EDUC6666. 81/82 Supervised Practicum in Correction of Reading Problems
Credits: 3
Schedule:
Professor:
Advisement:

Assigned Texts:


COURSE DESCRIPTION
This 45 hour course places candidates with a collaborating teacher and a university clinical teaching supervisor in a classroom/after school or university clinical reading setting for a minimum of 30 hours of supervised clinical practicum experiences, in which, the knowledge and skills from previous course work will be reinforced and extended. Each candidate will collaboratively plan and implement a “Response to Intervention Plan (RTIP)” conducted as an individual “case study.” A university clinical supervisor will observe the candidates, interview the collaborating teacher and provide support and mentoring. The practicum instructor coordinates the clinical supervision; provides mentoring with regards to the case studies under development; reviews best practices in literacy instruction; and surveys effective literacy programs, materials, and technological resources for diverse, struggling, K-12 readers. Emphasis is placed on the role of the reading specialist/coach in the interpretation of test data as a basis for collaborative planning and implementation of “Response to Intervention Plan (RTIP)” and through the implementation of effective literacy strategies and curricula materials for correcting individual student reading problems.

Course Objectives and Standards:
Upon completion of this course, all candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the School of Education claims in three cross-cutting liberal education themes: learning how to learn, multicultural perspectives and accuracy, and technology. All candidates will demonstrate competencies (knowledge, dispositions, skills, and performances) in New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS); New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers (NJPST), based on INTASC standards; and International Reading Association (2010) standards:
COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. The candidates will be able to diagnose and treat individual student reading and related literacy problems employing a diagnostic/instructional approach to correcting reading problems for struggling readers by planning and implementing “Response to Intervention Plan (RTIP).”

   **Standards:** NJPST # 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.5, 7.7 7.8, 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 9.6, 10.1, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7;
   NJCCCS # 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5;
   IRA (2010): # 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 5.1., 6.1

2. The candidates will learn how to correct literacy problems by diagnosing and tutoring targeted diverse students, and to conduct, write and present case studies to various audiences including: parents, teachers, other school professionals and colleagues, following a thorough investigation of student background, histories, and school supportive services.

   **Standards:** NJPST # 1.3, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 9.6, 10.1, 10.2, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7; NJCCCS # 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5;
   IRA (2010): # 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 5.1, 6.1

3. The candidates will be able to administer, analyze and use the results from multiple reading assessments of diverse, struggling readers to make informed instructional decisions for correcting decoding, vocabulary, fluency, and reading comprehension problems and to help students employ specific comprehension and metacognitive strategies to improve student literacy achievement.

   **Standards:** NJPST # 1.3, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 9.6, 10.1, 10.2, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7; NJCCCS # 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5;
   IRA (2010): # 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 6.1

4. The candidates will demonstrate leadership as reading specialists by using and recommending appropriate texts, materials and related technological resources for intervening and correcting reading problems of struggling readers, through the use of collaborative planning, collaborative coaching, on-going diagnosis and instruction.

   **Standards:** NJPST # 1.3, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 9.6, 10.1, 10.2, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7; NJCCCS # 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5;
BLACKBOARD: TECHNOLOGY PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENT:

CANDIDATES WILL NEED AN FDU WEBMAIL ACCOUNT. IT IS A SPECIFIC EMAIL ADDRESS THAT WILL ALLOW ENTRY INTO WEBCAMPUS BLACKBOARD, AN ONLINE WEBCOURSE SITE FOR WORK IN THIS COURSE.

- Candidates may request an account by entering the FDU main website at www.fdu.edu.
- On the left side of the screen in a white pull-down menu, press arrow and select webmail option.
- On new screen click on blue phrase, Click here for FDU’s Secure Webmail Server.
- On new screen with a photo of founder Fairleigh S. Dickinson in top center, select 4th option on the left column, Create new webmail account.
- On new screen select option: Student ID number, then click Proceed to next step.
- Follow the instructions from that point.
- The webmail account will be assigned usually within 48 hours but allow ample time for registration by completing during the first week of classes.
- Once registration is complete and webmail account established; enter WebCampus and use the entire webmail account including domain as User ID and the same password to locate this course in Blackboard.
- Be sure to post all completed written tasks to Blackboard and to present a hard copy to the instructor as well in order to meet the task requirements.

NOTE: It is the candidate’s responsibility to secure his or her Blackboard Webmail Account and to resolve any related problems. BLACKBOARD HELP INFORMATION can be found on the website and if that does not resolve the problem, be sure to contact a colleague for help. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Essential Question (EQ): How can teachers prevent &amp; Bean Ch. 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Course Requirements and Grading

**Correct struggling readers’ reading problems?**
Discuss a dynamic, assessment/instructional approach to correcting reading problems. Review syllabus, including course requirements and student respond to questions. Introduce the **case study** as a valuable research tool.

2

**EQ: How to put literacy research findings into practice; and how to conduct a case study?**
Case study protocols reviewed.

Pinnell Ch. 1-2
Morrow Ch. 3-4

3

**EQ: Which specific strategies improve reading comprehension and how can they be implemented effectively according to research?**
Developing automaticity of sight words and importance of teaching “labels” to help students’ cognitive ability. Vocabulary strategies: CPD/MGT approaches.

