William Paterson University of New Jersey **College of**
Education Department of Elementary and Early Childhood
Education

Preparing Inquiring Educators: Knowledge, Understanding, Application

Course Outline

1. COURSE NUMBER AND TITLE:

ELRL 624 Administration and Supervision of Reading
Programs 3 graduate credits

2. COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This graduate course is designed to study various process models for developing, implementing, and evaluating K-12 reading programs. By examining the roles of classroom teachers, reading specialists, reading supervisors, staff developers, and principals, students will understand how personnel responsibilities effect program development. Students will apply this understanding to their evaluation of the total reading program in one school system.

3. COURSE PRE-REQUISITES : ELRL 620, 621

4. COURSE OBJECTIVES: Candidates
will know and understand:

A.   Curriculum design within the context of teaching (literacy, content areas, and use of technology), learning, and assessment, including:

The Standards for the English Language Arts and the NJ Core Curriculum Content Standards for Language
Arts/Literacy
        Bloom's Taxonomy
        Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences
        Integrated Curriculum
        Multidisciplinary curriculum
        Alternative assessments
        Technology literacy
        Staff/professional development
(IRA Standards 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.3; NJPTS 4, 5, 6; WPUNJ B1, B2, B3, B4, D4)

B.   Current issues in reading/ literacy including NJCCCS and issues related to urban schools (IRA Standard 1.1,1.2; NJPTS 1,3, 8; WPUNJ B2, D8)

C.   How teachers and administrative staff demonstrate leadership for reading/literacy within the context of organizational culture and climate; and understand change as a process and decision-making as part of that process. (IRA Standard 5.1, 5.3; NJPTS 8,9;WPUNJ C1, C4, D7)
D.   How the observation process and supervision of staff is part of the larger picture of professional development. (IRA Standard 5.1, 5.3, 5.4; NJPTS 8;WPUNJ A1, C4, D8)

E.   How to organize knowledge and professional development experiences for school support staff (e.g., paraprofessionals, Basic Skills teachers) that demonstrate an understanding about the administration and supervision of reading programs within the context of the authentic experiences listed in objectives (A) through (G). (IRA Standards 5.1, 5.2, 5.4; NJPTS 8,9,10;WPUNJ C4, D4, D7)

F.   How school structures and school-wide programs impact the literacy development of students from diverse backgrounds, including those with special needs. (IRA Standards 2.2, 2.3; NJPTS 3, 4, 6, 7; WPUNJ C3, C4, D3)

G.   The impact assessments can have on students' literacy development and how various assessment tools (including technology) can be used for large-scale reform. (IRA Standards 3.3; NJPTS 5, 6; WPUNJ B4, D2, D3, D6)

5. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:
Candidates will be able to:

A.   Demonstrate their knowledge of current issues and trends in the administration and supervision of reading/literacy education programs by reviewing and sharing current research and reports. (IRA Standard 1.2, 5.1; NJPTS 1,8, 10;WPUNJ B2, D8)
B.   Demonstrate their understanding of curriculum design including the application of NJCCCS, indicators, frameworks, content domain and competencies (knowledge and skill outcomes), technology literacy, problem-based learning, and performance-based assessments by analyzing and evaluating an existing reading/literacy program and by preparing a Plan of Action for Improvement. (IRA Standards 2.3; NJPTS 4, 8,9,10;WPUNJ B1, B2, B3, B4, D4)
C.   Demonstrate their ability to design a school or district-wide reading/literacy program integrating other core content areas and using current research that addresses school reform, family involvement, effective professional development, and best practice strategies in reading/literacy instruction and assessment. (IRA Standards 2.1, 2.2,2.3,3.3, 4.1; NJPTS 4,6, 8, 9, 10;WPUNJ C4, D4, D8)
D.   Demonstrate their ability to design a professional development workshop for school support staff (e.g., paraprofessionals, Basic Skills teachers) that reflects best practices in reading/literacy and program administration and supervision. (IRA Standards 5.1, 5.2, 5.3; NJPTS 8,9,10;WPUNJ C4, D4, D7)
E.   Display positive attitudes toward the teaching of reading by positively and constructively evaluating their own and others' teaching practices by collaborating with peers from the course to prepare, present and critique a professional development workshop that will be presented to colleagues in a school and/or school district.(IRA Standards 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4; NJPTS 8, 9, 10; WPUNJ D8)

