NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the International Reading Association (IRA).

**Name of Institution**
The University of Memphis, TN

**Date of Review**
01/21/2008

**This report is in response to a(n):**
- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

**Program(s) Covered by this Review**
Masters of Science in Reading and Reading Specialist Licensure

**Program Type**
Advanced Teaching

**Award or Degree Level(s)**
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only

**PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION**

**SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):**
- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation [See Part G]
- Not nationally recognized
Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)
The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comment:
The program is requiring candidates to pass the PRAXIS for Reading Specialists. However, the adoption of this requirement is new to the program and data are reported on only three candidates. Two of the three candidates passed the exam. (The pass rate is not applicable to programs reporting fewer than 10 completers who have taken the exam over a three-year period.)

Summary of Strengths:
Faculty seems strong, with a wide array of expertise in native and English language learning.
The program reports a rich array of course offerings, including an extensive action research component to provide opportunities for application of knowledge.
Content knowledge and classroom teaching knowledge are addressed in multiple assessments.
The program has a system in place to make data driven decisions, including a yearly assessment retreat where data are reviewed, suggestions for program changes are submitted, and the program is evaluated.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. Foundational Knowledge. Candidates have knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. As a result, candidates:

Standard 1.1. Refer to major theories in the foundational areas as they relate to reading. They can explain, compare, contrast, and critique the theories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
Measured at program exit by PRAXIS for Reading Specialist exam, although insufficient candidate data are available to make inferences about program effectiveness. The program also needs more than one assessment of this element, and may want to consider adding a new assessment or modifying an existing assessment, such as the portfolio, for additional evaluation of this area.

Standard 1.2. Summarize seminal reading studies and articulate how these studies impacted reading instruction. They can recount historical developments in the history of reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Comment:**
See comment for 1.1.

**Standard 1.3.** Identify, explain, compare, and contrast the theories and research in the areas of language development and learning to read.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**
See comment for 1.1.

**Standard 1.4.** Are able to determine if students are appropriately integrating the components (phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation) in fluent reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**
See comment for 1.1.

**Standard 2. Instructional Strategies and Curriculum Materials.** Candidates use a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, and curriculum materials to support reading and writing instruction. As a result, the candidates:

**Standard 2.1.** Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in their use of instructional grouping options. They help teachers select appropriate options. They demonstrate the options and explain the evidence-based rationale for changing configurations to best meet the needs of all students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**
Assessment #3, the Inservice Training Plan, requires candidates to recommend to teachers varied ways to differentiate groupings. There could be a bit more detail provided in the actual assignment, which may exist in a referred to template which was not given. This assessment suggests thinking at the coaching level, but demonstration is in a written paper and not an actual interactive experience.

The element is also tested with Assessment #6, the Master's Project, which invites candidates to develop a project to improve their own teaching. However, the rubrics used to date have not explicitly addressed this element.

Insufficient candidate data are available from both assessments to make inferences about program effectiveness.

**Standard 2.2.** Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices. They help teachers select appropriate options and explain evidence-base for selecting practices to best meet the
needs of all students. They demonstrate the options in their own (and demonstration) teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Assessment #3, the Inservice Training Plan, requires candidates to recommend to teachers a wide range of instructional practices, etc. There could be a bit more detail provided in the actual assignment, which may exist in a referred to template which was not given. This assessment suggests thinking at the coaching level, but demonstration is in a written paper and not an actual interactive experience.

The element is also tested with Assessment #6, the Master's Project, which invites candidates to develop a project to improve their own teaching. However, the rubrics used to date have not explicitly addressed this element.

Insufficient candidate data are available from both assessments to make inferences about program effectiveness.

**Standard 2.3.** Support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of a wide range of curriculum materials. They help teachers select appropriate options and explain the evidence base for selecting practices to best meet the needs of all students. They demonstrate the options in their own teaching and in demonstration teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Assessment #3, the Inservice Training Plan, requires candidates to recommend to teachers a wide array of curriculum materials. There could be a bit more detail provided in the actual assignment, which may exist in a referred to template which was not given. This assessment suggests thinking at the coaching level, but demonstration is in a written paper and not an actual interactive experience.