Pinnell Ch. 3-4
Morrow Ch. 5-7

4

**EQ: What does research say about fluency and repeated reading strategies for improving reading comprehension?**
What do Samuels & Kuhn say about the repeated readings & read-a-long strategies for improving reading comprehension?
Candidates review protocols of **Case Studies.**

Bean Ch 5-6
Cunningham Ch. 9-12

5

**EQ: How can Interactive Writing be used to help struggling students learn word study, spelling and writing skills?**
Discuss writing as a thinking skill and as a reciprocal reading skill: Writing-to-Read/Reading-to-Write. Writing as a process; reading the punctuation for fluency.
Candidates review: How to write a **Case Study?**

Pinnell Ch. 5-6
Morrow Ch. 8

6

**EQ: Which essential elements of Balanced Reading help prevent and correct reading problems?**
Review of research on balanced reading programs. Defining literacy & balanced reading.

Cunningham Ch. 13
Morrow: Ch. 1-2

**CASE STUDY PRESENTATIONS (Group 1)**

7

**EQ: What specific scaffolding strategies can be used to correct comprehension problems?**
Strategies for improving content area achievement: Employing specific reading strategies: Directed Thinking Activity; Think-Alouds, Reciprocal Thinking, Retelling & Summarizing.
Strategies for improving reading non-fiction text. Teaching research based strategies, i.e., PLAN, QAR for scaffolding understanding: literal, inferential and implied meanings.

Morrow Ch. 16
Pinnell Ch. 7-8

8

**EQ: Which literacy metacognitive approaches work best with elementary level students? How can technology be employed to improve student vocabulary, automaticity, fluency and reading comprehension achievement?**

Cunningham Ch. 14
Morrow Ch. 14-16

**CASE STUDY PRESENTATIONS (Group 2)**
The 8 week, 15 hour syllabus above outlines the theory part of the course work for EDUC6666. In addition, a minimum of 30 hours of field work for this supervised practicum engages the candidates in a number of performance-based tasks or practice that include: 20 hours of one-on-one instruction with a struggling reader; plus 10 hours of collaboration activities, i.e.: a full-blown case study report on the targeted student; an analysis of the diagnostic data findings; a planned conference held with parents and other professional staff members; the planning of an RTIP with a collaborating teacher, including the selection and sharing of leveled texts, multicultural materials, curriculum resources and technology for the intervention; coaching one or more teachers, writing a formal proposal and conducting a staff development workshop presentation, are some of the essential encounters of this 45 hour practicum. The candidate will keep a diary/notebook to record how these 30 hours of collaboration/field work are accomplished.

The course requirements for EDUC6666 Supervised Practicum in Correction of Reading Problems are presented in the 5 tasks outlined below. The professional dispositions, readings, participation and quality of field work encounters, as part of the 30 plus hours of supervised practicum activities are a direct outgrowth of the previous course work and particularly, the content related to Diagnosis of Reading. The candidate will be responsible for maintaining a log of a minimum of 30 hours of field work activities which includes: administering authentic assessments and instructional interventions with a diverse and struggling reader in the field study setting. In addition to the satisfactory completion of the 5 performance-based tasks that follow (see point distribution for Tasks 1-5, rubrics and checklist forms), clinical supervisors will observe and evaluate the candidates in the field. Clinical supervisors will observe and evaluate candidates in the field with 2 instruments based upon the International Reading Association’s Standards for Reading Professionals (2010): Literacy Standards Instrument (LSI); and the Collaborating Literacy Teacher Interview Form.

Candidates will be required to meet the criteria set forth in each of the 5 tasks delineated below, and it is also essential that the candidate receive a “Proficient” rating on each of the above assessment instruments mentioned above in order to be recommended by the practicum instructor as fulfilling the requirements of the supervised practicum with a passing grade.

**TASK # 1: DEVELOP A RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION PLAN (RTIP)**

(15 PTS)
With a collaborating teacher, the candidate will develop a **Response to Intervention Plan (RTIP)** to correct the diagnosed reading problems of a targeted, struggling reader. These reading/literacy problems should be drawn from three or more of the skill areas listed below and which are based upon multiple assessment results, informing the candidate of the instructional interventions required:

*Phonological/Phonemic Awareness*
*Decoding*
*Vocabulary*
*Automaticity / Fluency*
*Reading Comprehension*

**The candidate will:**

1) Begin by submitting a **1 Paragraph e-mail proposal (end of week 3)** that shows how s/he plans to correct diagnosed needs of the targeted struggling reader’s literacy problems.

2) Explain which **multiple assessment** strategies will be utilized as part of the RTIP plan.

3) Provide a brief summary of each targeted student’s **needs assessment** findings or conclusions.

4) Describe in paragraph form how the **RTIP checklist of identified skills** will be implemented, using a tutorial, one-on-one clinical approach, to help correct the targeted student’s reading/literacy problems.

