National recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the International Reading Association (IRA).
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PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA decision on national recognition of the program(s):
- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation OR Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)
The program meets or exceeds SPA benchmarked licensure test data requirement, if applicable:
- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:
Oklahoma does not require candidates have a certain number of years in order to receive licensure in the state. Oklahoma also does not require candidates to take the Oklahoma State reading specialist test. Therefore, this reports only delineates the results of those program completer candidates who have taken this state assessment. Half the graduates of the program took the assessment with an 100% pass rate.

Summary of Strengths:
The project descriptions and assessments are well-developed and clearly aligned with the standards and provide multiple opportunities for candidates to develop their knowledge of and application of the standards. Numerous revisions have been made to strengthen the program. The faculty meet regularly to work on program goals and candidate progress.
**Standard 1.** Foundational Knowledge. Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

1.1: Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections.

1.2: Understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components.

1.3: Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students’ reading development and achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comment:**
Standard 1 is assessed through Assessments 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Candidates demonstrate their understanding of foundational knowledge by providing a rationale for choosing instructional strategies and by justifying their choices according to the appropriate theoretical and research background. Data was collected over 3 years. The rubrics used to assess Standard 1 do not specifically define the program's definition of "exceptional," "thorough and satisfactory," "minimally sufficient," and "unacceptable" categories. It is unclear how the program differentiates between each candidate performance on each section of the rubrics.

**Standard 2.** Curriculum and Instruction. Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.

2.1: Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.

2.2: Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections.

2.3: Use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comment:**
Standard 2 is assessed through Assessments 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Candidates demonstrate their content knowledge and ability to use instructional approaches, materials, and curriculum as part of tutoring experiences with individual students and small groups of students. In addition, they demonstrate these skills as they evaluate reading and writing in content areas and work with teachers in a coaching project as well as designing professional resources related to curriculum and instruction for educators. The rubrics used to assess Standard 2 do not specifically define the program's definition of "exceptional," "thorough and satisfactory," "minimally sufficient," and "unacceptable" categories. It is unclear how the program differentiates between each candidate performance on each section of the rubrics.

**Standard 3.** Assessment and Evaluation. Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.

3.1: Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.

3.2: Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes.

3.3: Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.
3.4: Communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

Standard 3 is assessed through Assessments 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7. Candidates select, administer, and interpret assessments as part of a tutoring practicum with individual students and with a small group of students as they develop their role as an interventionist. In addition, candidates recommend assessment tools to teacher colleagues in their literacy leadership role as part of assessment 7. Opportunities are provided for candidates to communicate results and their implications for instruction. The rubrics used to assess Standard 3 do not specifically define the program's definition of "exceptional," "thorough and satisfactory," "minimally sufficient," and "unacceptable" categories. It is unclear how the program differentiates between each candidate performance on each section of the rubrics.

**Standard 4. Diversity.** Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.

4.1: Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write.
4.2: Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students’ knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity.
4.3: Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

Standard 4 is addressed in Assessments 1, 2, 3, and 5. Through a variety of projects, assessment 3 requires candidates to look at diversity from a variety of lenses and to demonstrate their novice coaching role in working with colleagues as part of the project. Assessment 3 is focused on issues of equity and how candidates can provide for culturally relevant instruction. The rubrics used to assess Standard 4 do not specifically define the program's definition of "exceptional," "thorough and satisfactory," "minimally sufficient," and "unacceptable" categories. It is unclear how the program differentiates between each candidate performance on each section of the rubrics.

**Standard 5. Literate Environment.** Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.

5.1: Design the physical environment to optimize students’ use of traditional print, digital, and online resources in reading and writing instruction.
5.2: Design a social environment that is low-risk, includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students’ opportunities for learning to read and write.
5.3: Use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another; discussions, and peer feedback).
5.4: Use a variety of classroom configurations (i.e., whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

Standard 5 is addressed in each of the assessments. Throughout their
program, candidates focus on the literate environment within the context of individual and small group tutoring as well as in a coaching and leadership role. Candidates also consider the literate environment as part of planning professional development and evaluating content. The rubrics used to assess Standard 5 do not specifically define the program's definition of "exceptional," "thorough and satisfactory," "minimally sufficient," and "unacceptable" categories. It is unclear how the program differentiates between each candidate performance on each section of the rubrics.

**Standard 6: Professional Learning and Leadership.** Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility.

6.1: Demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning theories and related research about organizational change, professional development, and school culture.
6.2: Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.
6.3: Participate in, design, facilitate, lead, and evaluate effective and differentiated professional development programs.
6.4: Understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comment:**

Standard 6 is addressed in assessments 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Candidates have opportunities to display leadership and coaching skills throughout their graduate program as part of a professional development project, coaching project, program evaluation, and small group tutoring. The rubrics used to assess Standard 6 do not specifically define the program's definition of "exceptional," "thorough and satisfactory," "minimally sufficient," and "unacceptable" categories. It is unclear how the program differentiates between each candidate performance on each section of the rubrics.
### C.1. Candidates’ knowledge of content

Candidates' knowledge of content is determined through the state assessment and the required state portfolio. In the portfolio, candidates submit artifacts and description/reflection to demonstrate their knowledge in each area. Knowledge of teacher leadership and working with adult learners is also evident in the program. Data from the assessments document candidates' knowledge of content.

### C.2 Candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Candidates apply their content knowledge, skills, and dispositions through direct work with students and teachers in addition to developing a multicultural project (Assessment 3), a lesson plan collection (Assessment 4) and an online professional development resource (Assessment 7). Data from the assessments document candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills and dispositions.

### C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

Candidates work with students as part of Assessment 4 and 5 in tutoring situations. While candidates evaluate middle school and high school content area curriculum, it is not clear whether candidates work with a variety of age groups as part of their tutoring experiences. Data from the assessments document candidates have a positive effect on P-12 student learning.
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)

Faculty meet regularly to work on program goals. Numerous changes have been made to the program since the previous SPA results (e.g., adding threaded textbooks, adding adult learning theory, adding and revising assessments) to strengthen the program and prepare candidates for their roles.
PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

- Rubrics need levels of performance explicitly defined for better inter-rater reliability.
- Rubrics need more specific language aligning with the standards or elements of the standards being assessed.
### PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

| F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E: | None |
| F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the CAEP site visitors: | None |
PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- **National Recognition with Conditions.** The program has received a decision of conditional national recognition. See below for details.
The program is recognized through:

MM   DD   YYYY
08   /   01   /   2020

Subsequent action by the institution: Programs will have a maximum of two opportunities to resubmit a report with revisions to receive National Recognition. A report addressing the conditions must be submitted in accordance with the dates provided on the National Recognition Report. A program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it has the required data and is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this Recognition Report. If no reports are submitted by the noted date, the program’s recognition status will expire and revert to Not Recognized. In case the status expires, the program will not be able to submit a Response to Conditions Report, but may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review if time permits for the current CAEP accreditation cycle. Otherwise, the program may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review for the next CAEP accreditation cycle, three years before the site visit.

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a second Response to Conditions Report, the next report must be submitted by the date below. Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM   DD   YYYY
03   /   15   /   2020

The following conditions must be addressed within the time period specified above if the program’s recognition with conditions has been continued. See above for specific date.

1. Rubrics need levels of performance explicitly defined for better inter-rater reliability.
2. Rubrics need more specific language aligning with the standards or elements of the standards being assessed.
Please click "Next"

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