners. <strong>RepHarm6230</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8 The Program Provides Opportunities for Candidates to Learn Methods to Assist Teachers in Using Grade Level or School-wide Assessment Data to Implement and Revise Instructional Programs and to Plan, Implement, and Evaluate School-wide Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.8 The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn methods to assist teachers in using grade level or school-wide assessment data to implement and revise instructional programs and to plan, implement, and evaluate school-wide professional development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In TED 6231 candidates complete a Site Based Data Analysis project. This assignment requires candidates to analyze the data concerning literacy assessments for the students across grade levels. Candidates use the data they have gathered to plan a school-wide intervention program. <strong>Classdata6231</strong> In TED 6253 candidates prepare a professional development workshop, based on an Annenberg literacy video, to address an area of literacy need for their schools. <strong>PD6253</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 4: Integrating Curriculum through Fieldwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 4: Integrating Curriculum through Fieldwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In TED 6253 candidates examine the cognitive psychology literature that provided a theoretical grounding for comprehension research. Candidates read the National Reading Panel Report and examine the research base for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
candidates with opportunities to evaluate research for appropriateness to the target population, integrate research and practice, and to apply appropriate assessment, instruction, and differentiation in the field.

vocabulary, reciprocal teaching, and other methods designed to improve comprehension.

In the Field Experience Report for TED 6253, candidates assess and instruct Summer Reading Clinic students in research-based methods of comprehension instruction. FieldExp6253 Additionally, in TED 6253 candidates read chapters in their textbook, Comprehension Instruction: Research-based Best Practices that they evaluate in reader responses and classroom discussions.

In TED 6220 candidates discuss the research on second language acquisition and methods designed to improve the literacy achievement of English learners such as the article, Teaching English learners: What the research does – and does not say (Goldenberg, 2008) and the textbook, Breaking Through: Effective Instruction and Assessment for Reaching English Learners (Calderon, 2012).

In TED 6220 candidates assess and instruct Summer Reading Clinic English learners in research-based methods of comprehension instruction. EL6220

In TED 6230 candidates complete the Fluency Issues assignment which requires them to read and report on three research articles regarding a topic related to phonics, phonemic awareness, or fluency. FluencyIssues6230

In TED 6232 candidates complete and Intervention Program Review. They select a research-based intervention program or program identified for RTI tiered instruction (designed to address difficulties in one or more of the follow areas: Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Word Identification, Fluency, Comprehension or Vocabulary) and evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Intervention6232

4.2 Candidates will work with individuals and/or small groups of students at both early (PreK-3) and intermediate (4th grade and up) levels of literacy acquisition.

Candidates work with students at the primary and intermediate levels in the Reading Program.

In TED 6230 candidates complete a Fluency Lesson Plan Project with a beginning reader. FieldExp6230

Candidates work with intermediate readers in the Summer Reading Clinic for TED 6253 and TED 6220. FieldExp6253

In TED 6231 candidates administer an assessment battery to a primary reader and an intermediate or secondary reader. AssessReport6231

In TED 6232 candidates complete an intervention project with a student at the grade level of their choice. Intervention6232
### 4.3 Candidates will demonstrate the knowledge, understanding, and application of all elements of the curriculum defined in Curriculum Standards 2 and 3. Comprehensive experiences will be available for candidates to: interpret results of classroom assessments, including formative, on-going and summative; perform additional assessments as appropriate; implement instructional strategies based on results of the assessment; and monitor and evaluate student progress.

Candidates participate in comprehensive field experiences in each of their Reading Program courses. In each course candidates have the opportunity to assess student learning, interpret assessment results, and design instruction.

For example, in Ted 6253 candidates administer the following assessments:

- The QRI, the Comprehensive Vocabulary Test (based on the QRI), the Five-Minute Vocabulary Test, and Interest Inventory, and a rubric evaluated persuasive writing sample.

Candidates design five 90-minute lessons that provide explicit and sequential, and differentiated instruction, including scaffolding for English learners, designed to improve students’ comprehension difficulties. On the last session of Clinic, candidates administer posttests and evaluate student progress. Candidates write a detailed report on the Field Experience. Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx FieldExp6253

In TED 6231 candidates conduct a school-wide data analysis, a Standardized Reading Assessment Instrument Evaluation, and two assessment reports. AssessReport6231 StandardizedAssess6231

In TED 6232 candidates conduct a battery of assessments in the Intervention Project. Intervention6232

### 4.4 The program ensures that candidates work at field sites or clinical settings where the instructional approaches and methods are consistent with a balanced, comprehensive program of reading and literacy instruction.

Field experiences are required in each of the Reading courses and are often conducted at candidates’ own school sites. Our main clinical setting, the Summer Reading Clinic, provides an environment in which approaches and methods are consistent with a balanced, comprehensive program of reading instruction. The requirements for the TED 6253 Field Experience, which is conducted in the Summer Reading Clinic, demonstrate the nature this clinical experience:

Plan and implement a five-lesson unit focusing on reading comprehension, to one or more of the students in our Clinic. Include the following in the design and implementation of your unit:

- Carefully read your students’ referral forms from parents and teachers
- Administer an interest inventory to determine what is likely to motivate your students to read
- Administer tests to measure students’ oral language, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension
- Identify the students’ reading comprehension problems based on the referral forms, QRI and other assessments
- Select a research-based method/strategy or set of strategies designed to improve the comprehension problem that you have identified
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examine at least two research articles documenting the effectiveness of the method/strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design a unit including five 90-minute lessons focusing on the method(s) you have selected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align lessons to the California Common Core State Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring authentic texts (expository and narrative) and necessary materials to use in your Clinic lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the academic language demands posed by the text for your struggling reader and English learner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide explicit and sequential, and differentiated instruction, including scaffolding for your English learner, designed to improve students’ comprehension difficulties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include activities that focus on oral language, vocabulary development, and writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include activities designed to increase students’ motivation to read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include one or more activities involving digital media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide instruction to your Clinic students, collecting samples of work from each lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer posttests based on the QRI 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.5 Fieldwork must include on-going guidance, assistance, and feedback by the instructor, professor, or other designated, qualified personnel, including Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential candidates, (in conjunction with the program faculty) to ensure that candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills identified in Standards 2 and 3.**

Reading Program faculty members provide guidance and feedback for all field experiences. Professors spend time explaining field experience requirements and consulting with students as they complete their work. Field experience papers are graded on Blackboard (based on a rubric) and scores are reported as part of the Biennial Report. [FieldExp6253](#)

The major clinical experience for the program is the Summer Reading Clinic which is incorporated into TED 6253 and TED 6220. Dr. Lubliner, the Summer Reading Clinic director and course professor, observes each candidate teaching on a weekly basis. Informal feedback is provided frequently and a formal observation with written feedback is conducted once for each candidate during the Summer Clinic. Observations reveal the extent to which candidates are demonstrating the knowledge and skills identified in Standards 2 and 3. [Clinic Observation Rubric.docx](#)

Time is set aside each week for Clinic preparation and consultation with Dr. Lubliner. At the end of each Clinic session, time is devoted to discussion of what went well and challenges that candidates are facing with their students.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category C. Assessment of Candidate Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Standard 5: Planning, Organizing, and Providing Literacy Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Narrative Describing How the Institution Meets the Standard—hyperlink to supporting documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Reading and Literacy Research and Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program uses multiple measures through which each candidate demonstrates competence in the following areas:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **5.A1** Candidates evaluate the culture of literacy at a classroom, grade or school level, and identify how it supports or impedes students’ literacy development. Candidates use that information and current research and theories on reading and literacy development, including first and second language development, to develop a plan of action to strengthen the culture so that it better supports literacy learning.

  - In Ted 6231 candidates evaluate the culture of literacy at a school site. Candidates collect data on the school’s literacy performance and identify students who are struggling. Candidates then organize the students for intervention or instructional support and identify instructional strategies would anchor an intervention/instructional program. [Classdata6231](#).

  - In TED 6253 candidates view a PowerPoint on the culture of literacy and write a paper discussing current research that informs the culture of literacy that they have established or are working to establish in their classroom and school. [CultLit6253](#).

- **5.A2** Candidates interpret results of disaggregated school-wide assessment data to propose changes in instructional practices through grade and school level discussion and professional development.

  - In TED 6231 candidates evaluate the culture of literacy at a school site. Candidates collect data on the school’s literacy performance and identify students who are struggling. Candidates then organize the students for intervention or instructional support and identify instructional strategies would anchor an intervention/instructional program. [SchoolData6231](#).

  - In TED 6253 candidates complete a Professional Development Workshop assignment. Candidates review school-wide assessment data on reading. They evaluate school literacy achievement and select an area of need for the school (reading comprehension, writing, vocabulary, or oral language). Candidates select an
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### 5.A3 Candidates select appropriate assessments, administer, analyze and summarize the results of the assessments and report the results in ways that are meaningful to parents, classroom teachers and administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Annenberg video on this topic and design a professional development workshop for teachers at the school site. <a href="#">PD6253</a></strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In TED 6253 candidates administer assessments described in Standard 4.3. Candidates evaluate student progress and write letters to the students’ parents and teachers at the end of the Summer Reading Clinic. [ReportParents6253](#)

In TED 6231 candidates are required to include parent letters as part of their assessment reports. The following are the requirements for these letters:

- Review reason for student’s participation
- Review of the purpose of the assessment process
- Description of the assessments completed
- Explanation of the assessment results, identify strengths and needs
- For parents: Identify what the school will do to support the literacy development of the student. What programs and learning activities will be available to the student?
- For teachers: Detailed set of recommendations based on data from assessments. What should the teacher/literacy/learning specialist be prepared to carry out to support the literacy development of the student. [ReportParents6231](#)

In TED 6232 candidates complete an Intervention Project which includes a letter to the parents and teachers of the student. [Intervention6232](#)

### 5.A4 Candidates use assessment results to guide instruction and to determine the timing of appropriate placement in and exit from intervention programs with the goal of accelerated, successful reentry into grade level standards-based programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>In TED 6232 candidates complete an Intervention Project entailing a minimum of 10 hours of assessment and instruction. Candidates provided detailed information for parents and teachers regarding student progress and suggestions for successful reentry in grade level standards-based programs. <a href="#">Intervention6232</a></strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. Instruction and Intervention

The program uses multiple measures through which each candidate demonstrates competence in the following areas:

### 5.B1 Candidates plan and teach lessons to students who are different from the candidate, including, ethnic, cultural, gender, linguistic, and socio-economic differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>In the Reading Clinic candidates work with students who are struggling readers and English learners. Many of the students in the Clinic are culturally diverse from the candidates, and speak a variety of languages other than English.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 5.B2 Candidates plan, implement, and monitor formal literacy instruction that is sequential, linguistically logical, systematic, explicit, differentiated, and based on ongoing formal and informal assessments of individual students’ progress that assures that the full range of learners develop proficiency as quickly and effectively as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FieldExp6253</th>
<th>FieldExp6220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the Summer Reading Clinic candidates plan, implement, and monitor literacy instruction to their students. Candidates administer pretests, design instruction to meet student needs, administer posttests and evaluate student progress.

FieldExp6253  Clinic Testing and Instruction.docx

Candidates implement a Fluency Lesson Plan Project with a beginning reader in Ted 6230.  FieldExp6230

Candidates implement an intervention project with a student at a grade level of their choice in TED 6232.  Intervention6232

### 5.B3 Candidates use modeling, massed and distributed practice, and opportunities for application as strategies to facilitate student learning. Candidates select and use instructional materials, technology, routines, and strategies that are appropriately aligned with students’ assessed language and literacy needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FieldExp6253</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Candidates select and use appropriate instruction materials and technology and provide explicit strategy instruction to students in the Summer Reading Clinic.

FieldExp6253

Candidates also select appropriate materials and strategies in 6230 in the Fluency Lesson Plan Project with a beginning reader.  FieldExp6230

Candidates also select appropriate materials and strategies in the intervention project that they conduct in TED 6232.  Intervention6232

### 5.B4 Candidates know the critical aspects of, and can facilitate student and teacher use of, multiple digital literacies for 21st Century skills necessary for success in today’s global economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FieldExp6253</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Candidate view a PowerPoint on digital literacy in TED 6253.

They provide instruction that includes multiple digital literacies to their students in the Summer Reading Clinic.  FieldExp6253

Additionally, candidates read the following chapters on digital literacies in their textbook: 22) Research on Instruction and Assessment in the New Literacies; 23) Scaffolding Digital Comprehension; 24) Technologically Based Teacher Resources.
For more information, suggestions, helpful hints,

contact Dr. Geri Mohler, CTC Education Consultant

Phone: 916-327-7109

Email: gmohler@ctc.ca.gov
The Reading Certificate Program includes the following five courses:

**TED 6230 Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Research and Methods 1** (4 units)
Description: Review research; learn normal progression of literacy development relative to grade level standards; plan implement and assess research based literacy instruction including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and writing for pre-K and up.

**TED 6253 Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Research & Methods 2** (4 units)
Description: Review research; plan, implement and assess research based literacy instruction including oral language, vocabulary and reading comprehension for pre-K and up; facilitate use of print media and digital resources.

**TED 6220 Reading and Language Arts: Culture of Literacy: Focus on Diversity** (4 units)
Description: Review research; develop a culture of literacy capitalizing on students’ diverse knowledge and skills; support second language development; plan, implement and assess instruction to students for diverse ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic groups.

**TED 6231 Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Assessment & Intervention 1** (4 units)
Description: Review research; introduction to principles of formal and informal literacy-based assessments; learn to select, administer and evaluate assessment data for different audiences and purposes.

**TED 6232 Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Assessment & Intervention 2** (4 units)
Review research; learn to assess, instruct and provide intervention for each component of research based literacy instruction; modify the curriculum to address specific needs of students; interpret and use assessment data to inform placement and intervention decisions. Prerequisite: TED 6231

Part II includes syllabi for each of the Reading Certificate courses. Please note that a combined syllabus is used for TED 6253 and TED 6220. This is because the two courses are taught back-to-back on the same day, with the Summer Reading Clinic in between. Assignments for both courses (TED 6253 Field Experience and TED 6220 EL Planning Template) are completed with Clinic students.
California State University, East Bay
Department of Teacher Education
TED 6230: Reading/Language Arts: Fluency (4 units)
Summer 2013 Pleasanton (Amador HS)

Instructor: Dana L. Grisham, Ph.D.
Phone: 510-260-5425 (mobile)
Email: dana.grisham@gmail.com

Theme of the School of Education and Allied Studies
To prepare collaborative leaders, committed to professional excellence, social justice, and democracy who will influence a diverse and interconnected world.

Mission of the Department of Teacher Education
To prepare teachers who are dedicated to the academic achievement of all students, and who demonstrate a commitment to life-long professional growth and school leadership.

How This Course Relates to the Theme
Teaching children to read and write is the most important academic goal of schooling. Advanced proficiency as a reader, writer, speaker, and listener will enable students to be successful in school and in our democracy. Given California's linguistic diversity, this course will assist enable course participants to identify appropriate instructional strategies and materials for delivering core content to all students, with a focus on the needs of English Language Learners and students considered 'at risk'. This course will provide participants with the knowledge and skills to develop a variety of differentiated lesson plans and techniques and instructional strategies to teach reading and the language arts to all students.

Earthquake Information
During an earthquake, duck and cover - get under a desk or table. Protect your head with your arms. Do not exit the building; objects may fall from roof. Do not use elevators. After the shaking stops: remain calm. Think about a way out. Check for potential hazards. When safe, evacuate to an open area. At Hayward, assemble at the Amphitheater, where you will receive further information. Use the telephone (3333) only for genuine emergencies. At Concord, when safe, evacuate to an open area. Use the telephone (911) only for genuine emergencies. Expect aftershocks.

Documented Disability Statement
If you have a documented disability and require accommodations/course modifications, please notify the instructor so that appropriate arrangements can be made. If you may require accommodations and do not
have appropriate documentation, please see a counselor at the Student with Disabilities Resource Center. If you will need assistance in the event of an emergency, please contact the Department office at 510-885-3027 as soon as possible.

**Course Description**
Current research and practice for fluency development for K-12 students, including English language learners. Topics include acquisition of print concepts, phonemic awareness, and word attack strategies; spelling; selection of appropriate materials; and creating readers who read for multiple purposes.

**Course Information**
Course meets on Tuesdays from 1-4:00 pm at Amador High School. Some sessions will meet on Blackboard (online).

**Applicable RLAA Standards**
1.1 The design of the program follows an explicit statement of program philosophy and purpose. It is based on a sound rationale informed by current, confirmed, replicable and reliable research in literacy as referenced in the *California Preschool Learning Foundations and Frameworks* (Volume 1) and the *California Reading/Language Arts Framework*.

3.1 The program provides opportunities for candidates to review and analyze current, confirmed, reliable and replicable quantitative and qualitative research pertaining to language and literacy instruction and how that research is reflected in the contents of the *California Preschool Learning Foundations and Frameworks* (Volume 1) and the *California Reading/Language Arts Framework*.

4.1 The program will provide Reading and Literacy Added Authorization candidates with opportunities to evaluate research for appropriateness to the target population, integrate research and practice, and to apply appropriate assessment, instruction, and differentiation in the field.

4.4 The program ensures that candidates work at field sites or clinical settings where the instructional approaches and methods are consistent with a balanced, comprehensive program of reading and literacy instruction.

4.5 Fieldwork must include on-going guidance, assistance, and feedback by the instructor, professor, or other designated, qualified personnel, including Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential candidates, (in conjunction with the program faculty) to ensure that candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills identified in Standards 2 and 3.

5.B2 Candidates plan, implement, and monitor formal literacy instruction that is sequential, linguistically logical, systematic, explicit, differentiated, and based on ongoing formal and informal assessments of individual students’ progress that assures that the full range of learners develop proficiency as quickly and effectively as possible.

3.2b The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn how to assess, instruct, and provide intervention, if needed, for each component of research-based literacy instruction, including: word analysis.

3.2c The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn how to assess, instruct, and provide intervention, if needed, for each component of research-based literacy instruction, including: fluency.
The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn how to assess, instruct, and provide intervention, if needed, for each component of research-based literacy instruction, including: written language development.

The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn the normal progression of complexity for each component of literacy, as explicated in the Foundations/Standards and their Frameworks, the expected stages and patterns in students’ development including early and adolescent literacy, the implications of delays or differences in students’ literacy development relative to grade level standards, and when such delays/differences warrant further assessment, differentiated instruction and intervention.

Candidates will work with individuals and/or small groups of students at both early (PreK-3) and intermediate (4th grade and up) levels of literacy acquisition.

Candidates use modeling, massed and distributed practice, and opportunities for application as strategies to facilitate student learning. Candidates select and use instructional materials, technology, routines, and strategies that are appropriately aligned with students’ assessed language and literacy needs.

Course Objectives

In this class, the candidate will:

1. Develop an understanding of the reading process and its reciprocal relationship to the other language processes of writing, listening, and speaking.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the current research-based skills and knowledge about instructional strategies for developing fluent reading for students at all grade levels, including English Language Learners and culturally diverse students.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of research that focuses on how to teach word recognition; effective instruction in phonemic awareness, concepts about print, phonics and other word identification strategies and spelling instruction; all used to become fluent readers.
4. Demonstrate knowledge about the roles of different types of texts in reading instruction (predictable, decodable, non-instructional) and their role in developing fluency.
5. Demonstrate an understanding of the current research-based skills and knowledge about instructional strategies for developing fluent reading for students at all grade levels, including ELL and culturally diverse students.
6. Apply strategies in classroom situations to improve and promote fluency for students reading on primary and intermediate levels.
7. Develop an understanding of strategies used to promote independent and life-long readers and writers.
8. Use theoretical, current research, and classroom knowledge to critique commercially prepared materials available to promote fluency for all students.

Class Format

Includes, but not limited to lecture, discussion, interactive presentations, video, and Blackboard. It is the responsibility all students to activate their CSU East Bay Horizon account and check Blackboard and their horizon account e-mail account weekly.
Required Readings

Olson, L. (2011). *Reparable Harm: Fulfilling the Unkept Promise of Educational Opportunity for California's Long Term English Learners.* Retrieved from: http://www.wested.org/cs/eac/view/eac_rs/7?eac_fa_id=1 (You may also download the pdf from Blackboard)

Rasinski, Timothy and Padak, Nancy (2013). *From Phonics to Fluency: Effective Teaching of Decoding and Reading Fluency in the Elementary School*, 3rd Ed. New York: Pearson. (PF)[Note: The previous editions of this book will NOT work for this course. The third edition is also available in Kindle edition for the iPad on Amazon.com.]

California Preschool Learning Foundations:
http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/psfoundations.asp

National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read:
http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org/Publications/summary.htm

Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children (Summary):
www.ed.gov/initials/americareads/ReadDiff/read-sum.html

California Common Core State Standards:
http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/

Recommended Web Sites
National Center for Education Statistics nc.ed.gov/

Common Core of Data Information on Public Schools and School Districts in the United States nc.ed.gov/ccd/

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)
nc.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/

www.ed.gov/americacounts/naep.html

Improving Student Achievement: What state NAEP Test Scores Tell Us
www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR924

California Department of Education Academic Performance Index http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/

No Child Left Behind http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml

Fair Test www.fairtest.org

Council for Exceptional Children: http://www.cec.sped.org/am/template.cfm?section=Home
*IRIS Center (Vanderbilt and Claremont) [http://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/](http://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/)
Free downloads of modules, information briefs, podcasts, on general/special education topics.

*Text Project (Freddy Hiebert) Free resources for teachers including information on text complexity and CCSS
[http://textproject.org/](http://textproject.org/)

Learner.org (Annenberg Site/Resources K-12) [http://www.learner.org/index.html](http://www.learner.org/index.html)

Literacy Beat (An education blog on literacy and technology intersections)

**Recommended Videos Online**

**Guided Reading with Jenna: Small Group Guided Reading**

**The Teaching channel: Rick’s Reading Worskshop: Silent Reading**

**Strategies for Teaching Reading: Thinking Partners**
[http://youtu.be/qYoVkf3s7E](http://youtu.be/qYoVkf3s7E)

**Supporting ELL (English Language Learner) Students Using Read-alouds**
[http://youtu.be/zQM_C2i9X90](http://youtu.be/zQM_C2i9X90)

**Teaching Reading Comprehension,K-2: Predicting, Inferring, Visualizing, Determining Important Content**
[http://youtu.be/eVKkyc_ne4M](http://youtu.be/eVKkyc_ne4M)

**Strengthening Reading Comprehension, 3-6, Part II: Strategies That Improve Reading Comprehension**

**Grapho-phonc Cueing System**
[http://youtu.be/be_tuJkLjXY](http://youtu.be/be_tuJkLjXY)

**Grades**
1. Grades are based on successful completion of the class activities, assignments and quizzes. Regular attendance and appropriate preparation for each class session are required. Because of the high level of student involvement in this class, more than one excused absence, incident of leaving early, or coming to class late will result in lowering your grade by one portion regardless of the number of points earned (i.e., A- to B+).
2. All assignments are due on time at the beginning of the period and will not be accepted late for credit unless you can provide the instructor with a compelling reason to do so. Late assignments, even those late due to non-attendance, will result in a lowered grade. Most assignments will be submitted on Blackboard. Assignments submitted electronically are subject to the same timeframe (beginning of the class session unless otherwise stated).

3. Completeness, presentation, and adherence to the topic will be considered in the evaluation process. Since this is a graduate level class, written work should reflect depth of understanding of the content and clarity of organization. All written work must be typed or word-processed and completed with attention to grammar, usage, spelling, syntax, and punctuation.

Assignments will be graded as follows:

Responses to Readings and Discussions  80 points (8x10 points)
Reparable Harm Summary/Reaction                      15 points
Fluency/Assessments Lesson Plan Project               60 points
Research in Fluency Issues                          20 points
Writing Issues                                      20 points
Participation/Professionalism                        5 points

Total Points:                                        **200 points**

Final grades will be assigned according to the total number of points earned as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>186-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>180-185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>168-173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>160-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>146-153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>140-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>120-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>119 and below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>180-185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>174-179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>154-159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Attendance/Class Participation
The success of this class depends to a large extent to the thoughtful preparation and participation of all members. Your participation in discussions and interactive activities is essential to the success of this course. I assume that (1) you will do nothing to disrupt the class including but not limited to coming to class late, cell phone interruptions, text messaging, preparing to leave-leaving class prior the being dismissed, completing work other than TED 7982 work, or holding private conversations, and (2) you will contribute to the class with the knowledge gained from your reading and field experiences. Individuals who miss more than one class session will have their grade lowered by one grade regardless of the number of points earned. Individuals who repeatedly arrive late or come to class unprepared may be in jeopardy of failing the course.