The element is also tested with Assessment #6, the Master's Project, which invites candidates to develop a project to improve their own teaching. However, the rubrics used to date have not explicitly addressed this element.

Insufficient candidate data are available from both assessments to make inferences about program effectiveness.

**Standard 3. Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation.** Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading instruction. As a result, candidates:

**Standard 3.1.** Compare and contrast, use, interpret, and recommend a wide range of assessment tools and practices. Assessments may range from standardized tests to informal tests and also include technology-based assessments. They demonstrate appropriate use of assessments in their practice, and they can train classroom teachers to administer and interpret these assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment:
This element was met conditionally at the classroom teaching level. At least one more assessment of this element is needed for reliable evaluation of the program in this area.

The rubric aligns with the standards primarily at the classroom teaching level. It is recommended that additions be made to the rubric to indicate that alignment exists at the reading specialist/literacy coach level -- specifically for the training of classroom teachers to administer and interpret these assessments. In addition, see column four of Standards for Reading Professionals-Revised 2003 for requirements to meet this standard at the reading specialist/literacy coach level. This requires adding components to assessments that provide outreach to teachers and paraprofessionals to support their professional development through communication, collaboration, and demonstration regarding training in administration and interpretation of assessments. See also IRA website for "Suggestions fo Coaching" found on-line at http://www.reading.org/resources/community/ncate_support.html

More candidate data, on more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct adequate analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester and the amount of data expected for program reports submitted on September 15, 2007 data for a one year period.

Standard 3.2. Support the classroom teacher in the assessment of individual students. They extend the assessment to further determine proficiencies and difficulties for appropriate services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
The Case Study Assessment provides evidence that the candidate can administer assessments of individual students and extend assessments to further determine proficiencies and difficulties for appropriate services. In addition, it demonstrates that candidates can support the classroom teacher by the candidates' ability to assess students within the given classroom and/or recommend appropriate assessments that the classroom teacher can administer.

More candidate data, on more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct adequate analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester and the amount of data expected for program reports submitted on September 15, 2007 data for a one year period.

Standard 3.3. Assist the classroom teacher in using assessment to plan instruction for all students. They use in-depth assessment information to plan individual instruction for struggling readers. They collaborate with other education professionals to implement appropriate reading instruction for individual students. They collect, analyze, and use schoolwide assessment data to implement and revise school reading programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
The Case Study Assessment provides evidence that the candidate can assist the classroom teacher in using assessment to plan instruction for all students. The candidates are asked to report on the classroom/school/curriculum/assessment context with which the case-study student currently goes to school. The collaboration with other professionals to implement appropriate reading instruction for individual students is not evident within the assignment and it is recommended that this be included.
More candidate data, on more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct adequate analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester and the amount of data expected for program reports submitted on September 15, 2007 data for a one year period.

**Standard 3.4.** Communicate assessment information to various audiences for both accountability and instructional purposes (policymakers, public officials, community members, clinical specialists, school psychologists, social workers, classroom teacher, and parents).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Recommendations are made for instruction based on assessment data for case study (written communication is demonstrated).

More candidate data, on more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct adequate analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester and the amount of data expected for program reports submitted on September 15, 2007 is for a one-year period.

**Standard 4. Creating a Literate Environment.** Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, use of instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments. As a result, candidates:

**Standard 4.1.** Assist the classroom teacher and paraprofessional in selecting materials that match the reading levels, interests, and cultural and linguistic background of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Assessment #5, Creating a Literate Environment, requires candidates to submit a written paper that describes the inclusion of materials with consideration of students' interests, reading abilities, and backgrounds in literate environment design. This requirement demonstrates the candidates' knowledge in selecting materials that match the reading levels, interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds of students, thus implying that they could assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals. However, the coaching level is not explicitly assessed with this tool.

More data, and one more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester and the amount of data expected for program reports submitted on September 15, 2007 data for a one year period.