5) Describe the results of the progress made by the student, providing a specific analysis of the diagnostic/intervention utilized, including the multicultural literature, informational texts, curricular materials, manipulatives, visual tools, technology and other resources used to correct the reading/literacy problems of the targeted student. *(The results of these outcomes will be presented by the candidate as part of the required full-blown Case Study of the targeted student receiving tutorial RTIP intervention described in TASK #4.)*

**Standards:** NJPST # 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 9.6, 10.1, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6 10.7; NJCCCS # 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5;

**IRA (2010):** # 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 5.1., 6.1

**TASK # 2 WRITTEN REPORT OF THE RTIP IMPLEMENTATION RESULTS**

**(15 PTS)**
Candidates will submit a **RTIP Report (5-6 pages)** containing the results of the instructional intervention. The written report should include, but not be limited to, the following key topics:

- Background history of the student, including cultural and learning differences;
- Analysis of the supportive services provided by the district;
- Overview of the intervention instructional plan developed with a collaborating teacher;
- Description of the intervention procedures; materials and curriculum resources;
- Description of the cause/effect of the student’s literacy progress, if any;
- Listing of the multiple assessments used and an analysis of the specific results;
- The conclusions drawn from the diagnoses;
- Future recommendations based upon the instructional intervention

**Standards:** NJPST: # 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 9.6, 10.1, 10.2, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7; NJCCCS # 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5;
IRA (2010): # 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1

**TASK # 3: PEER READING COACH/OBSERVATION ACTIVITY AND REPORT**
(15 PTS)
The candidates will serve in the role of a peer reading coach following Rita Bean’s Four Step Coaching Cycle (p. 101, The Reading Specialist), and by writing a report that is ethnographic in style, thereby, citing the dialogue and key information that emerges from the experience, and which is related to the following four steps modified from Bean’s recommendations:

**Step 1. Planning:** *EQ. What does the teacher hope to gain from the experience?*

**Step 2. Observing:** *EQ. What does the reading coach learn by observing in the classroom, focusing on the aspects that have been jointly agreed upon in the planning meeting?*

**Step 3. Analyzing/Reflecting:** *EQ: What do the coach and the teacher glean from the lesson, and what data and questions help mirror this experience for both collaborators?*

**Step 4. Conferring:** *EQ: What commitment does the teacher make as to what aspects will be applied in future lessons?*

Also, as part of the professional dispositions expected of all FDU candidates, they will meet the New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers (NJPST) and the 2010 revised International Reading Association Standards (See 5.1) showing that the successful candidate must exhibit all Professional Dispositions.

**Standards:** NJPST: #1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 9.6, 10.1, 10.2, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7; NJCCCS # 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5; IRA (2010): # 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1
TASK # 4: CONDUCT A CASE STUDY: DIAGNOSE AND INSTRUCT A STRUGGLING READER UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE PRACTICUM INSTRUCTOR AND FIELD STUDY CLINICAL SUPERVISOR    (40 PTS)

1. Candidates will diagnose and instruct a struggling reader for 20 hours in a one-on-one tutorial setting in a public school or instructor’s approved educational setting.

2. Candidates will plan individual lessons with a collaborating teacher, sharing case study information; background history; supportive services provided by the school district; diagnosis, intervention strategies; metacognitive strategies; specific comprehension strategies; learning styles; multiple intelligence; reading materials, leveled texts, culturally and linguistically diverse reading and curriculum materials appropriate for meeting the needs of the targeted struggling diverse reader.

3. Candidates will write a full-blown Case Study report, following the protocol presented by the practicum instructor (who will provide supervision and mentoring throughout this research process). The candidate will share the outcomes of the multiple diagnoses and concomitant intervention used, with the student’s family at a scheduled conference, attended by the collaborating teacher and other school professionals.

4. The candidate will identify and analyze the results of the various supportive services being provided the struggling reader within the framework of the school day, i.e., the background history of the student and the supportive services provided should include but not be limited to:

   - Formative, standardized testing results;
   - Prior teachers’ recorded observations/informal testing results;
   - Basic Skills Improvement Program (BSIP) (Pull-out or Push-in; History and Dates of Service, if appropriate)
   - Classroom teacher modification re: curriculum/materials/instruction;
   - Outside tutoring history (parent/district);
   - IEP Classification (if appropriate);
   - Resource Center Assistance (if appropriate);
   - English Language Learner Program (ESL) (if appropriate);
   - Cultural or linguistic differences and accommodations;
   - Other support services or program modifications.

5. The candidate will share his or her case study, electronically and orally with a team of certified teachers, and/or LRS candidates, while maintaining strict confidentiality.

   Standards: NJPST# 1.3, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 8.9, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 9.6, 10.1, 10.2, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7; NJCCCS # 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5;
   IRA (2010): 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 5.1, 6.1

TASK # 5 DESIGN AND IMPLEMENT A STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP (15 PTS)
Each candidate will design and implement a Staff Development Workshop, stressing the importance and value of: Diagnosis and Correction of Reading Problems, i.e., using multiple assessments, including informal reading inventories, and running records in meeting specific needs of students (phonemic awareness; word study/phonics, vocabulary, fluency and specific reading comprehension). This workshop should be designed with the Collaborating Teacher; and other teachers and professional staff if available. The candidate will be responsible for writing the workshop presentation as a Proposal, just as one might submit for giving a presentation at a local, state or national reading conference. The workshop should be designed with new and/or non-tenured teachers and/or paraprofessionals in mind. The workshop can be offered as part of a Faculty Meeting or as part of a Staff Development after school meeting for interested teachers and staff members.

A Workshop Evaluation Form (See Task #5 Form, end of syllabus) must be filled out by teachers and/or paraprofessionals attending the workshop and submitted as evidence. Submit evaluations forms with the workshop proposal.