If you expect to miss a class or arrive late, you are expected to contact the instructor in advance. Contacting the instructor does not change the repercussions from non-attendance. All participants are responsible for the content of the course, obtaining course handouts from other participants and for making up any course work that took place.
Course Assignments

1. SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENT (Total 60 points)
Fluency Assessment and Lesson Plan Project:

The purpose of this project is to insure that candidates are able to assess the learning of and design and implement research-based fluency lesson plans for primary level students. This signature assignment has three parts.

Part 1
Assessment Administration and Write-up: Administer, interpret, and write-up the following assessments:
- One Passage Based Fluency Assessment
  - Dibels (U. Oregon)
  - District passages
  - Benchmark passages
- Two (2) High Frequency Word Assessments (K-3)
  - Dolch, San Diego Quick, Fry
- One (1) Phonics Assessment
  - District based
  - Dibels (U. Oregon)
  - Names Test
  - Basic Phonics
- One (1) Concepts About Print Assessment (K-1st)
  - Basic Reading Inventory
  - Marie Clay Observational Assessment
  - Dibels (U. Oregon)
  - District based assessment

- One (1) Spelling Assessment (WTW any grade level)

Your write up should include notes from the administration of the assessments, outcomes of the assessments, your diagnosis of the student’s needs for instruction, and your reflection on the process. Due: TBA

Part 2
Using the same primary level student, (tape or cd) your struggling reader using a passage at his or her independent reading level and administer the Multidimensional Fluency Scale (MDFS). Interpret the fluency level of the student, using the MDFS record provided in the syllabus (along with your notes and rationale for the scores you gave). Bring in the recording, text, and assessment information and lead a discussion about your student’s fluency with the class.

Sign up for a date you will present this in class.
Part 3

Using the same primary level student (K-3), develop and implement three lesson plans designed to promote and enhance fluency. For each lesson created, candidates will create an original artifact that can be used to enhance the lesson. Artifacts include, but are not limited to manipulatives, games, original worksheets, and other appropriate materials that can be used to teach the lessons. Each plan should contain the following elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Objective and Standards</th>
<th>Materials/Resources Needed to Complete the Lesson</th>
<th>Procedures for Instruction</th>
<th>Skill Practice</th>
<th>Follow-up &amp; Integration of Skill</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Provide enough information so that anyone who picks up this lesson plan will be able to implement it easily and with success. Please refer to the rubric for specificity of what is contained in the elements.

Submitting the Signature Assignment:

Post all three portions of this assignment to Blackboard (include the recordings). The rubric that will be used in the assessment of this assignment is included in the appendix of materials accompanying this syllabus.

2. **Responses to Reading in Class and Discussion Board (10 points each X 8 =80) Due various dates:** Write a summary for the chapter/articles assigned for each date followed by a reflection that focuses on how this knowledge will influence your teaching (not to exceed 2-3 pages, including at least half a page on reflection). Weekly readings may be combined in a single Summary/Reflection.

3. **Reparable Harm (15 points) Due July 2 (Online):** Download the article and write a summary (2 pages) and a reflection (1 page) on the challenges of teaching English Learners. Post to the Discussion Board by cutting and pasting in the Summary/Reflection. Then read and respond substantively to five (5) other posts.

4. **Fluency Issues Project (20 points) Due Aug 27:** Review an area of fluency research where there remains concern and/or controversy. Sign up for a topic from the list attached and find three scholarly articles about your topic (e.g., research based). Provide a 2-3-page summary with a bullet point list and bibliography. Paste into discussion board) and respond to 5 other posts.

5. **Writing Assignment (15 points). Due August 7**

Read the following article (posted in course content on Blackboard):

Primary grade writing instruction: A national survey.

Cutler, Laura; Graham, Steve


Prepare a response to the videos and the research article that summarizes your understanding of writing instruction at the primary level. Indicate in your response how you teach writing and how this relates to what you have learned about writing instruction. In your paper, provide a short writing sample from your tutee. How will you address this student’s writing strengths and needs? *Bring your completed paper to class on August 7.*

**Course Calendar** appears on the next two pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Assignments DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW Overview of the Syllabus and course requirements.</td>
<td>PF: Chapters 1-5 (pp. 1-81)</td>
<td>Discussion Questions (in class) (D#1/10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is Fluency? How does fluency develop?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word Study and Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic Concepts and Terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing Word Recognition and Reading Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Routines for Word Study and Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using Authentic Texts to Learn New Words and Develop Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td><strong>ISSUES FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS (Reparable Harm)</strong></td>
<td>Reparable Harm (available online or on BB)</td>
<td>Submit paper/ reflection by pasting into Blackboard DB; Respond substantively to 5 other papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>• Summary of the reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reflection on teaching ELs (based on your professional experience and questions; what might you change?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>INFORMATION PROCESSING PHONEMIC AWARENESS</td>
<td>WTW Chaps.1-3</td>
<td>Reading Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why Word Study?</td>
<td>PF: Chap 6-7 (pp. 82-119) and Chapter 13 (pp. 199-217)</td>
<td>Discussion Questions (DB#2/10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words and the Development of Orthographic Knowledge</td>
<td>Yopp, Phonemic Awareness Article (available on BB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing Orthographic Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Phonemic Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onsets, Rimes, and Basic Phonics Patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Choose topic for Fluency Issues Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yopp, Phonemic Awareness Article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>PHONICS</td>
<td>PF: Chap 8-12 (pp. 62-91)</td>
<td>Reading Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Perspectives on Phonics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Advanced Word Patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Banks and Word Sorts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Word Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-198) National Reading Panel Summary (available online)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Questions (DB#3/10 pts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Assignments DUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Week 5    | **FLUENCY**  
Word Games, Spelling and Word Learning; Beyond Word Study: Reading Fluency  
Debriefing Fluency Assessments  
Creation of Materials for Fluency  
Fluency Activities (Readers Theatre), Preparing Fluency Lesson Plans | PF Chap 14-16 (pp. 218-272)      | Reading Response  
Discussion Questions (DB#4/10 pts)  
Fluency Recordings and MDFS |
| Week 6    | **FLUENCY**  
Teaching Phonics and Fluency: Making Critical Choices for Authentic and Effective Instruction  
Discussion and Final Questions  
Presentation of Fluency Assessment Papers in Class | PF Chapter 17-18 (pp. 273-303)   | Reading Response  
Discussion Questions (DB#5/10 pts)  
Fluency Recordings and MDFS |
| Week 7    | **WRITING INSTRUCTION**  
View the Youtube videos and read the research article. You will present your response paper in small groups. | You-tube; research article       | Reading Response and class discussion (DB#6/10 pts) |
| Week 8    | **ONLINE SESSION:**  
INTERMEDIATE & ADVANCED WORD STUDY  
On the discussion board section of Blackboard, there will be a series of questions to answer and discuss. | WTW Chap 4-7                     | Reading Response  
Respond to questions posted on Blackboard (DB#7/10 pts) |
| Week 9    | **WORD STUDY- CONTINUED**  
Read chapter 8 in WTW. Prepare a reading response and paste it into the Discussion Board. Respond to 5 other posts. | WTW Chap 8                      | Reading Response  
Respond to questions posted on Blackboard (DB#8/10 pts) |
| Week 10   | **PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER**  
FLUENCY TOPICS | None.                           | All assignments due for Fluency Issues reports |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>our</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myself</td>
<td>moment</td>
<td>amazed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>town</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>silent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>exclaimed</td>
<td>wrecked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send</td>
<td>several</td>
<td>improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide</td>
<td>lonely</td>
<td>certainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>drew</td>
<td>entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quietly</td>
<td>since</td>
<td>realized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carefully</td>
<td>straight</td>
<td>interrupted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lesson Plans (Finals)**

| Online | All assignments must be submitted by Wednesday, TBA, by 5 pm in order to be counted in your grade. |

### Additional Materials

**San Diego Quick Assessment**

**Preprimer**
- see
- play
- me
- at
- run
- go
- and
- look
- can
- here

**Primer**
- you
- come
- not
- with
- jump
- help
- is
- work
- are
- this

**Grade 1**
- road
- live
- thank
- when

**Grade 2**
- bigger
- how
- always
- night
- spring
- today

**Grade 3**
- this

**Grade 4**
- that

**Grade 5**
- this

**Grade 6**
- this

**Grade 7**
- this
scanty  bridge  amber
business commercial dominion
develop abolish sundry
considered trucker capillary
discussed apparatus impetuous
behaved elementary blight
splendid comment wrest
acquainted necessity enumerate
escaped gallery daunted
grim relativity condescend

Grade 8
capacious
limitation
pretext
intrigue
delusion
immaculate
ascent
acid
binocular
embankment

Grade 9
Conscientious
isolation
molecule
ritual
momentous
vulnerable
kinship
conservatism
jaunty
inventive

Grade 10
zany
jerkin
nausea
gratuitous
linear
inept
legality
aspen
amnesty
barometer

Dolch Basic Sight Words

List 1
the
the
to
to
and
and

List 2
at
at
him
him
with
with

List 3
do
do
can
can
could
could

List 4
big
big
went
went
are
are

List 5
from
from
good
good
any
any
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>he</th>
<th>up</th>
<th>when</th>
<th>come</th>
<th>about</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>did</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>came</td>
<td>know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>ask</td>
<td>right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was</td>
<td>out</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>its</td>
<td>where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>ride</td>
<td>every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>pretty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List 6</th>
<th>List 7</th>
<th>List 8</th>
<th>List 9</th>
<th>List 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>away</td>
<td>walk</td>
<td>tell</td>
<td>soon</td>
<td>use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>made</td>
<td>fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>run</td>
<td>say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>gave</td>
<td>light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>pick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saw</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>has</td>
<td>hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>call</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>try</td>
<td>find</td>
<td>pull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>been</td>
<td>must</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think</td>
<td>may</td>
<td>start</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ran</td>
<td>stop</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>our</td>
<td>sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let</td>
<td>off</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>better</td>
<td>which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>hold</td>
<td>fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make</td>
<td>seven</td>
<td>does</td>
<td>buy</td>
<td>carry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going</td>
<td>eight</td>
<td>bring</td>
<td>funny</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>cold</td>
<td>goes</td>
<td>warm</td>
<td>under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown</td>
<td>today</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>ate</td>
<td>read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>fly</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>myself</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>those</td>
<td>own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>done</td>
<td>found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Another Dolch List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List 1 (first grade)</th>
<th>List 2 (first grade)</th>
<th>List 3 (first grade)</th>
<th>List 4 (second grade)</th>
<th>List 5 (third grade)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>around</td>
<td>better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>away</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>bring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>ate</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>been</td>
<td>carry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blue</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>cleat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>ask</td>
<td>best</td>
<td>cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>buy</td>
<td>draw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find</td>
<td>did</td>
<td>every</td>
<td>cat</td>
<td>drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>fly</td>
<td>cold</td>
<td>eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funny</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>does</td>
<td>fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>don't</td>
<td>far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>going</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td>got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>has</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>grow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>five</td>
<td>hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>found</td>
<td>hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jump</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>gave</td>
<td>hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>how</td>
<td>goes</td>
<td>if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>its</td>
<td>kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>let</td>
<td>made</td>
<td>laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my</td>
<td>our</td>
<td>live</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td>out</td>
<td>may</td>
<td>off</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>please</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play</td>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>pull</td>
<td>myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red</td>
<td>ran</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>read</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>run</td>
<td>ride</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said</td>
<td>say</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>sing</td>
<td>own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>put</td>
<td>sit</td>
<td>pick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>soon</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>tell</td>
<td>shall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>stop</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>these</td>
<td>six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>thank</td>
<td>those</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>upon</td>
<td>start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td>too</td>
<td>hen</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>want</td>
<td>think</td>
<td>use</td>
<td>together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>walk</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>try</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>wash</td>
<td>warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>went</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>which</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### San Diego Quick Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinician: ____________________________</th>
<th>Date: ____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student: ______________________________</td>
<td>Grade: ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent:**

**Instructional:**

**Frustration:**

**Pattern Analysis/Comments:**

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

**Anecdotal Observation**
El Paso Phonics Survey Results

Clinician______________________________________________ Date______

Student _______________________________________________ Grade_____

Anecdotal Observation

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Results/Analysis________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
Words Their Way Spelling Inventory

Clinician______________________________________________ Date_____  

Student_______________________________________________ Grade____

Anecdotal Observation__________________________________________________________

Level Test Administered______________

Results/Analysis

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

Beginning Reading Inventory

Clinician______________________________________________ Date_____  

Student_______________________________________________ Grade____

Test Results *(Adequate or Inadequate)*

Subtest 1: Concept of Print ____________________________________________
Subtest 2: Letter Name & Sound Knowledge

Subtest 3: Name & Word Writing/Recognition

Subtest 4: Sense of Story Grammar/Comprehension

Subtest 5: Phonemic Awareness

Results/Analysis/Interpretation

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

Multidimensional Fluency Scale

Clinician_____________________________ Date______

Student______________________________ Grade____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expression and Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Score (total expression/volume, phrasing, smoothness, and pace scores)
**Multidimensional Fluency Scale**

Use the following scales to rate reader fluency on the dimensions of expression and volume, phrasing, smoothness, and pace. Scores range from 4 to 16. Generally, scores below 8 indicate that fluency may be a concern. Scores of 8 or above indicate that the student is making good progress in fluency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Expression and Volume</strong></td>
<td>Reads with little expression or enthusiasm in voice. Reads words as if simply to get them out. Little sense of trying to make text sound like natural language. Tends to read in a quiet voice.</td>
<td>Some expression. Begins to use voice to make text sound like natural language in some areas of the text, but not others. Focus remains largely on saying the words. Still reads in a quiet voice.</td>
<td>Sounds like natural language throughout the better part of the passage. Occasionally slips into expressionless reading. Voice volume is generally appropriate throughout the text.</td>
<td>Reads with good expression and enthusiasm throughout the text. Sounds like natural language. The reader is able to vary expression and volume to match his/her interpretation of the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Phrasing</strong></td>
<td>Monotonic with little sense of phrase boundaries, frequent word-by-word reading.</td>
<td>Frequent two- and three-word phrases giving the impression of choppy reading; improper stress and intonation that fail to mark ends of sentences and clauses.</td>
<td>Mixture of run-ons, mid-sentence pauses for breath, and possibly some choppiness; reasonable stress/intonation.</td>
<td>Generally well phrased, mostly in clause and sentence units, with adequate attention to expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Smoothness</strong></td>
<td>Frequent extended pauses, hesitations, false starts, sound-outs, repetitions, and/or multiple</td>
<td>Several “rough spots” in text where extended pauses, hesitations, etc., are more frequent and</td>
<td>Occasional breaks in smoothness caused by difficulties with specific words and/or structures.</td>
<td>Generally smooth reading with some breaks, but word and structure difficulties are resolved quickly, usually through self-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fluency Issues Project Puzzle Piece

Present your fluency issues project and help put the puzzle pieces together... As we have discussed in class, fluency is more complex than the ability to read easily and with success. Fluency is more involved than learning sounds and symbols and putting them together to blend and pronounce a word. In fact, we have spent the summer studying, researching and reflecting on the many factors and components that influence a reader in their journey to acquire fluency. It is now time to put all of the pieces together. Your job is to listen to the presentations and respond to the following questions:

1) Why does ____________matter?  
2) What matters most in reading fluency?

We will build our puzzle and solve the fluency question at last!

**ASSIGNED PUZZLE PIECES (TOPICS):**

- Age/Grade of the Student
- Automaticity
- Attention
- Background Knowledge
- Comprehension
- Good Models
- Interest
- Memory
- Motivation
- Onsets & Rimes
- Phonemic Awareness
- Phonics

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Pace (during sections of minimal disruption)</th>
<th>Slow and laborious.</th>
<th>Moderately slow.</th>
<th>Uneven mixture of fast and slow reading.</th>
<th>Consistently conversational.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Practice Reading
Prosody
Rate
Self-Monitoring/Metacognition
Sight Words
Spelling
Structural Analysis
Text factors
Vocabulary
# Rubric for Evaluating Field Experience: Fluency Lesson Plan Project

## Part 1—Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unacceptable</strong></td>
<td>No evidence of all assignments—more than one is missing; administered on a student not at primary level.</td>
<td>Some evidence of some assessments; others are missing or incomplete or incorrectly administered.</td>
<td>Substantially completed assessments; correctly administered. May be one missing or incomplete.</td>
<td>Evidence that all assessments (Fluency, Sight Word, Phonics, Concepts about Print, and Spelling assessments are correctly administered on a primary level child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partial</strong></td>
<td>Missing the results of more than one assignment; results are not reported correctly.</td>
<td>Some evidence of mostly correct results in the write up.</td>
<td>Evidence of mostly correct results of assessments in the write up. May be incomplete on one.</td>
<td>Evidence of correct results of all assessments in the write up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptable</strong></td>
<td>Missing the diagnosis of child’s needs; inaccurate or incomplete recommendations for instruction.</td>
<td>Diagnosis does not match the assessment outcomes or mistakes recommendations.</td>
<td>Mostly accurate and appropriate diagnosis and recommendations for instruction.</td>
<td>Evidence of thoughtful and accurate diagnosis of child’s learning needs and recommendations for instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficient</strong></td>
<td>No reflection or minimal reflection on process.</td>
<td>Minimal reflections and/or impact on professional learning.</td>
<td>Substantially complete, but minimal or missing reflection or impact on professional learning.</td>
<td>Thoughtful reflection on the process of assessing the child and on the impact of this on the teacher’s professional learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2—Multidimensional Fluency Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audio Recording</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recordings are not posted or are inaudible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording is marginally audible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recordings are audible, but may have some data missing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Proficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording of primary level student is audible when presented in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDFS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDFS scoring sheet is not posted or may have substantial errors. No explanatory notes are present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDFS is incomplete or incorrectly interpreted. Notes may be sketchy or missing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDFS matches audio the recording but may have small errors and notes are present but may be incomplete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional Fluency Scale rating matches the audio recording and notes are appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom presentation is missing or incomplete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom presentation is made, but MDFS and peer input are not present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially complete classroom presentation with MDFS and peer input. May miss one or two details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher leads the class, as scheduled, in a discussion about the audio recording, linking it to the MDFS, and soliciting peer input in interpretation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective(s) missing, unclear, and/or not related to the California Common Core State Standards.</td>
<td>Objectives do not provide a clear sense of what the student will know and be able to do as a result of the lesson. Some of the objectives are tied to CCCSS.</td>
<td>Objectives provide some sense of what the student will know and be able to do as a result of the lesson. Most of the objectives are tied to CCCSS.</td>
<td>Objective provides a clear sense of what students will know and be able to do as a result of the lesson. Objectives clearly tied to CCCSS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials/Resources Needed to Complete Lesson</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of materials is incomplete and contains no notes or additional references and resources for this plan.</td>
<td>Some of the resources, notes, and materials are not listed and/or are inappropriate for this plan.</td>
<td>Most of the materials, notes, and references are listed for this plan.</td>
<td>Complete listing of materials, including notes about creating materials, along with references are clear and easy to follow are included for this plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures Used for Instruction</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures are missing and/or incomplete. No references are included for the method needed to implement.</td>
<td>Some of the procedures can be followed. Plan lacks specificity in reference guide for specialized method needed.</td>
<td>Most of the procedures can be followed. Plan includes minimal references and/or guide for specialized method needed.</td>
<td>Procedures are clear and easy to follow for anyone to pick up and implement. Plan also includes a guide for any specialized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill Practice</strong></td>
<td>Practice of skill is lacking. Environment and prepared materials are not appropriate.</td>
<td>Practice of skill is provided in a random or unrelated form and prepared materials and environment may not be appropriate.</td>
<td>Practice of skill along with prepared materials and environment are provided for in a somewhat appropriate format.</td>
<td>Practice of skill as well as materials and environment are provided for in an appropriate format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-Up and Integration of Skill</strong></td>
<td>Follow-up and integration of skills is missing and/or appears to be presented in a random context.</td>
<td>Follow-up and integration of skill is presented in an inappropriate and non-meaningful context with inappropriate support materials.</td>
<td>Follow-up and integration of skill is presented in a somewhat appropriate and meaningful context with somewhat acceptable support materials.</td>
<td>Follow-up and integration of skill is clearly presented in an appropriate and meaningful context with appropriate support materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Reflection on the Lesson</strong></td>
<td>Self-reflection is missing sections and does not provide insights into the component parts of the critique.</td>
<td>Self-reflection is superficial and lacks specificity in what went well, what should remain, and what could be done differently next time.</td>
<td>Most of reflection is thoughtful. Some insight is provided for what went well, what should remain, and what could change and what could be done differently next time.</td>
<td>Self-reflection is thoughtful and provides insight as to what went well, what should remain, and what could change and what could be done differently next time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>Written with little regard for spelling and/or grammar.</td>
<td>Many spelling and/or grammar errors are present.</td>
<td>Contains few spelling and/or grammar errors.</td>
<td>Spelling and grammar in this assignment are free from error.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

Department of Teacher Education

COMBINED SYLLABUS: TED 6253 & TED 6220

SUMMER, 2013, PLEASANTON

TED 6253 (4 UNITS)

READING AND LANGUAGE ARTS

LITERACY RESEARCH AND METHODS 2: COMPREHENSION

COURSE INFORMATION

Instructor: Dr. Shira Lubliner

Class Schedule: Wednesdays 1:00-4:30 – June 27-August 29

Location: Amador Valley High School

Office Hours: Wednesdays 12:30-1:00 by appointment

Phone: (510) 885-4484

E-mail Address: shira.lubliner@csueastbay.edu

THEME OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND ALLIED STUDIES

To prepare collaborative leaders, committed to professional excellence, social justice, and democracy who will influence a diverse and interconnected world

MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

To prepare teachers who are dedicated to the academic achievement of all students, and who demonstrate a commitment to life-long professional growth and school leadership

HOW THIS CLASS RELATES TO THE THEME AND MISSION STATEMENT

Effective literacy instruction and intervention is pivotal to helping students achieve success in their academic and personal lives. This course provides the candidate with the theoretical and practical knowledge necessary to play a leadership role in delivering effective instruction in oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary to students and in assisting the teachers who work with them.
COURSE DESCRIPTION
This course focuses on the development of a culture of literacy with an emphasis on oral language, reading comprehension, and vocabulary development. Candidates examine theory and research related to these topics and implement research-based methods of instruction with prek-12 students. An emphasis is placed on meeting the needs of English learners and struggling readers.

COURSE OBJECTIVES
The candidate will…

1. Demonstrate a thorough understanding of theory and research on elements of an effective culture of literacy, how that research is reflected in the contents of the California Preschool Learning Foundations and Frameworks (Volume 1) and the California Reading/Language Arts Framework. (RLAA 2.1, 3.1, 4.1)

2. Integrate research and practice, and apply appropriate assessment, instruction, and differentiation in the field, planning, implementing, and monitoring formal literacy instruction that is sequential, linguistically logical, systematic, explicit, differentiated, and based on ongoing formal and informal assessments of individual students’ progress that assures that the full range of learners develop proficiency as quickly and effectively as possible. (RLAA 3.2, 3.2a, 3.2d, 3.2e, 3.2f, 3.3, 5.B2)

3. Demonstrate knowledge of effective research-based instructional practices in each component of literacy and the ability to assess, instruct, and provide intervention for each component of literacy instruction, including oral language development, reading and listening comprehension, and vocabulary development, and writing. (RLAA 3.2, 3.2a, 3.2d, 3.2e, 3.2f, 3.3, 5.B2)

4. Demonstrate knowledge of the types and uses of comprehension and vocabulary assessments including informal and curriculum-embedded assessments, and reliable and valid norm-referenced and criterion-based assessments that are used for formative and summative purposes, such as, screening, diagnosis, placement, and progress monitoring. (RLAA 3.6, 5.B2)

5. Demonstrate the ability to work with and hold high expectations for students who are ethnically, linguistically, and socioeconomically different from the candidate at both early (PreK-3) and intermediate (4th grade and up) levels of literacy acquisition; modify the literacy curriculum to address the specific needs of diverse groups of students, including but not limited to struggling students, English learners, gifted and talented students, and students with special needs. (RLAA 2.1, 4.2, 5.B2)

6. Successfully plan and implement a supervised field experience in a balanced literacy environment, including the selection and use instructional materials, technology, routines, and strategies that are appropriately aligned with students’ assessed language and literacy needs. (RLAA 3.2e, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)

7. As part of the supervised field experience, demonstrate the knowledge, understanding, and application of all elements of the curriculum: interpret results of classroom assessments, including formative, on-going and summative; perform additional assessments as appropriate; implement instructional strategies based on results of the assessment; and monitor and evaluate student progress. (RLAA 3.2e, 3.6, 3.8, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)

8. Demonstrate the ability to incorporate information literacy skills into classroom activities in which students learn to access, evaluate, use and integrate information and ideas found in print, media, multiple digital literacies for 21st Century skills, and contemporary library skills. (3.5, 5.B3, 5.B4)

9. Demonstrate knowledge of the strategic use of reading, writing, listening, and speaking throughout the day, using narrative, expository and other texts, and developing online and offline
reading skills and the ability to foster students’ independence, engagement, motivation, and positive attitude towards reading, and development of a lifelong habit of reading and writing for pleasure and information. (RLAA 2.4, 3.2e, 3.2f, 3.5, 5.B3, 5.B4)

10. Demonstrate the ability to provide literacy leadership in reviewing and interpreting assessment data with teachers, implementing of the adopted curriculum, and providing peer coaching and professional development (RLAA 3.8, 4.3, 5.B4)

CLASS FORMAT

Includes, but not limited to lecture, discussion, interactive presentations, video, and blackboard. It is the responsibility all students to activate their CSU East Bay Horizon account and check Blackboard and their horizon account e-mail account weekly.

