

Program: Liberal StudiesDate: May 23, 2014Completed by: Victoria Marquesen

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): All faculty in Teacher Education participated in eportfolio assessment and complete program data were reviewed at the fall department convocation.

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, and submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2014. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2013-2014 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2014-2015 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2013-2014 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2012-2013. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?
Liberal Studies uses the term "Standards" for program	2012-2013; because the state and national	For most SLOs, the program uses multiple measures to	All el ed students admitted to TED, 2013-	<u>Expectations</u> include all of the following a) all program completers should	Details of assessment results are summarized below in table 1. In general, results	Although mean ratings always showed student proficiency was	Goals for 2014-2015 include: 1. Continue

<p>SLOs because that is the term used by its accrediting bodies. SLOs are included in table 1 below, aligned with the program's broader goals for students.</p>	<p>accrediting bodies for teacher education require the program to monitor all program outcomes to determine students' eligibility for licensure, all SLOs were assessed in 2013-2014.</p> <p>To determine eligibility, the state of Colorado requires completion of an assessment of graduates and their employers each year, as well as completion of a rating or each SLO for each student teacher during his/her final semester.</p>	<p>draw conclusions about student and program success. See table 1 (below). The program has attached the program rubrics used by faculty to assess performance for some SLOs discussed here as examples.</p> <p>All performance rubrics are available on the TED web site at http://ceeps.colostate-pueblo.edu/TEP/StandardsAndGoals/Pages/default.aspx.</p>	<p>2014; all ed students completing TED, 2013-2014; first year teachers in 2012-2013 (grads in 2011-2012). Please note: admission data for students in Spring 2014 are not complete at the date of this report and are not included (PP scores have not been returned from ETS); first year teacher data for last year's grads have not yet been returned and are not included.</p>	<p>receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards and avg. ratings by the group should be >3.00, b) 100% of program completers and >80% of individual students during the year who took the exam received passing scores, and c) >80% of graduates' and their supervisors'/ principals' ratings of performance are proficient (3.00 or >) and avg. ratings are >3.00 on evaluations of all standards for the group after one year of teaching.</p> <p>All three expectations/ benchmarks are considered in drawing conclusions on strengths and SLOs needing to be further addressed.</p>	<p>indicated that a) >96% received proficient ratings; mean ratings were always above 3.00; Although 2 of 46 program completers received ratings below 3.0 on specific standards, both were proficient on others and had sufficient success to be recommended for licensure. Weaknesses had been identified for both students early in their program, and both were on support plans during their program.</p> <p>Across all students, strengths in performance were seen in a number of outcomes related to applications of knowledge, especially literacy, and understanding of diversity. Weaker performance was noted in skills in mathematics, understanding of cognitive processes and their application, and in students' professional writing.</p> <p>100% of program</p>	<p>on the average above 3.00 across program outcomes, disaggregating this information did indicate strengths and challenges (see table 1): performance in mathematics, including application of math knowledge in teaching is a relatively weak area and average licensure test scores for students in some concentration areas (psychology, sociology) were lower than those of others; in addition, the decline in performance on the math subtest, which has been the strongest area of</p>	<p>revisions to enhance mathematics content and instruction.</p> <p>2. Monitor effects of changes in LS major on licensure subtest performance and performance during student teaching in all areas, disaggregating performance for students completing the newly designed concentrations.</p>
---	--	---	---	--	--	--	--

					<p>completers and 87% of individual takers had passing scores on the Elementary Education content exam (b). Strengths on this exam were scores in English Language Arts and in Science areas; performance in math declined.</p> <p>Additional information on specific strengths and weaknesses is listed below in table 1.</p>	performance, is problematic.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	------------------------------	--

Comments: Liberal Studies has three identified goal areas aligned with the eight teacher education program goals and standards that address more specific SLOs for all students. Program standards are aligned with the Colorado Performance Standards for Teachers, as well as the standards of professional and learned societies, and performance on the standards is the crucial level of assessment in terms of student outcomes, not program goals. Teacher Education has developed rubrics (available at <http://ceeps.colostate-pueblo.edu/TEP/StandardsAndGoals/Pages/default.aspx>) that outline in considerable detail the specific criteria and dimensions of performance that define outcomes required for each standard, and these outcomes are aligned with Liberal Studies goals (see table 1). Also included on the rubrics are benchmarks for performance at three different points in the program – admission to education, admission to student teaching, and program completion. Ratings based on this evidence are completed by faculty using a scale of 1-4, with a rating of 3.00 as an indication of minimally “proficient” on a standard. Formal evaluations are conducted and recorded for each student at admission to education and program completion based on multiple types and sources of evidence.