Standards: NJPST: #1.3, 1.6, 1.9, 2.1, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 8.9, 9.1, 9.3, 9.4, 9.6, 10.1, 10.2, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7; NJCCCS: # 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5;
IRA (2010): # 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 5.1., 6.1

NOTE: Dates for the completion of the above tasks will be arranged with each candidate once field study arrangements are completed. All assigned readings, however, should be read prior to the scheduled session, at which time, candidates will be assessed with regards to their participation and contribution to group discussion.

Also, all workshop proposals, outlines, materials, exemplars, and power point presentations must be submitted in hard copy and electronically to the instructor.

Literacy Specialist Inventory (LSI)
Fairleigh Dickinson University
Peter Sammartino School of Education
This form is designed to provide feedback for the Literacy/Reading Specialist candidate and for the School of Education. Please fill out this cover page completely, bubbling all appropriate descriptors. This composite information will be used for tracking our candidates and statistical analysis of our program.

Literacy/Reading Specialist candidate: _____________________________ Date: __________________

Collaborating Teacher: __________________________________________

Field Supervisor: ________________________________________________

Subject/Grade): _________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st observation</th>
<th>2nd observation</th>
<th>3rd observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semester:  
- O Spring_________  
- O Summer_________

Course in which enrolled

- O EDUC 6666 Supervised Practicum in Correction of Reading
- O EDUC 6609 Supervised Practicum in Reading

Instructions for the following pages: Please circle the rating for each performance indicator listed below, with Advanced Proficient indicating the HIGHEST competency and Pre-emergent indicating the LOWEST competency for each criterion.

Performance in each area is rated as follows:
- Advanced Proficient
- Proficient
- Novice
- Pre-emergent
- N/O Not observed

(Note: Please use N/O Not Observed sparingly. You should be able to rate each competency on this form, using additional evidence provided by the candidate and/or collaborating teacher for those indicators that are not observed.)

Your comments for each standard are also requested. Use the space provided. Please do not write in shaded areas.

After discussion with the Literacy/Reading Specialist candidate, both the supervisor and the candidate should sign below. If you are filling this out on Waypoint, you do not need to obtain signatures.

Overall evaluation:  
- O Advanced Proficient  
- O Proficient  
- O Novice  
- O Pre-Emergent

Signature of Supervisor: __________________________________________

Signature of Literacy/Reading Specialist Candidate: ______________________

Signature of Instructor: ____________________________________________

Signature of LRS Coordinator: ________________________________________
## IRA Standard #1: Foundational Knowledge
The candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Models fair-mindedness, empathy and caring behavior in teaching students reading development and achievement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Demonstrates thorough knowledge of NJCCCS</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Makes effective use of explanations and connections to prior learning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Designs effective reading plans</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Implements effective research-based reading plans that meet the specific needs of struggling readers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Word recognition</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Reading comprehension</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Strategic strategies in comprehension</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Reading/writing connections</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Literary analysis</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Syntax</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Selects and uses appropriate level texts and resources</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Employs various grouping options to differentiate instruction</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Uses assessment tools effectively</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Provides evidence of interpreting diagnostic assessments for struggling readers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Provides evidence of using multiple diagnostic assessments to plan instruction</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Provides timely and meaningful student feedback</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Uses results of formal assessment to gain further information of student’s profile</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
### IRA 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Uses a variety of resources that are sensitive to the needs of all learners and that represent an array of diversity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Demonstrates sensitivity to diverse learners’ cultural and linguistic background and needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

### IRA Standard #5: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Selects books and materials that match the reading levels, interests and cultural and linguistic background of students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Designs the physical environment to optimize students’ engagement with literacy activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Relates to students in warm and caring manner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Manages student behavior effectively</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Manages time effectively</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Provides an environment where all students feel safe and welcome</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

### IRA Standard #6: Professional Learning and Leadership
Candidates view professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Displays positive dispositions toward literacy, and shows enthusiasm for the teaching of reading and writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Provides evidence of a staff development workshop proposal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Provides evidence of positive feedback on the implementation of a staff development workshop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Collaborating Literacy Teacher Interview Form
Fairleigh Dickinson University
Peter Sammartino School of Education
1000 River Road
Teaneck NJ 07666

This form is designed to provide feedback for the Literacy/Reading Specialist candidate and for the School of Education. Please fill out this cover page completely, bubbling all appropriate descriptors. This composite information will be used for tracking our candidates and statistical analysis of our program.

Literacy/Reading Specialist candidate: ______________________________________ Date: ________________

Collaborating Teacher: ________________________________________________________________

Field Supervisor: _______________________________________________________________________

Subject/Grade): _______________________________________________________________________

1st observation  2nd observation  3rd observation

Semester: Spring_______ Summer_______

Course in which enrolled

EDUC 6666 Supervised Practicum in Correction of Reading
EDUC 6609 Supervised Practicum in Reading

Instructions for the following pages: Please circle the rating for each performance indicator listed below, with Advanced Proficient indicating the HIGHEST competency and Pre-emergent indicating the LOWEST competency for each criterion.

Performance in each area is rated as follows: Advanced Proficient Proficient Novice Pre-emergent N/O Not observed

(Note: Please use N/O Not Observed sparingly. You should be able to rate each competency on this form, using additional evidence provided by the candidate and/or collaborating teacher.)

Your comments for each standard are also requested. Use the space provided. Please do not write in shaded areas.

After discussion with the Literacy/Reading Specialist candidate, both the supervisor and the candidate should sign below. If you are filling this out on Waypoint, you do not need to obtain signatures.