REQUIRED READINGS


Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read: Reports of the Subgroups: Chapter 4


California’s Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts

http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/cc/index.asp

Model School Library Standards for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve
http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/lb/schlibrarystds.asp

RECOMMENDED READINGS


Webcast on Academic Language
http://www.colorincolorado.org/webcasts/academiclanguage/

GRADES

Grades will be based on the following point system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>95-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>84-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>74-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>67-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>64-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>60-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>59 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Assignments must be completed and turned in to Dr. Lubliner on the due dates specified in this syllabus. Incomplete grades will not be authorized except in the case of severe illness or family emergency. Absences and tardy arrivals will lower your grade.

ASSIGNMENTS

1. Professional Development Workshop, Based on Annenberg Video (15 points) (RLAA 2.1, 3.8, 4.3, 5.B4)

Review school-wide assessment data on reading at your school site (or a borrowed site). Evaluate school literacy achievement and identify an area of need for the school (reading comprehension, writing, vocabulary, or oral language). Select an Annenberg video on this topic and design a professional development workshop for teachers at the school site. The following are some of the Annenberg videos that are available:

- Conversations in Literature: Grades 6-12  http://www.learner.org/resources/series139.html#
- Making Meaning in Literature: A Video Library for Grades 6-8  http://www.learner.org/channel/libraries/makingmeaning/about/project.html
- Engaging with Literature: A Video Library for Grade 3-5  http://www.learner.org/resources/series182.html
- Teaching Reading 3-5 Workshop: Building Comprehension  http://www.learner.org/resources/series204.html#
Read all of the background information, review instructional materials and watch the video. Prepare statement of need (description of your school literacy needs) and a detailed outline (2-4 pages) for a professional development workshop for teachers at your site, based on the video. Be sure to address the following points in professional development workshop:

- Introduce the topic and provide a rationale (our students are struggling with comprehension)
- Introduce the video and explain that this is an example of how (comprehension strategy/method discussed in the video) looks in a classroom
- Show the video
- Invite teachers to comment on what they have seen
- Hand out materials and introduce a comprehension activity based on the video (many materials are available on the Annenberg website)
- Ask teachers to work in grade level teams, designing a comprehension lesson that can be used with their students
- Invite teams to share their lessons with the group
- Wrap up the workshop, emphasizing key points

Post your paper on Blackboard with the title of the video that you have viewed.
*Please note: your paper should be identify the need based on assessment data and should demonstrate how you would use the video to strengthen teachers’ ability to deliver effective instruction.

2. Reader Response (10 points) (RLAA 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 3.2)

Sign up to lead a class discussion on one of the chapters of the text. Present a 5-10-minute synopsis of key ideas in the chapter. Post your notes on Blackboard.

3. Sequence of the Standards (10 points) In-Class Assignment (RLAA 3.3)

Examine the Preschool Foundations (including ELD), California’s Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts, and ELD Standards and the Model School Library Standards for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve. Write a 2-3 page paper, discussing the progression of skills in Reading Comprehension and library standards that students, including English learners, are expected to attain. Post your paper on Blackboard.

4. Culture of Literacy Paper (10 points) (RLAA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5)

View the Culture of Literacy PowerPoint. Write a 2-3 page paper describing the culture of literacy you have created in your classroom and in your school. Be sure to include the following:

- Current research that informs the culture of literacy that you have established or are working to establish
- How you integrate reading, writing, listening, and speaking throughout the day with a variety of fiction, non-fiction, on-line and off-line texts
- How you honor students’ diverse knowledge, skills, abilities, and backgrounds
- How you increase student motivation to read
- Examples that demonstrate your high expectations for student literacy achievement
- How peer coaching and professional development is used to build a culture of literacy in your school
5. Text Analysis and Strategy Selection (5 points) In-Class Assignment (RLAA 3.3, 3.5, 5.B3, 5.B4)

Work with a partner. Select a total of three texts, one at each of the following levels: primary (Prek-2nd), intermediate (3rd-6th), and secondary (7th-12th). One of the texts must be a digital text. Analyze several passages from each text, identify text features that might impede students' comprehension, and select strategies to help students at the particular age range with the following challenges:

- Vocabulary demands
- Language demands
- Unfamiliar content and concepts (possible lack of background knowledge on the part of the students)
- Text structure
- Literal and inferential content
- Recall of text content
- Motivational factors

Fill out and post on Blackboard a Text Analysis Worksheet for each text (one set of worksheet per group). The Text Analysis Worksheet is located on page 9 of this syllabus.

6. Field Experience: Lesson Implementation and Report (40 points) (RLAA 2.1, 3.1, 3.2e, 3.2f, 3.6, 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.B2, 5.B3)

INSTRUCTIONS: Work with a partner and two or more Clinic students, at least one of whom is an English learner. Plan and implement a five-lesson unit focusing on reading comprehension, to one or more of the students in our Clinic. Include the following in the design and implementation of your unit:

- Carefully read your students’ referral forms from parents and teachers
- Administer an interest inventory to determine what is likely to motivate your students to read
- Administer tests to measure students’ oral language, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension
- Identify the students’ reading comprehension problems based on the referral forms, QRI and other assessments
- Select a research-based method/strategy or set of strategies designed to improve the comprehension problem that you have identified
- Examine at least two research articles documenting the effectiveness of the method/strategy
- Design a unit including five 90-minute lessons focusing on the method(s) you have selected
- Align lessons to the California Common Core State Standards
- Bring authentic texts (expository and narrative) and necessary materials to use in your Clinic lessons
- Analyze the academic language demands posed by the text for your struggling reader and English learner
- Provide explicit and sequential, and differentiated instruction, including scaffolding for your English learner, designed to improve students’ comprehension difficulties
- Include activities that focus on oral language, vocabulary development, and writing
• Include activities designed to increase students’ motivation to read
• Include one or more activities involving digital media
• Provide instruction to your Clinic students, collecting samples of work from each lesson
• Administer posttests based on the QRI 5

THIS IS WHAT YOU NEED TO POST ON BLACKBOARD BY THE DESIGNATED DUE DATE:

A detailed Field Experience Report based on the rubric at the back of the syllabus For full credit, explicitly label and address each component of the assignment based on the list below (the components of the scoring rubric).

• DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENTS: Discuss the setting and the students, including their age/grade, ethnic and linguistic background (CELDT scores) and reading proficiency. Summarize what you have learned about each student from the parent and teacher referral forms.
• RATIONALE: Provide a rationale for the strategy or method, explaining why you have chosen this particular approach to improving comprehension. Describe how you plan to implement the method and summarize the research supporting it. Provide a specific rationale for your English learners.
• OVERVIEW OF THE UNIT: Provide an overview of what you plan to do to improve students’ comprehension. Describe the texts and resources that you will use for instruction. Discuss how your unit supports English learners.
• ASSESSMENT: Specify the QRI assessments that you used to measure student reading proficiency. Carefully analyze pretest/posttest assessment data and student work. Discuss the effectiveness of your instruction based on the assessment data you collected. Be sure to include a data table with student scores from all assessments.
• CONTENT OF THE LESSONS: Provide detailed lesson plans for each of the lessons. Include California Common Core State Standards and ELD standards. Also include one or more samples of student work from each lesson.
• SCAFFOLDING FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS: Analyze the academic language demands posed by the text for your struggling readers and English learners and provide effective scaffolding so that English learners have access to the texts used for instruction
• INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: Evaluate the effectiveness of your instruction based on pretest/posttest QRI data. Discuss what students learned and how they responded to your instruction.
• REFLECTION: Discuss what you learned from the Field Experience Project and what you would do differently.

Include a reference list and be sure your paper conforms to APA format.

7. Field Experience Evaluation (RLAA 2.1, 3.1, 3.2e, 3.2f, 3.6, 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.B2, 5.B3)

Schedule an evaluation visit with the Clinic Director. Your lesson will be observed and evaluated based on the rubric included in this syllabus.

8. Field Experience Report for Parents and Teachers (10 Points) (RLAA 3.2e, 3.2f, 3.3, 3.6, 3.8, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.A3, 5.B2) Write a letter to the parents and a letter to the teacher of each of your students. Letters to parents should be free of jargon while letters to teachers may be more detailed and specific. Provide copies of each letter to Dr. Lubliner. Be sure to include the following elements in each letter:
- Description of reading comprehension activities provided during Clinic
- Explanation of how the student responded to instruction
- Results of Clinic instruction based on QRI pretest/posttest scores
- Recommendations for follow up activities to continue to strengthen reading comprehension achievement

WEIGHT OF ASSIGNMENTS

Professional Development Workshop  15%
Reader Responses 10%
Sequence of the Standards 10%
Culture of Literacy Paper 10%
Text Analysis 5%
Field Experience Report 30%
Field Experience Evaluation 10%
Field Experience Report for Parents & Teachers 10%

EARTHQUAKE INFORMATION

In the event of an earthquake, duck and cover. Get under a desk or table. Protect your head with your arms. Do not exit the building until the shaking stops. Do not use the elevators. After the shaking stops, remain calm and think of a way out. Check for potential hazards. When safe, evacuate to an open area. Expect aftershocks.

DISABILITY STATEMENT
If you have a documented disability (through Students Disability Resource Center/SDRC) and wish to discuss academic accommodations, or if you would need assistance in the event of an emergency evacuation, please contact the professor as soon as possible.

TECHNOLOGY

Graduate students are required to post the field experience report on Blackboard. Please be sure you have an active Blackboard account and are familiar with the use of Blackboard. Blackboard will be used for e-mail (check your Horizon account frequently) posting of assignments, and on-line discussion.
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, East Bay

Department of Teacher Education
TED 6220 (4 units)
Reading and Language Arts: Culture of Literacy: Focus on Diversity

SYLLABUS: SUMMER, 2013, PLEASANTON

COURSE INFORMATION
Instructor: Dr. Shira Lubliner
Class Schedule: Wednesdays 4:30-8:00 – June 27-August 29
Location: Amador Valley High School
Office Hours: Wednesdays 12:30-1:00 and by appointment
Phone: (510) 885-4484
E-mail Address: shira.lubliner@csueastbay.edu

MISSION AND THEME OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND THE SCHOOL OF ALLIED STUDIES
To prepare leaders who are committed to social justice, democracy, improving school practices for California’s diverse student populations and who can model such practices in schools

HOW THIS COURSE CONTRIBUTES TO THE MISSION AND THEME
Candidates who earn the Reading Certificate (RLAA) will become instructional leaders in their schools and school districts, committed to ending the wide disparity in reading and writing achievement among California’s K-12 population. This class will provide candidates with essential knowledge to meet the needs of English learners and students from diverse backgrounds.

COURSE DESCRIPTION:
This course will focus on developing a culture of literacy. Graduate students will explore the cultural and linguistic factors in literacy, with a particular emphasis on African American, Asian, and Hispanic American students. Graduate students will learn effective instructional strategies for teaching reading and writing to diverse learners, including methods of instruction designed to strengthen English language development. Graduate students will explore appropriate literacy assessment tools for diverse students and methods for developing home-community-school collaboration.
COURSE OBJECTIVES:

Graduate Reading Candidates Will:

1) Review current research on an effective culture of literacy designed to meet the needs of English learners and diverse students (RLAA 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 3.1, 4.1)
2) Demonstrate high expectations for all students and respect for socioeconomic, cultural and linguistic differences influence literacy development of California’s diverse K-12 student population (emphasis on African American, Asian, and Hispanic American students) and English learners (RLAA 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 4.1, 5A.1, 5.B1)
3) Explain reading and writing development in the context of second language acquisition, with an emphasis on languages spoken in California schools (RLAA 2.2, 3.2G)
4) Explain the impact of language and cultural background on assessment and evaluation techniques (RLAA 3.6, 4.1, 4.3)
5) Demonstrate the ability to modify the curriculum for English learners and to use SDAIE methods to facilitate student learning (RLAA 3.2G, 5.A1, 5.B3)
6) Demonstrate the ability to plan and deliver effective ELD standards-based literacy instruction to English learners (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2G, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.A1, 5.B1, 5.B2)
7) Identify and describe effective strategies for working with diverse students, families, and communities (RLAA 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.2G, 5.A1)

TECHNOLOGY:

Technology is an important component of this class. Students are required to have a current horizon e-mail address, which will enable them to access the web-based instructional program, Blackboard. Students will use Blackboard frequently to obtain lecture notes and to receive important communications from Dr. Lubliner. Students must also purchase a subscription to Blackboard. The CSU East Graduate Department requires students in all graduate courses to submit selected assignments on Blackboard.

REQUIRED READING


Teaching English learners: What the research does – and does not say

www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/summer2008/goldenberg.pdf

Left in the Margins: Asian American Students and the No Child Left Behind Act (2008)
http://www.aaldef.org/docs/AALDEF_LeftintheMargins_NCLB.pdf


& Sharkey, N. (Ed.) Education Policy and Practice: Bridging the Divide

ELD standards (aligned to Common Core)
http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/eldstandards.asp
http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/sbeoverviewpld.pdf

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS
1) Native Language Report (15 points) Blackboard
2) EL Unit Planning Template (10 points) Blackboard
3) Field Experience (50 points) TASK STREAM
4) Reader Response (10 points)
5) Summary on the Education of African American Children (10 points)
6) Participation (5 points)

ASSIGNMENT SPECIFICATIONS:

1. **NATIVE LANGUAGE REPORT (15 POINTS)** (RLAA 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.2G)
Work with a partner and select one of the following native languages other than English (NL) spoken by children in California schools: Spanish, Vietnamese, Filipino, Cantonese, Hmong, Korean, Mandarin, Pjabi, Arabic. Investigate the characteristics of the NL and compare the language to English. Identify problems that native speakers of the language may experience as they learn English and suggest methods that teachers can use to help students acquire English language literacy

This is what you will need to prepare:

Written Report (2-3 pages) posted on Blackboard. The paper should include the following: a) description of the NL (oral and written), b) comparison of the NL to English, c) literacy problems: challenges that NL speakers face in developing proficiency in academic English, and d) instructional support: ways that teachers can help NL students in reading and writing academic English.

Be sure to discuss the following aspects of your NL in terms of English literacy acquisition:

- Oral language
- Concepts about print
- Phonics and decoding
- Vocabulary, cognates
- Language structure
- Academic language

Oral Presentation of your report, emphasizing problems that NL students have learning to read in English and ways that teachers can help NL students acquire English language literacy
2. EL UNIT PLANNING TEMPLATE (10 POINTS) (RLAA 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 3.2G, 3.6, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.A1, 5.B1, 5.B2,)
Complete the Unit Planning Template (included in this syllabus) for your EL Clinic students.

FIELD EXPERIENCE (50 POINTS) (RLAA 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 3.2G, 3.6, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.A1, 5.B1, 5.B2,)
Plan and implement lessons for one or more English learners (ELs) in the Clinic. The assignment can be completed with students at any grade level, Prek-12. The students must be designated English language learners (ELs) by their school district at a level less than proficient.

This is what you need to prepare for your English learner:

Design a Unit-Planning Template for your English learner. Carefully review the texts you plan to use for instruction and design six CELDT-level appropriate lessons that provide access to grade level content standards. Fill in and post the Unit-Planning Template on Blackboard.

Teach the unit, following the guidelines for the Field Experience for TED 6253.

Post your paper on Blackboard by the designated due date

3. SUMMARY ON THE LITERACY EDUCATION OF AFRICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN (10 POINTS) (RLAA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2G, 4.1)

- Read the assigned research articles and lecture notes on the education of African American children
- Write a two-three-page paper summarizing key points regarding the literacy education of African American children
- Participate in a class discussion

4. READER RESPONSE (10 POINTS) (RLAA 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 4.1, 4.3)

- Sign up to review a chapter or article
- Present a response to the chapter or article to the class and post the response on Blackboard (presentations limited to 5 minutes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Experience Evaluation Rubric</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning of sequential, systematic, explicit comprehension instruction aligned to student’s language and literacy needs</td>
<td>Lesson is inadequate and not aligned to student needs</td>
<td>Lesson is barely adequate and minimally aligned to student needs</td>
<td>Lesson is adequately designed and aligned to student needs</td>
<td>Lesson is very well designed and fully aligned to student needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of appropriate instructional materials</td>
<td>Instructional materials are missing or inadequate</td>
<td>Instructional materials are somewhat appropriate to the lesson</td>
<td>Instructional materials are reasonably appropriate to the lesson</td>
<td>Instructional materials are fully appropriate to the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Research-Based Strategy Instruction</td>
<td>Strategy instruction is poorly delivered and appears to be ineffective</td>
<td>Strategy instruction is delivered with minimal skill and appears to be slightly effective</td>
<td>Strategy instruction is adequately delivered and appears to be reasonably effective</td>
<td>Strategy instruction is well delivered and appears to be highly effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>Student appears to be completely unengaged in the lesson</td>
<td>Student appears to have minimal engagement in lesson</td>
<td>Student appears to be somewhat engaged in lesson</td>
<td>Student appears to be fully engaged in lesson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please evaluate the text in terms of each feature that might impede reading success for English learners and native English-speakers. Suggest strategies and explain how they could be used to facilitate students' comprehension and recall. Indicate your recommendation as to whether students would read the text independently or if the teacher should read it to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT FEATURES THAT MIGHT IMPEDE READING SUCCESS</th>
<th>STRATEGIES AND HOW THEY COULD BE USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar content and concepts (possible lack of background knowledge on the part of the students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal and inferential content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit Planning Template

Student’s Name: _________________________  Grade: ________  CELDT Level: _____________

Common Core Standards: ____________________  ELD Standards: _________________________

Texts and Materials: _______________________________________________________________

Unit Topic: _______________________________  Instructional Goals: ______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON TOPIC</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>CHALLENGES FOR EL</th>
<th>TEACHING SEQUENCE INCLUDING EL MODIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Unacceptable</td>
<td>2 Partial</td>
<td>3 Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale for the strategy</strong></td>
<td>Rationale and research supporting the strategy is missing</td>
<td>Rationale and discussion of research does not support the strategy</td>
<td>Rationale and discussion of research supporting the strategy is adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of the students</strong></td>
<td>Description of the students and their reading proficiency is missing</td>
<td>Description of the students and their reading proficiency superficial</td>
<td>Description of the students and their reading proficiency adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview of Unit</strong></td>
<td>Overview of unit, standards, purpose of instruction, and/or description of content missing</td>
<td>Overview of unit, standards, purpose of instruction, and/or description of content &amp; description</td>
<td>Overview of unit, standards, purpose of instruction, and/or description of content adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Pretest and/or Posttest test data and/or analysis of test results are missing</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest test data and/or analysis of test results are incomplete or inadequate</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest data are complete but analysis of test results lacks detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content of Lessons</strong></td>
<td>Missing components from five-lesson sequence, explicit strategy instruction, materials</td>
<td>Five-lesson sequence, explicit strategy instruction, materials, and description are poorly done</td>
<td>Five-lesson sequence, explicit strategy instruction, materials appear well-designed but description is superficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Instruction does not appear to have been effective in teaching strategy &amp; addressing objectives</td>
<td>Instruction appears to have been marginally effective but did not adequately teach strategy or address objectives</td>
<td>Instruction appears to have been reasonably effective in teaching strategy &amp; addressing objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scaffolding for English Learners</strong></td>
<td>Academic language demands on English learners are not mentioned and little or no scaffolding is used to provide access to the texts used for instruction</td>
<td>Academic language demands on English learners are mentioned and scaffolding is used to provide partial access to the texts used for instruction</td>
<td>Academic language demands on English learners are discussed and scaffolding is used to provide reasonably good access to the texts used for instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections</td>
<td>Reflections are missing</td>
<td>One or more components of the reflections are missing or inadequate</td>
<td>Reflections describing what the students learned, what you learned and what you would do differently are superficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliber of the Paper</td>
<td>Paper is poorly written and does not address specifications in the syllabus</td>
<td>Paper lacks clarity in writing and/or does not fully address specifications in the syllabus</td>
<td>Paper is well written but somewhat superficial in addressing specifications in the syllabus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For full credit, explicitly label and carefully address each component of the assignment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **One 6/27** | Historical Overview of Comprehension Instruction  
Understanding Comprehension: A Paradigm for Cognition (Kintsch)  
Theoretical Models of Comprehension: Dual Coding, Cognitive Flexibility, Metacognition, Constructivist Theory  
Understanding Reading Comprehension Research  
Sequence of the Standards: California Preschool Learning Foundations & California Common Core State Standards  
Reading Comprehension Assessment – Using the QRI  
Preparation for Clinic  
Introduction  
Legal, demographic, and instructional issues, Second language acquisition theories, Reading in a second language  
Assessment of English learners |
| **Two 7/4** | **On-line Session**  
National Reading Panel Report on Comprehension  
New Research since the NRP Report  
ELD Standards |
| *No Class* | ELD Standards |
| **Three 7/11** | The Role of Vocabulary in Comprehension  
The Roles of Oral Language and Vocabulary in Comprehension  
Developing Listening Comprehension Skills in Young |

Reading Assignment Due:  
California Common Core State Standards  
Sequence of the Standards (in class assignment)  
California Common Core State Standards  
Cal Chap 4, 5  
ELD Standards  
*California Common Core State Standards*  
Cal Chap 6, 7  
Help for Struggling Upper-Grade Elementary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four</th>
<th>7/18</th>
<th>Text Genres and Text Structure</th>
<th>B&amp;P Ch 11, 12, 13, 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Differing Demands of Expository and Narrative Texts</td>
<td>Text Analysis and Strategy Selection (in-class assignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Engagement and Motivation</td>
<td>EL Planning Template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction-Integration Model (Kintsch)</td>
<td>Native Language Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction Between Text and Reader (Rosenblatt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text Analysis Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text analysis for English learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension and Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education of Latino children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheltering content: SDAIE methods, SIOP model, CALLA model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native Language Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>7/25</td>
<td>The Socio-cognitive Model (Vygotsky)</td>
<td>B&amp;P Ch 14, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit Cognitive Strategy Instruction</td>
<td>Left in the Margins: Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reciprocal teaching (Palincsar &amp; Brown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transactional Strategy Instruction (Pressley et al.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Six 8/1 | Exemplary Practices in Comprehension Instruction  
Creating Strategy Cue Cards  
Teaching Comprehension Skills to English Learners  
Introduction to Annenberg Media  
Becoming a Literacy Leader  
Educating Asian American Children |
| Six 8/1 | American Students and the No Child Left Behind Act |
| Six 8/1 | Six 8/1 | Metacognitive Factors in Comprehension  
Teaching Students Self-Monitoring and Self-Regulating Skills  
Comprehension and Writing  
The Roles of Schema and Memory and Background Knowledge  
Beyond Reciprocal Teaching  
Comprehension Best Practices  
Understanding and Preventing "Fourth Grade Slump"  
Teaching Comprehension at the Preschool, Elementary, and Secondary Levels  
Motivation  
Teaching Comprehension to At-Risk Students and Students with Learning Disabilities  
Review research on education of African American children |
| Six 8/1 | B&P Ch 5, 16, 17, 18, 19  
Delpit, Ladson Billings  
Summary on the Education of African American Children |
| Seven 8/8 | Neuroscience and Comprehension  
Evaluating, Using, & Integrate Information and Ideas Found in Print, Media, and Digital Resources (Library Skills)  
Finding On-line Resources and Integrating them into Comprehension Instruction  
Annenberg videos on Reading Comprehension  
Designing a Professional Development Workshop |
| Seven 8/8 | B&P Ch 8, 22, 23, 26, Epilogue  
Field Experience Letters for Parents & Teachers  
Cal Chapter 11, |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examining the Roles: Reading Teacher, Reading Specialist, Reading Coach</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>Review Family Outreach Programs Digital resources for English learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td><strong>On-line Session:</strong> Future Trends in Comprehension Instruction</td>
<td>8/15</td>
<td>Using What You’ve Learned to Improve Comprehension and Student Outcomes in Your School</td>
<td>Annenberg Video Professional Development Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td><strong>On-line Session:</strong> Completing your Field Experience Report</td>
<td>8/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td><strong>On-line Session:</strong> Completing your Field Experience Report</td>
<td>8/29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Experience Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texts:
BP – Block and Paris (TED 6253)
Cal – Calderon (TED 6220)
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

Department of Teacher Education

TED 6231

FALL 2013, PLEASANTON
READING AND LANGUAGE ARTS

ASSESSMENT

COURSE INFORMATION
Instructor: Dr. Linda Smetana
Class Schedule: Wednesdays 4:30 - 8:00
Location: Amador Valley High School
Office Hours: Wednesdays 3 – 4 and by appointment
Phone: (510) 885-4489
E-mail Address: linda.smetana@csueastbay.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION
This course focuses on the development and use of assessments to gather data on which to create a culture of literacy with an emphasis on oral language, reading comprehension, vocabulary development and motivation. Candidates examine theory and research related to these topics and implement research-based methods of assessment with pre-k-12 students. An emphasis is placed on meeting the needs of English learners and struggling readers.

