

Texas A&M International University

Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER)

Date Submitted May 22, 2007 -- Revised 2007 Report

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

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. 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. 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.

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. The data collected and analyzed to this point indicate that the program is effective in preparing graduate students in the area of Reading.

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.

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 faculty members on 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 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. Students will be expected to achieve a score of at least 3 out of 4 on a rubric developed by Reading faculty. Areas 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 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 defense, students seeking the Master of Science in Education with a major in Reading will demonstrate 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 on 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

Spring 2007, Fall 2007, and Summer 2007

Outcome 2

Spring 2007, Fall 2007, and Summer 2007

Outcome 3

Spring 2007, Fall 2007, and Summer 2007

What were the results attained (raw data)?

Outcome 1

1a. Oral Comprehensive Examination. Students taking the oral comprehensive examination were required to demonstrate their understanding of principles of instruction surrounding successful reading programs. Questions were asked in the following areas: (1) components of literacy that facilitate instruction; (2) resources designed to facilitate reading instruction; and (3) procedures designed to facilitate reading instruction. Eight students took the oral comprehensive examination in the Spring 2007. The average score was 2.48, based on a scale of 3, on the rubric. In the Fall 2007, four students took the oral comprehensive exam. The average score was 2.75. In the Summer 2007, one student took the oral comprehensive examination and scored an average on all items tested on the rubric of 2.83. All students who took the oral comprehensive examination for the Master of Science in Education-Reading during 2007 satisfactorily completed the oral comprehensive examination, with an overall average for the year of 2.74. 1b. Thesis Defense. Three students completed a thesis defense in the Spring 2007. The average score on the thesis defense was 3.66, based on a rubric ranging from 0 - 4. All three students satisfactorily completed their thesis defense. No students who completed the Master of Education - Reading during the Fall 2007 and Summer 2007 semesters wrote a thesis as part of their degree requirements. Therefore, they were not required to undergo the thesis defense.

Outcome 2

2a. Oral Comprehensive. Outcome two required students to demonstrate their understanding of principles of assessment to meet the needs of diverse learners in successful reading programs. In the Spring 2007, the average score on the oral comprehensive examination was 2.25 for the eight students who took the examination. The average score for the four students taking the oral comprehensive examination in the Fall 2007 was 2.5, and in the Summer 2007 the student who completed the oral comprehensive examination scored an average of 2.44. The overall average performance on outcome 2 for the year was 2.41. 2b. Thesis Defense. The three students who completed a thesis and sat for the thesis defense in the Spring 2007 successfully completed the examination, with an average of 3.66.

Outcome 3

3a. Oral Comprehensive. On the oral comprehensive exam, students were expected to

demonstrate their understanding of principles of leadership necessary for developing successful reading programs. The eight students who took the oral examination in the Spring 2007 achieved an average score of 1.95. In the Fall 2007, the average score achieved by the four students who took the oral comprehensive examination was 2.37. The student who took the oral examination in the Summer 2007 scored 3.0 on the rubric. The overall score achieved by all students who took the oral comprehensive examination during 2007 was 2.44. It is to be noted that the area of leadership was shown to be the area in which students were weakest. Principles of leadership for reading programs is an area that needs to be addressed more fully. 3b. Reading Specialist Examination. Five graduate students pursued the Reading Specialist certificate during 2007 and completed the Reading Specialist Examination. All five students passed the Reading Specialist Examination with scores ranging from 260 - 292 out of a possible 300 points on the test. The Reading Specialist Examination is not required for students who are pursuing the Master of Science in Education-Reading. The Reading Specialist Examination is taken only by those students who are pursuing the Reading Specialist Certificate. For this reason, the number of students taking the Reading Specialist Examination is lower than the total number of students completing the Masters Degree in Reading.

Who (specify names) conducted analysis of data?

Outcome 1

Dr. Cathy L. Guerra

Outcome 2

Dr. Cathy L. Guerra

Outcome 3

Dr. Cathy L. Guerra

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.)**

Results and analysis were shared with the Department of Curriculum and Instruction faculty at their monthly meeting on February 12, 2008. Faculty agreed that some modifications in the assessment process for the Master of Science in Education-Reading are needed to enable faculty to focus more closely on strengthening the Leadership Strand of the program. On February 22, 2008, the committee for the MS in Reading met to further discuss the results and to prioritize needs for improvement. It was decided that in addition to focusing on leadership, students need additional reinforcement in the areas of theory and research on reading.

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: Criteria were met overall. Components of literacy and procedures to facilitate reading instruction should be emphasized more strongly, since not all students pursuing the Masters Degree in Reading have the same background in the area of Reading.

Outcome 2

Met **Not Met**

Provide narrative: Students' responses on the rubric indicated that they possess a good understanding of principles of assessment and the role of assessment in meeting the needs of diverse learners.

Outcome 3

Met **Not Met**

Provide narrative: Although the overall score was satisfactory for this outcome, some individual responses indicate a need to increase the emphasis on this component of the graduate Reading program. Specific graduate courses in Reading will be designated to include increased emphasis on the area of leadership, especially as it pertains to leadership of reading programs.

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

The faculty will begin to examine competencies in Leadership that are tested on the Reading Specialist Examination as a guide for developing a more defined instrument for assessing the effectiveness of the program in delivering the leadership component by looking at the three components identified as necessary for effective leadership in reading programs: (1) theoretical foundations of literacy; (2) research-based reading/literacy curriculum; and (3) collaborating and communicating with educational stakeholders.

Faculty further agreed that a set of questions for assessing leadership competencies be generated so that questions will be more uniform.

A third modification will be the development of a Survey of Student Perceptions. This instrument will be used to collect data beginning with the 2008 academic year. Faculty expressed the importance of students evaluating the program.

A fourth modification will be a change in the sequence of courses so that students will complete the Foundations of Research course (EDGR 5320) earlier in the program.

A fifth modification will be the addition of field activities related to leadership.

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):
Enter text here

New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below):

New outcomes will be focused on the Leadership Strand of the Master of Science in Education -Reading Program. Other outcomes that have been evaluated have proven to be strong. However, it is the Leadership Strand that appears to need improvement. Therefore, the following outcomes will be assessed beginning in 2008:

(1)(a) During their oral comprehensive examination, students will demonstrate their understanding of the theoretical foundations of literacy based on their responses to questions, with an average minimum score of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale on a rubric developed by Reading faculty. (1)(b) Students will complete a Survey of Student Perceptions to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Master of Science in Education - Reading program in meeting their professional goals.

(2)(a) During their oral comprehensive examination, students will demonstrate their understanding of research-based reading/literacy curriculum based on their responses to questions on a rubric developed by Reading faculty, with an average minimum score of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale. (2)(b) Students will complete a Survey of Student Perceptions to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the master of Science in Education - Reading program in meeting their professional goals.

(3)(a) During their oral comprehensive examination, students will demonstrate their understanding of the role and processes for collaborating and communicating with educational stakeholders based on their responses to questions on a rubric developed by Reding faculty, with an average minimum score of 2.0 on a 3.0 scale. (3)(b) Students will complete a Survey of Student Perceptions to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Master of Science in Education- Reading program in meeting their professional goals.

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