



Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report
(For Institutions in the Yellow, Blue, and Violet Cohort Due Summer/Fall 2012)
Academic Years 2010-11 and 2011-12

Institution	California State University, Fresno	
Date report is submitted	August 1, 2012	
Program documented in this report	Reading/Language Arts Specialist	
Name of Program	Reading/Language Arts	
Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)	Traditional	
Credential awarded	Reading/Language Arts Specialist	
If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered		
Program Contact	Imelda Basurto	
Title	Reading/Language Arts Coordinator	
Phone #	559.278.0285	
E-Mail	ibasurto@csufresno.edu	
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:		
Name		
Title		
Phone #		
E-mail		

BIENNIAL REPORT
California State University, Fresno (2010-2012)
Section A. Part I
Contextual Information

READING/LANGUAGE ARTS SPECIALIST CREDENTIAL PROGRAM

California State University, Fresno is one of twenty-three universities in the California State University system. Fresno State began as a normal school in 1911 and has a strong history of service and preparation of educational professionals. Its last joint accreditation (NCTE/CCTC) visit was in March 2006. The Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential program is one of 16 programs, headed by the Dean of the Kremen School of Education and Human Development (KSOEHD)

The Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential program is designed to help teachers learn how to make curricular decisions about the teaching of reading and how to meet the needs of students with varying language communication backgrounds. Its mission is *“to inspire teachers to upgrade the reading/language abilities of students through demonstrations of effective reading strategies.”* More specifically, the goal of the program is to prepare candidates to plan, organize, and develop reading programs for schools.

It (Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential) is integrated with the Master of Arts degree in Education with an in emphasis in Reading/Language Arts offered by KSOEHD. The Master’s Degree in Education is a 30-unit degree. It consists of a 12-unit core that all students in the program are required to take along with 9 units of electives, and 9 units of research and measurement. Of the many master’s degree courses offered, 27 units may be applied to the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential. The credential is available only to those graduate students already holding a valid California teaching credential. While not required, most Specialist Credential Candidates complete the Master’s Degree. Note: Our master’s degree is also available online. It was approved in the fall of 2010 by WASC and the Chancellor’s Office of the CSU System.

Graduate students enrolled in the Reading Language Arts Specialists complete 18 semester units of Reading/Language Arts core subject matter and 9 units of supervised field work. The core subject matter courses include literacy processes (LEE 278), K-12 language arts practices (LEE 213), assessment of reading abilities (LEE 224), language issues in reading (LEE 215), children & adolescent literature (LEE 214), and research for reading professionals (LEE 244). Core subject matter competence is documented through the completion of the program and confirmation of key assessments. The supervised field work courses are LEE 230, LEE 234 and LEE 254.

LEE 230 is taken after the core courses have been completed followed by LEE 234 and LEE 254. Candidates in LEE 254 spend a portion of their time shadowing a certified Reading Specialist and perform district and community-based program evaluation. In LEE 230, candidates demonstrate effective elementary reading practices by tutoring a small group of elementary, remedial readers where as in LEE 234 they demonstrate effective secondary reading

practices by tutoring one secondary level student. Field experiences courses are documented through the verification of a Matrix of Experience form. This form is a summative compilation of all the candidates' fieldwork experiences needed for the master's degree and the certificate of advanced study, which is the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential. It also serves as a program assessment tool.

All courses are offered in a predetermined sequence on and off-campus, and online. Off campus courses are offered as a cohort model. A cohort model allows candidates to master courses as a learning community and streamlines the sequence to meet the needs of the candidates in the cohort. The sequence of courses in the Reading/Language Arts Specialist credential is outlined in the master's degree program brochure. This brochure is provided to all candidates in their first semester course, LEE 278.

From the fall 2010 through the spring of 2012, 89 graduate students were seeking a master's degree with a Reading/Language Arts emphasis. Of those 89, 59 candidates were enrolled in the Reading Specialist Credential program. Of the 59 candidates, 27 completed the specialist credential program. Table 1 below indicates the number of candidates by cohort.