6. **TOPICAL OUTLINE FOR COURSE CONTENT**

    A.   Factors shaping students' literacy development and instruction
       i. Current issues in literacy and reading
       ii. Theories on language, learning, literacy development, and instructional approaches
       iii.   Curriculum
            Standards
            Policies (ex: NCLB and accountability)
    B.   School wide initiatives
       i. Reform models
       ii. Change as a process
       iii.   Frameworks for instruction
       iv.   Stakeholders / Shifts in perspectives
            1   Leaders as change agents
            2   Changes in leadership
            3   Teachers as leaders
            4   Collaborative decision making
            5   Parents
            6   Teachers
            7   Students
            8   Staff members
    C.   Evaluation, assessment, and action
       i. Forms of assessments
       ii. Program design
       iii.   Professional development
       iv.   Curriculum design
    D.   Characteristics of effective literacy programs
       i. Effective reading programs
            1   elementary
            2   middle
            3   high school
       ii. Intervention programs
       iii.   Instruments for analysis /Identifying data sources
            1   assessments
            2   student work
            3   informal observations
            4   surveys
    E.   Program evaluation and development
       i. Intervention
       ii. Balanced literacy
       iii.   Interdisciplinary
    F.   Curriculum design and implementation
       i. Content specialty
       ii. Interdisciplinary/ Thematic/ Integrated
    G.   Professional development
    H.   Role of Technology
       i. Literacy development
       ii. School evaluation
       iii.   Communication
       iv.   Assessments

7. **TEACHING/LEARNING METHODS**

A. Lecture, readings and discussions--pair, small and whole group work.
B. Demonstrations and presentations
C. Audio and Videotapes
D. Hands-on experiences

8. **METHODS OF STUDENT ASSESSMENT:**

    A.   Attendance, knowledge of required readings, and participation in cooperative groups. Candidates are required to complete readings and participate in weekly discussion groups.
    B.   Assignments (see attached rubric):

<u>Assignment #1 –Group/Workshop Presentation (30min)</u>

<u>Task:</u>
Based on the workshop you have been assigned, prepare and deliver a workshop for participants (class members).

Utilize information discussed in class and acquired from the readings to help identify issues to be addressed in literacy as it pertains to your workshop topic. Incorporate theories discussed to facilitate a workshop that fulfills constructivist models of teaching and learning.

Prepare a workshop evaluation sheet that will be distributed to participants of the workshop.

It is expected that students take the initiative to complete the assignment outside of class, such as through the exchange of email addresses.

After conducting the workshop in your school district a minimum of 5 completed evaluation forms must be submitted from workshop participants.

The instructor will be a participant/ observer/ evaluator during these "workshop" sessions.

**Grading for this assignment will be the *average* of evaluation from the instructor and peer feedback based on the rubric.

- • **Workshop #1**: Ways to improve literacy through parental involvement
- • **Workshop #2**: Culturally responsive teaching: Develop effective instructional strategies to meet the needs of diverse students
- • **Workshop #3**: Preparing students for standardized tests: Curriculum, procedures, and assessments
- • **Workshop #4**: The many hats of the Literacy Coach/ Reading Specialist: Community liaison and literacy leaders

Assignment # 2: Fishbowl Discussion Group (30min)

Task: Choice
(A)**
Go to the Center for Education Policy's website: http://www.cep-dc.org Click on publications Click on Publications by topic Click on "Improving Public Schools" or "Standards-based Education Reform" Click on one of the reports that peak your interest Save the report to your computer. I do not recommend you print them because they are very long. If you wish you could order the report from the Center for Education Policy in Washington, DC.

Choice (B)**

Select a research study on any aspect of **literacy development**, **literacy programs**, **or school reform**. Please seek approval from the instructor as to whether the text you have selected is an appropriate study to fulfill this assignment.

It is recommended that you provide a **one-page handout to help members of the audience follow along with your discussion.

**Grading for this assignment will be the *average* of evaluation from the instructor and peer feedback based on the rubric.

Assignment #3: Analysis of School Wide Literacy Program and Action Plan for Improvement

Conduct an analysis of the school wide literacy program at your school. Your analysis should include critical questions aroun d the following aspects: Description of the learning context and communication, Literacy Program, Instructional Practices/ Teaching Approaches for Literacy Instruction, Curriculum Materials, Assessment Tools, Professional / Staff Development. These areas should be analyzed in isolation to determine their level of effectiveness and in relationship to the school wide literacy program. You will utilize various sources to collect data (evidence/examples) in order to design an action plan for improvement. In order to support you in this process, we will address each aspect of the analysis (see tentative class schedule). During designated sessions you will be provided with examples to practice for your own investigation. The report should be a minimum of 10-15 pages not including appendices. This report should be shared and discussed with members of your school community. See rubric for further description on each aspect of the analysis.

