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I. Program Outcomes

Please include in this section your program learning outcomes as they are listed in the P-1 form in eCurriculum. If you are already planning to revise those program learning outcomes, indicate in this section which ones might be changed, and what the new program learning outcomes are likely to be. In general, learning outcomes should be measurable, assessable, or observable in some way and aligned with national standards.

Program Learning Outcomes*

As a result of completing this program, students will be able to ...

1. Define the key terms associated with first and second language learning theories (i.e., acquisition, learning, development, competence, and performance) and explain the differences between first and second language learning in relation to instructional practice.

2. Synthesize theoretical and pedagogical research to formulate and articulate a basic conception of language and literacy as “social practices” linked to participation in particular contexts, groups, communities, or institutions.

3. Evaluate various instructional models and educational theories to identify and critique deficit assumptions of language use and develop a perspective of cultural and linguistic difference as a resource for, and not as an impediment to, the learning process.

4. Identify an appropriate focus and research question for a Master’s project or thesis, and compose a formal proposal to guide the development of the project/thesis.

5. Describe the differences between quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research designs, and select and develop methods appropriate to the investigation of the Master’s project/thesis focus and research question.

6. Demonstrate skills in the areas of research (online and library), critical analysis, and scholarly writing (e.g., APA style).

*Note: The Program Learning Outcomes for 18 MED-DL LSLS-DL were revised Summer 2013.
II. Curriculum/Program Map

Please include in this section a grid that identifies connections that exist between required courses in this program and the corresponding program-level learning outcomes. In other words: how will program outcomes be met? This grid should further indicate the expected levels of learning at each level (whether emerging, strengthening, or achieved).

**Curriculum Map: 18 MED-DL LLSL-DL (M.Ed. in Literacy and Second Language Studies)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Required Core Courses Identified in the P-1</th>
<th>Performance-Based Assessments</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>As a result of completing this program, students will be able to ...</strong></td>
<td><strong>LSLS 7053: Foundations of 1st and 2nd Language Learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>7053: Threaded Bb Discussions/Responses; Theory-to-Practice Research Paper</strong></td>
<td>80% at or above the proficient level for all critical performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Define the key terms associated with first and second language learning theories (i.e., acquisition, learning, development, competence, and performance) and explain the differences between first and second language learning in relation to instructional practice.</td>
<td><strong>LSLS 7054: Literacy as a Linguistic and Cultural Tool</strong></td>
<td><strong>7054: Multi-Genre Paper Cultural Artifact Paper; Coaching with curriculum Development Group</strong></td>
<td>80% at or above the proficient level for all critical performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Synthesize theoretical and pedagogical research to formulate and articulate a basic conception of language and literacy as “social practices” linked to participation in particular contexts, groups, communities, or institutions.</td>
<td><strong>LSLS 7057: Master’s Culminating Experience</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interview and Observation Assignment; Reflective Journal Assignment</strong></td>
<td>80% at or above the proficient level for all critical performances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **I** = Introduced
- **D** = Developed
- **A** = Assessed

*Note: The grid and criteria are placeholders and should be replaced with actual course descriptions and evaluation criteria.*
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluate various instructional models and educational theories to identify and critique deficit assumptions of language use and develop a perspective of cultural and linguistic difference as a resource for, and not as an impediment to, the learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I, D, A</td>
<td>7053: Theory-to-Practice Research Paper 7054: Strategy Assignment Event 80% at or above the proficient level for all critical performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify an appropriate focus and research question for a Master’s project or thesis, and compose a formal proposal to guide the development of the project/thesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I, D, A</td>
<td>7057: Threaded Bb Discussions/Responses; Project Proposal 80% at or above the proficient level for all critical performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Describe the differences between quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research designs, and select and develop methods appropriate to the investigation of the Master’s project/thesis focus and research question.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I, D, A</td>
<td>7057: Literature Review; Threaded Bb Discussions/Responses; Project Proposal 80% at or above the proficient level for all critical performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstrate skills in the areas of research (online and library), critical analysis, and scholarly writing (e.g., APA style).</td>
<td></td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>I, D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Methods and Measures

Please include in this section a description of the assessment methods that your program plans to use in assessing each of its program learning outcomes. These methods ideally include both direct and indirect examples of student learning, with authentic, performance-based assessment performed at all levels.