Table 1. Enrollees and Completers for Semesters 2010-2012

Semester	Cohort	Master's Degree	Specialists Credential	Completers Graduates	Complete Specialists
Fall 2010	Clovis (New)	23	20	0	0
Spr 2011				0	0
Fall 2011				0	0
Spr 2012				0	0
Fall 2010	Visalia (New)	19	16	0	0
Spr 2011				0	0
Fall 2011				0	0
Spr 2012				0	0
Fall 2011	On-Campus	15	8	0	0
Spr 2012				0	0
Fall 2010	*Hanford	0	7	0	7
Spr 2011					
*(May 2010 Graduates)					
Fall 2010	Leavenworth	13	5	13	0
Spr 2011				0	0
Fall 2010	Madera	7	5	7	0
Spr 2011				0	0
Fall 2010	Sanger	12	10	12	0
Spr 2011				0	0
Fall 2011				12	0
Spr 2012				0	10
TOTALS		89	59	32	27

Changes since Commission Approval of Current Program Document (2010-2012):

1. New textbook (Serafini) adopted for LEE 234 Fall 2010
2. Formulated a partnership with Clovis Unified School District Fall 2010
3. Matrix for LEE 230,234, & 254 reviewed Fall 2010
4. Added new technologies Spr 2011
5. Graduate Student Handbook Approved Spr 2012

California State University, Fresno (2010-2012)
Section A. Part II
Candidate Assessment/Performance & Program Effectiveness Information

Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

A. Candidate Key Assessments:

Theory to Practice Paper and Project. Graduate students are expected to connect theory with practice and to demonstrate exemplary practices. This is accomplished in the first semester in LEE 213, Teaching the Language Arts in K-12. In LEE 213, graduate students write a research paper and conduct a project, which demonstrates research based exemplary practices. This project is assessed using a course specific rubric.

Reading/Language Arts Specialist Instructional Portfolio (LEE 230) – Each candidate prepares a Reading/Language Arts Specialist Instructional Portfolio during the semester the candidate is enrolled in the initial field experience course. This portfolio consists of chronology field log, tutee profiles, tutee testing, lesson plans, professional readings, and tutor self-examination. Candidates must score a 48 or higher on a 60-point scale to document proficiency for the portfolio requirements. The fieldwork supervisor pre-scores the portfolio and if weaknesses are noted candidates are assisted in strengthening it.

Matrix of Experience (LEE 230, 234, & 254) – At the completion of the final field experience course, candidates submit a Matrix of Experience form indicating the number of Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential objectives met by the candidate. The Reading/Language Arts faculty developed this document, and identified 20 activities in which candidates are to document completion of planned experiences across all three-fieldwork courses. Candidates indicate the date each activity was met. The Fieldwork Supervisor signs the document. These 20 activities were consolidated into three broad categories for data reporting purposes.

Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Self-Assessment Exit Survey – At the end of the credential program, candidates complete a Specialist Credential Self-Assessment Exit Survey. The survey consists of 6 questions. Candidates “self-rate” their levels of preparedness in the areas of oral language, reading/language arts, English learners, diagnosis of reading difficulties, administration of reading assessments, and the role of the Reading/Language Arts Specialist using a 1 to 5 Likert- scale ranging from 1 to 5. One being “not prepared” and five being “well prepared.”

SUMMARY OF DATA -- Six tables represent the data collected for academic years 2010-2012. Each table contains data from the key assessments as follows:

1. Table 2 summarizes the data for the Theory-to-Practice Paper/Project.
2. Table 3 summarizes the data for LEE 230 Portfolio.
3. Table 4 summarizes the data for the Matrix.
4. Table 5 summarizes the data collected for the Self-assessment Survey
5. Table 6 summarizes the data collected from the Post-Program Evaluation upon Exit Survey.

6. Table 7 summarizes the disposition results taken as a sub-set of indicators from the Post-Program Evaluation upon Exit Survey
7. Table 8 summarizes the data collected from the Specialists Program Effectiveness Survey

Table 2. In the fall of 2010, 43 students completed their Theory-to-Practice projects. Of those 43, 14 received a score of 3, 15 received a score of 2, and 4 received a 1 for format resulting in a mean of 2.47. For the diversity rating, 20 received a score of 3, 13 received a score of 2, and 10 received a score of 1, resulting in a mean of 2.19. For the application rating, 20 received a score of 3, 14 received a score of 2, and 9 received a score 1 resulting in a mean score of 2.16. For the praxis score, 24 students received a 3, 14 received a 2, and 4 received a 2 resulting in a mean score of 2.42. For the presentation rating, 30 received a score of 3, 12 a score of 2, and 1 a score of 1 resulting in a mean of 2.66. *This results in a sum of means of 2.38 for the Theory to Practice Project for the fall of 2010.* In the spring of 2012, 12 students completed their Theory-to-Practice projects. Of those 12, 10 received a score of 3 and 2 a score of 2 for format resulting in a mean of 2.83. For the diversity rating, all 12 students received a score of 3 resulting in mean of 3.0. For the application rating, 11 students received a rating of 3, and 1 a score of 2 resulting in a mean of 2.92. For the praxis rating, 10 students received a 3 and 2 a score of 2 for a mean of 2.83. For the presentation rating, all 12 students received a score of 3 resulting in a 3.0 mean. *This resulted in a 2.93 sum of means for the spring of 2012, and a Grand Mean of 2.65 for 10-12.*