Assignment #4: Design of a School-Wide Reading/Literacy Program

Your program must include, but is not limited to:
       1. Philosophy of the program.
       2. Curriculum design with a focus on diverse learners and differentiated instruction.
       3. Roles of the administration, staff (to include para-professionals), the learner, the parents, and the community at large.
       4. Methods for assessment of the program.
       5. Inclusion of technology.

9. SUGGESTED TEXTBOOKS

Posner, G. (2004). *Analyzing the curriculum, 3rd ed*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Wepner, S., Feeley, J., Strickland, D. (2002). *The administration and supervision of reading programs*, 3rd ed. Newark, DE: Teachers College Press

**Required readings can be found on the William Paterson University Library website's electronic reserve system (ERES).

<u>Accessing electronic (online) reserve reading materials – ERES Readings</u>
    1. On William Paterson Website click on Library

2. Click on electronic online reserve materials
3. Accept disclaimer
4. Type in course number then click enter
5. The password in the course number
6. Retrieve reading materials

10. BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* 5th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

Barth, R. (2001). *Learning by heart*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Carr, J. & Harris, D. (2001). *Succeeding with standards: Linking curriculum, assessment, and action planning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Farstrup, A. & Samuels, S. eds. (2002). *What research has to say about reading instruction, 3rd ed*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1998) *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources 5th ed*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Maeroff, G. (1993). *Team building for school change: Equipping teachers for new roles*. New York, NY: Teachers College

Mathews, D. (2002). *For communities to work*. Dayton, OH: The Charles Kettering Foundation.

Maxwell, J. (2001). *The seventeen indisputable laws of teamwork*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers

Monroe, L. (1997). *Nothing's impossible: Leadership lessons from inside and outside the classroom* . New York, NY: PublicAffairs.

Schain, R. (1988). *Supervising Instruction: What is it and how to do it*. Brooklyn, NY: Educators Practical Press

Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press

Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (1998). *Best practice: New standards for teaching and learning in America's Schools (2nd Ed.)*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Rubric for Fishbowl Discussion Group (Instructor's Rubric)

Rubric for Group/Workshop Presentation (Instructor's Rubric)

Criteria	Exemplary (4pts)	Satisfactory/ Effective (2pts)	Unsatisfactory/ Ineffectiv e (1pt)
Content	Provides a summary of the information presented in the study; synthesizes the main idea and perspectives found in the document; identifies the theoretical framework used to ground the research; synthesizes research methodology used to conduct the study; identifies the findings/ results of the study	Provides a brief summary of the study, which is presented in a reading or "run through" of the information written by the author(s) and does not synthesize the main ideas presented in the document; there is some mention of the theories that support the research; research findings and methodologies briefly mentioned	Does little to go beyond a reading or "run through" of the text. There is little or no attempt to identify theories or synthesize research findings as presented in the study.
Critique	Analyzes the validity of the study to determine whether procedures used were appropriate; critically explores the content/ information presented in the document for its relevance and connection to teaching and learning; examines the report for broad connections to different points of views and "gaps" or limitations that might be inherent in the document.	Some attempt to evaluate the report based on methodology, relevance and connection to teaching and learning; little attempt to address the " gaps" or limitations of the research study	No attempt to critique the document for the way in which the study was conducted. For the most part the report is taken at face value.
Educational Implications	The educational implications of information presented in the study has been clearly/ explicitly address; members make inferences about the information presented and how it might transfer into practice by providing examples from the "real world" in which the areas addressed in the report can be problematic and by discussing the feasibility of several recommendations suggested in the report.	There is some attempt to address the educational implications of the information presented in the document. There is minimal attempt to connect the recommendations and/or issues raised in the report to practice through the use of specific examples.	Little or no attempt was made to connect the information presented in the study to practice. The discussion did not address the consequences of recommendation presented in the report to educational contexts.
Participation	Everyone actively participates in the discussion by commenting and providing feedback to peer comments and addressing individual issues of concern about information presented in the article; each member in of the discussion group rotates between and among cooperative learning roles (listener, discussion leader, questioner, evaluator, etc.)	Some participation by all members of the group; for the most part there is only one discussion leader who continuously prompts/ probes for meaning by posing questions, raising comments, or issues presented in the document; there is some feedback from group members on the issues and/or questions raised by peers	Minimum participation from all members of the group; at times there is only one person speaking; it is evident that close reading of the text was limited; members do not engage in talk that results from initiation of questions and/or comments, then feedback from peers.