Overall evaluation:  O Advanced Proficient  O Proficient  O Novice  O Pre-Emergent

Signature of Supervisor: __________________________________________________________________

Signature of Literacy/Reading Specialist Candidate: ____________________________

Signature of Instructor: __________________________________________________________________

Signature of LRS Coordinator ________________________________________________
### IRA Standard #1: Foundational Knowledge
The candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Show evidence of being able to apply foundational knowledge, including the use of prior knowledge and scaffold?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Exhibit professional judgment and practical knowledge to improve all students’ reading development and achievement?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Model fair-mindedness, empathy and caring behavior in teaching students &amp; in working with other professionals?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Provide students with appropriate support and instructional interventions?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Provide students with appropriate texts, resources and materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Plan with the collaborating teacher to use various grouping options to best meet the needs of all students?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Plan with the collaborating teacher to design, implement and evaluate the reading and writing curriculum for all students?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Serve as a resource for other teachers in planning to implement instructional approaches for all students?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Show evidence of being able to use, interpret, and recommend a wide range of assessment tools and practices?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Serve as a resource to others by modeling the use of multiple assessments to plan instruction for all students?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Communicate effectively about assessment practices and results to staff, administration and parents?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

### IRA 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Show evidence of being sensitive, caring and capable of meeting the needs of diverse learners?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Use a wide range of materials and best practices to meet the cultural and linguistic needs of all students? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4

4.3 Plan with collaborating teacher to build strong home-school literacy connections? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4

Comments:

**IRA Standard #5: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Create a supportive and safe environment for all struggling readers?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Use appropriate routines to support reading and writing instruction?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Plan with collaborating teacher use of differentiated instruction?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

**IRA Standard #6: Professional Learning and Leadership**
Candidates view professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the literacy/reading specialist candidate:</th>
<th>Not Observed</th>
<th>Pre-Emergent</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Display positive dispositions in collaborative planning?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Display positive dispositions and skills in his/her role as a reading specialist/coach?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Promote the value of literacy through working with other faculty and staff?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Demonstrate leadership qualities in professional relationships?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
## EDUC6666 – Supervised Practicum in Corrections of Reading Problems –  
Tasks #1-5: RUBRIC for Oral Presentations and Written Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
<th>ACCEPTABLE</th>
<th>DEFICIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Teaching:**  
- Topic  
- Organization  
- User (Teacher) friendly  
- Grammar/Structure correct  
- Citations dually noted | Area of reading is clearly stated  
Grammatically correct  
Well-organized  
Easy to follow/use  
Citations are included | Area of reading is clearly stated  
Grammatically correct  
Organized adequately  
Teacher friendly  
Citations may not be included or cited properly | Area of reading is not evident  
Grammatical errors evident  
Somewhat disorganized  
Hard to implement  
No citation included |
| **Presentation (Small Group):**  
- Materials  
- Exemplars  
- Organization and Planning | Materials for all to participate  
Exemplars clearly demonstrate problems and teaching strategies  
Presentation is well organized and planned/presented clearly  
Correct diagnosis and appropriate interventions/strategy recommended | Materials for all to participate  
Exemplars demonstrate problems and teaching strategies  
Presentation is somewhat organized  
Diagnosis is correct, but interventions/strategy may not thoroughly address problem | Limited materials  
Exemplars do not demonstrate how to address learning needs  
Presentation is disorganized  
Little planning is evident  
Diagnosis is incorrect and interventions are inadequately addressed |
| **Presentation (Whole Group):**  
- Materials  
- Exemplars  
- Organization and Planning | Materials for all to participate  
Exemplars clearly demonstrate problems and teaching strategies  
Presentation is well organized and planned/presented clearly  
Correct diagnosis and interventions are recommended | Materials for all to participate  
Exemplars demonstrate problems and teaching strategies  
Presentation is somewhat organized  
Diagnosis correct, but interventions may not thoroughly address problem | Limited materials  
Exemplars do not demonstrate how to address learning needs  
Presentation is disorganized  
Little planning is evident  
Diagnosis incorrect and interventions not adequately addressed |
**EDUC6666 Task #1: Develop A Response to Intervention Plan (RTIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Proposal</th>
<th>Multiple Assessment Strategies</th>
<th>Findings and Conclusions</th>
<th>Overall Written Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> A one Paragraph e-mail proposal by the end of week two that shows how you plan to correct one or more aspects of your students' assessed literacy problems. Paragraph is well composed and free of grammatical errors.</td>
<td>Uses many ongoing multiple assessment strategies based on the information gathered from: anecdotal records, running record, BRI, Ekwall Shanker Reading Inventory in order to improve and correct reading skills.</td>
<td>There are specific recommendations for each strength and weakness listed under the diagnosis such as phonological/phonemic awareness, decoding, vocabulary, automaticity, fluency, and comprehension. The recommendations are detailed enough to be used for effective interventions.</td>
<td>Report includes working notes. Report is well written and free of errors. Report is well presented, organized, comprehensive, and complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Less than half a paragraph with some grammatical errors.</td>
<td>Uses some multiple assessment strategies over a brief period of time based on the information gathered from limited assessments.</td>
<td>There are specific but limited recommendations to be used for effective interventions.</td>
<td>Report includes working notes, is well written with some errors and is well presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Less than half a paragraph one week late with many grammatical errors.</td>
<td>Uses one valid assessment strategy over a brief period of time based on the information gathered from one assessment.</td>
<td>There are limited recommendations that do not contain detailed enough to be used for effective interventions.</td>
<td>Report includes incomplete notes, paper contains numerous errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Paragraph was never emailed.</td>
<td>No strategies implemented.</td>
<td>There are no valid recommendations to be used for effective interventions.</td>
<td>Report includes no notes. Paper is not well written with many errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDUC 6666 – TASK #2: RESULTS OF RTIP IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED AREAS</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Overview of RTIP and intervention is complete and accurate.</td>
<td>Overview of RTIP and intervention is somewhat complete and adequate.</td>
<td>Overview of RTIP is partially complete but lacking detail.</td>
<td>Overview is Incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITIES &amp; PLAN</strong></td>
<td>Interventions and activities to develop strengths and weaknesses are varied.</td>
<td>Interventions and activities are provided.</td>
<td>Interventions and activities are minimal.</td>
<td>Interventions and activities are not evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT PROGRESS</strong></td>
<td>Progress was noted and explained thoroughly.</td>
<td>Progress is included and explained.</td>
<td>Student progress is included but not explained.</td>
<td>Student progress is not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENTS &amp; RESULTS</strong></td>
<td>Variety of appropriate assessments and results are adequately reported.</td>
<td>Few assessments utilized and results recorded.</td>
<td>Minimal assessments used and results noted.</td>
<td>No assessment or results are noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONCLUSION &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS</strong></td>
<td>Conclusions and recommendations are comprehensive.</td>
<td>Conclusions and recommendations are limited.</td>
<td>Conclusions and recommendations are quite weak.</td>
<td>Conclusions and recommendations are lacking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TASK # 3