Table 1. Overview of methods and tools used to assess student outcomes, as well as major conclusions/results of assessment in 2013-2014.

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards/SLOs	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>1. Acquisition of Knowledge. Graduates are broadly educated in the liberal arts and sciences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. understanding the significant ideas, concepts, structures and values within disciplines, including theoretical, ethical, and practical implications. 2. mastering content knowledge in all areas taught in elementary schools: the arts, math, literature and language, social sciences, sciences, and human development and learning. 3. balancing a breadth of knowledge in the liberal arts and sciences with depth of knowledge within a discipline. 	<p>2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which s/he is preparing to teach. For elementary education, content areas include: civics, economics, foreign language, geography, history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education (1a,b,c)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proficiency Profile (PP) • Faculty Recommendations • Field Experience Teacher Evaluations • GPA in math, composition, and speech courses • Cumulative GPA at admission • GPA in major at admission to student teaching • Licensure Exam Scores 	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> When compared to junior students at regional comprehensive institutions nationally, LS students scored within the average range on the PP (within the SEM for each subtest and for overall performance). The overall mean PP scaled score in Fall 2013 was higher than those for the previous nine years. However, the students' subscore in math continued to decrease, with the lowest average score in the last 6 years.</p> <p>Faculty ratings based on recommendations and eportfolio documents indicated that 91% met or exceeded the benchmark rating of 2.00 ('developing") on Standard 2.11. Those not meeting the benchmark were cited for difficulties in writing in eportfolio documents and weak faculty recommendations.</p> <p>Cum mean GPA (3.338) was above the GPA required (2.6) and higher than avgs. for the last two years. Average GPAs in courses in writing (3.8), math (2.7), and speech (3.8) exceeded benchmarks. Spring 2014 scores were not complete at the time this report was written.</p> <p><u>Licensure Exam Scores:</u> 100% of program completers passed the licensure exam; the program uses 3 statistics to track student progress: 1) the overall pass rate (average score for all takers; since some students take the test more than once, repeated takers can skew results), 1st time pass rate (average score for each student the first time the test was taken), and last time pass rate (average score of students using the last test rather than first test taken). Averages for test administrations from 9/2-13-5/2014 were 65% (overall), 70% (1st), and 87% (last). Strengths in subtest performance were seen in scores in English Language Arts and Science.</p>

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>2. Construction of Knowledge. Graduates demonstrate habits of thinking, including analytical skills, independent thinking, reasoned judgment, mature values, and imagination:</p> <p>4. utilizing the tools of inquiry of the humanities, arts, mathematics, and behavioral, social, and natural sciences to understand and evaluate ideas.</p> <p>5. developing habits of critical intellectual inquiry, including self-direction and self-reflection.</p> <p>6. making connections from different intellectual perspectives and multiple viewpoints to form cross-disciplinary connections.</p>	<p>2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning.</p> <p>3.3 Establishes a learning environment that promotes educational equity and implements strategies to address them (2a, 2c, 4e)</p> <p>5.3 Creates and implements a range of standards-based long term plans, including thematic units, interdisciplinary/ integrated units, literature-based units (2c)</p> <p>5.10 Works in cooperation with library, media and other resource specialists in providing student instruction on how to access, retrieve, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information literacy skills (2d)</p> <p>6.5 Draws upon a variety of sources as supports for development as a learner and a teacher, including colleagues and professional literature (2a, 2d)</p> <p>8.7 Demonstrates flexibility in thinking and behavior; remains open-minded, reserving judgment for evidence (2b)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2014.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education (2.10, 3.3, 8.7):</u> Mean eportfolio ratings were in the “developing” range or higher for 95% of students, the benchmark for all three standards/outcomes evaluated at admission to education. Faculty ratings are based on both recommendations and eportfolio documents; incomplete self-evaluations/reflections accounted for the majority of low ratings in these areas.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean performance ratings (for standards at left) all exceeded the 3.00 benchmark for “proficient;” mean ratings were 3.61(Standard 2.10), 3.76(3.3), 3.70(5.3), 3.58(5.10), 3.73(6.5), and 3.82(8.7). For all standards/outcomes, the benchmark was met or exceeded by >95% of the students. Among the 2 (of 46) students not meeting proficiency, 2 received a rating of <3.0 on standards 2.10; one of these students received a rating <3.0 on standards 5.3, 5.10, and 6.5; 100% of students reached proficiency on standards 3.3 and 8.7. Performance on standards 3.3, 5.3, 6.5, and 8.7 were among those receiving the highest mean ratings among all standards/outcomes evaluated for elementary student teachers. Although above benchmark level, the average ratings for standard 5.10 were among the lowest for performance on all standards.
<p>3. Communication of Knowledge. Graduates communicate effectively:</p> <p>a. writing clearly in a variety of</p>	<p>8.9 Communicates through speaking, writing, and listening in a professional level (3a,b)</p> <p>7.3 Uses technology to manage and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proficiency Profile (PP) Faculty Recs. Field Experience Teacher 	<p><u>At admission to education (8.9, 7.3):</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 7.3 for all LS students were in the “developing” range,</p>