THEME OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND ALLIED STUDIES
To prepare collaborative leaders, committed to professional excellence, social justice, and democracy who will influence a diverse and interconnected world

MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION
To prepare teachers who are dedicated to the academic achievement of all students, and who demonstrate a commitment to life-long professional growth and school leadership

HOW THIS CLASS RELATES TO THE THEME AND MISSION STATEMENT
Effective literacy instruction and intervention is pivotal to helping students achieve success in their academic and personal lives. This course provides the candidate with the theoretical and practical knowledge necessary to play a leadership role in delivering effective and bias free literacy assessment and relating instruction in the areas of fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, and written language. Candidates
demonstrate effective strategies for working with students and colleagues in order to develop effective literacy practices.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Candidates will

1. Demonstrate effective practices for literacy assessment and create instructional sequences to provide intervention for each component of research-based literacy instruction, including: oral language, word analysis, fluency, vocabulary development, listening and reading comprehension, written language development, and to develop the skills needed to address the specific needs of diverse groups. (RLAA 3.2, 3.2a, 3.2b, 3.2c, 3.2d, 3.2e 3.2f, 3.3, 5.2B)

2. Demonstrate the skills needed to modify curriculum to address the specific needs of diverse groups of students, including but not limited to struggling students, English learners, gifted and talented students, and students with special needs (RLAA 3.2g, 3.3, 5.2)

3. Candidates integrate research and apply appropriate assessment, instruction and differentiation in the field, planning literacy instruction that is sequential, linguistically logical, systematic, explicit, differentiated and based on formal and informal assessments of individual student’s progress that assures that the full range of learners develop proficiency as quickly and efficiently as possible ((RLAA 3.2, 3.2a, 3.2b, 3.2c, 3.2d, 3.2e 3.2f, 3.3)

4. Demonstrate knowledge of the normal progression of complexity for each component of literacy as presented in the Foundations/Standards and their Frameworks, the expected stages and patterns in students’ development including early and adolescent literacy, the implications of delays or differences in students’ literacy development relative to grade level standards, and when such delays/differences warrant further assessment, differentiated instruction and intervention. (RLAA 3.3, 5.2A2, 5.2A3, 5.2A4)

5. Demonstrate the selection and application of appropriate assessment instruments including informal and curriculum-embedded assessments, and reliable and valid norm-referenced and criterion-based assessments that are used for formative and summative purposes, such as, screening, diagnosis, placement, and progress monitoring. (RLA 3.6)

6. Demonstrate knowledge of differences and relationships between the skills needed for assessing and supporting students’ literacy development and those necessary for promoting language acquisition and development in order to know when a student may be struggling with a language acquisition problem rather than a reading problem (RLA 3.7)

7. Demonstrate the ability to work with colleagues in using grade level or school wide assessment data to implement/revise instructional programs to meet the needs of diverse learners. (RLA 3.8)
8. In site based field experiences, interpret results of classroom assessments, including formative, ongoing and summative; perform additional assessments as appropriate; implement instructional strategies based on results of the assessment; and monitor and evaluate student progress. (RLAA 4.3)

9. Apply principles of equity as they work with colleagues to interpret results of disaggregated school-wide assessment data to propose changes in instructional practices through grade and/or school level discussion and/or professional development (RLAA 5.A2)

10. Select appropriate assessments, administer, analyze and summarize the results of the assessments, use assessment results to guide instruction report the results in ways that are meaningful to parents, classroom teachers and administrators. (RLAA 5.A3, 5.A4)

11. Use assessment results to guide instruction and to determine the timing of appropriate placement in and exit from intervention programs with the goal of accelerated, successful reentry into grade level standards-based programs. (RLAA 5.A5)

UNIVERSITY INFORMATION

University Policies Regarding Cheating and Academic Dishonesty:
By enrolling in this class the student agrees to uphold the standards of academic integrity described in the catalog at: http://www20.csueastbay.edu/ecat/general-info/grading-and-academic-standards.html

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:
If you have a documented disability and wish to discuss academic accommodations, or if you would need assistance in the event of an emergency evacuation, please contact me as soon as possible. Students with disabilities needing accommodation should contact and then speak with a member of Accessibility Services. Accessibility Services may be found at http://www20.csueastbay.edu/af/departments/as/

Emergency Information:
Information of what to do in an emergency situation (earthquake, electrical outage, fire, extreme heat, severe storm, hazardous materials, terrorist attack) may be found at: http://www.aba.csueastbay.edu/EHS/emergency_mgnt.htm.

TEXTS


Additional articles and readings will be posted on Blackboard

California Preschool Learning Foundations and Frameworks - Foundations in Language and Literacy
www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/fd/documents/preschoollf.pdf

California Common Core State Standards

GRADES

Grades are based on the evaluation of coursework submitted and class participation. Points are assigned as follows:

Site Based Data Assignment 15 + 25
Assessment Reports 40 + 40
Standardized Assessment Evaluation 30
Reader Response 20

Grades are based on the percentage of points earned:

94-100% A 87-89% B+ 77-79% C+ Below 70 D
90-93% A- 84-86% B 74-76% C Candidates may be required to retake the course if
80-83% B- 70-73% C- they earn a grade below a B-.

* In class evaluation and participation activities will take place throughout the quarter. You are expected to participate in class and be respectful of your colleagues. Lack of, or limited participation may lower your earned grade by one-half grade. Thus an earned A would be a final grade of A-. 
COURSE REQUIREMENTS
Assignments must be completed and submitted prior to or on the due dates specified in this syllabus. Incomplete grades will not be authorized except in the case of severe illness or family emergency. Absences and tardy arrivals will lower your grade.

Since candidates have already completed courses in vocabulary and comprehension as well as early literacy and fluency, this course will emphasize the diagnostic assessment of word recognition, decoding and encoding skills. However, candidates are expected to incorporate information from the previous courses into their assessment of student knowledge, skills and performance.

1. Data Analysis and Presentation
This assignment provides candidates with the opportunity to analyze the data concerning literacy assessments for the students in their classroom, grade level, and across grade levels. This assignment has two parts. The first part is the online session 10/16. The second part is scheduled for the online class 11/27

Background
As a literacy leader one of your roles will be to assist teachers as they analyze data and create intervention sequences. One of the standards refers to working with colleagues in order to disaggregate data in order to improve site-based instruction. Some questions to be addressed in the assignment include:

Which of the students will progress through the use of the stated instructional program?
Do you need more authentic assessments to gather more relevant data?
Which of the students will most likely need some intervention such as re-teaching, additional practice or mastery instruction?
Which of the students might be candidates for tier 2 interventions? What will be the focus of the intervention?
What is the role of student’s motivation in the assessment process? Can some of the scores be attributed to the level of motivation and student engagement?
How can the resources at the school site be arranged/allocated to serve out students?
Would student’s benefit from the development of or a change in the organization of the literacy instructional and intervention program?

The data collected will be used throughout the quarter as you create assessment protocols to better learn about the students in your classroom or grade level. Over the course of fall and winter quarters you will be collecting and analyzing data and then developing classroom and site based intervention sequences.
If you do not have access to school based data, a data set will be provided. Let the instructor know at the first class meeting.

**Part 1 15 points  work for online class 10/16**

**Classroom Data Analysis**

The purpose of this online assignment is for you to analyze your classroom or grade level data. For your caseload, classroom or grade level, identify the students who are at basic level or below with respect to ELA. Expand your data set – another classroom’s students- another subject area’s students so that you have a least 20 students in this data set.

Disaggregate the CST score to determine the area(s) of need.

For each student list the areas where you want to gather more data or information

Identify English Learners and students with IEP plans

Identify how the additional data could be collected

Create a chart that presents a visual representation of your sample population

Create a narrative summary that further explains your findings and your thoughts on next steps towards a plan for literacy instruction

Post the chart by October 23. Bring a copy to class and be prepared to discuss your findings with your colleagues.

**Part 2 25 points  work for online class 11/6**

**School Wide Data Analysis**

As a Reading, Language and Literacy Specialist you may find that you are in the position of analyzing data to plan a school wide intervention program. Although some schools have intervention program in place, there is always room for improvement. Expand your data collection to include the students, who are struggling in classes or specific courses, yet have above basic scores on the CST. You may include students in several grades or content areas. This sample should be at least 40 students. Disaggregate the CST scores and the student’s work in class assignments.

Organize the students for intervention or instructional support. What is the best way to improve their progress? What are the areas for instructional need? What would be the focus of the intervention/instruction? What personnel are needed to carry out the intervention/instructional program? You have had courses in fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension development. What instructional strategies would anchor an intervention/instructional program?
2. **Standardized Reading Assessment Instrument Evaluation 30 points** work for online class 10/2. Final report DUE 10/9 posted on Blackboard. Bring a 1 page overview/handout to class to incorporate into the groups brief oral presentation.

The context for your presentation is a report to your colleagues. Your school district must purchase a set of standardized assessment instruments to be incorporated into each schools intervention plan. Is the instrument one that should be considered for adoption? Plan to meet or communicate to complete the assignment on 10/2.

**In groups of four** review and use a standardized test that is distributed in class. These assessments will be available to you during your enrollment in the RLAA program. The evaluation will take place on your own as an online class. Prepare one report per group for online presentation to the class.

a) Describe each test and discuss its purpose
b) Summarize the reviews of the test as found in the Mental Measurement Yearbook, in professional journals, or available online
c) Use the sections of the assessment in one of your assessments. You may report raw scores or scores from the protocol. Some assessments will not allow a score report to be generated when some of the scores from the remainder of the battery are missing.
d) What additional information and data does the formal assessment present? Is the information and data useful to plan intervention or instruction? How does the information and data gained compare with the information gained from informal assessments, criterion referenced or classroom-based assessments?
e) At what point in the data and information gathering process would this assessment be most appropriate?
f) Explain whether you would or would not recommend the use of this assessment instrument and under which circumstances would the assessment be most effective. Be specific in your recommendations.
g) State what additional assessments and information would be needed in order to get more comprehensive picture of your student.
h) Conclude your report with a brief discussion regarding the value and limitation of this instrument in terms of assessing and gathering data regarding student literacy.

Additional information regarding Assessment Instrument Evaluation is posted on Blackboard.

3. **Reader Response 20 points**

Sign up to lead a class discussion on one of the articles or chapters of the text. Present a 5-10-minute synopsis of key ideas presented. All participants are expected to be knowledgeable of the content of the material to be presented.

4. **Two Assessment Reports 40 points each**

Over the course of the quarter you are expected to complete two in depth analysis of students literacy skills. Since the summer fluency course focused on early readers, the assessments for this course will focus on reader in grades 4 and above. However, the assessment of a younger student is acceptable.
Choose one of the assessment reports to post on Taskstream. This assessment report will be included in the data gathering process for accreditation.

Additional information regarding the form and content of the assessment as well as sample assessment reports are posted on the course Blackboard.

**Formal (Norm Referenced) Assessment Option**

An option is available to candidates who wish to incorporate a formal assessment instrument into the assessment battery. Candidates, who wish to do so, may substitute a formal assessment battery for the informal battery presented above. However, the final assessment battery must cover the areas represented by the informal battery above. Therefore your battery for the student may include formal and informal assessments. For example, if a candidate chooses to incorporate selections of the WIAT (Weschler Individual Achievement Test) in the assessment battery, some of the components of the informal assessments can be deleted.

All candidates will be incorporating the following elements in each of the assessment reports.

**Writing Sample**

The writing sample can be one from the student’s class work since the sample will be more authentic than that of an on demand, writing sample. The sample should be a first draft or one with limited revisions. The purpose of the writing sample is to evaluate a student’s production of written language. The sample should be long enough to be able to evaluate. Note if the student is not able to generate a written language sample.

- Analysis of writing: mean length utterance, type to token ratio, 6 Traits writing rubric (descriptions of these elements will be presented in class)
- Analysis of spelling in context

**Observation**

Note observations of the student’s behavior during the assessment process. For example: What did you observe regarding the students use of strategies during the assessment process? How did the student handle material that was too difficult? Additional observations regarding the student during the assessment process that will add to understanding or ways to work within the intervention process add to the completeness of the assessment report.

Include an observation of the student in class. Are the reading difficulties apparent? What behaviors do you see that may/may not indicate that the student has difficulty with reading and other related language arts or in content area subjects.
Findings and Summary

Analyze the data collected. Create a data chart that presented your findings. What are the levels of skills in each of the areas identified on the Student Profile Sheet? Provide a detailed analysis to the reader. Then discuss student's reading strengths and difficulties based on specific information derived from the assessment battery and provide recommendations for reading instruction designed to improve achievement.

Report to Parent /Teacher/Specialist

For the first report create a letter to the student’s parents and for the second report a letter to the teacher or literacy specialist. The letter to the parents should be comprehensible and free from educational jargon. The letter to the teachers should be more detailed. Include the following information in both communications:

- Review reason for student’s participation
- Review of the purpose of the assessment process
- Description of the assessments completed
- Explanation of the of the assessment results, identify strengths and needs
- For parents: Identify what the school will do to support the literacy development of the student. What programs and learning activities will be available to the student?
- For teachers: Detailed set of recommendations based on data from assessments. What should the teacher/literacy/learning specialist be prepared to carry out to support the literacy development of the student

Informal Assessment Instructions

Choose students for the assessment assignment from two of the three levels (primary, intermediate, middle/high school) presented.

Primary Student

Choose a beginning reader who is currently in second grade and has been identified by the classroom teacher as having significant difficulty in learning to read and write. The primary area of reading/writing difficulty should not be due to the student’s level of English Language development. However, should you choose an English Learner, indicate the students CELDT level.

Prepare an assessment report including the following introductory components:

- Student Identifying Information
- Background/Home Information - include only if this information impacts the student’s performance and abilities. Is there something special that the reader should know about the student that may impact his/her literacy development?
- Results from district assessments such as DIBELS, CST, Aims-Web

Assessment Battery: Administer the assessment battery listed below. List each test, student score and your interpretation of assessment results. When available beginning page numbers for the assessments
are listed below.

**Blackboard**

Yopp-Singer Test of Phonemic Segmentation

**Assessment for Reading Instruction**

Fry Sight Word Test p.116
Informal Phonics Survey p. 125
Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (Garfield) p. 215
Interest Inventory – choose one
Qualitative Spelling Checklist p.145

**Words Their Way**

Primary Spelling Inventory p. 315

**Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI)**

Word Lists p. 100+ determine Word % Automatic, %
Determine **Independent, Instructional, and Frustration Levels**
Select Oral Reading Passages at the Instructional Level; one passage must be an expository selection
Level Scoring Form; include the following:
  Concepts % Familiar/Unfamiliar
  Accuracy (Miscue Analysis Scoring Form p. 67)
  Comprehension Questions

**Intermediate Grade Student**

Choose a struggling reader in 4th, 5th, or 6th grade who has been identified by the classroom teacher as reading at least 2 grade levels below grade level placement. The primary area of reading/writing difficulty should not be due to the student’s level of English Language development. However, should you choose an English Learner, indicate the students CELDT level.
Prepare an assessment report including the following introductory components:

- Student Identifying Information
- Background/Home Information - include only if this information impacts the student’s performance and abilities. Is there something special that the reader should know about the student that may impact his/her literacy development?
- Results from district assessments such as DIBELS, CST, Aims-Web

Assessment Battery Components

Administer the assessment battery listed below. Some of the assessments are posted on Blackboard or available in the *Assessments for Reading* text.

**Assessment for Reading Instruction**

Fry Sight Word Test p.116

Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (Garfield) p. 215 or a more appropriate attitude survey (see surveys beginning on page 213)

Reader Self-Perception Scale p.231

Interest Inventory – choose one

Qualitative Spelling Checklist p.145

Informal Phonics Survey (if appropriate)

**Words Their Way**

Elementary Spelling Inventory p. 315

**Blackboard**

The Names Test

**Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI)**

Student Profile Sheet p. 87

Miscue Analysis Sheet p. 67

Word Lists p. 100 + Indicate Words%, Automatic %

Determine **Independent, Instructional, and Frustration Levels** using the narrative text selections. Then...
Select Two Expository Reading Passages at the Instructional Level

Level Scoring Form Include the following:

Oral Reading
- Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar
- Accuracy
- Reading Comprehension: Questions w/without Look-Back
- CWPM (Correct Words per Minute) - Oral Reading
- Include Think-Aloud data when appropriate

Silent Reading
- Retelling
- Questions, if appropriate

Middle/High School Student

Choose a struggling reader in 7th, 8th, 9th or 10th grade who has been identified by a teacher/counselor as reading at least 2 preferably 3 grade levels below grade level placement. A struggling student who is in grade 11 or 12 that are at least 3 years below grade level may be assessed. The primary area of reading/writing difficulty should not be due to the student’s level of English Language development. However, should you choose an English Learner, indicate the students CELDT level.

Prepare an assessment report including the following components:

- Student Identifying Information
- Background/Home Information - include only if this information impacts the student’s performance and abilities. Is there something special that the reader should know about the student that may impact his/her literacy development?
- Results from district assessments such as CST and CAHSEE

Assessment for Reading Instruction

Fry Sight Word Test p. 116
Z-Test p. 132
Morris McCall Spelling List p. 146 or Words Their Way Upper Level Spelling Inventory p.322

Blackboard
The Names Test
The Reader Self-Perception Scale

**Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI)**

Student Profile Sheet p.87
Miscue Analysis Sheet p.67
Word Lists

Determine **Independent, Instructional, and Frustration Levels**

Select two **Expository Reading Passages** and one **Narrative Reading Passage** at the Instructional Level

Fill Out a Level Scoring Form including the following:

**Oral Reading**
Concept Questions/Background
Accuracy (Miscue Analysis)
Comprehension Questions without and with look-back
CWPM (Correct Words per Minute) - Oral Reading (p. 82)

**Silent Reading**
Concept Questions/Background
Comprehension Questions without and with look-back
Note taking ability (page 99)
WPM (Words per Minute)

**Content Reading Sample**

Select a sample of text from two content texts that the student is required to read as a part of the course of study. Have the student tread the text to you, silently or orally and then complete a retell about the text. Your alternative is to create a CLOZE from a sample of the student’s text.

**Informal Interview**

Conduct an interview to learn about how your student perceives himself as a person and as a reader. What does the student like about school, dislike? What are the student’s interests and abilities? Where does the student see him/herself in 2-3 years?
Course Schedule

Note: Additional readings may be found on Blackboard. Readings and the reader response for each session are to be done in advance of the session. This schedule is subject to change by the instructor in order to meet the needs of the course participants. Candidates will receive at least one-week notice of any changes in the schedule. Participants should independently read the components of the QRI and other assessments as needed to complete the course requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| One     | 9/25   | **Orientation, Introductions, Syllabus, Foundations of Assessment**  
Overview of Class, Purpose, Requirements  
Theoretical Models and Principles of Assessment  
Models of Assessment: Deficit, Contextual, Stage  
Cognitive Factors of Reading & Assessment | BRING ALL texts to class  
Review QRI 1, 2  
McKenna/Stahl Chapter 1  
Walker Chapters 1, 2 | Be prepared to complete a KWL of the QRI with a focus on the K and W sections |
| Two     | 10/2 online class | **Formal Standardized Assessments**  
PowerPoint Slides posted on Blackboard  
McKenna/Stahl Chapter 2 | Identify first student for case study. Bring questions regarding assessment of this student to class on 10/9. |
| Three   | 10/09  | **Student Assessment - Preparing an Assessment Report**  
Organizing the Report  
Anecdotal Observations  
Assessment: Statistical Terms and Measurements  
Implications for instruction. | McKenna/Stahl Chapter 3  
Walker Chapter 5  
QRI Section 2 | Questions regarding target student  
Assessment Instrument Evaluation posted on the course Blackboard.  
One-page over to structure class brief presentation of instrument to class. |
| Four    | 10/16  | **Examining and Analyzing Site Data**  
PowerPoint Slides posted on Blackboard | McKenna/Stahl Chapter 6 | Post you response to Part 1 by 10/23 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading/Assignments</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10/23     | Five| online class| Completion of Part 1                                                 | QRI sections 2, 3, 4 10, 11, 12, 13  
Walker Chapter 6                                                        | Identify second student for assessment report.                                    |
| 10/30     | Six | Peer Review | Assessment Strategies and Data Based Information                      | McKenna/Stahl Chapter 8, Appendix                                                  | Draft of completed assessment report for peer review.                  |
|           |     |             |                                                                      |                                                                                   | Bring a copy of the assignment rubric to class.                        |
| 11/6 online class | Seven | 11/6 online class | Examining and Analyzing Site Data                                      | QRI sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9  
McKenna Chapter 7                                                          | Post your response to Part 2 By 11/13                                            |
| 11/13     | Eight | Progress Monitoring | Course Participants  
Communicating Results: Students, Teachers,  
Parents, Tutors and other Professional Personnel                  | McKenna/Stahl Chapter 9  
| 11/20     | Nine | Data Based Decision Making | Class/Conference format                                                   | McKenna/Stahl Chapters 5, 6, 7                                             | Post Case Study #2 on Blackboard. Peer review must be completed by 11/29. Use the information from the peer review and assessment review to strengthen your report. |
| 11/27 online | Ten | Online learning communities: per review of second case study         | Complete online peer review of second case study. Use the assignment rubric to guide your responses | Post Both Assessment Reports online. Identify one report to be included in the data set for program | |
Since you have incorporated the QUI into your work during the summer quarter, it is expected that you are familiar with the components of the QRI and that you know how to administer and score the students results. You are responsible for Qualitative Reading Inventory Components—Procedures, Practice; Calculating Independent, Instructional, Frustration Levels

Miscue Analysis – word recognition and decoding, Running Records, Listening Level

IRI Summary Form

Miscue Analysis Chart

Bring your McKenna/Stahl text to class as we may be practicing some of the assessments. We will be reviewing the assessments in the McKenna/Stahl text as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of Word Recognition and Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psuedowords, Structural Analysis, Phonics, Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry Sight-Word Assessment*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolch Words by Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Phonics Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Test*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of Knowledge of Onsets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Test of Word Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Qualitative Spelling Inventory*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Spelling Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris-McCall Spelling List*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Quick Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obtaining Information about the Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Affective Factors,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude and Interest Surveys: ERAS, MRQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Reading Inventory Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader Self-Perception Scale (Reading Activity Inventory &amp; Title Recognition Test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Reading Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Purposes of Reading Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Reading Awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Textbook Interview

**Strategic Knowledge**

Purpose & Knowledge
Anecdotal Observations
Other Considerations
Assessment: Statistical Terms and Measurements
Assessment: Types of Tests
California State University, East Bay
School of Education and Allied Studies
Department of Teacher Education

TED 6232
Reading and Language Arts: Assessment and Intervention II
(4 Units) Pleasanton Cohort

Instructor: Dr. Linda Smetana
Message Phone: 510-885-4489
Office Hours: by appointment before and after class
E-mail: linda.smetana@csueastbay.edu
Location: Amador Valley High School
Wednesdays 4:30-8:00

COURSE DESCRIPTION:
This course focuses on the use of effective instructional practices to provide targeted intervention to students who are experiencing developing literacy skills. Emphasis is placed on design and implementation of instructional interventions to assist non-readers and struggling readers, including English Learners, in the areas of work identification skills, oral language, reading comprehension, vocabulary development and motivation. Candidates examine theory and research related to these topics and implement research-based methods of intervention with pre k-12 students.