Table 2. Summary of data for Theory to Practice Paper and Project

Semester	Criteria	n	*Mean	SD
Fall 2010	Format	43	2.47	.617
	Diversity	43	2.19	.70
	Application	43	2.16	.623
	Praxis	4	2.42	.629
	Presentation	43	2.66	.512
Spring 2012	Format	12	2.83	.389
	Diversity	12	3.00	.0
	Application	12	2.92	.89
	Praxis	12	2.83	.389
	Presentation	12	3.0	.0

*Scores are based on a 3.0 Likert Scale (3.0 Exceeds, 2.0 Meets, 1.0 Needs Improvement)

Table 3 provides information on candidate's scores on the Instructional Portfolio for the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program for semesters 2010-2012. Portfolios are scored using an Instructional Portfolio Rubric.

Table 3. Summary of Candidate's Portfolio Mean Scores & Pass Rate by Semester

Semester	Criteria	n	Mean Score	SD
Fall 2010	Instructional Planning Portfolio	17	48.4	1.27
Fall 2011	Instructional Planning Portfolio	12	56.66	1.97

*Scores are based on a 60-point scale, with a score of 48 or higher required for proficiency.

Table 4 provides summary data on candidates planned experiences in reading instruction as assessed by the Matrix of Experiences. This matrix evaluates activities at three separate school sites for three different field experience courses. To successfully complete all activities over the course of two or three semesters, the candidate would have to complete 26 theoretical background activities, 20 assessment-based instructional activities, and 7 selection, use, and evaluation of materials and methods for teaching activities.

Table 4. Summary of Mean Number of Experience Activities Completed by Semester

Semester	Number of Candidates	*Theoretical Background	*Assessment-Based Instruction	*Selection, Use and Evaluation of Materials & Methods
Fall 2010	7	26.0	20.00	7.0
Spring 2011	10	26.0	20.00	7.0
Fall 2011	0	00.0	0.0	.0
Spring 2012	10	26.0	20.00	7.0

*Scores are based on the number of competencies completed for each area.

Table 5 contains the results of the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential “Self-Assessment” Exit Survey. Twenty-seven surveys were made available to students. Of those 27, 7 were for the fall of 2010, 10 for the spring of 2011, and 10 for the spring of 2012. Only 6 of the 27 respondents completed surveys. This resulted in 5% percent return rate for semesters 2010-2012.

Table 5. Summary of Perceived “Self-Assessment” Level of Preparedness

Areas of Preparedness	n	*Mean	SD
Oral language development	6	3.80	.88
Teaching the reading/language arts	6	4.80	.45
Using English learner methods	6	4.20	.84
Diagnosis of reading difficulties	6	3.80	.84
Administration of reading assessments	6	4.80	.45
Role of the reading specialist	6	4.20	.84

*Scores are based on a 5.0 Likert-scale (1 not prepared and 5 well-prepared)

B. Additional information collected on candidate performance and program effectiveness.

1. Post-Program Evaluation upon Exit Survey– Every semester, candidates for the master’s degree and the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential are surveyed to determine their perception of their level for teaching the reading/language arts. The survey consists of 15 questions on a 5 point likert scale. 0 for non-applicable and 5 for Excellent Preparation. The purpose of the survey is to measure the effectiveness of the Reading/Language arts coursework in preparing graduates to teach the core concepts of the program and to measure the learning dispositions established by the Kremen School of Education and Human Development (KSOEHD). This data is presented to the Reading/Language Arts faculty to assist in making recommendations for program improvement.

2. Reading/Language Arts Specialist Program Survey – Every semester, district and school administrators as well as CSUF faculty, current and post-graduates are surveyed to determine their perceptions of the Reading/Language Arts Specialist program’s effectiveness. The survey consisted of 6 questions on a 5 point Likert scale. 1 being “high” disagreement and 5 being “high” agreement. The areas measured are oral language, reading & writing development, assessment techniques and instruments, English learners, professionalism, and school needs. Due to the nature of the program, the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Program Survey areas are aligned with the areas found on the “self-assessment” survey. This data is also presented to the Reading/Language Arts faculty to assist in making recommendations for program improvement.