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>academic and practical formats.</p> <p>b. speaking effectively in a variety of settings.</p> <p>c. utilizing technology as a tool to inform and communicate.</p>	<p>communicate information (3c)</p>	<p>Evaluations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GPA in math, composition, and speech courses Eportfolio rating of these areas at admission to education* Student Teacher Performance Ratings* <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2014.</p>	<p>the benchmark for this outcome. Among the 9% who did not meet the benchmark for standard 8.9, weaknesses were cited in errors in writing among documents in the eportfolio.</p> <p><i>Proficiency Profile</i> scores were within 1 SEM of those of peers at other comprehensive universities. Spring 2014 scores have not arrived as this report is written, but the mean standard score on the writing subtest for admitted LS students in Fall 2013 was 114.87, an increase over the past 2 years (113.60, 113.70) . The avg. score for the national sample is 114.45.</p> <p>Mean GPAs remained above admission requirements; all eportfolio ratings were above the benchmark of 2.00; 91% met or exceeded the benchmark rating of 2.00 (“developing”) on Standard 2.10.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean student teacher ratings were at or above benchmark levels. The average ratings in 2013-2014 for these 2 standards were 3.62 and 3.81. All but one student teacher received a rating of 3.00 or greater.</p>
<p>4. Application of Knowledge. Graduates create standards-based learning experiences that make knowledge accessible, exciting, and meaningful for all students:</p> <p>7. Using multiple representations and explanations of disciplinary concepts that capture key ideas and link them to students’ prior understandings.</p> <p>8. Using different viewpoints,</p>	<p>2.3 Develops reading comprehension and promotion of independent reading, including: comprehension strategies for a variety of genre, literary response and analysis, content area literacy, and student independent reading.</p> <p>2.4 Supports reading through oral and written language development including: developing oral proficiency in students; development of sound writing practices, including language usage, punctuation, capitalization, sentence structure, and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education (2.10)* Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching Ratings by Supervisors 	<p><u>At admission to education (2.10):</u> See results related to standard 2.10 in Goal 2.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings on performance at completion of student teaching were at or above benchmark levels for all standards. The table below summarizes the mean ratings of student teachers in 2013-2014. Standards receiving the highest mean ratings (above 3.65) and those receiving the lowest (below 3.56) are highlighted.</p>