THEME OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND ALLIED STUDIES
To prepare collaborative leaders committed to professional excellence, social justice and democracy, who will influence a diverse and interconnected world.

MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION
To prepare teachers who are dedicated to the academic achievement of all students, and who demonstrate a commitment to life-long professional growth and school leadership

HOW THIS CLASS RELATES TO THE THEME AND MISSION STATEMENT
Effective literacy instruction and intervention is pivotal to helping students achieve success in their academic and personal lives. This course provides the candidate with the theoretical and practical knowledge necessary to play a leadership role in delivering effective and bias free literacy assessment and relating instruction in the areas of fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, and written language. Candidates demonstrate effective strategies for working with students and colleagues in order to develop effective literacy practices.

COURSE OBJECTIVES
Candidates will

1. Demonstrate effective practices for literacy assessment and create instructional sequences to provide intervention for each component of research-based literacy instruction, including: oral language, word analysis, fluency, vocabulary development, listening and reading comprehension, written language development, and to develop the skills needed to address the specific needs of diverse groups. (RLAA 3.2, 3.2a, 3.2b, 3.2c, 3.2d, 3.2e 3.2f, 3.3, 5.2B)

2. Demonstrate the skills needed to modify curriculum to address the specific needs of diverse groups of students, including but not limited to struggling students, English learners, gifted and talented students, and students with special needs (RLAA 3.2g, 3.3, 5.2)

3. Integrate research and apply appropriate assessment, instruction and differentiation in the field, planning literacy instruction that is sequential, linguistically logical, systematic, explicit, differentiated and based on formal and informal assessments of individual student’s progress that assures that the full range of learners develop proficiency as quickly and efficiently as possible ((RLAA 3.2, 3.2a, 3.2b, 3.2c, 3.2d, 3.2e 3.2f, 3.3)

4. Demonstrate knowledge of the normal progression of complexity for each component of literacy as presented in the Foundations/Standards and their Frameworks, the expected stages and patterns in students’ development including early and adolescent literacy, the implications of delays or differences in students’ literacy development relative to grade level standards, and when such delays/differences warrant further assessment, differentiated instruction and intervention. (RLAA 3.3, 5.2A2, 5.2A3, 5.2A4)

5. Demonstrate the selection and application of appropriate assessment instruments including informal and curriculum-embedded assessments, and reliable and valid norm-referenced and criterion-based assessments that are used for formative and summative purposes, such as, screening, diagnosis, placement, and progress monitoring. (RLLA 3.6)

6. Demonstrate knowledge of differences and relationships between the skills needed for assessing and supporting students’ literacy development and those necessary for promoting language acquisition and development in order to know when a student may be struggling with a language acquisition problem rather than a reading problem (RLAA 3.7)

7. Demonstrate the ability to work with colleagues in using grade level or school wide assessment data to implement/revise instructional programs to meet the needs of diverse learners. (RLAA 3.8)

8. In site based field experiences candidates interpret results of classroom assessments, including formative, on-going and summative; perform additional assessments as appropriate; implement instructional strategies based on results of the assessment; and monitor and evaluate student progress. (RLAA 4.3)
9. Apply principles of equity as they work with colleagues to interpret results of disaggregated school-wide assessment data to propose changes in instructional practices through grade and/or school level discussion and/or professional development (RLAA 5.A2)

10. Select appropriate assessments, administer, analyze and summarize the results of the assessments, use assessment results to guide instruction report the results in ways that are meaningful to parents, classroom teachers and administrators. (RLAA 5.A3, 5.A4)

11. Plan, implement, and monitor formal literacy instruction that is sequential, linguistically logical, systematic, explicit, differentiated, and based on assessments data assures that the full range of learners develop proficiency as quickly and effectively as possible. Candidates use modeling massed and distributed practice, and opportunities for application as strategies to facilitate student learning that incorporates instructional materials, technology, routines, and strategies that are appropriately aligned with students’ assessed language and literacy needs. (RLLA 5.B2, 5.B3)

**Required Texts:**


Additional readings may be assigned over the course of the quarter.

University Policies

- By enrolling in this class the student agrees to uphold the standards of academic integrity described in the catalog at [http://www20.csueastbay.edu/academic/academic-policies/academic-dishonesty.html](http://www20.csueastbay.edu/academic/academic-policies/academic-dishonesty.html).
- If you have a documented disability and wish to discuss academic accommodations, or if you would need assistance in the event of an emergency evacuation, please contact me as soon as possible. Students with disabilities needing accommodation should speak with Accessibility Services. [http://www20.csueastbay.edu/af/departments/as/](http://www20.csueastbay.edu/af/departments/as/)
- Information on what to do in an emergency situation (earthquake, electrical outage, fire, extreme heat, severe storm, hazardous materials, terrorist attack) may be found at: [http://www.aba.csueastbay.edu/EHS/emergency_mgnt.htm](http://www.aba.csueastbay.edu/EHS/emergency_mgnt.htm).

Please be familiar with these procedures. Information on this page is updated as required. Please review the information on a regular basis.

Additional readings may be assigned over the course of the quarter.

COURSE FORMAT AND COMMUNICATION REQUIREMENTS

Class format includes, but not limited to lecture, discussion, interactive presentations, video, and blackboard. It is the responsibility all candidates to activate their CSU East Bay Horizon account and check Blackboard and their horizon account e-mail account regularly. All work is to be submitted in Microsoft Word and structured according to APA 6th edition. Google docs, pdf’s or text format will not be read. PDF documents will be accepted when submitting student work or assessment reports that include student work.

Assignments must be completed and submitted on the due dates specified in this syllabus. A minimum of 5 points will be deducted from partially completed assignments or assignments turned in after the due date. Incompletes will not be authorized except in the case of severe illness or family emergency.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS:

1. Intervention project 60 points
2. Intervention program review & presentation 15 points
3. Instructional strategy presentation 15 points
4. Professional research practices/issues 10 points
1. **Intervention Project**

Candidates implement a Reading/Language Arts intervention plan with one student based on the results of an IRI (expository) and phonics survey or case study from last quarter. Intervention will take place for a minimum of 10 hours over the course of the quarter. The intervention sessions should take into consideration the age/grade of the student and identified needs.

Submit the following to receive credit. The project will be evaluated according to the rubric at the end of the syllabus.

1. Copy of revised assessment report
2. Intervention planning sheet
3. Complete lesson plans and sample student work using the format provided
4. Self-reflection
5. Suggestion to continue progress for parent/guardian/teacher/tutor implementation

Additional materials to structure the intervention process will be posted on the course Blackboard.

2. **Intervention Program Review & Presentation**

1. Select a research-based intervention reading program or program identified for RTI tiered instruction.

The research-based reading program should be designed to address difficulties in one or more of the following areas: Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Word Identification, Fluency, Comprehension or Vocabulary

Examples of programs are: Lindamood Bell, Reading Recovery, Slingerland, and Read 180

2. Sign up for a date to present your program
3. Collect information: Strategies include: attending a workshop or visiting a school, center, or clinic using the program, examination of materials; review of published research or other materials regarding the program
4. Write a paper: Develop a three +-page evaluation of the intervention program

The paper and presentation should cover the following: a) description of the program, including its research base, b) key instructional methods, c) placement within the RTI process, d) sample materials, e) documented outcomes, f) feasibility (cost per student, class school, district, training, etc), g) your own evaluation of program effectiveness

5. Presentation (15 minutes): Present a 15-minute overview of your program, using visual aids. Post copies of your paper in advance of the presentation.

3. **Instructional Strategy Presentation**
1. Choose an instructional strategy that you will be incorporating into your intervention plan.
2. Locate a theoretical reference or foundations of the strategy
3. Identify the components of the strategy and the target area/skills for use
4. Learn the strategy so that you are able to teach it to the class
5. Bring materials to demonstrate the strategy and if possible, student work.

4. Professional practices discussion circle
   1. Work in teams of 4 (each of you will locate an article on the same topic)
   2. Locate a professional article or chapter in a book or monograph on a topic of interest. Topics may include, but are not limited to: motivation, middle and high school struggling readers, motivating boys, site based instruction plans or increasing academic vocabulary.
   3. Post the article on Blackboard for colleagues to read
   4. Lead a small group discussion on your article
   5. After small group discussion, convene whole class discussion on implications for practice

ASSIGNMENT DETAILS
Assignment #1: Intervention Project
Revised assessment report from fall quarter DUE January 17

The schedule is presented to enable candidates to complete the reading and assessments as well as research effective policies and practices. The schedule may be change to meet the needs of the candidates.

SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Profiles of struggling readers</td>
<td>Walker chapter 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10</td>
<td>Linking assessment to instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading intervention: Designing the intervention sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>January 17</td>
<td>Motivating Readers</td>
<td>Strategy Presentation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choosing Strategies</td>
<td>Intervention Program Presentation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building Skills for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phonemic Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alphabet Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sight Words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phonics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Context Clues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>January 24</td>
<td>Building Skills for:</td>
<td>Strategy Presentation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Reading Errors/Miscues</td>
<td>Intervention Program Presentation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phrasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phonics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selecting texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>February 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Presentation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention Program Presentation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Research article presentations and discussions</td>
<td>Research Article Presentations and Discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remediating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concept Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary as Word Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Remedial Program Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Research article presentation and discussion</td>
<td>Research Article Presentations and Discussions</td>
<td>Mid-quarter report DUE posted on Blackboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remediating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension of Narrative Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension of Expository Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of Retelling in Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate, Location Skills, Dictionary, Rate, Location Skills, Dictionary,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skimming &amp; Scanning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Remedial Program Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>Remediation Comprehension Difficulties QAR’s, Self-Questioning,</td>
<td>Strategy Presentation (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Comprehension Interactive</td>
<td>Presentation (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Eight   | Visual Imagery, Discussion Cards  
Graphic representations, Spelling  
When intervention fails…next steps  
Introduction to dyslexia         |
| March 7 | Strategy Presentation (2)  
Instructional Program Presentation (2)  
Strategies from Walker part Two  
Profession...al Practices/Research Discussion (1) |
| Nine    | Small group presentations of draft  
Assessment and intervention reports.  
Peer review using the rubrics for the assignments. Bring your lesson plans and intervention overview. |
| March 14| Strategy Presentation (2)  
Instructional Program Presentation (2)  
Strategies from Walker part Two  
Profession...al Practices/Research Discussion |
| Ten     | Assessment and Intervention Reports                                                                                                         |
| March 21| Intervention Reports  
DUE; online submission Blackboard |

The Six T’s of Effective Elementary Literacy Instruction [http://www.readingrockets.org/article/96](http://www.readingrockets.org/article/96)

Why Readers Continue to Struggle [http://ptgmedia.pearsoncmg.com](http://ptgmedia.pearsoncmg.com)
The following assessments were included in the 2013 Biennial Report:

1) **TED 6253 – Reading Comprehension Field Experience Report**
   Plan and implement a five-lesson unit, focusing on reading comprehension. Write a detailed report describing the instructional unit and analyzing how the student responded to instruction based on an analysis of pretest/posttest data.

2) **TED 6231 - Assessment Report**
   Write an assessment report about a struggling reader. Include a description and interpretation of the assessments administered. Identify and describe strategies that the student incorporates into his/her problem solving behaviors and student strengths and needs based on data. Suggest ways that the assessment results can be used to design an intervention.

3) **TED 6232 – Literacy Intervention Project**
   Plan an intervention based on the Assessment Report completed in TED 6231. Use assessment results to select appropriate instructional methods designed to improve reading proficiency. Discuss the efficacy of the intervention based on student work samples and assessments. Include suggestions for parents to reinforce instruction.

4) **GRP Graduate Reading Survey (2012-2013)**
   The GRP Graduate Reading Survey is an on-line evaluation of the program administered through Survey Monkey. Graduates are asked to respond to survey questions and open-ended questions about the GRP.

The following documents include a copy of each assessment with complete candidate instructions and scoring rubric.
TED 6253: Reading Comprehension Field Experience

Field Experience: Lesson Implementation and Report (40 points) (RLAA 2.1, 3.1, 3.2e, 3.2f, 3.6, 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.B2, 5.B3)

INSTRUCTIONS: Work with a partner and two or more Clinic students, at least one of whom is an English learner. Plan and implement a five-lesson unit focusing on reading comprehension, to one or more of the students in our Clinic. Include the following in the design and implementation of your unit:

- Carefully read your students’ referral forms from parents and teachers
- Administer an interest inventory to determine what is likely to motivate your students to read
- Administer tests to measure students’ oral language, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension
- Identify the students’ reading comprehension problems based on the referral forms, QRI and other assessments
- Select a research-based method/strategy or set of strategies designed to improve the comprehension problem that you have identified
- Examine at least two research articles documenting the effectiveness of the method/strategy
- Design a unit including five 90-minute lessons focusing on the method(s) you have selected
- Align lessons to the California Common Core State Standards
- Bring authentic texts (expository and narrative) and necessary materials to use in your Clinic lessons
- Analyze the academic language demands posed by the text for your struggling reader and English learner
- Provide explicit and sequential, and differentiated instruction, including scaffolding for your English learner, designed to improve students’ comprehension difficulties
- Include activities that focus on oral language, vocabulary development, and writing
- Include activities designed to increase students’ motivation to read
- Include one or more activities involving digital media
- Provide instruction to your Clinic students, collecting samples of work from each lesson
- Administer posttests based on the QRI 5

THIS IS WHAT YOU NEED TO POST ON BLACKBOARD BY THE DESIGNATED DUE DATE:

A detailed Field Experience Report based on the rubric at the back of the syllabus For full credit, explicitly label and address each component of the assignment based on the list below (the components of the scoring rubric).

- DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENTS: Discuss the setting and the students, including their age/grade, ethnic and linguistic background (CELDT scores) and reading
proficiency. Summarize what you have learned about each student from the parent and teacher referral forms.

- **RATIONALE:** Provide a rationale for the strategy or method, explaining why you have chosen this particular approach to improving comprehension. Describe how you plan to implement the method and summarize the research supporting it. Provide a specific rationale for your English learners.

- **OVERVIEW OF THE UNIT:** Provide an overview of what you plan to do to improve students’ comprehension. Describe the texts and resources that you will use for instruction. Discuss how your unit supports English learners.

- **ASSESSMENT:** Specify the QRI assessments that you used to measure student reading proficiency. Carefully analyze pretest/posttest assessment data and student work. Discuss the effectiveness of your instruction based on the assessment data you collected. Be sure to include a data table with student scores from all assessments.

- **CONTENT OF THE LESSONS:** Provide detailed lesson plans for each of the lessons. Include California Common Core State Standards and ELD standards. Also include one or more samples of student work from each lesson.

- **SCAFFOLDING FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS:** Analyze the academic language demands posed by the text for your struggling readers and English learners and provide effective scaffolding so that English learners have access to the texts used for instruction.

- **INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS:** Evaluate the effectiveness of your instruction based on pretest/posttest QRI data. Discuss what students learned and how they responded to your instruction.

- **REFLECTION:** Discuss what you learned from the Field Experience Project and what you would do differently.

- Include a reference list and be sure your paper conforms to APA format.

**Field Experience Scoring Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale for the strategy</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Partial</th>
<th>3 Acceptable</th>
<th>4 Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale and research supporting the strategy is missing</td>
<td>Rationale and discussion of research does not support the strategy</td>
<td>Rationale and discussion of research supporting the strategy is adequate</td>
<td>Rationale and discussion of research supporting the strategy is complete and detailed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the students</th>
<th>1 Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 Partial</th>
<th>3 Acceptable</th>
<th>4 Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of the students and their reading proficiency is missing</td>
<td>Description of the students and their reading proficiency superficial</td>
<td>Description of the students and their reading proficiency adequate</td>
<td>Description of the students and their reading proficiency is complete and detailed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of Unit</td>
<td>Overview of unit, standards, purpose of instruction, and/or description of content missing</td>
<td>Overview of unit, standards, purpose of instruction, &amp; description of content superficial</td>
<td>Overview of unit, standards, purpose of instruction, &amp; description of content adequate</td>
<td>Overview of unit, standards, purpose of instruction, &amp; description of content complete and detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Pretest and/or Posttest test data and/or analysis of test results are missing</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest test data and/or analysis of test results are incomplete or inadequate</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest data are complete but analysis of test results lacks detail</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest data is complete and analysis of test results is thoughtful and detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of Lessons</td>
<td>Missing components from five-lesson sequence, explicit strategy instruction, materials</td>
<td>Five-lesson sequence, explicit strategy instruction, materials, and description are poorly done</td>
<td>Five-lesson sequence, explicit strategy instruction, materials appear well-designed but description is superficial</td>
<td>Five-lesson sequence, explicit strategy instruction, materials are well-designed and are described in detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Effectiveness</td>
<td>Instruction does not appear to have been effective in teaching strategy &amp; addressing objectives</td>
<td>Instruction appears to have been marginally effective but did not adequately teach strategy or address objectives</td>
<td>Instruction appears to have been reasonably effective in teaching strategy &amp; addressing objectives</td>
<td>Instruction was clearly highly effective in teaching strategy &amp; addressing objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding for English Learners</td>
<td>Academic language demands on English learners are not mentioned and little or no scaffolding is used to provide access to the texts used for instruction</td>
<td>Academic language demands on English learners are mentioned and scaffolding is used to provide partial access to the texts used for instruction</td>
<td>Academic language demands on English learners are discussed and scaffolding is used to provide reasonably good access to the texts used for instruction</td>
<td>Academic language demands on English learners are thoughtfully analyzed and highly effective scaffolding is used to provide access to the texts used for instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections</td>
<td>Reflections are missing</td>
<td>One or more components of the reflections are missing or inadequate</td>
<td>Reflections describing what the students learned, what you learned and what you would do differently are superficial</td>
<td>Reflections describing what the students learned, what you learned and what you would do differently are complete and detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliber of the Paper</td>
<td>Paper is poorly written and does not address</td>
<td>Paper lacks clarity in writing and/or does not fully</td>
<td>Paper is well written but somewhat superficial in</td>
<td>Paper is extremely well written and addresses all specifications in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specifications in the syllabus</td>
<td>address specifications in the syllabus</td>
<td>addressing specifications in the syllabus</td>
<td>syllabus fully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TED 6231: Assessment Report Assignment

Instructions for completing the Assessment Report:

The Assessment Report regarding a struggling reader is intended to provide candidates with the opportunity to assess a student’s knowledge skills and abilities in reading and language arts. The findings from the assessment may be used to plan interventions.

The Assessment Report should include the following components:

Identifying Information: Includes the demographic information regarding the student. This information may impact the choice of assessments and the choice of criteria for the calculation of assessment scores.

If you are able to provide any background or history, please do so, however this content is outside of material scored.

Reason for Assessment: Provide a reason or rationale for the assessment.

Indicate the information or type of information you are seeking

Observation(s) in Classroom or Assessment Session(s)

Note any behaviors that you think are important or those that may impact the performance of the student.

Note any observations of actions or behaviors that may provide information about the student’s processing, motivation, stamina, problem solving or other abilities.

Indicate the number and the approximate length of the assessment sessions.

Provide any information that may have impacted the student’s performance.

Standardized Assessment (s) Administered

Identify and describe the standardized instruments for which there are findings that are included in the report.

Informal and/or Curriculum Based Assessment(s) Administered

Identify and describe the informal and/or curriculum based assessments for which there are findings that are included in the report

Assessment Administered

Scores for the assessments are presented.

Begin to identify patterns in the assessment results

Chart is helpful for overall ease of reading and interpreting results

Assessment Processes and Results
This section should be in the form of a narrative report that presents and interprets the data gathered from the assessments.

Present the assessment data as presented specifically for the report.

Present your interpretation of the assessment results and findings.

Identify and interpret data patterns

Identify and describe strategies that the student incorporates into their problem solving behaviors.

Identifies student strengths and needs based on data

Summary

Present conclusions regarding the abilities of the student

Summarize information so that a teacher could read only this section and learn about the skills of the identified student.

Answer the questions raised in the reason for the referral.

Content and Organization

Format and organize your document so that a colleague or professional would be able to read the document and follow through with an intervention plan.
## Assessment Assignment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels/Criteria</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Standard value: 1.00</th>
<th>Marginally Meets Standard value: 2.00</th>
<th>Meets Standard value: 3.00</th>
<th>Exceeds Standard value: 4.00</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identifying Information</strong></td>
<td>Little of no evidence (less than 4 items present)</td>
<td>Partial evidence of identifying information with 4 or 5</td>
<td>Includes report &amp; test date, student’s name, grade, age and birth date; other information missing</td>
<td>Includes student’s name, age, gender, report date, testing date (s), grade, examiner’s name, and birth date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Reason missing</td>
<td>Reason vague or missing or need for report in question; reason could be speculated</td>
<td>Reason clearly stated but understanding of what report should answer is unclear.</td>
<td>Specifically stated with an understanding of what the evaluation should answer or address.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations in Classroom or Assessment Sessions</strong></td>
<td>Description is consistently judgmental and attributes qualities to the student that are speculative</td>
<td>Description is sometimes judgmental and attributes qualities to the students that are speculative</td>
<td>Use both behavioral terms and examples; sometimes attributes qualities to the student that are speculative.</td>
<td>Written in specific behavioral terms. Includes examples that are objective and not speculative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized Assessments Administered</strong> (Section A)</td>
<td>Some test scores missing or data presentation incomplete.</td>
<td>Most tests with appropriate test scores (e.g., standard scores, percentiles, grade levels) when appropriate.</td>
<td>Most tests included with appropriate test scores (e.g., standard scores, percentiles, grade levels) when appropriate to test. Additional data sources sufficient.</td>
<td>All assessments included with appropriate test scores (e.g., standard scores, percentiles, grade levels) when appropriate to test. Additional narrative or descriptive data included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Section A OR Section B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels/Criteria</td>
<td>Does Not Meet Standard value: 1.00</td>
<td>Marginally Meets Standard value: 2.00</td>
<td>Meets Standard value: 3.00</td>
<td>Exceeds Standard value: 4.00</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal and Curriculum Based Assessment(s) (Section B)</td>
<td>No informal assessments(s) administered</td>
<td>Informal assessment(s) partially administered.</td>
<td>Assessment(s) listed but the purpose of the assessment is results of the assessment are not clear.</td>
<td>All informal assessment(s) included with results clearly reported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TED 6232: Literacy Intervention Report

Part I Initial Information

Clinician: Student: Age:
Initial Assessment: School: Primary Language:

Secondary Language:
Date of Report Grade: Health/Wellness:

Introduction

Introduce the student to the reader. Include the reason for the need for intervention. Add any information that adds to one’s knowledge regarding the student. Include SST, retention, ADD or other relevant information.

Part II Planning for Intervention

Baseline Data

Place initial scores that structured the intervention here. Indicate if the scores presented are all of the scores from the initial assessment or are the scores that demonstrate skills and needs of the student.

Intervention Plan Strengths and Needs

Identify the components of the intervention plan. Base the plan on the initial assessment data.

For example: a second grade student

Strengths

☐ Mastery of Basic Code (consonants and short vowels)
☐ Comprehension
☐ Reading with Expression

Needs/Areas/Skills for Intervention

☐ Learning the Advanced Code (digraphs, diphthongs)
☐ Auditory Processing of Phonemes
☐ Fluency Training

Goals Established Based on Assessment Data

☐ Teach to mastery the Advanced Code, vowel digraphs and diphthongs.
☐ Teach to mastery phoneme manipulation.
☐ Teach to mastery reading with speed, accuracy and expression.