Methods and Measures: 18 MED-DL LSLS-DL (M.Ed. in Literacy and Second Language Studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Core Course Identified in the P-1</th>
<th>Corresponding Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)</th>
<th>Assessment Methodologies (Performance-Based &amp; Indirect)</th>
<th>Expected Level of Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LSLS 7053 Foundations of 1st and 2nd Language Learning | PLO #1. Define the key terms associated with first and second language learning theories (i.e., acquisition, learning, development, competence, and performance) and explain the differences between first and second language learning in relation to instructional practice. **CAEP/TESOL Performance Indicator:** Domain 1: Language. Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language to construct learning environments that support ESOL students’ language and literacy development and content area achievement. | Performance-Based Assessments:  
- Threaded Discussions and Responses on Blackboard Course Site; graded by rubric  
- Theory-to-Practice Research Paper; graded by rubric  
Indirect Assessments:  
- Strand-Specific Program Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data (aggregated) from OACI  
- Syllabus Analysis conducted by Strand-Specific Program Faculty | 80% at or above the proficient level for both critical performances |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #2. Synthesize theoretical and pedagogical research to formulate and articulate a basic conception of language and literacy as &quot;social practices&quot; linked to participation in particular contexts, groups, communities, or institutions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAEP/TESOL Performance Indicator:</strong> Domain 2: Culture. Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups to construct learning environments that support ESOL students’ cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance-Based Assessments:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interview/Observation Assignment; graded by rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reflective Journal Assignment, graded by rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Assessments:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strand-Specific Program Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data (aggregated) from OACI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Syllabus Analysis conducted by Strand-Specific Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80% at or above the proficient level for both critical performances</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #3. Evaluate various instructional models and educational theories to identify and critique deficit assumptions of language use and develop a perspective of cultural and linguistic difference as a resource for, and not as an impediment to, the learning process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAEP/TESOL Performance Indicators:</strong> Domain 3. Planning, Implementing, and Managing Instruction. Candidates know, understand, and use standards-based practices and strategies related to planning, implementing, and managing ESL and content area instruction, including classroom organization, teaching strategies for developing and integrating language skills, and choosing and adapting classroom resources. Domain 4. Assessment. Candidates understand various issues of assessment (e.g., cultural and linguistic bias; political, social, and psychological factors) in assessment; the importance of standards; and the difference between language proficiency and other types of assessment as they affect ESOL student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance-Based Assessments:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Theory-to-Practice Research Paper; graded by rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Threaded Discussions and Responses on Blackboard Course Site; graded by rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Assessments:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strand-Specific Program Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data (aggregated) from OACI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Syllabus Analysis conducted by Strand-Specific Program Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80% at or above the proficient level for both critical performances</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Required Core Course Identified in the P-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corresponding Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)</th>
<th>Assessment Methodologies (Performance-Based &amp; Indirect)</th>
<th>Expected Level of Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLO #2. Synthesize theoretical and pedagogical research to formulate and articulate a basic conception of language and literacy as “social practices” linked to participation in particular contexts, groups, communities, or institutions.</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<em>ILA Standards for Reading Professionals Performance Indicator: Foundational Knowledge.</em> Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction. Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, and a valuing of differences in society.</td>
<td><strong>Performance-Based Assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Multi-Genre Paper (Culminating Assignment); graded by rubric  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Indirect Assessments:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Strand-Specific Program Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data (aggregated) from OACI  &lt;br&gt;• Syllabus Analysis conducted by Strand-Specific Program Faculty</td>
<td>80% at or above the proficient level for this critical performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLO #3. Evaluate various instructional models and educational theories to identify and critique deficit assumptions of language use and develop a perspective of cultural and linguistic difference as a resource for, and not as an impediment to, the learning process.</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<em>ILA Standards for Reading Professionals Performance Indicator: Diversity.</em> Candidates recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write.</td>
<td><strong>Performance-Based Assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Strategy Assignment (aligned with IRA Standard IV benchmarks); graded by rubric  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Indirect Assessments:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Strand-Specific Program Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data (aggregated) from OACI  &lt;br&gt;• Syllabus Analysis conducted by Strand-Specific Program Faculty</td>
<td>80% at or above the proficient level for this critical performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

PLO #6. Demonstrate skills in the areas of research (online and library), critical analysis, and scholarly writing (e.g., APA style).

Performance-Based Assessments:  
- Reading List Assignment using Internet and Library Searches  
- Theory-to-Practice Research Paper; graded by rubric
Candidates use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students’ knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with the features of diversity. Candidates develop and implement strategies that advocate for equity.

PLO #6. Demonstrate skills in the areas of research (online and library), critical analysis, and scholarly writing (e.g., APA style).