EDUC6666

PEER READING COACH AND OBSERVATION REPORT

15 points

EACH CANDIDATE WILL WRITE A COMPLETE, CONFIDENTIAL PEER COACHING/TEACHER REPORT FOLLOWING THE RITA BEAN 4 STAGE MODEL BY ANSWERING 6 EQs:

DID THE CANDIDATE/COACH USE AN ETHNOGRAPHIC REPORTING STYLE? _______ (3 Pts)

DID THE CANDIDATE/COACH CITE WHAT THE ESTABLISHED GOAL FOR THE LESSON WAS SUPPOSED TO BE AS DEVELOPED DURING THE PRE-CONFERENCE STAGE? _______ (2 Pts)

DID THE CANDIDATE/COACH REVEAL (CONFIDENTIALLY) WHAT THE LESSON CONSISTED OF AND WHETHER IT MET THE GOAL SET FORTH IN THE PRE-CONFERENCE? _______ (2 Pts)


DID THE CANDIDATE/COACH CITE WHAT THE TEACHER COMMITTED TO FOLLOWING THEIR POST-CONFERENCE MEETING? _______ (3 Pts)

DID THE CANDIDATE PROVIDE A CONCLUSION AND FINAL SELF-EVALUATION RELATED TO THIS PEER COACHING EXPERIENCE, EXPLAINING WHAT WAS LEARNED AND WHAT IMPROVEMENTS MIGHT BE NEEDED TO BECOME A BETTER PEER READING COACH IN THE FUTURE? _______ (3 Pts)
TASK # 4: CASE STUDY REPORT: EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(40 Pts – 2pts each)

Did the candidate:

_____ Submit 30 hour log with collaborating teacher verifying signature?
_____ Use multiple assessments to diagnose the targeted student?
_____ Include formative and informative standardized test results in the history?
_____ Include prior teachers’ observations and assessment information in history?
_____ Interview the parents to complete the background for the case study?
_____ Interview prior teachers and staff for case study background?
_____ Involve the targeted student in setting instructional goals for the intervention?
_____ Include developmental milestones as part of the student’s screening?
_____ Provide analysis, summary of data with recommendations?
_____ Write an analysis of the supportive services, provided by the district?
_____ Determine if the classroom teacher is modifying the literacy program?
_____ Plan instructional lessons, with a collaborating teacher?
_____ Utilize metacognitive, and specific reading comprehension strategies?
_____ Use learning styles and/or multiple intelligences, for the intervention?
_____ Follow the case study protocol meticulously, in developing the report?
_____ Share results of the testing and intervention with the student’s family?
_____ Share results with the collaborating teacher and other school professionals?
_____ Report case study findings, with colleagues in EDUC6666?
_____ Submit electronic copy of the case study, via Blackboard?
_____ Submit a hard copy of the case study, to the practicum instructor?
### TASK # 4 PRESENTATION OF CASE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td>-Presented in logical order</td>
<td>-Details lacking some information</td>
<td>-Details lacking much information</td>
<td>-Details unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Is on topic</td>
<td>-Strays from topic</td>
<td>-Thoughts and ideas are not very strong</td>
<td>-Presentation is weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Clear and concise</td>
<td>-Thoughts and ideas are not very strong</td>
<td>-Some areas are covered</td>
<td>and presenter is unprepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Knowledge on all areas of child’s RTIP</td>
<td>-Most areas are covered</td>
<td>-Some presentation of information is evident</td>
<td>-Few areas are covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Well planned and confident presentation</td>
<td>-Most of child’s strengths and needs are addressed</td>
<td>-Presentation is not well-planned</td>
<td>-Presentation is poorly planned and presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Focus on child’s needs and Strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Plan</strong></td>
<td>-Interventions and activities develop strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>-Interventions and activities are provided</td>
<td>-Interventions and activities are minimal</td>
<td>-Interventions and activities are not evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are varied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
<td>-Most areas of the child’s RTIP are addressed including:</td>
<td>-Many areas of the child’s RTIP are addressed</td>
<td>-Child’s RTIP is minimally addressed</td>
<td>-Does not address the child’s RTIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Concepts and print</td>
<td>-Interventions relative to strengths and weaknesses are somewhat developed</td>
<td>-Meets minimally meets criteria</td>
<td>-Does not address the strengths and weaknesses of the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Phonological awareness</td>
<td>-Strong conclusions but not complete</td>
<td>-Addresses some strengths and weaknesses of the child</td>
<td>-Interventions are not sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Decoding and word recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Interventions not up to par</td>
<td>-Conclusion is missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Reading strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Vocabulary and concept development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Comprehension skills and response to text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Inquiry and research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-All criteria are met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Conclusions are complete and strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Learning</strong></td>
<td>-Extremely informative and beneficial to classmates</td>
<td>-Informative and beneficial to classmates</td>
<td>-Somewhat beneficial to classmates</td>
<td>-Not informative or beneficial to classmates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

