

LEE 254 Program Evaluation Report

In LEE 254-Supervised Field Experiences in Reading, students use evaluation tools and school data to construct an evaluation report of their school site's literacy program. In these reports, students provide analysis of data regarding school instructional procedures and curriculum materials, the strengths and weaknesses of these elements, and conclusions regarding program enhancement and professional development.

LEE 254 PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT RUBRIC

| LEE 254 PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT RUBRIC | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Components | Excellent 5 pts | Fair 3 pts | Poor 1 pts |
| RTI (Interventions)/ Assessment Practices | | | |
| Tiers How many levels? What are they like? When? Who teaches? | All levels of interventions listed and thoroughly described. Includes program names, materials, schedules, grouping, and instructor qualifications. | All levels of interventions listed, and most thoroughly described (classroom/pull-out). Description may not include all key elements. | Few levels of interventions are listed and description lacks many of the key components. |
| Assessment What tools? How administered? How analyzed? What purpose? | 3 tools used to measure student learning in various grade levels are presented and thoroughly described. Includes how tools are used for placement, monitoring, and transition out of programs. | 2-3 tools are listed, and most are thoroughly described. Description may not include all key elements: placement, monitoring, transition. | Few tools are listed and descriptions lack many of the key components. |
| Achievement Data | Data from at least 3 tools used to measure student learning in various grade levels are presented and results are clearly and accurately interpreted. | Data from at least 2 tools used to measure student learning in various grade levels are presented, but results may be unclearly or inaccurately interpreted. | Data from only 1 tool are presented, and results may be unclearly or inaccurately interpreted. |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>RTI Analysis</p> | <p>Clearly written and accurately reflects data provided. Thoroughly synthesizes strengths and weaknesses of all components. Supported by at least 2 APA cited references to current research.</p> | <p>Analysis is clearly written and accurately reflects data provided. Strengths/weaknesses are not clearly synthesized across all components. Analysis is supported by at least 1 APA cited reference to current research.</p> | <p>Not clearly written; does not accurately reflect data provided. Strengths/weaknesses not clearly synthesized across all components. No references to current research.</p> |
| <p>Literacy Instruction</p> | | | |
| <p>Activities/Groups (e.g., teacher read aloud, small group, whole class)</p> | <p>Quantitative and Qualitative data are presented from interviews, observations and surveys across grade levels. Types and frequency of instructional activities and grouping structures are clearly described.</p> | <p>Quantitative and Qualitative data are presented from interviews, observations and surveys across grade levels. Types and frequency of instructional activities and grouping structures are vaguely described.</p> | <p>Report does not include both Quantitative and Qualitative data. Types and frequency of instructional activities and grouping structures are vaguely described.</p> |
| <p>Reading Components (e.g., Vocabulary comprehension, phonics)</p> | <p>Quantitative and Qualitative data are presented. Types and frequency of reading areas taught are clearly described.</p> | <p>Quantitative and Qualitative data are presented from interviews, observations and surveys across grade levels. Types and frequency of reading areas taught are vaguely described.</p> | <p>Does not include both Quantitative and Qualitative data. Types and frequency of reading areas taught are vaguely described.</p> |
| <p>Writing Skills (Process, Components)</p> | <p>Quantitative and Qualitative data are presented from interviews, observations and surveys across grade levels. Types and frequency of writing instruction are clearly described.</p> | <p>Quantitative and Qualitative data are presented from interviews, observations and surveys across grade levels. Types and frequency of writing instruction are vaguely described.</p> | <p>Report does not include both Quantitative and Qualitative data. Types and frequency of writing instruction are vaguely described.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Instruction Analysis</p> | <p>Clearly written and accurately reflects data provided. Thoroughly synthesizes the strengths/weaknesses of all components. Analysis is supported by at least 2 APA cited references to current research.</p> | <p>Analysis is clearly written and accurately reflects data provided. Strengths/weaknesses are not clearly synthesized across all components. Analysis is supported by at least 1 APA cited reference to current research.</p> | <p>Not clearly written; does not accurately reflect data provided. Strengths/weaknesses not synthesized across all components. No references to current research.</p> |
| <p>Instructional Materials</p> | | | |
| <p>Use of Materials (texts, books, workbooks, videos, websites)</p> | <p>Quantitative and Qualitative data are presented. Types and frequency of use of instructional materials clearly described. Includes: type of material, genre, use/purpose.</p> | <p>Quantitative and Qualitative data are presented from interviews, observations and surveys across grade levels. Description lacks key components: type of material, genre, use/purpose.</p> | <p>Does not include both Quantitative and Qualitative data. Description lacks components: type of material, genre and use/purpose.</p> |
| <p>Technology Resources</p> | <p>Quantitative and Qualitative data are presented. Types and frequency of use of instructional technology are clearly described. Description includes type of material, genre and use/purpose.</p> | <p>Quantitative and Qualitative data are presented from interviews, observations and surveys across grade levels. Types and frequency of use of instructional technology are described. Description may lack key components: type of material, genre and use/purpose.</p> | <p>Does not include both Quantitative and Qualitative data. Types and frequency of use of instructional technology are vaguely described, Description lacks key components: type of material, genre and use/purpose.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Materials Analysis | Analysis is clearly written and accurately reflects data provided. Analysis thoroughly synthesizes the strengths/weaknesses of this area and is supported by at least 2 APA cited references to current research. | Analysis is clearly written and accurately reflects data provided. Strengths/weaknesses are not clearly synthesized across all components. Analysis is supported by at least 1 APA cited reference to current research. | Not clearly written; does not accurately reflect data provided. Strengths/weaknesses not identified. Not supported by references to current research. |
| Recommendations Weighted x4 | | | |
| Program Elements | Succinct and precise summary synthesizes information from report to clearly identify areas of strength and need. Conclusions are strongly supported by evidence in the report and recommendations for refinements are supported by at least 4 research references. | Summary synthesizes most information from report to identify most areas of strength and need. Some conclusions are not supported by evidence in the report and recommendations for refinements are supported by less than 4 research references. | Synthesis of information to identify areas of strength and need is lacking. Conclusions not supported by evidence in report, recommendations are supported by less than 4 research references. |
| Professional Development | Clearly identifies areas of need for future PD. Content of PD is strongly supported by evidence in the report and formats for PD are supported by at least 4 research references from PD literature and Adult Learning Theory literature. | Report identifies most areas of need for future professional development. Some content of PD is not supported by evidence in the report and recommended processes/formats for PD are supported by less than 4 research references from PD literature and Adult Learning Theory literature. | Report does not identify need for future professional development. Many PD recommendations not supported by report or 4 research references from PD literature and Adult Learning Theory literature. |
| Format/Writing Conventions | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|
| Writing Mechanics | Excellent scholarly writing. Organization is logical. Report is carefully written and edited, free of serious grammar, syntax, spelling and punctuation errors. | Organization is adequate but at times difficult to follow. Report shows some signs of editing, but needs more care to address grammar, syntax, spelling and punctuation errors. | Report is disorganized and difficult to follow. Report contains serious grammar, syntax, spelling and punctuation errors. |
| APA Requirements | All citations provided in body of text and reference section Accurately adheres to APA style in formatting, organization, and construction. | Minor errors in formatting of the citations | The paper does not follow APA guidelines for in text citations or references |