**Standard 4.2.** Assist the classroom teacher in selecting books, technology-based information, and nonprint materials representing multiple levels, broad interests, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment:
Assessment #5, Creating a Literate Environment, requires candidates to submit a written paper that describes their current or future environment and that presents a collection of written materials (a variety of genres), technology-based information, and non-print materials to represent broad interests, and cultural-linguistic backgrounds of students. This requirement demonstrates the candidates' knowledge base regarding the standard, thus implying that they could assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals. However, the coaching level is not explicitly assessed with this tool.

More data, and one more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester and the amount of data expected for program reports submitted on September 15, 2007 data for a one year period.

Standard 4.3. Demonstrate and model reading and writing for real purposes in daily interactions with students and education professionals. Assist teachers and paraprofessionals to model reading and writing as valued lifelong activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
It is not evident that this standard is being assessed. The Creating a Literate Environment assessment measures the candidates' knowledge of modeling opportunities for reading and writing but it lacks the demonstration and modeling requirements. The rubric needs to be adjusted to include more explicit assessment of actual modeling and demonstration.

More data, and more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester and the amount of data expected for program reports submitted on September 15, 2007 is for a one-year period.

Standard 4.4. Use methods to effectively revise instructional plans to motivate all students. They assist classroom teachers in designing programs that will intrinsically and extrinsically motivate students. They demonstrate these techniques and they can articulate the research base that grounds their practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
The paper demonstrates candidates' knowledge but does not necessarily assess whether the candidate can demonstrate these techniques.

More data, and more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct analysis and interpretation. It will be helpful to cross check this standard with the candidates' performance on this aspect of the Masters Project, or in another assessment. Also, data were submitted for one semester and the amount of data expected for program reports submitted on September 15, 2007 is for a one-year period.

Standard 5. Professional Development. Candidates view professional development as a career-long effort and responsibility. As a result, candidates:

Standard 5.1. Articulate the theories related to the connections between teacher dispositions and student
Comment:
Assessment #2, Professional Portfolio, requires candidates to include information regarding dispositions related to literacy teaching. The assessment and rubric align with the standard.

More data, on more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester only, whereas a year of data are expected.

**Standard 5.2.** Conduct professional study groups for paraprofessional and teachers. Assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in identifying, planning, and implementing personal professional development plans. Advocate to advance the professional research base to expand knowledge-based practices.

Comment:
Assessment #2, Professional Portfolio, requires candidates to demonstrate ways in which they have interacted with other professionals through submission of a description of entry, a minimum of two artifacts, and one reflection. However, candidates are not explicitly asked to conduct study groups, prepare, or help to prepare professional development plans. The alignment of the standard to the assessment and rubric is not evident.

More data, on more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester and the amount of data expected for program reports submitted on September 15, 2007 data for a one year period.

**Standard 5.3.** Positively and constructively provide an evaluation of their own and others’ teaching practices. Assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals as they strive to improve their practice.

Comment:
Assessment #2, Professional Portfolio, requires candidates to report on high quality collaborative experiences. However, it does not ask candidates explicitly to evaluate their own or others’ teaching practices. The alignment of the standard to the assessment and rubric is not evident.

More data, on more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester only, whereas a year of data are expected.

**Standard 5.4.** Exhibit leadership skills in professional development. They plan, implement, and evaluate professional development efforts at the grade, school, district, and/or state level. They are cognizant of and can describe the characteristics of sound professional development programs. They can articulate the evidence base that grounds their practice.
Comment:
Assessment #2, Professional Portfolio, requires candidates to include information (description of entry, a minimum of 2 artifacts, and one reflection) regarding involvement in professional development programs. However, it does not require candidates to explicitly exhibit leadership skills in professional development at multiple levels, or to demonstrate knowledge of sound professional development programs. The alignment of the standard to the assessment and rubric is not evident.

More data, on more than one assessment, are necessary to conduct analysis and interpretation. Data were submitted for one semester and the amount of data expected for program reports submitted on September 15, 2007 data for a one year period.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates’ knowledge of content
The candidates are assessed using a combination of measures (PRAXIS for Reading Specialists and Professional Portfolio). All aspects of Standard 1 are addressed, and Assessment 1 demonstrates a clear focus on content knowledge. However, some elements of Standard 5 were not assessed by Assessment 2 or any other assessment in a clearly aligned way, though appropriate classroom level content knowledge was demonstrated in Assessment 2, and, again, in Assessment 6.