Part III Implementing Intervention

Indicate areas for intervention and the strategies implemented. If possible include texts, books or other specific materials in the intervention process.

Part III Observation

Present your observations of the student. Include information that would assist another person to work with the student.

Part IV Summary and Conclusions

Include a narrative that summarizes the intervention process and makes recommendations for future intervention.

Part V Supporting Strategies/Resources

Name and describe 5-7 strategies/resource materials for the teacher, parent, tutor or other individual who may provide additional support for the student. For middle/high school students include resources that they can access and use to support their literacy development.

Appendix A: Revised Assessment Report

Appendix B: Intervention Plan

Appendix C: Intervention Lesson Plans

Scoring Rubric for Literacy Intervention Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completeness 10%</td>
<td>Complete in all respects; reflects all requirements</td>
<td>Complete in most respects; reflects most requirements</td>
<td>Incomplete in many respects; reflects few requirements</td>
<td>Incomplete in most respects; does not reflect requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Process 5%</td>
<td>Evaluation process is complete and comprehensive</td>
<td>Evaluation process is complete and includes</td>
<td>Evaluation process is cursory and includes some of</td>
<td>Evaluation process is minimal and includes few to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Analysis</strong> 15%</th>
<th>Presents an insightful and thorough analysis of the areas of skill development on which the intervention is based.</th>
<th>Presents a thorough analysis of most of the areas of skill development on which the intervention is based.</th>
<th>Presents a superficial analysis of some of the areas of skill development on which the intervention is based.</th>
<th>Presents an incomplete analysis of the areas of skill development on which the intervention is based.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention Plan 15%</strong></td>
<td>Intervention plan is detailed specifying steps for instruction, and assessment; identifies materials for the lessons; incorporates strategies and materials from professional sources including course texts.</td>
<td>Intervention plan is detailed and includes most of the steps for instruction and assessment; identifies most of the materials for the lessons; incorporates some strategies and materials from professional sources including course texts.</td>
<td>Intervention plan is superficial and presents an incomplete sequence of steps for instruction and assessment; incorporates few strategies from professional sources including the course texts.</td>
<td>Intervention plan and sequence of steps for instruction and assessment are incomplete; identifies few materials for the lessons. Incorporate few or no strategies from professional sources including the course texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies 15%</strong></td>
<td>Makes appropriate and powerful connections between the student’s</td>
<td>Makes appropriate connections between the student’s strengths and needs identified</td>
<td>Makes appropriate but somewhat vague connections between student’s needs and</td>
<td>Makes little or no connection between the student’s strengths and needs identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Implementatio
goal | Present detailed, specific and appropriate lessons that require active engagement of the student; lesson plans reflect multiple components of literacy. | Presents specific and appropriate lessons that require active engagement of the student; lesson plans reflect multiple components of literacy. | Presents appropriate lessons that may or may not engage the student; lesson plans reflect few components of literacy. | Presents lessons with lesson plans that may or may not engage the student; lesson plans are limited to one component of literacy. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plans</td>
<td>Lesson plans include detailed notes in the following areas: findings, target skill, resources, materials, procedures, adaptations, evaluation and follow-up integration.</td>
<td>Lesson plans include notes in the following areas: findings, target skill, resources, materials, procedures, adaptations, evaluation and follow-up integration.</td>
<td>Lesson plans include limited notes in the following areas: findings, target skill, resources, materials, procedures, adaptations, evaluation and follow-up integration.</td>
<td>Lesson plans are incomplete, minimal and lack notes in the following areas: findings, target skill, resources, materials, procedures, adaptations, evaluation and follow-up integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Report incorporates detailed description of fact</td>
<td>Report incorporates descriptions of 5 activities to</td>
<td>Report incorporates descriptions of</td>
<td>Report incorporates cursory description of fewer than 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of 5-7 activities to support student learning in school and at home.

| Writing mechanics and APA 6th format 5% | Writing demonstrates a sophisticated clarity, conciseness, and correctness; includes thorough details and relevant data and information; extremely well organized and presented. | Writing is accomplished in terms of clarity and conciseness and contains only a few errors; includes sufficient details and relevant data and information; well-organized and presented. | Writing lacks clarity or conciseness and contains numerous errors; gives insufficient detail and relevant data and information; lacks organization; presentation is incomplete. | Writing is unfocused, rambling, or contains serious errors; lacks detail and relevant data and information; poorly organized; presentation is incomplete. | Total Score |
TED Graduate Reading Program Exit Survey

(Candidates were asked to complete the survey on-line using Survey Monkey.)

1. Which program are you completing?
   Reading Certificate only
   Reading Certificate plus MS in Education, Option in Reading Instruction
2. How satisfied are you with the Reading Program?
   Very satisfied
   Somewhat satisfied
   Somewhat unsatisfied
   Very unsatisfied

3. How much did you learn from the coursework in your Reading Program?
   I learned a great deal from the program
   I learned some things from the program
   I learned a little from the program
   I learned nothing from the program

4. Please rate the quality of instruction that you received in the Reading Program?
   Very high quality instruction
   Adequate quality instruction
   Somewhat inadequate quality instruction
   Poor quality instruction
5. Please rate the value of your field experiences including the Summer Reading Clinic
   Very valuable
   Somewhat valuable
   Not very valuable
   Not at all valuable
6. How well did the Reading Program prepare you to be a literacy leader in your school/district?
   Very well
   Somewhat well
   Very little
   Not at all

7. How likely would you be to recommend the Reading Program to your friends or colleagues?
   Very likely
   Somewhat likely
   Not very likely
   Not at all likely
8. What assignments were most useful? Why?

9. Is there anything you would change about the Reading Program?

10. Is there anything else you would like to share about the Reading Program?
Overview

The purpose of this report is to describe the progress made in implementing the Unit and program improvement objectives defined by Unit program faculty and the Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF) during the 2010-2011 academic year. This report completes the accreditation/assessment cycle for the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years.

After the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) focused visit in May of 2011, the Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF) decided to move to a two-year assessment cycle:

* 2010-2011 and each subsequent academic year ending with an odd number will be an “Analysis Academic Year.” The analysis of the status of the Unit conducted by the UAATF will occur in each Analysis Academic Year. By the end of March of each Analysis Academic Year, the faculty in each cluster consider the data and determine to what extent each program in the cluster had met Unit Assessment Outcome (UAO) rubric criteria for “Target,” “Acceptable,” or “Unacceptable” levels. Program faculty also will identify any CTC standards that need to be addressed. Then, the UAATF will complete the Unit-level analysis. In 2010-2011, faculty and the UAATF analyzed data gathered in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010.

* 2011-2012 and each subsequent academic year ending with an even number will be an “Implementation Academic Year.” During and Implementation Academic Year, the following will be implemented:

   (a) the Goals and Objectives to Improve Unit Operations, defined during the previous Analysis Academic Year by the UAATF and reported in the Unit Evaluation Report; and

   (b) the several Cluster Goals and Objectives, defined during the previous Analysis Academic Year by Program Faculty and reported in the several Cluster Improvement Plans.

* In every academic year, data will be collected, aggregated, disaggregated, and stored on SharePoint.
Goals and Objectives to Improve Unit Operations

For five UAOs, the UAATF concluded in 2010-2011 that the Unit was at the Acceptable level. For each UAO at the Acceptable level, goals and objectives for bringing the UAO to Target were defined:

________________

Goal 1: Teaching Credentials Cluster: Improve candidate competence in teaching English Learners and students with special needs (UAO 1: Equitable Learning Outcomes).

Objective 1.1: Reconsider coursework and field experience requirements and placements for work with English Learners and students with special needs.

Objective Met

- Changed requirement to two placements for field practicum
- Changed the TED Credential Handbook for the 2011 Summer Entry
- Informed field supervisors of new requirement in September 2011 meeting
- Review candidates’ first placement scores on TPE 7 (January 2012) and discuss in the next Supervisors’ meeting (February 2012)
- Review candidates’ TPA scores on EL and SN (February 2012)
- Review CSU Exit Survey data

________________

Goal 2: Special Education Cluster: Improve candidate competence in the area of student support (UAO 3: Working Collaboratively).

Objective 2.1: Mild Moderate Program: Incorporate content and strategies in curriculum and instruction courses that prepare candidates with the knowledge and skills to support student access to and learning in the core curriculum.

Objective Met

The content of EPSY 6133 was revised to incorporate targeted strategies that would provide candidates with more knowledge and skills to support student’s access to the core curriculum.

They syllabus was reorganized; the content of the course became subject matter focused.

The text, Validated Practices for Teaching Students with Diverse Needs and Abilities r presented candidates with subject specific strategies as well as strategies that could be incorporated across the curriculum. Candidates were presented with strategies and
programs that have documented success as presented in research and professional literature. Programs such as Board English, Board Math, Touch Math, Read Naturally, REWARDS were modeled by the course instructor and then practiced by the candidates. Strategies from the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM) developed at the University of Kansas were modeled in class. Candidates were able to apply some of the strategies and/or materials in their classrooms. Documentation of the strategy implementation was presented in a course assignment.

Candidates prepared a strategy presentation through the use of pod-casts, video demonstrations, Voice-Thread, Prezi or Glogster presentation programs. Technology presentation and student interaction/response is an underutilized method to provide for student access to the core curriculum.

The requirements for the Teacher Work Sample completed by candidates in EPSY 6134 were revised to focus on demonstration of candidate’s knowledge and skills to enable their students to access the core curriculum.

Objective 2.2: Mild Moderate Program: Incorporate content and strategies in curriculum and instruction courses that enable candidates to increase student positive behavior, social, and communicative skills.

Objective Met

The content of EPSY 6127 was revised to incorporate strategies that would prepare candidates to increase student positive behavior, social and communication skills. The assigned reading for the course included chapters from Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning and Behavior Problems on positive behavior support, social and communication skills. Additional readings from You’re Going to Love this Kid!, focused on building social and communication skills for students with autism. In class materials from the IRIS center http://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/index.html and from a multi agency site http://www.autismininternetmodules.org/ added to candidates knowledge and skills in the areas of communication, social skills and positive behavioral support.

Candidates shared the positive behavior support plan forms and procedures from their school districts. In class candidates reviewed websites such as Positive Environments Network of Trainers (PENT) http://www.pent.ca.gov, papers and presentations from Dr. George Sugai and others. Candidates completed a positive behavior support case study where they identified a student who required such support, conducted a functional analysis and used the data gathered to create a positive behavior support plan. Candidates implemented the positive behavior support plan and provided a progress report of changes in student behavior.
Social and communication skills were addressed through the incorporation of the work of Michelle Garcia Winner and her Social Thinking Program and Carol Gray’s Social Stories into the content of the course. Candidates created instructional sequences to develop students’ social and communication skills; many were able to carry out their plans within their fieldwork sites and service delivery models.

Candidates in EPSY 6134, Level II Advanced Curriculum and Instruction and Behavioral Support studied executive functioning and the role that executive functioning has in learning and behavior. Candidates completed a case study of a student with executive functioning difficulties. The candidates collected baseline data from a variety of sources, identified executive functioning difficulties and created a program to help the student build executive functioning skills.

---

**Objective 2.3: Moderate Severe Program:** Include information in course syllabi for EPSY 6671 on collaboration with families, general educators, related services, and peers via individual student planning meetings.

**Objective Met**

The added content focus on collaborative Individual Student Planning Team ongoing meetings facilitation and strategies has been added to the Advanced Seminar EPSY 6671 syllabus. For example, student teachers are now required to lead and prepare an analysis of at least one ISPM as an assignment during the final student teaching quarter of 6671. (please see Sharepoint, Winter 2012).

---

**Objective 2.4: Moderate Severe Program:** Identify local practitioners to present student planning meeting strategies to class.

**Objective Met**

The University Supervisor, Maureen Kennedy, is also a part time Inclusion Support Teacher in an area district, who regularly conducts such meetings for students on her caseload. Ms. Kennedy presents this content and demonstrates the competencies for students in field sites. In addition, each of our Master Teachers in school districts now schedules/co-conducts Individual Student Planning Meetings with the student teachers as well.
Goal 3: Speech/Language Pathology Cluster: Improve candidate competence in the area of collaborative consultations (UAO 3: Working Collaboratively).

Objective 3.1: Identify ways to collaborate with peers, clients/families, and professionals in classes, clinic, and field work.

Objective 3.2: Include information in course syllabi explaining how each class project is designed to promote collaboration.

Objectives Met

Over the course of two department meetings, faculty identified key cooperative learning assignments in courses and refined their implementation. In the Winter 2013 and Spring 2013 quarters, each course will have a statement about these assignments should promote collaboration.

Goal 4: Teaching Credentials Cluster: Define data sources to determine effectiveness of candidates in working collaboratively with students, parents/guardians, and other professional, there is a lack of data in this area (UAO 3: Working Collaboratively).

Objective 4.1: Examine all existing data sources to identify sources of information on the effectiveness of candidates in working collaboratively: TPA, field experience evaluations, CSU Exit Survey, CSU Graduate Survey. If needed, create a candidate survey to determine their level of collaboration in their field practicum and course assignments.

Objective Met

(1) TPA

No sources of data here – we don’t want candidates to collaborate on the TPA.

(2) Field Experience Evaluations
We could examine:

_TPE 13 Professional Growth_

The candidate demonstrates professional dispositions by (1) evaluating her/his own teaching practices, *(2) soliciting and accepting feedback*, (3) using that information to increase subject matter knowledge and teaching effectiveness *(boldface added)*. Scores by the master teacher and the university supervisor on TPE 13 would provide some information in regards to the ability of the candidate to solicit and accept feedback. This would shed some light on the candidate’s ability to work collaboratively with master teachers and university supervisors.

*(3) CSU Exit Survey*

Two items are good sources of data for both Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates, under our SharePoint system, from “Effectiveness of Preparation of Teachers 1”:

Possible Responses:

As a new teacher, I am ...

* well prepared to begin . . .
* adequately prepared to begin . . .
* somewhat prepared to begin . . .
* not at all prepared to begin . . .
* can not answer

...to communicate effectively with the parents or guardians of my students.

...to work collaboratively on school issues with other teachers in our school.

(The items are not numbered)

*(4) CSU Survey of Graduates*
Response Options:
* Well prepared
* Adequately prepared
* Somewhat prepared
* Not prepared

Results combine (1) well prepared or adequately prepared, (2) somewhat prepared or not prepared

Table 1 – Evaluation Completed by Employment Supervisors

Item 9: Communicate effectively with the parents or guardians of his/her students

Table 3 – Evaluation Completed by Program Graduates after One Year of Teaching

Item 9: Communicate effectively with the parents or guardians of his/her students

Goal 5: At the Unit level, fully implement the Unit Assessment Plan and remove all Areas for Improvement cited in the CTC and NCATE 2009 reviews (UAO 5: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation).

Objective 5.1 Share 2011 Unit Evaluation Report with Unit faculty, campus colleagues, and K-12 partners in January/February 2011; with Deans in February 2011; and make revisions as necessary.

Objective Met
The 2011 Unit Evaluation Report was reviewed by each of the following groups:

(1) The Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF) on 11/12/10, 12/9/10, 1/12/11, 2/9/11.
(2) The Campus Committee on Professional Education (CCPE): 1/24/11, 2/23/11
(3) Unit Faculty and Staff: 1/26/11
(4) K-12 Advisory Councils: 1/26/11, 2/8/11, 2/15/11, 2/17/11
(5) Dean of CEAS Rountree, Associate Dean of CLASS Guo and Dean Nelson of CEAS, 3/3/11

Objective 5.2 Begin work toward meeting all objectives immediately; achieve objectives.

Objective Partially Met

Program faculty began working on meeting objectives soon after the 2011 CTC/NCATE focused visit. The work continues. It appears, however, too many objectives were defined.

Goal 6: At the conclusion of this inaugural Unit Assessment cycle, evaluate the Unit Assessment System, including the Unit Assessment Plan and Program Assessment Plans, and design road maps for improvement (UAO 5: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation).

Objective 6.3 Evaluate the Unit Assessment Plan and the Program Assessment Plans in regards to: (a) data collected, (b) the process of analysis, and (c) the use of data for Unit and Program improvement.

Objective Met
After the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) focused visit in May of 2011, the Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (UAATF) decided to move to a two-year assessment cycle (UAATF meeting of 5-1-11). See description in the “Overview” section starting on page 1.

------

**Objective 6.4** Maintain and complete the 2010-2011 *Unit Assessment System Evaluation Record*, including a road map for revising the Unit Assessment Plan and Program Assessment Plans.

**Objective Met**

The 2010-2011 Unit Assessment System Evaluation Record was completed on June 1, 2011. Earlier drafts were dated February 11, 2011 and April 22, 2011. However, in the future, we will not need a Unit Assessment Evaluation Record. This document, the Unit Evaluation Report can catalog changes in our Unit Assessment System.

------

**Goal 7: Expand the sophisticated database of candidates in the Teaching Credentials Cluster to candidates in the Pupil Personnel Services and Special Education Cluster (UAO 5: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation).**

**Objective 7.1** Complete the addition of the PPS and SPED candidates to the database.

**Objective Met**

By the beginning of the 2012-2013 academic year, all PPS and Special Education students were in the Credentials database.

------

**Goal 8: Hire tenure-track faculty to replace those who have either resigned, retired, or entered our early retirement program (UAO 8: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development).**
Objective 8.1: Complete the process of advancing 2011-2012 tenure track requests to the Deans and the Provost.

Objective Met

Tenure track faculty recruitment requests were completed and forwarded to the Provost in December of 2010. Tenure-track positions were approved for two positions in the Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders (Speech/Language Pathology Cluster), the Department of Educational Leadership (Administrative Services Cluster), and the Department of Teacher Education (responsibilities in both the Curriculum/ECE Cluster and the Teaching Credentials Cluster).

Objective 8.2: Form search committees for new hires.

Objective Met

Search committees were elected in the Spring Quarter of 2011:

Communicative Sciences and Disorders: Nidhi Mahendra (chair, Fall), Shubha Kashinath (chair, Winter), Robert Peppard

Educational Leadership: Gilberto Arriaza, Michelle Collay, Jose Lopez (chair), Peg Winkelman

Teacher Education: Joan Davenport, Eric Engdahl (chair), Lettie Ramirez

Hiring process completed in April of 2012. New hires:

Ardella Dailey (EDLD)
Elena Dukhovny (CSD)
Kai Greene (CSD)
Diane Mukerjee (TED)
Goal 9: Allocate greater resources for faculty professional development (UAO 8: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development).

Objective 9.1: Identify possible funding sources for faculty development: Internal savings, external sources, Academic Affairs allocation; and develop a plan for distribution of resources.

Objective Met

The Provost’s 2011-2012 allocation to the College of Education and Allied Studies included $22,270 for professional development. Dean Nelson decided to allocate additional resources so that the plan described subsequently could be implemented. At the June 21, 2011 meeting of the CEAS Council of Chairs, the Council approved a 2011-2012 professional development program for faculty. Each tenure-track faculty member in CEAS will have access to $1500 for faculty development. Faculty have two choices:

(1) Faculty will be reimbursed up to $1500 for travel expenses they incur to a professional conference when they (a) make a presentation or (b) serve on a board.

(2) Participate in a series of seminars titled “eLearning in CEAS,” enhance the technology component of a course they teach, and make a presentation at the CEAS eLearning Forum during the Spring 2011 quarter.

Faculty in the Speech/Language Pathology Cluster are housed in the Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders (CSD) in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS). In 2011-2012, full-time faculty are eligible for $1000 from CLASS and $800 from CSD to support professional travel. In addition, new hires in CSD are offered a $5000 start-up fund to support research experiences.

In addition, for the three new tenure-track hires, the Provost has approved funding for 8 annual Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) of assigned time in their first two academic years.

Goal 10: Continue to “right-size” programs and utilize available resources wisely (UAO 9: Unit Governance and Resources)
Objective 10.1: Complete re-organization of CEAS staff, including a comprehensive assessment of the re-organization process and product.

Objective Met

By the end of the Spring 2011 Quarter, the re-organization of CEAS staff was completed. Previously staff worked out of seven offices. Staff have now been organized into the four “cooperatives”:

(1) Art and Education Cooperative: 5 staff members serving the Departments of Educational Leadership, Educational Psychology, and Teacher Education.

(2) Credential Student Service Center: 7 staff members serving all credential programs in the Unit.

(3) Dean’s Suite Cooperative: 7 staff members serving the College.

(4) HRT/KIN Cooperative: 4 staff members serving the Departments of Hospitality, Recreation, and Tourism; and Kinesiology.

________________

Other Goals and Objectives from the Cluster Improvement Plans

Administrative Services Cluster

Administrative Services Cluster UAO Goal 1: Reduce the number of graduates of the Tier I Program who consider themselves to be only “somewhat prepared” to help teachers design and implement an instructional program that allows all students, including English Learners and students with special needs, to succeed (2010 survey of graduates = 18%; UAO 1: Equitable Learning Outcomes).
Objective UAO/ADM 1.1: Reconsider coursework and field experience requirements that prepare candidates to help teachers design and implement an instructional program that allows all students, including English Learners and students with special needs, to succeed.

Objective Met

The end-of-year leadership portfolios provide abundant evidence that candidates who work at schools and in districts serving large numbers of English Learners and students with special needs possess the understandings and skills to lead schools in serving diverse student populations. With this in mind, the department is using the cohort model (intentionally and consistently partnering and grouping candidates across sites) to enrich the course and fieldwork experience of candidates who currently work in districts and sites that serve smaller populations of English Learners and students with special needs.

In the first quarter, EDLD 6000 instructors provide relevant research, activities and professional expertise to address the topics of English Learners and students with special needs. Educational leadership students reflect on their understanding and practices of program mindscapes including Mindscape 1: Teaching and learning for equity and high achievement. This mindscape further defines the California Professional Standard for Educational Leaders 2: Culture for student and professional growth, advocating nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. The program Mindscape 1 focuses on a desired Impact: Race, class, language, culture, income, gender and sexual identity are no longer good predictors of academic success (or failure). All students are producing high quality work and achieving at high levels.

In the second quarter, EDLD 6400 educational leadership students are required to develop an Equity Plan based on this desired impact. In their sites and districts, they conduct a collaborative inquiry to better address the needs of students who are not achieving. They pose essential questions: What difference are we making and for which students? What skills and support do I need to take risks and lead for equity? The Equity Plan signature assignment requires leadership students to analyze achievement data, complete an equity audit and develop a plan to address an equity achievement issue. Leadership students participate in class-based think tanks or study groups to support their analysis, strategy development and reflection. Leadership students share their plans in class and at their sites and these plans become one component of the portfolio completed by the end of the third quarter. In the third quarter EDLD 6550 focuses on organizational systems and structures to support under-served students. The topics of students with special needs and English Language Learners are approached at a systemic level as relevant research and model programs are presented and further examined in terms of site, district, and state level implementation.

As a program we will continue to intentionally and consistently address the preparation of leaders who “help teachers design and implement an instructional program that allows all students, including English Learners and students with special needs, to succeed”.


Program Standard Goal 1: Evaluate the expectations for authentic and significant field experiences at a variety of school levels for candidates in the Preliminary Administrative Services Tier I Program (2009 CTC Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences)

Objective ADM/PSG 1.1: Develop a revised set of options for cross-level field experiences for Tier I candidates; cohort leaders could then select from the options to design a set of field experiences that best fit the needs of individual candidates.

Objective Met

The department leverages the cohort model (intentionally and consistently partnering and grouping candidates across school level sites) to enrich the course and fieldwork experience of all candidates. All courses provide readings, presentations, and assignments (i.e. principal interviews and colleague visits) that oblige leadership students to engage with administrators, teachers, parents, students, and programs across grade levels. The yearlong Fieldwork Activities Plan specifically requires candidates to “become familiar with a site that serves students of different grade levels, socio-economic, racial, language, and cultural backgrounds than the student population at your current work site”. The artifacts included in the end-of-year leadership portfolios provide evidence that candidates integrate “authentic and significant field experiences at a variety of school levels” into their repertoire of leadership strategies and their portfolio reflections demonstrate emerging understandings of PK-12 educational leadership.

As a program we will continue to evaluate our “expectations for authentic and significant field experiences at a variety of school levels for candidates in the Preliminary Administrative Services Tier I Program”.

Curriculum/ECE Cluster

Curriculum/ECE Cluster UAO Goal 1: Provide for better alignment between assessment rubrics and course assignments (UAO 5: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation)

Objective UAO/CUR-ECE 1.1 Revise rubrics for review of research paper in TED 6020 and research report in TED 6901 to ensure that rubrics accurately reflect assignment components.