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results																								
theories, “ways of knowing,” and methods of inquiry in teaching of subject matter content. a. Evaluating curriculum for their comprehensiveness, accuracy, and usefulness for representing particular ideas and concepts. b. Engaging students in generating knowledge and testing hypotheses according to the methods of inquiry and standards of evidence used in the discipline. c. Developing and using curricula that encourage students to see and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives. d. Creating interdisciplinary learning experiences that allow inquiry from several subject areas	spelling; the relationships among reading, writing, and oral language; vocabulary, and structure of standard English. 2.5 Utilizes Academic Standards in Reading and Writing for the improvement of instruction 2.6 Develops students’ understanding and use of: number systems, geometry, measurement, statistics/ probability, functions, use of variables. 2.7 Utilizes Colorado Standards in Math for the improvement of instruction 2.8 Integrates literacy and mathematics into content area instruction (4f) 2.9 Enhances content instruction through a thorough understanding of all CO standards and bases long-term and lesson planning on standards (4c) 2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning (4a, b, d) 3.1 Employs a wide range of teaching techniques to match the intellectual, emotional, physical, and social level of each student, and chooses teaching strategies and materials to achieve different curricular purposes 5.3 Creates and implements a range of standards-based long term plans, including thematic, interdisciplinary, literature-based (4c, 4f) 5.4 Understands the cognitive processes associated ... learning (e.g., critical/ creative thinking, problem structuring and problem solving, invention, memorization and recall) and uses these learning processes so that students can master content standards (4d)	after One Year of Teaching * Tool = Program rubrics Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2014.	<table><tr><th>Standard</th><th>Student Teacher MN Rating</th></tr><tr><td>2.3</td><td>3.60</td></tr><tr><td>2.4</td><td>3.61</td></tr><tr><td>2.5</td><td>3.71</td></tr><tr><td>2.6</td><td>3.64</td></tr><tr><td>2.7</td><td>3.66</td></tr><tr><td>2.8</td><td>3.60</td></tr><tr><td>2.9</td><td>3.64</td></tr><tr><td>2.10</td><td>3.61</td></tr><tr><td>3.1</td><td>3.68</td></tr><tr><td>5.3</td><td>3.70</td></tr><tr><td>5.4</td><td>3.55</td></tr></table>	Standard	Student Teacher MN Rating	2.3	3.60	2.4	3.61	2.5	3.71	2.6	3.64	2.7	3.66	2.8	3.60	2.9	3.64	2.10	3.61	3.1	3.68	5.3	3.70	5.4	3.55
Standard	Student Teacher MN Rating																										
2.3	3.60																										
2.4	3.61																										
2.5	3.71																										
2.6	3.64																										
2.7	3.66																										
2.8	3.60																										
2.9	3.64																										
2.10	3.61																										
3.1	3.68																										
5.3	3.70																										
5.4	3.55																										

II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
<p>The following SLOs in Goal 1: 2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which s/he is preparing to teach. For elementary education, content areas include: civics, economics, foreign language, geography, history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education (1a,b,c)</p> <p>The following SLOs in Goal 4: 2.6 Develops students' understanding and use of: number systems, geometry, measurement, statistics/ probability, functions, use of variables. 2.7 Utilizes Colorado Standards in Math for the improvement of instruction 2.8 Integrates literacy and mathematics into content area instruction (4f)</p>	<p>Spring 2014: student teacher and graduate/ supervisor results and admissions data (PP)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review content in ED 417 (Teaching Elementary Math) in terms of meeting new Colorado/Common Core Math standards. 2. Review possibility of changing math core course from MATH 156 to MATH 109 to improve content for students. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Because of Dr. Piazza's medical leave for fall semester 2014, the first recommendation for change was not completed and will be continued for 2014-2015. 2. The program submitted a proposal that was accepted by CAPB and will go into effect in Fall 2014 to change the math requirements to allow MATH 109, MATH 121, MATH 156, or MATH 126 as LS requirements; the purpose is to provide students with a broader background in diverse areas of math prior to completion of MATH 360/361/362. 	<p>Because changes will not go into effect until Fall 2014, we will monitor the change in proficiency in math as the new requirement is implemented.</p>
<p>SLO in Goal 1): 2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which s/he is preparing to teach. For elementary education, content areas include: civics, economics, foreign language, geography,</p>	<p>2013-2014: licensure test data</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Make suggestions for changes in concentration areas and course content, including review of content and 	<p>Yes. The program submitted a proposal that was accepted by CAPB and will go into effect in Fall 2014 to change all concentrations, increasing them from 12 to 15 hours and strengthening content around the Colorado Academic</p>	<p>Because changes will not go into effect until Fall 2014, we will monitor the change in proficiency as the new requirements are implemented.</p>

history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education (1a,b,c)		assignments in PSYCH 342 and relationship of concentrations to standards in liberal studies.	Standards.	
SLOs in Goal 1		4. Continuing, unmet goals from 2012-2013: Review content in LS core courses and revise as needed, including alignment with expectations relative to 21 st Century and Post Secondary Workforce curriculum requirements for teachers .	Yes. Major evaluation of content was completed as new concentrations were designed. Faculty in content areas were also contacted about proposed changes for input.	Because changes will not go into effect until Fall 2014, we will monitor the change in proficiency as the new requirements are implemented.