PRESENTER’S NAME ______________________________________________

WORKSHOP TITLE _______________________________________________

SKILL/CONCEPT FOCUS ___________________________________________

PLACE OF WORKSHOP ____________________________________________

DATE OF WORKSHOP ____________________________________________

Please rate the workshop on a Likert Scale from:  1 (lowest) – 5 (highest) –

1. Overall rating of session:  1 2 3 4 5

2. Clarity of content:  1 2 3 4 5

3. Relevance to the classroom:  1 2 3 4 5

4. Knowledge of content:  1 2 3 4 5

5. Planning of session evident:  1 2 3 4 5

6. Literacy expertise evident:  1 2 3 4 5

7. Responses to questions:  1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS: (Use other side for additional space.)

*Candidates return workshop evaluation forms to instructor before end of course.
FDU School of Education Policy Reference

Mission: The mission of the School of Education at Fairleigh Dickinson University is to foster a diverse community of effective, professional educators who are caring, competent, reflective, ethical leaders committed to developing scholarship, advancing student learning and achievement, and promoting democratic ideals in our global society.

A. Attendance: Students are required to attend class, arrive on time and participate in all courses for which they are enrolled. Class attendance and participation are essential to academic progress. Individual instructors may include class participation in the determination of the final grade. Each instructor will announce his or her grading policies at the beginning of the semester in each course, making clear the weight to be given to participation in grade determination. (FDU policy). The School of Education’s Policy Committee suggests the following for graduate classes which meet for 15 sessions:

a. Attendance is required in all our classes
b. 3 absences, grade drops by a half a grade
c. 4 absences, grade drops by one full grade
d. 5 absences, the student fails or withdraws from the class

B. FDU Academic Integrity Policy


Students enrolled at Fairleigh Dickinson University are expected to maintain the highest standards of academic honesty. Students have the responsibility to each other to make known the existence of academic dishonesty to their course instructor, and then, if necessary, the department chairperson or the academic dean of their College. Course instructors have the added responsibility to state in advance in their syllabi any special policies and procedures concerning examinations and other academic exercises specific to their courses. Students should request this information if not distributed by the instructor.

Academic dishonesty includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the following:
1. Cheating—Giving or receiving unauthorized assistance in any academic exercise or examination. Using or attempting to use any unauthorized materials, information or study aids in an examination or academic exercise.
2. Plagiarism—Representing the ideas or language of others as one’s own.
3. Falsification—Falsifying or inventing any information, data or citation in an academic exercise.
4. Multiple Submission—Submitting substantial portions of any academic exercise more than once for credit without the prior authorization and approval of the current instructor.
5. Complicity—Facilitating any of the above actions or performing work that another student then presents as his or her assignment.
6. Interference—Interfering with the ability of a student to perform his or her assignments.

Sanctions: Any student found guilty of academic dishonesty will, for the first offense, receive one or a combination of the following penalties:
1. No Credit (0) or Failure for the academic exercise.
2. Reduced grade for the course.
3. A Failure in the course that is identified on the student’s permanent record card as permanent and cannot be removed.
4. Recommendation for academic probation to the Dean’s Office. In cases of interference and complicity, when the student is not registered in the affected course, the incident may be
recorded on the student’s permanent record card. In any case, the incident and penalty will be recorded in the student’s file maintained in the campus Office of Enrollment Services. For a second offense of academic dishonesty, a student will be subject to any combination of the above sanctions and, with concurrence of the academic dean, one of the following:

1. **Suspension** from the University for one year. Readmission will be contingent upon the approval of the academic dean.
2. **Dismissal** from the University.

---

**C. Graduate Programs – Grading & similar policies**

1. **Grades** (*The instructor should specify his or her grading scale to equate points/percentages into letter grades.):*

   a. **Weighted grades:** A, A-, B+, B-, C+, C, and F. (Grades of C- or D are not acceptable grades in graduate programs.) The minimum passing grade for the graduate programs is a C.

   b. **Incompletes** (not a grade but a temporary status): STUDENTS HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO COMPLETE ALL WORK IN A COURSE IN THE PRESCRIBED TERM. A student has the added responsibility to notify the course instructor of circumstances that will prevent the student from completing the required coursework on time. An incomplete should be given only in exceptional or emergency circumstances at the discretion of, and after consultation with, the instructor. The students will have through the third week of the next full semester (fall or spring) to complete the requirement for the course or the incomplete automatically will change to a failure. If appropriate, the instructor can request an extension of the incomplete, which requires the approval of the school director and the college dean.

   c. **Change of Letter Grades:** “No instructor shall change a grade from one letter grade to another based upon submission by the student of additional work unless the same opportunity has been made to all other students in the class.” A change of grade is always legitimate and appropriate when the recorded grade is the result of an error by any university employee.