Objective Met
During the October, 2011, Curriculum/ECE faculty meeting, faculty voted and accepted the new rubrics for TED 6020 and TED 6901. These rubrics have been posted on TaskStream in November, 2011. The professor will use the new rubric during the Winter, 2012 quarter. Additionally, faculty voted and accepted a supporting document entitled, “Parts of the Paper” which serves as the organization piece for TED 6020 and TED 6901. Lastly, our Core Course Chart was revised to reflect the changes as well.

______________

Curriculum/ECE Cluster UAO Goal 2: Improve the quality of written assignments for candidates in the Early Childhood Cluster (UAO 4: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)

Objective UAO 2/C-ECE 2.1: For ECE candidates, develop academic writing assignment that will be implemented in the first program class, TED 4070.

Objective Met

Students were given a series of 3 articles to read and using APA format were asked to respond to the articles using APA format. Professor provided an overview of APA and students also purchased the Perrin text.

______________

Educational Technology Cluster

Educational Technology Cluster UAO Goal 1: Ensure candidates are able to use and apply all relevant instructional technology (UAO 4: Candidate, Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions).

Objective UAO/EDT 1.1 Increase instructor use of Podcasting with smart phones; increase candidate knowledge, use, and application of Podcasting for smart phones in EDUI 6110, 6200, 6500, 6600.

Objective Met

Our Educational Technology Masters Program is moving toward the direction to reach the objective. Currently, the instructors for EDUI6110, 6200, 6500, and 6600 use Lecture Capture to podcast their class lectures. The class lectures are all available in Blackboard or in the links provided via email from East
Bay Replay Panopto CourseCast Support. Our students can use their smart phones to view the class lectures at any time and any place.

Objective UAO/EDT 1.2 Increase live broadcasting to Concord campus so that candidates will learn to design instruction for live broadcasting using cooperative teaching in EDUI 6110, 6200, 6210, 6240, 6600.

Objective Met

Our Educational Technology Master Program has been steadily using the live broadcasting to Concord campus in EDUI6110, 6200, 6210, 6240, and 6600. Our students who used the system enjoyed the benefits of the live broadcasting very much. However, the system is broken the Fall quarter of 2011. The University Instructional Technology staff is configuring a new system to replace it. We hope the new live broadcasting system will be ready to run in Winter 2012.

Educational Technology Cluster UAO Goal 2: Improve the quality of the reviews of the professional literature completed by candidates (UAO 4: Candidate, Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions).

Objective UAO/EDT 2.1 In EDUI 6500, devote additional attention to the analysis and synthesis of the professional literature in a given topic.

Objective Met

Starting from Winter 2011, the instructor for teaching how to write the reviews of the professional literature has incorporated a new and effective literature review online tool, Zotero, to help educational technology candidates successfully complete the task with high quality. It is found that students’ literature reviews have been improved tremendously in terms of the scope of reviewed literature as well as the contents organization of their writing in the literature review.
Pupil Personnel Services Cluster

Pupil Personnel Services Cluster UAO Goal 1: Refine the use and development of igoogle Professional Practice Portfolio (PPP) platform (UAO 5: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation).

Objective UAO/PPS 1.1 In EPSY 6205, Advanced Pupil Personnel Services, require all candidates to post at least one project documenting how the candidate took action to do one thing better within their school counseling program, i.e. systems intervention, case study, action research, program evaluation.

Objective Met

Procedural: The Intervention Strategies for Systems and Organizational Change course is offered during the Winter term. This is the course where candidates develop plans to do one thing better at their school site placements and document plans in the Portfolio.

Substantive: Candidates will revisit and develop their igoogle Professional Practice Portfolios in the Intervention Strategies for Systems and Organizational Change course. They will be required to post their projects at the end of the Winter, 2012 term.

Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) Cluster UAO Goal 2: Refine the use and development of the multiple assessment tools in EPSY 6205 (UAO 5: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation).

Objective UAO/PPS 2.1 : In EPSY 6205, Advanced Pupil Personnel Services, maintain multiple assessment streams and target one for revision: (a) Revise and align Field-Site Quarterly Evaluation to include the California Association of School Counselors 2008 The California Standards for the School Counseling Profession; (b) Revise and align Quarterly School Psychology Field Evaluations to include 2010 Revised Standards for Training, National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

Objective Met
Procedural: During the Spring 2011 quarter the School Counseling and the School Psychology faculty reviewed Fieldwork Supervisor Evaluations and discussed gaps between evaluation items and respective professional standards.

Substantive: During Spring and Summer 2011 the School Counseling and the School Psychology programs revised the Fieldwork Supervisor Evaluations for the 2011-12 school year. The revised evaluations, now better aligned with ACSA and NASP, are being implemented as of Fall 2011 and results will be reviewed quarterly. Results from Fieldwork Evaluations will be compared at the end of the school year, June 2012.

Pupil Personnel Services Cluster UAO Goal 3: Develop an equitable program dismissal policy consistent with national standards, state standards, and University policy (UAO 5: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation).

Objective UAO/PPS 3.1: After researching other Unit program dismissal policies and relevant national and state standards, write a policy that details unethical and unprofessional behaviors that will result in dismissal from program, and include the policy in PPS Cluster handbooks.

Objective Met

Procedural: The PPS faculty reviewed existing Expectations for Professional/Ethical Behaviors, documented in the respective Student Handbooks, and discussed links between these existing expectations and a proposed, comprehensive dismissal policy.

Substantive: A Dismissal Policy has been developed and is now in the School Counseling and the School Psychology Handbooks, Fall 2011. The policy was introduced at the Fall 2011 PPS Student Orientation.

Reading Cluster
Program Standard Goal 1: Begin developing programs consistent with revised CTC standards for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization and the Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential (2010 revised CTC program standards for reading)
Objective RC/PSG 1.1 Submit “Transition Date Form” to CTC by April 1, 2011.

Objective Met

During the Spring of 2011, program faculty decided to only create a program for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization. The program consists of five revised courses:

- TED 6220 Reading and Language Arts: Focus on Diversity (4 units)
- TED 6230 Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Research and Methods I (4)
- TED 6231 Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Assessment and Intervention I (4)
- TED 6232 Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Assessment and Intervention II (4)
- TED 6253 Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Research and Methods II (4)

Objective RC/PSG 1.2 Develop a plan for aligning courses with the 2010 standards.

Objective Met

Courses are aligned with new standards. As new courses are taught syllabi will be developed, completing the alignment. Current plan is for the courses to be taught for the first time during the Summer 2012 quarter. New course syllabi were developed and implemented for the following courses: TED 6230: Literacy Research and Methods 1; TED 6253: Literacy Research and Methods 2; and TED 6220: Culture of Literacy – Focus on Diversity.

Program Standard Goal 2: Improve candidates’ ability to design and implement instruction for English Learners that is driven by the results of assessment (1998 CTC Standards for the Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, Standard 4: Planning and Delivery of Reading Instruction Based on Assessment; Standard 10: Crosscultural Practice; and Standard 15: Preparation for Meeting the Reading and Writing Needs of all Students)
Objective RC/PSG 2.1 Consider changes in the course content in TED 6220 that will improve the ability of candidates to link assessment to instruction for English Learners in their field experience assignment.

Objective Partially Met

Revised course was taught for the first time in the Summer of 2012. Analysis of the student data from that course will be analyzed in 2012-2013.

Program Standard Goal 3: Improve candidates’ ability to provide a coherent rationale for the lessons to be implemented during field experience (1998 CTC Standards for the Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, Standard 4: Planning and Delivery of Reading Instruction Based on Assessment)

Objective RC/PSG 3.1 Consider alternatives for improving candidates’ ability to provide sound rationales for the five-lesson sequence implemented in TED 6253.

Objective Partially Met

Revised course was taught for the first time in the Summer of 2012. Analysis of the student data from that course will be analyzed in 2012-2013.

Special Education Cluster

None, all goals and objectives for this Cluster are stated in the previous section.

Speech/Language Pathology Cluster

Speech/Language Pathology Cluster UAO Goal 1: Improve assessment system to include tracking of individual candidates’ performance, rather than tracking only the cohort (UAO 5: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation).
**Objective UAO/SPLC 1.1:** Examine all existing data sources to include the tracking of each candidate as they progress through the program in their key assignments, including: clinical practicum, field experience, comprehensive finals, and PRAXIS Exam.

**Objective Met**

In the first phase of changing the process of tracking student progress, handwritten tracking forms were replaced with an Excel format (11-12). In the second phase, the Unit database developed by Tom Soo Hoo will be used (12-13).

--------

**Teaching Credentials Cluster**

**Program Standard Goal 1:** Expand Field Experience Residency model to include three more elementary schools and one high school (CTC Common Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice and CTC Multiple Subject and Single Subject Program Standard 14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Field Work)

**Objective TCC/PSG 1.1:** Evaluate efficacy of Field Experience Residency model at Roosevelt School in San Leandro.

**Objective Met**

Evaluation consisted of interviews with candidates, principal, master teachers, support staff, and University supervisors. The responses were uniformly positive, with suggestions for improvement included in the policy stated below.

--------

**Objective TCC/PSG 1.2:** Develop a set of policies and candidate expectations for the Field Experience Residency model.
Objective Met

Policy Recommendations:

(1) Need strong relationship with district office/ district liaison - individual Point of Contact (such the current model at NHUSD, Antioch USD, and the past model at WCCUSD)

(2) Need to ensure/ establish support from Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent to determine the liaison who will be the contact to assist in attaining quality student teaching placements (to avoid personnel turnover issues)

(3) Try to connect the Residency models at Linked Learning Sites

(4) It is important to involve the local Administration in the development of the Residency Model

(4) Better to established these Residency sites at the district level where 30 – 40 students can be placed (as opposed to individual sites)

(5) San Leandro USD is a Potential Residency site as it is piloting at Roosevelt Elementary and San Leandro HS is showing interest

Candidate Expectations:

- **Placements in Cohorts:** Candidates’ cohort experience with their coursework is extended into their placement. The peer group provides ongoing support and collaboration in linking theory to practice. All candidates at the school have the same university supervisor, which strengthens their common experience and unifies the expectations from the university.

- **Yearlong Placement:** Each candidate will have one academic year in the same school. He/She will have one placement in a primary classroom (K-2) and one placement in an intermediate classroom (3-5), with flexibility regarding whether the 3rd grade placement is a primary or an intermediate placement. Over the year under the mentorship of the two master teachers, candidates will begin their student teaching observing, move to co-teaching, and then teaching the class.

- **Shadowing Support Teachers and Principal:** Candidates will deepen their knowledge of the school culture and the work support teachers do in creating a safety net for children at risk. (Sign up form for observations attached.)
• **Shadowing Staff:** Candidates will understand the contributions of the staff. (Sign up form for observations attached.)

• **Observing Classroom Teachers:** Candidates will observe a classroom teacher other than their master teacher once a week for 30 minutes. Candidates will request the observation at the beginning of the week.

Unitevaluationreport110112final
June 15, 2013

Dear Parent:

You are invited to enroll your child in the California State University East Bay Summer Reading Clinic, held in cooperation with Pleasanton Unified School District. This letter provides a brief overview of our program and responds to the most frequently asked questions. If, after reading this letter, you wish to apply on behalf of your child, please complete and return the attached application as an email attachment no later than June 28 (shira.lubliner@csueastbay.edu) or fax the application form to Dr. Lubliner at 925-283-1744.

What: Individualized assessment and tutoring in reading comprehension will be provided weekly by teachers who are pursuing a Reading Certificate/Reading and Literacy Added Authorization in the California State University East Bay Graduate Reading Program.

Who: The Reading Clinic serves students who will enter fourth through eighth grade in fall, 2012 and have difficulty with reading comprehension. English learners are encouraged to participate.

When: This summer the Reading Clinic will be conducted on Wednesday afternoons from 3:30-5:00. Students who enroll in the Reading Clinic are expected to attend regularly and complete homework assignments. Clinic dates are 7/10, 7/17, 7/24, 7/31, 8/7.

Where: The Reading Clinic will be held at Amador Valley High School (classrooms will be announced prior to the first session).

Cost/Responsibilities: There is no charge to parents for this service. All materials and instruction are provided by the University and the District. Parents of participating students must assume responsibility for daily transportation to and from Amador Valley High School. Reading instructors will need to return to class immediately after Clinic ends, so students must be picked up promptly. Students whose parents are late in picking them up from Clinic will be dismissed from the program. Parents agree to bring their children to ALL Clinic sessions except in the case of illness. Only students whose parents are willing to make this commitment will be accepted into the program.
Procedures: Parents who wish to enroll their child in this program should return the application by June 28, 2013. Completed applications will be carefully screened by the clinic director. Parents will be notified by July 2 whether or not their child has been accepted. A limited number of Clinic spaces are available.

If you have questions about the Reading Clinic, please contact Dr. Shira Lubliner at shira.lubliner@csueastbay.edu.

Best wishes,

Dr. Shira Lubliner

Professor, Graduate Reading Coordinator, Reading Clinic Director
Attachments: parent application
Clinic Observation Form

Clinician: ______________________________________________   Date: _________________
Student: ______________________________________________    Grade: ________________
Strategy: _____________________________________   Text: __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning of sequential, systematic, explicit comprehension instruction aligned to student’s language and literacy needs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson is inadequate and not aligned to student needs</td>
<td>Lesson is barely adequate and minimally aligned to student needs</td>
<td>Lesson is adequately designed and aligned to student needs</td>
<td>Lesson is very well designed and fully aligned to student needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of appropriate instructional materials</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials are missing or inadequate</td>
<td>Instructional materials are somewhat appropriate to the lesson</td>
<td>Instructional materials are reasonably appropriate to the lesson</td>
<td>Instructional materials are fully appropriate to the lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of Research-Based Strategy Instruction</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy instruction is poorly delivered and appears to be ineffective</td>
<td>Strategy instruction is delivered with minimal skill and appears to be slightly effective</td>
<td>Strategy instruction is adequately delivered and appears to be reasonably effective</td>
<td>Strategy instruction is well delivered and appears to be highly effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student appears to be completely unengaged in the lesson</td>
<td>Student appears to have minimal engagement in lesson</td>
<td>Student appears to be somewhat engaged in lesson</td>
<td>Student appears to be fully engaged in lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>7/10</th>
<th>7/17</th>
<th>7/24</th>
<th>7/31</th>
<th>8/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Oral Language Assessment, QRI MC Comp, Retelling, Fluency, Interest Inventory</td>
<td>QRI Vocab</td>
<td>5-Minute Vocab</td>
<td>Writing Assessment</td>
<td>QRI MC Comp, Retelling, Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Main Idea Questioning</td>
<td>Main Idea Questioning, QAR</td>
<td>Clarifying Strategies</td>
<td>Text Genres</td>
<td>Summarizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Adaptations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Reading Program 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Winter 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Certificate (RLAA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reading Certificate (RLAA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reading Certificate (RLAA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reading Certificate (RLAA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6230 (4 units)</td>
<td>TED 6231 (4 units)</td>
<td>TED 6232 (4 units)</td>
<td><strong>Reading Certificate/RLAA Completed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Research &amp; Methods 1 (Fluency)</td>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Research &amp; Methods 2 (Comprehension)</td>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Assessment &amp; Intervention 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6253 (4 units)</td>
<td>TED 6231 (4 units)</td>
<td>TED 6232 (4 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Research &amp; Methods 2 (Comprehension)</td>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Assessment &amp; Intervention 1</td>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Literacy Assessment &amp; Intervention 2 (Diagnostic Strategies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED 6220 (4 units)</td>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Culture of Literacy: Focus on Diversity</td>
<td><strong>Reading Certificate/RLAA Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Language Arts: Culture of Literacy: Focus on Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MS Core Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Winter 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TED 6250 (4 units)</td>
<td>TED 6020 (4 units)</td>
<td>TED 6901 (4 units)</td>
<td><strong>Reading Certificate/RLAA Completed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Research &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>Research in Education</td>
<td>Graduate Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MS in Education, Option in Reading Instruction Completed</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DANA L. GRISHAM

605 Quinan St. Mobile: (510) 260-5425
Pinole, California 94564 Email: dana.grisham@gmail.com
Home: (510) 724-0969

Dana L. Grisham, Ph.D. currently is an educational consultant. Retired from the California State University system, she serves as Core Adjunct Faculty for National University in San Diego, California, Touro University in Vallejo, California, and CSU Fresno. Dr. Grisham is past co-editor of *The California Reader* (with Thomas DeVere Wolsey) and presently serves as Associate Editor of *Reading and Writing Quarterly*. She has a long-standing interest in the intersections of technology and literacy and has published research in scholarly journals such as *JAAL, The Reading Teacher*, and *Journal of Literacy Research* (JLR). With Bridget Dalton, Bernadette Dwyer, and Jill Castek, she is a founder and contributor to a blog called Literacy Beat ([http://literacybeat.wordpress.com/](http://literacybeat.wordpress.com/)) and she has a book due in May 2012 with Guilford on teaching writing instruction using technology.

### Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Education, University of California, Riverside, Curriculum and Instruction. Areas of Emphasis: Literacy and Language Arts, Curriculum and Instruction, and Research Methodology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Touro University, Graduate School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to Present</td>
<td>National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjunct Professor (Online Masters Degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 to 2010</td>
<td>California State University, East Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Education Department (TED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 to 2006</td>
<td>The California State University, Office of the Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Co-Director, Center for the Advancement of Reading (CAR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Range</td>
<td>Institution and Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 to 2006</td>
<td>San Diego State University, San Diego California. College of Education, School of Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 to 1995</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley, School of Education,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989 to 1993</td>
<td>University of California, Riverside, School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 to 1993</td>
<td>University of California, Riverside (Extension) Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983 to 1988</td>
<td>Menifee Union School District, Menifee, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1983</td>
<td>Val Verde Unified School District, Teacher: Grade 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Long Beach Unified School District, Long Beach, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECENT PUBLICATIONS (2009-2012)**


**RECENT CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS AND PAPERS (2010-2011)**

2011  
Literacy Research Association, November 30-December 3, 2011, Jacksonville, FL.  
Expanding the Investigation: Exploring the Impact of Teacher Preparation Programs on the Instructional Practices of Teacher Candidates. TERSG Longitudinal Investigation, Phases I and II.

2011  
California Reading Association Professional Development Institute, Vacaville, CA, November 4-5, 2011.  
(1) Research on Early Literacy and Technology: The AWARD Reading Online Program (with Carissa Patague)
2011  East Bay Computer Using Educators (EBCUE)
Workshop: Weaving Online Reading, Writing, and Collaboration Tools Together (with Jill Castek).
Access at https://sites.google.com/site/onlinereadingandwriting/

2010  Literacy Research Association (formerly NRC) December 1-4, 2010, Ft. Worth, TX
(1) Graphic Novels (with Linda Smetana)
(2) Promising Practices in Teacher Education (with DeVer Wolsey)
(3) TERSG: Study of Teacher Preparation in Literacy (with Linda Smetana)
(4) Discussant: Trends in Digital Education

2010  California Reading Conference, October 14-16, 2010, Riverside, CA
Teaching Vocabulary and Comprehension using Web 2.0 Technologies

2010  Alameda County Reading Association (Invited)

2010  World Reading Conference, July 12-15, 2010, Auckland, New Zealand
(1) Engaging Students with Children’s/Young Adult Literature Through Multimedia Response and Web 2.0 (with Bridget Dalton)
(2) eVoc Strategies: Technology-enriched Strategies for Engaging Students in Vocabulary Learning (with Bridget Dalton)

2010  International Reading Association, April 2010, Chicago Illinois
Love that Book, with Bridget Dalton
Generative Technology for Teacher Educators (TILE-SIG) with Linda Smetana
GRANTS

Reading Institute for Academic Preparation (RIAP), Co-Director, 2007/2008

College of Education Inquiry Grant for Study of Teacher Efficacy, 2004

College of Education Inquiry Grant for Improving Reading Comprehension in K-12 Education, 2003
   2001-2002 $89,000.
   2002-2003 $129,000.

Spencer Research Conference Grant (October 2000) Co-Principal Investigator. Research Dissemination on Teacher Education
Dean’s Grant, SDSU, 1997-98. 1998-99


Mini-grant, Literacy Research, Washington State University, Vancouver 1996-97

Mini-grant, Literacy Research, Washington State University, Vancouver, 1995-96.

Principal Investigator, Southwest Washington Educational Partnership (SWEP), 1996


Inland Area Writing Project Grant Writing Contributor (1991, 1992, 1993)
Shira Lubliner Ed. D.

EXPERIENCE

2011- Present  Graduate Reading Coordinator  
California State University, East Bay

2008 – Present  TPA Coordinator  
California State University, East Bay

2001 – Present  Associate Professor, Teacher Education Department  
California State University, East Bay (tenured)

2006-2008  Special Consultant for Reading Institution for Academic Preparation

Summer, 2001  Adjunct Professor  
California State University, Hayward

1997 – 2001  Adjunct Professor  
University of San Francisco

1999 – 2000  Adjunct Professor (Reading)  
San Francisco State University

1999 – Present  Staff Development Presenter: Reciprocal Teaching  
School Districts throughout CA and USA

1999 – 2000  Teacher-Leader & Staff Development Presenter  
Mt. Diablo Unified School District

1997 – 2000  Fifth Grade Teacher: Ayers Elementary  
Mt. Diablo Unified School District

1995 – Present  Educational Consultant
1987 – Present  Staff Development Educator  
Jewish Federations of East Bay and San Francisco  

Spring, 1998  Teaching Fellow in Language Arts  
University of San Francisco  

1995 – 1997  Instructor for Skills Enhancement Institute (SEI)  
Staff development program for novice teachers  

1994 – 1996  Founding Principal, Ohr Emet School  

1994 – 1996  Chairperson of the East Bay Principals’ Council  

1987-1988  Coordinator of Pilot Program in Staff Development  

1982 – 1994  Principal, B’nai Shalom School  

1982-1988  Founding Director of Contra Costa Midrasha  
(Community Hebrew High School)  

1981-1982  Principal, Beth Jacob School  

1975 – 1981  Teacher, Maarev School (kindergarten, 1st, 2nd, 5th)  


**EDUCATION**  
Dec. 13, 2001  Doctor of Education, Major: Learning and Instruction  
University of San Francisco  

August, 1997  Multiple Subject Teaching Credential  
Chapman University  

August, 1997  Cross Cultural, Language and Academic
Development Certificate

June, 1975  Master of Arts in Teaching
University of Judaism

March, 1974  Bachelor of Arts: Major in Jewish Studies
University of California Los Angeles

AWARDS

2011  California Reading Association - Margaret Lynch Exemplary Service Award
("Recognizes individuals for their outstanding contributions in the field of reading")

2007  International Reading Association Elva Knight Research Grant

2000  Assessment Fellowship, University of San Francisco

1999  Impact II Grant for Excellence in Curriculum
Contra Costa County Office of Education

1998  Teaching Fellowship
University of San Francisco

June, 1997  Award for Academic Excellence
Chapman University

May, 1974  Yochanan Leshefsky Award for Academic Excellence
University of Judaism
**PUBLICATIONS**

**BOOKS**

In Press  

2008  

2008  

2005  
Getting Into Words: Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension. Baltimore, MA: Brookes Publishing Company

2001  

**ARTICLES**

2011  

2006  
*Constructs Underlying Word Selection and Assessment Tasks in the Archival Research on Vocabulary Instruction* (Scott, J., Lubliner, S. & Hiebert, E.) 55th Yearbook of the National Literacy Conference

2005  
The Effect of Comprehensive Vocabulary Instruction on Title I Students Metacognitive Word Learning Skills and Reading Comprehension (Journal of Literacy Research, Vol. 37, 2)

2005  
"Go Look It Up": Dictionary Instruction Revisited (The California Reader, Vol. 38, 4)

January, 2005  
*Dr. Shira Lubliner on Vocabulary Instruction* (Brookes Publishing's Education Newsletter)
February, 2004  Help for Struggling Upper Grade Readers  
(The Reading Teacher, Feb. 2004)

November, 2001  Breaking Down the Gates: Instructional Practices that Support the Success of All Children  
(Classroom Leadership, 2001)

April, 1990  The Transformation of a Congregational School: A Case Study. (The Pedagogic Reporter)

GRANTS, AWARDS

November 5, 2011  Margaret Lynch Exemplary Service Award for Outstanding Contribution to Reading (California Reading Association)

February, 2007  Elva Knight Research Grant (International Reading Association)