Summary of Data:

Table 6 summarizes the results from the Post-Program Evaluation upon Exit Survey. This survey is administered 4 times during 2010-2012.

Table 6. Summary of graduate students preparation level on teaching reading/language arts for semester 2010-2012

Master’s and Specialist Core Concepts	2010-2011		2011-2012	
	n	*Mean	n	*mean
Techniques to build rapport	8	3.85	4	4.75
Organizing professional tasks	8	3.85	4	4.50
Responding to diverse clientele	8	4.28	4	4.75
Upholding all students can learn	8	4.28	4	4.75
Receiving proper theoretical grounding	8	4.28	4	4.75
Research familiarity	8	4.28	4	4.75
Relating my learning to actual situations	8	4.57	4	4.75
Assessing the progress of students	8	4.14	4	4.75
Conducting oneself in an ethical manner	8	4.42	4	4.75
Collaborating successfully	8	4.42	4	4.75
Assessing own performance	8	4.42	4	4.75
Receiving appropriate supervision	8	4.00	4	4.75
Thinking critically	8	4.28	4	4.75
Modeling the value of lifelong learning	8	4.28	4	4.75
Degree of preparedness	8	4.28	4	4.75

*Mean scores are based on a 5.0 Likert-scale. (1 = unprepared and 5 = fully prepared)

Table 7 summarizes the disposition results taken as a sub-set of indicators from the Post-Program Evaluation upon Exit Survey.

Table 7. Summary of graduate students dispositions for semesters 2008-2010

Dispositions	2008-2009		2009-2010	
	n	*Mean	n	*mean
Valuing diversity (3)	8	4.28	4	4.75
Reflection (7)	8	4.57	4	4.75
Professional ethics (9)	8	4.42	4	4.75

Collaboration (10)	8	4.42	4	4.75
Critical thinking (13)	8	4.28	4	4.75
Life-long learning (14)	8	4.28	4	4.75

*Mean scores are based on a 5.0 Likert-scale. (1 = unprepared and 5 = fully prepared)

Table 8 summarizes the results from the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Program Survey. It was administered twice in the semesters of 2010-2012. Twenty-seven surveys were made available. Of those 27, 6 were reported in the spring of 2012. This resulted in an overall response rate of 5% for semesters 2010-2012.

Table 8. Summary of Program Specialist Effectiveness for Semesters 2009-2010

Core Specialist Areas	n	*Mean	SD
Instructional approaches	6	4.88	.33
Assessments	6	4.54	.52
English Learners	6	4.00	.86
Professional partnerships	6	4.45	.52
School needs	6	3.66	.52

*Scores are based on a 5.0 Likert-scale. (1 = high disagreement and 5 = high agreement)

California State University, Fresno (2010-2012)
Section A. Part III
Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION IN SECTION A-2

- Of the 59, candidates enrolled in the Reading/Language Arts **Specialist Credential Program**, 27 successfully completed the program during 2010-2012.

- Analysis of the data gathered from the **Theory to Practice Research Paper and Project**, the signature assignment for **LEE 213**, which requires more than simple writing indicates that in 2010-2012, 94% of the 55 graduate students enrolled in LEE 213 were successful in completing their Theory to Practice Research Paper and Project. This data reflects the excellent caliber of master student enrolled in LEE 213. These projects highlight the connections students make between applying theory to the classroom and including considerations for diverse learners. The weakest areas, the written statement and the praxis/reflection lead the faculty to consider how to alter their instruction. This resulted in faculty spending more time in class on how to structure the written piece and having students work in groups to decide practical applications for their research and by stressing the need for differentiating according to learning style, preparation level and ability, we were able to improve student scores in those areas.

- Although most of the enrolled candidates successful completed the Instructional Portfolio in LEE 230, it was noted that due to the variety of school settings, it was difficult to focus on specific school standards. As a result, the faculty attempted to focus on the school standards or requirements by discussing first how to engage the students in activities that were relevant before moving them to the required curriculum which they sometimes viewed as being irrelevant. For example, when one teacher discussed her need to teach the structure of poetry, including forms such as odes and iambic pentameter, we suggested she begin with “An Ode to Pizza” by Pat Mora. The teacher brought in pizza and the high school students read the ode. She then asked the group what they believed constituted an “ode” based on what they’d just read. From there they moved to tasting other foods and writing their own odes. Thus, one of the requirements for the CASE was met while the experience made the purpose of an ode meaningful, relevant, and fun.