2.3 Develops reading comprehension and promotion of independent reading, including: comprehension strategy variety of genre; literary response and analysis; content area literacy, fluency, vocabulary; the application of skills to reading and writing.

NOTE: Content Area Literacy comprehension and vocabulary skills and 2.3a (using a variety of text for information, using strategies to motivate reading, and using reading to accomplish a variety of tasks --reading for pleasure, information, and to solve problems) are addressed in Standard 2.5.

	CO	Basic (1.0 - 1.9)	Developing (2.0 - 2.9)	Proficient (3.0 - 3.9)
Knowledge <i>All Students</i>	5.01.5 5.01.7	Below 70% on competency test, indicating lack of understanding of the following concepts:	76-85% on competency test, indicating understanding of the following concepts:	86-93% on competency test, indicating understanding of the following concepts:
	5.01.5.b	a. Knowledge and processes used in reading comprehension (e.g., decoding, word naming, speed, inference-making background/prior knowledge, word meaning knowledge)		
	5.01.5c	b. Factors influencing comprehension, including the reader, text, the reading task, environmental context, and internal motivation		
	5.01.5j-l	c. Conventions and text structures associated with a variety of genres		
	5.01.7	d. Expectations/norms for fluency as reading skills develop and relationship of fluency and other skill areas; factor e. Passage reading techniques for increasing fluency (e.g., independent reading, repeated readings, simultaneous oral reading)		
Performance <i>K-6/English Language Arts/LDE/SPED</i>	5.01.5	No evidence of lesson plans to teach any reading skills listed below using evidence-based strategies:	Plans and implements systematic, explicit, evidence-based techniques to teach some of the skill areas listed below; lessons must be somewhat independent of basal lesson plan and commercial/published learning materials:	Plans and implements systematic, explicit, evidence-based techniques to teach each of the skill areas listed below; lessons must be somewhat independent of basal lesson plan and commercial/published learning materials:
	5.01.5d	a. Conventions and text structures associated with a variety of genres, including literary texts (e.g., poems, stories) and expository texts		
	5.01.5e	b. Strategies for analyzing components of literary texts (e.g., theme, point of view) and expository texts (e.g., author's position)		
	5.01.5f	c. Text comprehension strategies (e.g., metacognitive monitoring, graphic/semantic organizers, answering/generating questions)		
	5.01.5g	d. Discussions that increase engagement in literary response and analysis, expand thinking, and support affective dimensions		
	5.01.5m	e. Passage reading techniques for increasing fluency (e.g., independent reading, repeated readings, simultaneous oral reading)		
	5.01.7i	f. Strategies for teaching word meaning (e.g., multiple meanings, idioms, demands of categorical and hierarchical reasoning)		
	5.01.7k	g. Direct and indirect strategies for teaching vocabulary		

Operationalization/Criteria:

Guidelines for Admission to Education: *Not evaluated at admission to education*

Guidelines at Admission to Student Teaching:

For K-12/secondary teachers (with the exclusion of English). This standard is met prior to student teaching in RDG 435/535 with passage of a proficiency

Benchmark at admission for students preparing to be elementary, English language arts, linguistically diverse, and special education is "Developing" on the following:
Plans and implements systematic, explicit, evidence-based techniques to teach some reading comprehension skills.

Examples of Evidence: Test score on proficiency exam, lesson plans and units, possible videoclips of teaching, field experience ratings by classroom teachers may address 2.3

Guidelines for Program Completion/Student Teaching:

1. Required for program completion are ratings of "Proficient" on all dimensions.
2. Observe a variety of lessons in different areas of responsibility in the student's lesson plan book.
3. Directly observe teacher's ability to implement strategies to teach different comprehension skills as well as fluency, and vocabulary.
4. Consistency = requires fluency/repetition, including documentation of competence across a variety of lessons, in TWS and daily plans.
5. The narrative for the Inventory should specify an example of a skill/observation that led to the rating, e.g.: *During the semester she taught taught a lesson incorporating explicit instruction on all of the following: vocabulary (word etymology), summarizing, author's point of view, and fluency building (reaching for fluency).*

