

Program Level Learning Outcomes Assessment¹
Annual Program Assessment Report
M.Ed. Reading Specialist Program

Annual Program Assessment Reports should be based on program assessment plans; be approximately three to five pages in length; and provide the following²:

1. Brief Program Overview (250 words max.)

The M.Ed. in Reading program is designed specifically to deepen K-12 teachers' pedagogical content knowledge with the aim of improved student (K-12) literacy achievement. This program is delivered in e-Learning formats so that it is possible to complete the degree while teaching in one's own district. Technological tools facilitate course delivery, communication, and research. Candidates in the reading program focus on developmental, cognitive, and sociocultural aspects of reading acquisition, instruction, and assessment. Professional and caring attitudes and beliefs about teaching lead to responsive and rigorous instruction in reading and literacy for all K-12 students, including those who are culturally and linguistically diverse. Accomplished teaching professionals promote collaboration with students, colleagues, parents, families, and the larger community to improve literacy learning and student achievement in their contexts. Students prepare an exit portfolio that is aligned to the program standards of the International Literacy Association (2017 Standards) to demonstrate levels of knowledge and pedagogy commensurate with the skills and dispositions of highly competent advanced teaching professionals.

2. Program Level Learning Outcomes (PLOs). Note whether the PLOs listed in the UAS Course Catalog (CourseLeaf) are correct and written properly (measurable outcomes, not all starting with "students will", etc.). If applicable, list the date corrected in Courseleaf.

The program level learning outcomes on CourseLeaf are correct.

STANDARD 1. Foundational Knowledge Candidates demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical, conceptual, historical, and evidence-based foundations of literacy and language, the ways in which they interrelate, and the role of the reading/literacy specialist in schools.

STANDARD 2. Curriculum and Instruction: Candidates use foundational knowledge to design literacy curricula to meet needs of learners, especially those who experience difficulty with literacy; design, implement, and evaluate small-group and individual evidence-based literacy instruction for learners; collaborate with teachers to implement effective literacy practices.

STANDARD 3: Assessment and Evaluation: Candidates understand, select, and use valid, reliable, fair, and appropriate assessment tools to screen, diagnose, and measure student

¹ PLOs describe what we want our students to know or have learned by the time they finish the program

² **Enrollment Data (SCH, retention rates, graduation rates, etc.) do not need to be included in the assessment report.**

literacy achievement; inform instruction and evaluate interventions; assist teachers in their understanding and use of assessment results; advocate for appropriate literacy practices to relevant stakeholders.

STANDARD 4: Diversity and Equity: Candidates demonstrate knowledge of research, relevant theories, pedagogies, and essential concepts of diversity and equity; demonstrate an understanding of themselves and others as cultural beings; create classrooms and schools that are inclusive and affirming; advocate for equity at school, district, and community levels.

STANDARD 5: Learners and the Literacy Environment Candidates meet the developmental needs of all learners and collaborate with school personnel to use a variety of print and digital materials to engage and motivate all learners; integrate digital technologies in appropriate, safe, and effective ways; foster a positive climate that supports a literacy-rich learning environment.

STANDARD 6: Professional Learning and Leadership: Candidates demonstrate the ability to be reflective literacy professionals, who apply their knowledge of adult learning to work collaboratively with colleagues; demonstrate their leadership and facilitation skills; advocate on behalf of teachers, students, families, and communities.

3. How the data is collected on the PLOs (rubrics, portfolios, etc.)

The data is collected through course assignments (See Assessment Plan) that are aligned with the six International Literacy Association Standards. There are rubrics for each assignment.

Additionally, student grades and qualitative responses to mid-semester reflections and end of course reflections are drawn on to continue to refine and improve practice.

4. The data collected on the PLOs during the previous academic year (assessment period)

Program data are collected at several junctures, according to CAEP and ILA. The assessments that will be used for reporting and analysis in this round of data reporting include:

1	Licensure assessment or other content-based assessment	Foundations Essay	EDRE 674	Early program
2	Assessment of Content Knowledge	Portfolio	EDRE 698	End of program
3	Assessment of Candidate ability to plan instruction	Analysis of Instructional Practice	EDRE 675	Mid program
4	Assessment of internship, practicum,, or other clinical	Teaching Video and Reflection	EDRE 680	Mid program

	experience	Project		
5	Assessment of candidate effect on student learning	Instructional Case Study	EDRE 681	Mid program
6	Assessment that addresses ILA Standards	Colleague Coaching Analysis	EDRE 696	Capstone/End of program

5. An evaluation/analysis of the data collected

All candidates who completed the program last year met the standards (ILA, 2017). Five of seven completers in 2024 consistently scored “exceeds” on their portfolio. Two of the seven completers scored “meets” with some “exceeds.”

Throughout the program, opportunities to assess candidates growth in proficiency toward the standards occur in a variety of ways: Opportunities to view their video recordings of classroom practice where they apply ideas explored in each course, reading their written analyses of classroom practice and the connections they make to course content, observations of their discussions in class meetings, as well as their reflections on course content in reading journals.

Each of these data points allows for direct communication and feedback that is formative. Because there are multiple iterations of analysis of classroom practice across courses, this formative feedback supports continual refinement of both practice and analysis.

6. Conclusions and plans for program improvement

In the Foundations Essay, criteria related to understanding of the writing process was added to make even more explicit the connections between reading and writing processes.

Each of the instructional video assignments has an added component of making connections to course content evident (based on data that candidates were not always articulating how they were applying ideas from the readings to their instructional design). Lastly, additional scaffolds and models for colleague coaching were added based on the previous cohort’s engagements in coaching conversations that did not fully integrate concepts related to adult learning. A new course text seems to be resonating well with candidates as they are digging in to the purposes and approaches to collegial coaching (aligned to ILA Standard 6).

We are continuing to be responsive to the Alaska Reads Act. Most districts have adopted new reading curricula. We do not teach to a particular curriculum, but I have found that continuing to support candidates in understanding the purpose and rationale for the different aspects of their

curricular materials is essential for responsive implementation. We are also working to continue to support candidates to select and analyze texts to engage their students.