Criteria	Exemplary (4pts)	Satisfactory/ Effective (2pts)	Unsatisfactory/ Ineffectiv e (1pt)
Content	Topic(s) addressed during the workshop are pertinent to language and literacy (reading and writing) development; workshop material is practical and applicable in nature; information presented addresses the needs of diverse community members and reflect the demographics encountered in many urban school contexts; information presented in the workshop is supported by literature/ readings and theories of language and literacy (reading and writing) development	Some information presented in the workshop is supported by readings/ literature and theories of language and literacy development; much of the workshop material is practical in nature, there are some areas of the presentation that do not address issues in literacy (reading) development	Workshop information is mostly theoretical (too abstract) and does not provide explicit transfers into practice; does not address the needs of diverse populations; information presented does not reflect the literacy needs as is suggested in research and theories of language and literacy (reading and writing) development.
Presentation	Well organized; topic is clearly presented; there is a clear connection to research; there is a clear connection between theory/research and practice by providing concrete examples for the participants; uses a constructivist approach to teaching and learning with some direct instruction (modeling) by the facilitators with "space" for active, hands-on participation by audience members; uses visuals and other graphics (ex: power point, charts, and graphs); information is presented in a way that it addresses diverse learning modalities; hand outs are also provided to the participants; completed w/in time limit	Some aspects of the workshop are unclear and are not supported with direct instruction / modeling by facilitators; there is little hands-on activity by participants to practice, apply, or discuss what was presented; few visuals were used during the presentation; hand outs are provided but have little use for application by participants	Workshop presentation is disorganized; participants were unprepared; topic was unclear and materials used were irrelevant; no visuals were used by presenters to explain the topic; participants were given little or no time to apply new learning; little or no handouts were provided during the session.
Participation	All group members actively participate/ facilitat e the workshop activities; all group members provide clarification for participants at some point during the session; each group member presents some aspect of the topic during the session	Only some group members present information on the topic during the session; few members facilitate workshop activities and interact with participants during the session	Little or no participation by all group members; there is little or no interaction between presenters and participants during the workshop session
Workshop Evaluation Form	Form addresses all of the following areas: ⑩ Was the objective of the workshop achieved? ⑩ Were participants' questions answered during the session? ⑩ Request for additional/follow up information ⑩ Feedback on the disposition(s) of the presenter(s) (ex: approachable, effective communicator) ⑩ Was the material appropriately matched to the topic being addressed? After conducting the workshop in your school district a minimum of 5 evaluation forms completed by participants, are submitted to the instructor	Address at least 3 of the areas indicated at the "exemplary" level.	Addresses 1 or none of the areas indicated at the "exemplary" level.

Feedback Group Presentation

Exemplary (above standard) = 4pts, Satisfactory/Effective (at standard) = 2pts, Unsatisfactory/Ineffective (below standard)= 1pt. **Directions**: Use the rubric scale to rate the participation/performance of **each member**. *CHECK* the score that best represents the student while working in the group.

Group Member _____

Questions	Exemplary (4pts)	Satisfactory/ Effective (2pts)	Unsatisfactory/ Ineffective (1pt)
Was the group member available for meetings?			
Did this group member actively participate by providing ideas to the project?			
Was he or she cooperative in making group decisions?			
Did this group member play a leadership role in one or more areas of the project?			
Did this group member complete his or her "fair share" of the project? This includes preparation of t he final presentation, research/resources, attendance at group meetings or participation in online communication, etc.			
Do you think this group member worked well with others?			