Examples of Evidence:

TWS, lesson plans and units, lesson plan book of daily lessons, direct observation of teaching, videoclips of teaching, examples of student work, inter-cooperating teacher/mentor, examples of student work

Rationale:

- Allinder, R., Dunse, L., Brunken, C., & Obermiller-Krolinkowski, H. (2001). Improving fluency in at-risk readers and students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Special Education*, 22, 48-54.
- Carnine, D.W., Silbert, J., Kame'enui, E.J., Tarver, S.G., & Jungjohann, K. (2006). *Teaching struggling and at-risk readers: A direct instruction approach*. River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Conley, M.W. (2008). *Content area literacy: Learners in context*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon
- Deshler, D., Schumaker, B., Lenz, K., Bulgren, J., Hock, M., Knight, J., & Ehren, B. (2001). *Ensuring content-area learning by secondary students with learning disabilities that work*. Nebraska: Brookline Books.
- Foorman, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Preventing and remediating reading difficulties*. Baltimore, MD: York Press.
- Foorman, B. & Torgesen, J.K. (2001), Critical elements of classroom and small-group instruction to promote reading success in all children. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 16, 203-221.
- Gunning, T. G. *Creating literacy instruction for all students*, 7th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gunning, T. G. *Assessing and correcting reading and writing difficulties*, 4th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Honig, B., Diamond, L., & Gutlohn, L. *Teaching reading sourcebook*, 2nd. Ed. Novato, CA: Arena Press.

Mastropieri, M., Scruggs, T., & Graetz, J. (2003). Reading comprehension instruction for secondary students: Challenges for struggling students and the disabled. *Disability Quarterly*, 26(2), 103-116.

McKenna, M., & Robinson, R.D. (2009). *Teaching through text: Reading and writing in the content areas*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Moats, L. (2001). When older kids can't read. *Educational Leadership*, 58(6), 36-46.

National Reading Panel Final Report. Available at www.nationalreadingpanel.org/.

Ogle, D., & Beers, J. (2009). *Engaging in the language arts: Exploring the power of language*. Boston: MA: Pearson Publishing.

Rayner, K., Foorman, B.R., Perfetti, C.A., Pesetsky, D., & Seidenberg, M.S. (March 2002) How should reading be taught? *Scientific American*, 85-91.

Reading for the 21 century: Adolescent literacy teaching and learning strategies. Alliance for Excellent Education. Available at www.all4ed.org/sitemap

Teaching reading sourcebook: for all educators working to improve reading achievement. (2008). CORE Literacy Training Materials, 2nd ed.

Tierney, R.J., & Readence, J.E. (2000). *Reading strategies and practices: A compendium*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Tompkins, G.E. (1998). *Fifty literacy strategies: Step by step*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Tompkins, G.E. (2005). *Language arts: Patterns of practice*, 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Vacca, R.T., & Vacca, J. L. (2010). *Content area reading: Literacy and learning across the curriculum*, 10th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Websites:

mwp01.mwp.hawaii.edu/resources/TA%201-01%20workshop%20A.pdf (content literacy resources)

www.howard.k12.md.us/langarts/Curriculum/ (subject area reading strategies)

www.middleweb.com/ReadWrkshp/JK34.html (road map for content area reading)

strategies.htm#SUBJECT%20AREA (reading across the curriculum strategies)

www.pgcps.pg.k12.md.us/%7Eelc/readingacross.html (reading across the curriculum strategies)

www.tea.state.tx.us/reading/practices/redbk4.pdf (research based content area reading instruction)

<http://www.litandlearn.lpb.org/>

ies for a
thinking

ategies to
blems)

Advanced (4.0)
Scored 94-100% on competency test, indicating understanding of the following concepts: king, comprehension monitoring, ractions among these factors s influencing fluency ral reading)
Meets criteria for "Proficient" and documents multiple, well-sequenced examples for at least 6 of the 7 areas: tory writing (e.g., textbooks) is, story structure, summarizing) of comprehension))

by assessment.

n all dimensions:

om

init on "biography,"
lers theatre).

view with

Journal of Remedial

ch . Upper Saddle

1 learning materials

Disabilities

achers. *Learning*

.html#Literacy.