In another LEE 230 group, two teachers working together with first-graders related to the class during seminar that they were working with second language learners and were required to use the school anthology. Suggestions included having the teachers work together to model conversations interacting with each other and extending the anthology story to a language experience activity as the children related their own experiences thus connecting the text to their lives. In all cases, these challenges were not simply discussed in class but were part of the class’ lesson plan reflections. The instructional preparations are core to the course requirements and become central to the culminating assignment for the course, a portfolio of lesson plans, observations, reflections, and changes to students’ instruction based on the data collected.

- Even though a hundred percent of the enrolled candidate's successfully met their field experience activities requirements as evidenced on the matrix indicating that all students in the specialist program are completing their requirements for all three-fieldwork experience courses, i.e., LEE 230, 234, & 254, it should be noted that graduate students need improvement in the area of assessment-based instruction. Students need more opportunities to work with non-district assessments. It was also noted that candidates need ways to differentiate the environmental factors that influence reading behavior.
- More specifically, in LEE 254, scores were consistently low for the literacy instruction and the recommendations sections. In subsequent semesters, one class was dedicated to modeling the use of specific tools for classroom observation; these tools were then revisited throughout the semester as students shared their experiences using them. This effort seemed to have assisted students' understanding of how to collect data that could provide accounts of classroom instruction. To support students' understanding of recommendations for school improvement, the program evaluation report was separated into short assignments. Segmenting the process allowed students to focus on specific areas and analyze one set of data at a time. Initial results seem to have been positive across the different sections as well as in the synthesis of final recommendations.
- Graduates in the program rated themselves well prepared in all areas except when it came to oral language development. Preparedness for the administration of reading assessments and the role of Reading Specialist received the highest ratings with a mean score of 4.75.
- The Post-Progress Evaluation Exit Survey provided a favorable picture of the extent to which graduate students perceived they were prepared. All competencies received an above average score indicating that graduate students seeking a Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential were pretty satisfied with the program. Anecdotal responses to a set of open-ended questions at the end of each survey revealed the following graduate students' programmatic recommendations for the semesters of 2010-2012:
 - a) Focus more on district needs rather than whole language activities
 - b) Cover more secondary literacy instruction including assessment and working with high school English learners
 - c) Include more instruction and assessment for working with adolescent learners
 - d) Assign classes the semester before so that professors can become more knowledgeable with the content of the courses

Data Conclusions:

- While the effectiveness of the program's field work is based on collaboration between university students and the supervision of instructors, the LEE 230 it is not listed as a supervision course in terms of faculty load and it should be. Often times, graduate students are from different school districts, four of which were 140 miles from campus. The times students were able to schedule interventions ranged from 7 am to noon- recess to after-school instruction. As a result, it was virtually impossible for the instructor to effectively visit, make suggestions for improvement, and follow through on the implementation of

suggestions. Therefore, it is suggested that the program reevaluate its distribution of fieldwork requirements for the instructor and the student.

- The current disposition survey needs to be refined in order to identify candidate dispositions by course.. Therefore, the program should create a program specific assessment for candidate dispositions.
- Systemic collections of data can only occur more if the faculty could enter the data into a common data base online.

Program adjustments in response to student programmatic recommendations for the semesters of 2010-2012:

- a) Moved from self-coaching evaluation to program evaluation
- b) Implemented new assessment tools for struggling readers
- c) Included district curriculum materials and hired district personnel as adjuncts

California State University, Fresno (2010-2012)

Section A. Part IV

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Reading/Language Specialist Credential Program

Data Source	Specific Objective	Action(s)	Responsible Person(s)	Due Date
Exit survey for early departure candidates	Discover the reasons for attrition	Design an Exit Survey for early departure candidates	Program Coordinator and Faculty	By December 2012
Candidate Disposition Survey	Utilize candidate dispositions as data for professional growth and program improvement	Faculty will meet as a team to decide the method and forum to assess the six dispositions established by the KSOEHD within each course	Program Coordinator	By May 2012
Program Exit Surveys	Move the program exit surveys to Blackboard	Surveys will be made available through specific classes	Program Coordinator and Faculty	By May 2012