

Texas A&M International University

Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER)

Date Submitted February 28, 2007

Assessment Period Covered (2006)

Academic Program/AES Unit Master of Science in Education-Reading

Person(s) Preparing Review Dr. Cathy Guerra

Provide summary of the last cycle's use of results and changes implemented

Assessment of Students' Performance: The report that was submitted to the department at the December 2005 meeting indicated that 01 student had taken the Reading Specialist exam during the last testing period and had passed. It also mentioned that during the year two additional students (a total of 3 for year) had taken this exam and passed it. It also stated that the Reading faculty will continue to examine the curriculum in our program to determine how we can continue to enhance our students' performance on this examination and their eventual performance in the field.

Recommendation(s): Reading faculty will meet early in the Spring 2006 term to review the Reading Specialist Certification program competencies and their corresponding descriptors. We will also examine the opportunities that our students have to be introduced to this information, to encounter it multiple times, and eventually to apply it in meaningful, real-world terms throughout their coursework. We also plan to meet with Reading Specialists working in the field to gain additional insights regarding the challenges that they are encountering. To the extent possible, we will explore these issues at appropriate places in the curriculum to help prospective Reading Specialists develop potential alternatives for addressing these matters.

Section I: Planning and Implementation

Institutional Mission

Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, prepares students for leadership roles in their chosen profession in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society ... Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University embodies a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

Academic Program or Administrative/Educational Support Unit Mission

The mission of the College of Education at Texas A&M International University is to provide a comprehensive and coherent professional development system for educators which links all aspects of the educational profession. Through educational experiences provided by this system, educators will be prepared to provide learner-centered instructional experiences that promote

excellence and equity for all students in the field.

Identify outcomes and the relationship to Strategic Plan

Outcome 1

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?

Students completing the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will demonstrate their understanding of the principles of instruction surrounding successful reading programs.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 1

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 1

1.7 Establish and pursue student learning outcomes appropriate for each program with systematic assessment and use of results for continuous quality improvement.

Identify methods of assessment to be used

1a. During their oral comprehensive examination, students seeking the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will demonstrate their understanding of principles of instruction surrounding successful reading programs by responding to questions asked by three faculty members regarding the following topics, with a score of at least 2 out of 3 on a rubric developed by Reading faculty: (1) components of literacy that facilitate instruction; (2) resources designed to facilitate reading instruction; and (3) procedures designed to facilitate reading instruction. 1b. During their thesis or research paper defense, students seeking the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will demonstrate their understanding of principles of instruction surrounding successful reading programs by explaining how relevant principles have been incorporated into their thesis or research paper. Students will be expected to achieve a score of at least 3 out of 4 on a rubric developed by Reading faculty. Aspects to be addressed include: (1) Introduction (including statement of purpose, research problem, research question(s), significance of study; (2) Discussion of relevant research reviewed; (3) Methodology and results (thesis only); (4) Conclusions reached, accompanied by appropriate rationale; and (5) Limitations and recommendations.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

The average score of students pursuing the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will be 2 on the rubric for assessment method 1a and the average score on the rubric for students will be 3 on the assessment method 1b.

Outcome 2

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?

Students completing the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will demonstrate their understanding of principles of assessment to meet the needs of diverse learners in successful reading programs.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 2

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 2

1.7 Establish and pursue student learning outcomes appropriate for each program with systematic assessment and use of results for continuous quality improvement.

Identify methods of assessment to be used

2a. During their oral comprehensive examination, students seeking the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will demonstrate their understanding of principles of assessment to meet the needs of diverse learners in successful reading programs by responding to questions asked by three faculty members regarding the following topics with a score of at least 2 out of 3 on a rubric developed by Reading faculty: (1) oral language; (2) phonological awareness; (3) alphabetic principle; (4) word identification; (5) reading fluency; (6) reading comprehension; (7) vocabulary; and (8) written language.

2b. During their thesis or research paper defense, students seeking the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will demonstrate their understanding of principles of assessment to meet the needs of diverse learners in successful reading programs by explaining how relevant principles have been incorporated into their thesis or research paper. The following sections must be addressed and a score of at least 3 out of 4 achieved on the rubric developed by Reading faculty: (1) Introduction (research problem or question, purpose, statement of problem, significance); (2) Discussion of relevant research reviewed; (3) Methodology and results (thesis only); (4) Conclusions reached accompanied by appropriate rationale; and (5) Limitations and recommendations.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

The average score of students pursuing the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will be 2 on the rubric for assessment method 2a and the average score of students on the rubric for assessment method 2b will be 3.

Outcome 3

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?

Students completing the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will demonstrate their understanding of principles of leadership necessary for developing successful reading programs.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 3

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 3

1.7 Establish and pursue student learning outcomes appropriate for each program with systematic assessment and use of results for continuous quality improvement.

Identify methods of assessment to be used

3a. During their oral comprehensive examination, students seeking the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will demonstrate their understanding of professional knowledge required for effective leadership in successful reading programs by responding to questions asked by three faculty members regarding the following topics with a score of at least 2 out of 3 on a rubric developed by Reading faculty: (1) theoretical foundations of literacy; (2) research-based reading/literacy curriculum; and (3) collaborating and communicating with educational stakeholders. 3b. Students pursuing the Reading Specialist Professional Certificate as part of their Master's degree program will take the TExES Reading Specialist examination. Student success on the Reading Specialist examination will be used to assess the program. Results on each domain of the examination will be analyzed to determine areas where changes may be needed to strengthen the overall program.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

The average score of students pursuing the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading on assessment method 3a will be 2. The Benchmark Criteria for 3b assessment method will be: A minimum of 70% of students taking the Reading Specialist examination during the assessment cycle will pass the examination with a minimum score of 240.