Total points earned _____

Analysis of School Wide Literacy Program and Action Plan for Improvement Rubric

Criteria	Exemplary (4pts)	Satisfactory (2pts)	Unacceptable (1pt)
Description of the learning context and communication	Provides demographic information about the context; provides details about the environment that influencing language and literacy (reading and writing) development – such as physical space and arrangement of classrooms and how resources are placed in learning contexts; evaluates communication procedures in the context as well as how staff members communicate with parents; examine the level of participation of all stakeholders (including community members and parents)	Some aspects from an "exemplary" analysis are evident (min of 4)	Little or no aspects of an "exemplary" analysis are evident
Literacy Program	Provides detailed information about the literacy program in place; Examines the literacy program by using various sources of data -- instruments to evaluate the program (ex: original checklists or one used in previous research), observational data from "walk throughs", and interviews with various stakeholders such as teachers, administrators, students, parents; examines literacy instruction within content areas	"	"
Instructional Practices/ Approaches for Literacy Instruction	Thoroughly examines and provides a comprehensive detailed description of instructional approaches used, including those who interact with members of diverse groups (ex: special education, ELL); utilizes various data sources (ex: observation, checklists, rubrics) to document and evaluate teachers' instructional choices	"	"
Curriculum Materials	Provides a comprehensive analysis of the curriculum materials being used; includes a discussion of how technology is being used; examines curriculum/standards alignment across content area; examines what is emphasized in the curriculum by identifying specific examples/evidence of what is taught in each of the four main academic disciplines (Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, English)	"	"
Assessment Tools	Provides a comprehensive analysis of the assessment tools; closely examines a wide variety of assessments (including those to evaluate both teacher and students); includes a description of how assessment data is being used to address the teaching/learning continuum;	"	"
Multiple Perspectives	Several individuals interviewed to collect data on the strengths and weaknesses of your school's literacy program (Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Specialist(s) or Literacy Coach (s), Staff Developer or mentor teacher, classroom teacher(s), active parent(s)	"	"
Professional / Staff Development	Provides a comprehensive analysis of professional development activities; provides examples of professional development sessions; examines how teacher learning, professional knowledge, collegiality, advocacy, leadership, and accountability are fostered by providing a comprehensive description of professional development activities		
Action Plan and Narrative (Report)	Has a clear focus; has identified one initiative you believe will increase the effectiveness of the school's literacy program; narrative synthesizes the findings of your evaluation; charts/tables and/or graphs used to represent data/information (strengths and weaknesses) collected through your evaluation; reflects information obtained from various data sources (including but not limited to student assessment data, feedback from various stakeholders in the school community); presents a clear timeline for implementation which goes from analysis of data to identification of resources to what will be done and when; identifies resources (both internal and external) that are needed for implementation and can be effectively utilized; presents a clear connection to theories and research on literacy (reading and writing) and school reform; identifies ways to address the needs of each aspect of the evaluation (learning context, literacy program, instructional practices/ approaches, curriculum materials, assessment tools, and professional development); addresses the needs of all st akeholders of the school community (including parents and students with special needs); copies of this report have been shared and discussed with those interviewed	Some aspects from an "exemplary" analysis are evident (min. of 6)	Little or no aspects of an "exemplary" analysis are evident
Format / Organization	Well organized; follows APA guidelines for citations; no spelling errors; no grammatical errors; subheadings and titles are used to separate the sections of the analysis and for improving performance. to provide examples of all data collection sources or instruments used for evaluation; includes a reference list that follows APA guidelines		"

Candidates who do not achieve a rating of "Satisfactory" must meet with the professor to develop a plan for improving performance.

Dispositions for the M.Ed in Reading Program

	Met	Not Met

IRA Standard 5.1 Display positive dispositions related to reading and the teaching of reading

	Met	Not Met
1. Shares professional readings and reflections on those readings	——	——
2. Contributes to class discussions related to reading and the teaching of reading	——	——
3. Has high expectations for all children	——	——
4. Models enthusiasm for reading and writing	——	——
5. Prepares lesson and unit plans that demonstrate respect for cultural and linguistic diversity and students with special learning needs	——	——
6. Maintains confidentiality in working with students and their families when collecting and sharing data for diagnostic purposes and sharing	——	——
7. Clearly articulates knowledge and findings with colleagues and families while advocating for all aspects of child development.	——	——

IRA Standard 5.2 Continue to pursue the development of professional knowledge and dispositions

	Met	Not Met
1. Is a current member of a professional literacy organization such as IRA (International Reading Association), NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English) , NRC (National Reading Council), NJRA (New Jersey Reading Association), etc.	——	——
2. Attends professional development conferences, workshops, etc.	——	——
3. Is open-minded and flexible.		
4. Follows through on suggestions/recommendations for further study	——	——

IRA Standard 5.3 Work with colleagues to observe, evaluate and provide feedback on each other's practice

	Met	Not Met
1. Gives constructive feedback to colleagues during class presentations	——	——
2. Seeks and values collaboration and contributes significantly to group projects	——	——
3. Engages in reflective pedagogy	——	——
4. Conducts research in an ethical manner	——	——