PRESENTATIONS

November 5, 2011  Featured Speaker Annual Conference California Reading Association – Vacaville: Teaching Content Vocabulary: Words that Matter Most for Comprehension and Achievement

May 25, 2011  Research presentation at the CEAS Spring Forum: The Power of Cognates

July 14, 2011  Presentation to CSUEB Doctoral Candidates: The Power of Cognates

October 16, 2010  Featured Speaker Annual Conference California Reading Association – Coalinga: English Learners – A Comprehensive Approach to Vocabulary Development that Strengthens Comprehension

June 5, 2010  California Reading Association – Harris Ranch: Children in Charge: A Multifaceted, Metacognitive Approach to Vocabulary Development

November, 2009  Featured Speaker, California Reading Association: English Learners: A Comprehensive Approach To Vocabulary Development that Strengthens Comprehension

April 16, 2009  American Educational Research Association: The Effects of Cognate Strategy Instruction on Spanish-speaking Students’ Cognate Identification, Vocabulary Acquisition, and Reading Comprehension

Dec. 3, 2008  National Reading Conference: CSI: The Effects of Cognate Strategy Instruction on Spanish-Speaking Students’ Cognate Identification, Vocabulary Acquisition, and Reading Comprehension

Nov. 7, 2008  Center for the Advancement of Reading Conference: Top Ten Ways to Teach Vocabulary

Oct. 17, 2008  Featured Speaker Annual Conference California Reading Association: Nourishing Vocabulary: Providing Students with a Well-Balanced Vocabulary Diet
May 7, 2008 International Reading Association (Research Poster) Cognates and Academic Language: The Keys to Comprehension for Spanish-Speaking Students

April 10, 2008 Presentation to Contra Costa Reading Association (East County)


Feb. 7, 2008 Keynote Speaker: Oregon Reading Association: Getting Students Into Words: Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension and Achievement

Nov. 9, 2007 Featured Speaker Annual Conference California Reading Association: Knowing What They Know: Vocabulary Assessment that Strengthens Learning Outcomes

Nov. 10, 2007 Annual Conference California Reading Association, Research Strand: Effects of Systematic Cognate Instruction of Latino Students Vocabulary and Comprehension

Nov. 29, 2007 Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference: Session Chair and presenter: Assessing Spanish/English Bilingual Students' Knowledge of Cognates of Varying Levels of Transparency

Oct. 26, 2007 CSU Center for the Advancement of Reading: Preparing Teachers to Accelerate Students' Vocabulary Acquisition

Oct. 12, 2007 Belle Air Elementary School: Nourishing Vocabulary

August 14-15 DPI Wisconsin Professional Development (Wausau)

August 9, 2007 San Francisco Unified School District Professional Development

August 6-7 DPI Wisconsin Professional Development (Milwaukee #2)

June 28-29, 2007 DPI Wisconsin Professional Development (Milwaukee #1)

April 28, 2007 Lake Mendocino Reading Council: Vocabulary Instruction Across the Curriculum and Throughout the School

March 3, 2007 Modesto: Helping English Learners Succeed

Feb. 16, 2007 San Jose Middle School: Getting Into Words

Feb. 7, 2007 DPI Wisconsin Professional Development: Reading First Coaches

Dec. 5, 2006 San Francisco Unified School District Principals

Sept. 30, Oct.21, 2006 San Francisco Unified School District Professional Development

August 15, 16, 2006 San Francisco Unified School District Professional Development

August 14, 2006 San Francisco Unified School District Principals

August 10, 2006 Chicago Schools: Getting Into Words: Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2006</td>
<td>International Reading Association: Symposium: <em>Components of Effective Vocabulary Instruction</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 2006</td>
<td>International Reading Association: Pre-conference Institute: <em>Linking Word Knowledge to the World</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2006</td>
<td>American Educational Research Association: Session Chair: <em>Choosing Words to Teach</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1, 2006</td>
<td>Presenter at Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference <em>Vocabulary Instruction: Moving Between Theory &amp; Practice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 5, 2006</td>
<td>Contra Costa Jewish Book Festival: <em>Are Our Schools Working for Our Children?</em> State of Education Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4, 2006</td>
<td>Featured Speaker, California Reading Association: <em>Children in Charge: A Multifaceted, Metacognitive Approach to Vocabulary Development</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 21, 2006</td>
<td>Vocabulary Institute, Session 1, San Francisco Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 7, 2006</td>
<td>Reading Instruction for Academic Achievement: <em>Vocabulary and Academic Language, CSU Bakersfield</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 30, 2006</td>
<td>Vocabulary Institute, Session 2, San Francisco Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 26, 2006</td>
<td>Contra Costa Reading Association: <em>Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 14, 15, 16</td>
<td>Summer Vocabulary Institute, Reading First Teachers, San Francisco Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 11, 2006</td>
<td>Reading Instruction for Academic Achievement: <em>Vocabulary and Academic Language, CSU East Bay</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 10, 2006</td>
<td><em>Getting Into Words: Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension</em>, Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29, 2006</td>
<td>Reading Instruction for Academic Achievement: <em>Vocabulary and Academic Language, CSU Stanislaus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 2006</td>
<td>Reading Instruction for Academic Achievement: <em>Vocabulary and Academic Language, CSU Channel Islands</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2006</td>
<td><em>Choosing Words to Teach</em> (Session Chair) Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 9, 2005</td>
<td><em>The Power of Vocabulary for Reading Achievement</em> Regional Technical Assistance Center, California Reading First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 5, 2005</td>
<td><em>Accelerating Vocabulary Development and Improving Comprehension</em> Annual Conference of the California Reading Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 28, 2005</td>
<td><em>Rethinking Vocabulary Instruction: Strategies that Help Struggling Readers Catch Up</em> Annual CAR Reading Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 14, 2005</td>
<td><em>Academic Vocabulary, Reading Institutes for Academic Preparation Leadership Institute</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 15, 2005</td>
<td><em>Wine and Wisdom: A Sampling of Wine and Teaching</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vocabulary Strategies, Placer County Office of Education and Placer Area Reading Council

June 24, 2005
Instruction that Accelerates Vocabulary Acquisition and Improves the Reading Comprehension of English Learners, 26th Annual Reading/Language Arts Conference, San Diego State University

May 5, 2005
Getting Into Words: Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension, Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association

April 30, 2005
Promote Student Learning through Vocabulary Development: How Vocabulary Affects All Forms of Literacy and Academic Achievement, Day of the Teacher, CSUEB Concord

March 5, 2005
Vocabulary and Comprehension, Gateway Reading Council

Feb. 26, 2005
Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension, Florida Department of Education Weekend with the Experts for Speech and Language Pathologists

Feb. 12, 2005
Getting Into Words: Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension, Featured Speaker, Annual State Conference, Oregon Reading Association

Feb. 4, 2005
Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension, CAR Regional Conference at SFSU

Nov. 20, 2004
Generating Document-Based Questions, Annual Conference of the National Council for the Social Studies

Nov. 5, 2004
Wrestling with Words: Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension, Annual Conference of California Reading Association

May 3, 2004
Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension, Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association

April 14, 2004
The Effects of Comprehensive Vocabulary Instruction on the Metacognitive Word Learning Skills and Reading Comprehension of Disadvantaged Students, Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association

Feb. 2, 2004
CSUH Scholar-Olli featured speaker

Nov. 15, 2003
News and Views: Using Reciprocal Teaching Strategies with Challenging Texts, Annual Conference of the National Council for the Social Studies

Nov. 7, 2003
News and Views: Using Reciprocal Teaching Strategies with Challenging Texts, Annual Meeting of the California Reading Association

Nov. 1, 2003
Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension, Keynote address, Saturday Seminar' West Virginia Reading Association, Wheeling

Oct. 18, 2003
Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension, Keynote address, Saturday Seminar' West Virginia Reading Association, Huntington

Oct. 10, 2003
Breaking Down the Gates: Instructional Practices that Support the Success of All Students, Featured speaker, Washington Word Conference

Aug. 20, 27, 29, 2003
Teacher training for the H3 Character Education Grant, Alameda County Office of Education

May 5, 2003
Vocabulary Strategies that Strengthen Comprehension, Annual Meeting of the International
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 2003</td>
<td>Recognition or Recall: What Reading Comprehension Tests Really Measure, Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 23, 2002</td>
<td>Teaching Teachers, Reaching Students: Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 7, 2002</td>
<td>The Power of Clarifying, Annual Conference of the California Reading Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5, 2002</td>
<td>Studies in Reading Comprehension Discussant at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2002</td>
<td>Reciprocal Teaching Presentation to Contra Costa Chapter of the California Reading Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 20, 2002</td>
<td>Tackle the Textbook – Reading Strategies that Work Hayward International Studies Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 15-17, 2002</td>
<td>Reciprocal Teaching Trainer of Trainers Houston Integrated School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 9, 2001</td>
<td>Reciprocal Teaching: Content Literacy in the Diverse Classroom Annual Meeting of the California Reading Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 17-18, 2001</td>
<td>Trainer of Trainers: Reciprocal Teaching Wright Group/McGraw-Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2, 2001</td>
<td>Meaningful Literacy Experiences in the Diverse Classroom Annual Meeting of the Colorado International Reading Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 1999</td>
<td>Format Differences in the Assessment of Students ’ Mathematical Problem-solving Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association

REPORTS
October 15, 2011  Commission on Teacher Credentialing Biennial Report, Academic Year 2009-2011 (Graduate Reading Program)
(To be filed) Year 2009-2011 (Graduate Reading Program)
December 16, 2009  Quarterly Report Teacher Performance Assessment Program: Fall, 2009
February 17, 2009  Quarterly Report Teacher Performance Assessment Program: Fall, 2008
September 1, 2008  Commission on Teacher Credentialing Biennial Report, Academic Year 2007-08 (Graduate Reading Program)
September 1, 2008  Commission on Teacher Credentialing Biennial Report, Academic Year 2007-08 (Multiple Subjects Credential Program)

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
American Educational Research Association
Program Chair of the Vocabulary SIG/AERA
California Professors of Reading and Language Arts
International Reading Association
California Reading Association
National Reading Conference

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
Anti-Defamation League
Family Life Advisory Board, Diablo Valley College
Contra Costa Advisory Board, California State University East Bay
Professional Advisory Board, Contra Costa Jewish Day School
Books for the Barrios

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES
Member of UAATF (CEAS Accreditation Taskforce, 2010-Present)

Member of NCATE Accreditation Faculty Group (2008-2009)

Member of AVP Search Committee that hired Rhea Williamson

**Member of CSUEB Early Childhood Education Minor and Human Development Course Modification Project (Grant from First Five Contra Costa)**

**Member of the TED Department Chair Search Committee (2006)**

**Chair of the CEAS Research and Development Committee (2005-2006)**

**Member of CEAS Research and Development Committee (2004-2006)**

**Member of CEAS College Council (2005-2006)**

**Member of Writing Skills Subcommittee (CIC) (2005-2010)**

**Curriculum Committee, Teacher Education Department (2001-2003, 2005-2007)**


**Member of PTR subcommittee of the Academic Senate (2004-2005)**


Outstanding Professor Sub-committee of the Faculty Affairs Committee (2003-2004)

CEAS Special Events Committee (2003 - 2004)

Student Affairs Committee, Teacher Education Department (2001-2003)

**Center for Character Education (2001-2003)**

**CSUEB COURSES**

Research in Education (TED 6901)

Reading and Language Arts: Research and Evaluation (TED 6250)

Reading and Language Arts: Field Experience (TED 6251)

Reading and Language Arts: Adolescent Literacy (TED 6240)

Reading and Language Arts: Advanced Clinical Experience (TED 6233)

Reading and Language Arts: Clinical Seminar (TED 6234)

Reading and Language Arts: Comprehension and Study Skills (TED 6253)

Reading and Language Arts: Fluency (TED 6230)

Reading and Language Arts: Diagnosis and Remediation (TED 6232)

Reading and Language Arts: Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners (TED 6220)

Reading and Language Arts: Foundations (TED 6210)

Reading/Language Arts: Assessment (TED 6231, 7983)

**Foundations of Curriculum Development (TED 6300)**

Equity and Diversity (TED 5355)
Social Studies in the Elementary School (TED 5365)
Team Seminar 1/2 (TED 5372/5373)
Team Seminar 3 (TED 5374)
Team Seminar 4 (TED 5375)

**Introduction to Multicultural Education (TED 5038)**
Mathematics in the Elementary School (TED 5350)

Team Leader for Concord Cohorts 92 and 93

**Developed New Courses for Early Childhood Education Minor:**

**E.C.E. Integrated Language Arts and Social Studies (TED 5071)**
E.C.E. Practicum (TED 5075)
VITA  
Linda D. Smetana

Home Address:  
106 Ardith Drive  
Orinda, California 94563  
Home: (925) 376-8539

Office Address:  
Department of Educational Psychology  
California State University, East Bay  
25800 Carlos Bee Boulevard  
Hayward, California 94542-3077  
Email: linda.smetana@csueastbay.edu

Earned Degrees

Ed.D.  Curriculum and Instruction, Brigham Young University
M.S.   Education, Emphasis in Reading Instruction California State University, Hayward.
AB     Psychology, University of California, Berkeley

California Credentials

Standard Elementary Credential- life
Learning Handicapped Credential- life
Resource Specialist Certificate of Competence- life
Reading Specialist- life
English Language Development (CLAD) Authorization
Tier 1 Administrative Services Credential (SLLA examination)
Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization (Completing September, 2013, Alliant University)

Professional Experience

California State University, East Bay Department of Educational Psychology

2011  
Professor of Special Education
Coordinator, Education Specialist Mild Moderate Disabilities Credential Programs;
Master’s of Science in Special Education, Option in Mild Moderate Disabilities Program
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization program developer –to be offered 9/2014
2008-2011  
Associate Professor of Special Education  
Coordinator, Education Specialist Mild Moderate Disabilities Credential Programs;  
Master’s of Science in Special Education, Option in Mild Moderate Disabilities Program  

California State University, East Bay Department of Teacher Education  

2001-2008  
2008  
Associate Professor and Multiple Subjects Coordinator  
2001-2008  
Dual Credential, Multiple Subject and Education Specialist (TED/SPED) Team Leader  
2005-2008  
Associate Professor Education  
2001-2005  
Assistant Professor of Education  

1990-2001  
Holy Names College, Oakland California  

1998-2001  
Associate Professor of Education  
Coordinator Education Specialist: Mild Moderate Disabilities Credential Program  
Coordinator Educational Therapist Certificate Program  
Literacy Specialist  

1998  
Clinical Supervisor, Raskob Learning Institute  

1993-1998  
Assistant Professor of Education  
Coordinator Learning Handicapped Credential Program  
Literacy Specialist  

1990-1993  
Assistant Professor (pro-rata)
1998 – 1999  Teaching Fellow, Sequoia Elementary School, Oakland, CA

1988 – 1989  Clinical Supervisor and Lecturer, St. Mary’s College, Moraga, CA

1986 - 1988  University of California, Berkeley, School of Education Advanced Reading, Language Leadership Program (ARLLP)
Assistant Director, Longfellow Reading Clinic
Fieldwork Supervisor
Lecturer

1987-1988  University of California, Berkeley, School of Education,
Visiting Scholar, School University Partnership for Educational Renewal (SUPER) Project

1987-1988  Consultant, San Francisco Unified Consent Decree Schools

1988 to 1993  University of California, Berkeley Extension Division
Course developer, instructor
x 343, The Reading Program (1988, 1991)
 x 344 Literature for Children of All Ages (1991)

1976- present  West Contra Costa Unified School District (Richmond Unified School District)

1978 – Resource Specialist, elementary and present continuation high school levels
Currently, Resource Specialist Madera Elementary School, El Cerrito, CA
1976-1978  Title I Project Director and Reading Specialist, Fairmede Elementary School

1972-1974  Pittsburg Unified School District
Teacher, State Demonstration Pre School

PUBLICATIONS

Book Chapter (peer reviewed)


Referred Journals


Publications in Progress


Non-refereed Publications

Smetana, L (2009, 2011) Education Specialist Mild Moderate Disability Programs, program document for CTC, NCATE accreditation reviews


Smetana, L. (2003) California State University, Hayward Special Education Intern Program California Special Education Intern Programs monograph

Books

RESEARCH INTERESTS

• Teacher preparation for literacy instruction
• Models for fieldwork supervision
• Collaboration for differentiation
• Graphic novels as motivational and instructional text
• Response to Intervention Tier 2: Creating effective intervention programs
• Strategic Intervention Model (SIM) Strategies
• Use of questioning as thinking strategies by students with learning disabilities

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


2010 Literacy Research Association (formerly National Reading Conference)
December 1-4, 2010, Fort Worth, Texas.
Graphic Novel Symposium Learning from Graphic Novels: Word and Images Meet (with T.D. Wolsey, D.L. Grisham, D. Lapp, N. Frey)

2010 Literacy Research Association (formerly National Reading Conference)
December 1-4, 2010, Fort Worth, Texas.
Teacher Education Research Study Group (TERSG) Alternative Session
Teacher Preparation and Literacy Development (with TERSG research group members)

Generative Technology for Teachers and Teacher Educators TILE SIG (Technology in Literacy Education Special Interest Group) with Dana Grisham
Engaging Deaf Students with Graphic Novels (with Dana Grisham)

Reno, Nevada.
A Look At Special Education Reform

2008 Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, National Conference, October 31-November 2, 2008, Dallas, Texas.
Developing Teacher Preparation Standards for Special Education Teachers of the Next Decade.

Re-structuring Special Education Teacher Certification: Role of IHE’s

TETF Preparing Teachers for Teaching Diverse Students: General Education/Special Education Collaboration (with members of the TETF panel)

Preparing Teachers to Teach in Inclusive Settings: What Teachers Need and How to Help Them.

Preparing Teachers to Teach in Inclusive Settings: Strategies for Success.

Enhancing Comprehension Through Visual Imagery
2004  38th California Reading Association, October 31-November 2, 2004, San Jose California.
Castles in the Air: Using Visual Imagery to Enhance Comprehension.

Storybook Reading: Engaging at Readers with Text.
News and Views: Using Reciprocal Teaching Strategies with Texts (2.5 hour workshop with Shira Lubliner).

News and Views: Using Reciprocal Teaching Strategies with Texts (with Shira Lubliner).

2003  48th International Reading Association, May 4-8, 2003 Orlando, Florida.
Vocabulary Instruction that Strengthens Comprehension (2.5 hour workshop, with Shira Lubliner).

Recognition or Recall: What Reading Comprehension Tests Really Measure (with Shira Lubliner).

Concept Development in Lesson Planning.

Test Format Differences in the Measurement of Reading Comprehension (with Shira Lubliner).

Questioning Strategies to Improve Comprehension of Content Area Text (with Shira Lubliner).

2002  California Council for Teacher Education, October 18-19, 2002, San Diego, California
Beyond Survival: Case Studies of Struggling Readers (with Thea Maestre).
2000  Holy Names College, Oakland, California, July 1, 2000
Sustaining Ourselves: Meeting the Challenge of Urban Schools
A Symposium for Teachers

1999  Parent University, Oakland Unified School District, October 1, 1999.
Multicultural Literature for Children's Enjoyment

1999  Holy Names College, Irvine Multicultural Project, July 2, 1999
Co-Leader Building Literacy in Multicultural Settings (with Thea Maestre)

1998  Olinda Elementary School
Learning About Learning Disabilities Over 50 hours of student and staff development regarding reading disabilities, ADD/ADHD, writing difficulties and other learning differences.

Learning Differences: Family Involvement, What to Do Next.
Families: Bridges to the Next Millennium Conference

1993  Unity Conference (by Fresno Pacific College and the San Joaquin County Office of Education) February 12, 1993
Making Connections: Developing Children's Enjoyment of Literature

Special Education, Is It Really Special? An overview and analysis of the laws and regulations that impact the education of student with suspected as well as identified special needs.

1992  26th California Reading Association, November 5-7, San Diego, California
Book Journeys: Developing Metacognitive Reading Strategies for Intermediate Grade Students
1988  West Contra Costa Unified School District, May 1, 1988
Introducing the California English/Language Arts Framework.

REPORT and DOCUMENT PREPARATION

2009  Response to the Standards of Quality for Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities Credential Programs

Preliminary Level I

Professional Level II

2009  Biennial Report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Data Report)
Education Specialist: Mild Moderate Disabilities
Credential Programs
Preliminary Level I
Professional Level II

2004  Response to the SB 2042 Standards for the Multiple Subjects Credential Program
(included structure and content of program; syllabi preparation)

2000  Response to the Standards of Quality for Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities Credential Program Level II

1997  Response to the Standards of Quality for Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities Credential Program Level I

1997  Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) Document
Education 336: Curriculum and Instruction Language Arts

1997  Certificate Program in Educational Therapy
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Committee on Teacher Special Education Design Team (wrote new standards for Credentialing: Education Specialist programs, added authorizations)

Special Education Task Force

Member Program Review Panel (new program review)

Board of Institutional Reviewers (on-site program review)

University Committees: Faculty Learning Community, Assessment and Instructional Learning Outcomes, 2010-2011

Faculty Affairs; Lecturer Subcommittee (2008-present)

Committee on Academic Program Review (CAPR) 2004-2009

Teacher Education Task Force (TETF), CSU Office of the Chancellor (2005-2007)

CAPR Representative to the Library Committee (2008-2009)


Higher Education Committee of the Oakland Cabinet

Faculty Development Committee, 1995-1997

Appointments Committee, 1993-1995

Admissions Committee, policy only 1993-1994


WASC Accreditation Standard subcommittee

School/College Committees: Unit Accreditation and Assessment Task Force (2009-present)


CEAS Special Events Committee (2001-2001)

CEAS College Council
Faculty Welfare Committee, 1997-2001
Program Review Committee 1996-1998

Department Committee PTR Kinesiology and Physical Education 2011-2012
Student Faculty Affairs Committee (2006-2008)
Faculty Search Committee (2007-2008)
Faculty Search Committee (2005-2006)
PTR Educational Leadership
PTR Hospitality, Leisure and Tourism
Curriculum Development Committee (2002-2004)

Teacher Education Committee, 1997-2001
Student Support Committee 1993-1998

Community Service

**Editorial Review Board:** *California Reader* (2009-present)

---

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

2010 California Teachers Association, Classroom Management

2009- present Alameda Unified School District
  Strategic Intervention Model

2009 University of Kansas, Center for Research on Learning
  Strategic Intervention Model
Courses in the Department of Educational Psychology
Educational Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities Program and Masters of Science in Special Education Program
EPSY 5021 Teaching Diverse Learners in General Education Settings
EPSY 6133 Curriculum for Mild Moderate Disabilities
EPSY 6134 Advanced Curriculum and Behavioral Support
EPSY 6206 Current and Emerging Research and Practice
EPSY 6021 Thesis/Project
EPSY 6023 Research
EPSY 6630 Induction Planning
EPSY 6670 Graduate Seminar Level I
EPSY 6820 Graduate Seminar II
EPSY 6127 Instruction and Behavioral Support (spring 2010)

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Courses in the Department in the Department of Teacher Education
Multiple Subject Credential Program
TED 5352 Reading A
TED 5353 Planning for Instruction
TED 5356 Reading B
TED 5360 Reading C: Language Arts
TED 5360 Language Arts and Social Studies
TED 5272, 73, 74, 75 Team Seminars
TED 5378 Teaching Diverse Learners in General Education Settings

Reading Specialist Credential Program
TED 6210 Foundations of Reading
TED 6230 Teaching Fluent Readers and Writers
TED 6231 Assessment in Reading Disabilities
TED 6232 Diagnostic Instruction in Reading Disabilities
TED 6233 Clinic in Reading Disabilities
TED 6234 Clinical Seminar in Reading Disabilities
TED 6253 Comprehension

Additional Courses
TED 6242 Multicultural Literature

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

May 31 –June 5 Preservice Educator Institute: Strategic Intervention Model (SIM) University of Kansas

September –March 2009-2010 Alameda Unified School District

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE)
International Reading Association (IRA)
California Reading Association (CRA)
National Reading Conference (NRC)
California Association of Professors of Special Education (CAPSE)
Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
Middle School Association

REFERENCES

Dr. Thea Maestre, Professor Dr. Jan Jones-Wadsworth
Department of Teacher Education retired consultant Commission on
Holy Names University Teacher Credentialing
Maestre@hnu.edu drjjw@aol.com

Dr. Michelle Cepello, Professor
Special Education
CSU Chico
mcepello@csuchico.edu