2. **Repeat Courses:** If a graduate student repeats a course, both grades remain on the transcript and are averaged in the cumulative grade-point-ratio (GPA). The student will earn credit for one course.

3. **Degree Requirements and Academic Probation**

   a. The School of Education requires a minimum grade-point-ratio of 2.75 (3.25 for the MACT and the MA in Learning Disabilities) for graduation.

   b. Students who receive two or more grades of C in graduate coursework will be warned, and if they do not demonstrate improvement in their academic performance they will be asked to withdraw.

   c. Retention in the MAT program is contingent on maintaining a minimum grade-point-ratio of 3.00 (3.25 for the MA in Learning Disabilities).

   d. A graduate program of study must be completed within a period of five years from the time the student first registers for graduate study.

---

**D. Undergraduate Programs – Grading & similar policies**

1. **Grades**
a. Weighted grades: A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, and F. The minimum passing grade for the undergraduate programs is a D.

b. Incompletes (not a grade but a temporary status): STUDENTS HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO COMPLETE ALL WORK IN A COURSE IN THE PRESCRIBED TERM. A student has the added responsibility to notify the course instructor of circumstances that will prevent the student from completing the required coursework on time. An incomplete should be given only in exceptional or emergency circumstances at the discretion of, and after consultation with, the instructor. The students will have through the third week of the next full semester (fall or spring) to complete the requirement for the course or the incomplete automatically will change to a failure. If appropriate, the instructor can request an extension of the incomplete, which requires the approval of the school director and the college dean.

c. Change of Letter Grades: “No instructor shall change a grade from one letter grade to another based upon submission by the student of additional work unless the same opportunity has been made to all other students in the class.” A change of grade is always legitimate and appropriate when the recorded grade is the result of an error by any university employee.

2. Repeated Courses: If an undergraduate student repeats a course, both grades remain on the transcript but only the last earned grade will be computed in the cumulative grade-point ratio. The student will earn the credit associated with the grade received in the last repeated course.

3. Degree Requirements and Academic Probation

a. In general, a student must earn a minimum 2.00 GPR (GPA) for graduation. The School of Education, however, requires a minimum undergraduate grade-point-ratio of 3.00 for acceptance and retention in the QUEST program. If a full-time student’s semester GPR (or part-time student in blocks of twelve credits) is between 2.75 and 3.00, the student will be continued in the QUEST program for one additional semester. Students will not be retained in the QUEST program if their CGPR falls below 2.75.

b. QUEST students who receive two or more grades of C in MAT courses will be placed on probation. If they do not demonstrate improvement in their MAT coursework they will be removed from the program.

c. An undergraduate program of study must be completed within a period of ten years.

E. Student Academic Services: The University attempts to meet the needs of all students with special needs. The Office of the Dean of Students coordinates, through appropriate campus offices, services that would provide reasonable accommodations for students with special needs. If special accommodations are required, contact the dean of students as early in the semester as possible to that appropriate arrangements can be made.

F. Policy on course completion: In order to maintain matriculation status, students must register consecutively for the fall and spring semesters. If consecutive registration is not maintained, students must reapply to the Admissions Office. A leave of absence allows students to interrupt their graduate studies if necessary. Please see the Student Handbook for specific details.

G. Student responsibilities regarding fulfilling course requirements (the following represents the committee’s policy regarding student responsibility in fulfilling course requirements):
It is expected that students enrolled in courses and programs in the FDU School of Education take a proactive stance in assuring that they meet the requirements to fulfill all courses necessary for certification and/or their respective program in the correct sequence and in a timely fashion. This means that it is the student’s responsibility to meet regularly with his or her advisor, to line up a sequence of courses and a time frame for completion, to make sure that all check sheets are updated regularly and are current, and to make sure that all documentation such as resumes, transcripts, and Praxis reports are on file. While the School of Education faculty will make every effort to smooth the path for students and keep accurate records, it is ultimately the responsibility of the student to ensure that he or she has completed the necessary paperwork and courses for certification and/or graduation.

H. Picking up graded papers: Students are requested to pick up all of their papers from their professors (or the School of Education main offices at each campus) within the first 3 weeks of the new semester. All work not retrieved by the end of these 3 weeks will be discarded.
THIRTY-HOUR LOG FOR FDU EDUC 6666: SUPERVISED PRACTICUM IN
CORRECTION OF READING PROBLEMS

Candidate: __________________________________________________________
Collaborating Teacher: _________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE: MINUTES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>DATE: MINUTES</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL HOURS (30 HOURS MINIMUM) ________________

Collaborating Teacher: ____________________________ DATE: __________
(Signature: Verifying 30 hours of student contact & collaborating/coaching time is accurately documented.)

Candidate’s Signature: _________________________ DATE: _________

Note: Return form to Nicole no later than May 15, 2010.