Section II: Analysis of Results

When (term/date) was assessment conducted?

Outcome 1

Summer/August 2005 and Fall/December 2006

Outcome 2

Summer/August 2005 and Fall/December 2006

Outcome 3

Spring 2006/April 29, 2006

What were the results attained (raw data)?

Outcome 1

1A. Oral Comprehensive Examination: Scores of 2.3, 2.4, 2.9, and 3.0 on the rubric with a mean of 2.65, based on a 3-point scale. All students attained passing scores on the rubric.

1B. Thesis Defense: Three of the four students participated in the thesis defense, obtaining the following scores on the rubric: 3.25, 4.0, and 3.9 with a mean of 3.71, based on a 4-point scale. All three students attained passing scores on the rubric.

Outcome 2

2A. Oral Comprehensive Examination: Scores of 2.3, 2.4, 2.9, and 3.0 with a mean of 2.65 on the rubric, based on a three-point scale. All students attained passing scores on the rubric.

2B. Thesis Defense: Three of the four students participated in the thesis defense, obtaining the following scores on the rubric: 3.25, 4.0, and 3.9 with a mean of 3.71, based on a 4-point scale. All three students attained passing grades.

Outcome 3

3A. Oral Comprehensive Examination: Scores of 2.3, 2.4, 2.9, and 3.0 with a mean of 2.65 on the rubric, based on a three-point scale. All students attained passing scores on the rubric.

3B. Reading Specialist Exam: One student took the exam (April 29, 2006). The student attained a passing score on the exam and was certified as a Reading Specialist.

Who (specify names) conducted analysis of data?

Outcome 1

Dr. Barbara Greybeck

Outcome 2

Dr. Barbara Greybeck

Outcome 3

Dr. Barbara Greybeck

When were the results and analysis shared and with whom (department chair, supervisor, staff, external stakeholders)? Submit minutes with data analysis to assessment@tamiu.edu (Please use Minutes Template located on the [Project INTEGRATE web page.](#))

The faculty committee responsible for overseeing the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading met on January 25, 2007, to review assessment results for the candidates who completed the program during the reporting year. The committee includes Dr. Juan Lira, Dr. Barbara Greybeck, and Dr. Cathy Guerra. All members were present for the meeting. A total of four students completed the program. All four took the Oral Comprehensive Exam, and all four passed, based on scores on the rubric. Three students participated in the thesis defense, and all three passed the thesis defense as documented on their rubrics. One student was pursuing the Reading Specialist certificate and took the Reading Specialist exam. That student achieved a passing score on the test. A more detailed account is found in the minutes which have been submitted as indicated above.

NOTE: Submit all assessment documentation (i.e., surveys, rubrics, course exams with embedded questions, etc.) to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.

Use of Results: Indicate whether criteria were met/not met and what changes, if any, have been identified based on the data collected?

Outcome 1

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: Four students graduated with an M.S. in Reading since the spring of 2005. All four students took the Oral Comprehensive Exam and all four students scored above 2 on the rubric measuring their understanding of the principles of instruction for successful programs, based on a passing score of 2 out of 3. Three of the four students participated in the Thesis Defense. The three students all scored above 3 on the rubric measuring understanding of principles of instruction for successful reading programs, based on a passing score of 3 out of 4.

Outcome 2

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: Four students graduated with an M.S. in Reading since the spring of 2005. All four students scored above 2 on the rubric (2 out of 3) measuring their understanding of principles of assessment to meet the needs of diverse learners. The three students who participated in the Thesis Defense all scored above 3 on the rubric measuring their understanding of principles of assessment, based on a passing score of 3 out of 4.

Outcome 3

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: Four students graduated with an M.S. in Reading since the spring of 2005. All four students scored above 2 on the rubric (2 out of 3) measuring their understanding of principles of leadership necessary for developing successful reading programs. Only one student

who graduated took the Reading Specialist Exam. That student achieved a passing score, for a 100% pass rate.

How have these data-based changes improved your program/unit?

Although the number of students graduating has been low, the data have given us a basis to guide course development to focus on the understandings required for successful reading professionals. In addition, the assessment process has provided a focus for helping to ensure that students taking the Professional Reading Specialist exam are well-prepared.

Section III: Programmatic Review

Are resources affected by the changes identified in Section II? Yes No

If so, specify the effect(s) using the chart below:

Funding	Physical	Other
<input type="checkbox"/> New resources required	<input type="checkbox"/> New or reallocated space	<input type="checkbox"/> Primarily faculty/staff time
<input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation of current funds		<input type="checkbox"/> University rule/procedure change only
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other: Enter text here

Provide a narrative description and justification for requested resources (include linkage to Strategic Plan)

Enter text here

Identify proposed outcomes for the next assessment cycle:
Continuation of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for continuation): The recommendation of the committee reviewing data is to continue using the assessment and outcomes that are in place. The reason for continuing is that, to date, so few students have completed the Masters in Reading. The committee wants more data for the present outcomes before making any changes.
New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below): Enter text here
Modification of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for modification): Enter text here

****** This section to be completed by dean/director/vice-president ******

Are resources requested a priority for the academic program/AES unit?

Yes No

Comments:

Enter text here

If funding, physical or other resources were requested, what is the impact of the budget decisions on the academic program/AES unit?

Enter text here