C.2 Candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions
Assessment 3, the Inservice Training Plan, Assessment 4, the Case Study, and Assessment 6, Action Research Study, provide evidence in this area, but some of these elements (Standards 3 & 4) were assessed with only one assessment, and one standard was not assessed at all using the above assessments (Standard 5 was, instead, assessed with Assessment 2). Assessment 3 suggests that candidates are invited to think about working with others on such skill sets, but no assessment actually invites candidates to work with others as coaches in specific, well articulated ways. It is also unclear if candidates complete the demonstration called for by Standard 4.3, given that the only task with which this was assessed was a written paper. Taken together, the assessments seem to indicate that candidates are asked to demonstrate knowledge of pedagogy and content knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to teaching, and to think about coaching. However, assessment of actual application of such knowledge, skills, and dispositions, other than self-assessment, was not apparent in any of the assessments.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning
Assessment 5, Creating a Literate Environment, provides evidence that candidates know how to create an environment with impact on P-12 student learning. However, it does not provide evidence regarding candidates' actual effects on P-12 student learning. Nor does it assess Standard elements 4.1-4.4. Assessment 4, the Case Study, assesses some aspects of 4.1-4.4. However, candidates' use of assessment also does not indicate candidates' actual effects on P-12 students' learning.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)
Limited data were available to evaluate. Even so, the program report provided considerable evidence that program faculty consider assessment results to evaluate and revise course offerings, candidate performance, and assessments.

The report identifies several goals that the program will be revised to include. The report states that the graduate faculty are completing an audit and revision of the M.S. program in Reading/Literacy Education which is being done with anticipation of implementing a new program. Attention will be paid to:

- Content knowledge across courses
- Addressing diverse learners in all courses
- Exploring ways to include meaningful practice of communication (parents, teachers, students)
- Including authentic assessments for K-12 settings

There is a lack of indication that program attends to the requirement to prepare candidates to develop the ability to support and assist classroom teachers and paraprofessionals. Data need to be provided that assessment results are being evaluated in this area.

**PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**Areas for consideration**

Program faculty will likely want to create more comprehensive assessment of each standard element by assessing more of them with multiple measures (Standards 1, 3, 4, & 5 are measured only once).

Program faculty may want to elaborate on assessments and assessment rubrics so that candidates have a clear idea of exactly the performance that is expected to be produced for each assessment.

Program faculty may want to elaborate on the nature of the supervised practicum, including assessments that evaluate application of classroom and coaching expertise.

**PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:**

The section of the report that asked for a description of criteria for admissions, retention and exit instead included explanations of the unit vision, mission, commitments, and outcomes.

The alignment between the College of Education requirements and IRA elements was described, although the detailed workings of the Unit assessment system were not.

**F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:**

---

**PART G - DECISIONS**

**Please select final decision:**

Program is nationally recognized. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized.
through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

**NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS**

The program is recognized through:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM</th>
<th>DD</th>
<th>YYYY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequent action by the institution:* To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below. The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period. The range of possible deadlines for submitting reports are 4/15/08, 9/15/08, 2/1/09, 4/15/09, or 9/15/09. **Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 2/1/09 submission date.**

*Note: for this semester only, programs that have been cited as Recognized with Conditions for a second time have been given one more opportunity to submit another Response to Conditions report. The report may be submitted April 15, 2008; Sept. 15, 2008, or Feb. 1, 2009.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM</th>
<th>DD</th>
<th>YYYY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (see above for specific date):

- The program should monitor pass rates on the Praxis II and report current data in the Response to Conditions Report.
- Program assessments should be revised to clearly assess each element of each IRA standard (4.3 & 5.2-5.4).
- The program should gather sufficient data to determine that candidates complete assessments and meet standards. Additional data must be collected and analyzed for all assessments.
- The program should address reading specialist/literacy coach elements of each standard.
- Program should clearly state how it includes six credit hours of supervised practicum.
Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.