Performance-Based Assessment:
- Multi-Genre Paper (Culminating Assignment); graded by rubric

80% at or above the proficient level for this critical performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Core Course Identified in the P-1</th>
<th>Corresponding Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)</th>
<th>Assessment Methodologies (Performance-Based &amp; Indirect)</th>
<th>Expected Level of Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LSLS 7057 Master's Culminating Experience | PLO #4. Identify an appropriate focus and research question for a Master's project or thesis, and compose a formal proposal to guide the development of the project/thesis. | Performance-Based Assessments:  
- Project Proposal (Culminating Assignment); graded by rubric  
- Threaded Discussions and Responses on Blackboard Course Site; graded by rubric  
Indirect Assessments:  
- Curriculum Analysis conducted by all LSLS Program Faculty  
- Student Survey & Exit Interviews to gauge overall student preparation for the Master's Project/Thesis | 80% at or above the proficient level for both critical performances |
| | PLO #5. Describe the differences between quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research designs, and select and develop methods appropriate to the investigation of the Master's project/thesis focus and research question. | Performance-Based Assessments:  
- Threaded Discussions and Responses on Blackboard Course Site; graded by rubric  
- Literature Review; graded by rubric  
Indirect Assessment: | 80% at or above the proficient level for both critical performances |
| PLO #6. Demonstrate skills in the areas of research (online and library), critical analysis, and scholarly writing (e.g., APA style). | Performance-Based Assessments:  
- Literature Review; graded by rubric  
- Project Proposal (Culminating Assignment); graded by rubric  
- Reflective Essay; graded by rubric | 80% at or above the proficient level for all 3 critical performances |

### IV. Assessment Infrastructure

*Please include in this section a description of the process by which your program intends to assess its learning outcomes.*

- **Describe which program faculty will be charged with overseeing the execution of the assessment plan as well as the ways in which they will carry out that charge, including a description of the planned timeline for assessment.**
- **Identify what kinds of administrative support will be available for those faculty.**

*Please note that assessment plans should be capable of producing reports annually based on their review of the relevant data from their programs. The work of your faculty might also be coordinated and aligned with similar assessment efforts at the college and institutional levels.*

**Assessment Infrastructure: 18 MED-DL LSLS-DL (M.Ed. in Literacy and Second Language Studies)**

The School of Education receives assessment support from the CECH Office of Assessment and Continuous Improvement (OACI). The data collection and summarization is managed by that office. Data is entered through web-based rubrics and assessments by the end of each semester. During the summer, OACI generates program-specific reports and provides them electronically and in hard copy to each program. By December 15, each program faculty is required to analyze the data provided by OACI and develop program improvement plans, as needed. Plans for program improvement are communicated to OACI and a report is generated. Any curricular changes must be submitted by **February 1.** OACI also maintains a web site that contains all assessment documentation developed and submitted to our major accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Additionally, CECH maintains a web site that includes links to all CAEP
programs and their assessment data. The CAEP page on the CECH web site can be found at: http://www.uc.edu/cech-accreditation/educator-prep.html.

Assessment activities to ensure continuous improvement of the 18 MED-DL LSLS-DL program are included in the timeline on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data to be Collected, Analyzed, and Used for Continuous Improvement of the Program</th>
<th>Program Faculty Responsible for Oversight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>By September 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following data is aggregated, summarized, and reported by Unit Head and Dean’s Office for use by program area faculty:</td>
<td>All LSLS Program Faculty will review CECH and SoE data supplied by the Unit Head and Dean’s Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prior year budget results</td>
<td>LSLS Program Coordinator will update the LSLS Graduate Handbook, curriculum guides, and program outlines to reflect changes from the previous year, and will work with appropriate College and School personnel to revise web pages as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Budget projections for current academic year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accreditation annual reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty productivity reports (research, grant work, teaching evaluations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Satisfaction Survey results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By October 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review OACI report to identify any accredited courses or assessments needing attention/updating</td>
<td>Reading Endorsement Coordinator and TESOL Endorsement Coordinator will oversee the review/analysis of OACI report data with appropriate program faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review selected, aggregated data from Spring and Summer teaching evaluations to identify issues relative to course design, course sequencing, and overall program effectiveness</td>
<td>LSLS strand-specific faculty will analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **By November 15** | • Review all core course syllabi and assessments to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes (P-1) and the program’s accreditation body; revise syllabi and assessments as necessary  
• Determine any curricular changes and submit proposed changes to the School leadership via eCurriculum  
• Work with the Unit Head and Dean’s Office to identify additional data sources to provide evidence of program impact, student retention and satisfaction, and new student recruitment; use data to target areas that need attention or improvement   |
|                    | LSLS faculty will review core course syllabi and assessments; strand-specific faculty will discuss any curricular changes with LSLS Program Coordinator before submitting proposed changes to the School leadership via eCurriculum.  
LSLS Program Coordinator will work with the Unit Head and Dean's Office to identify additional data sources relative to program impact and student retention, satisfaction, and recruitment issues. |
| **By December 15** | • Monitor assessment data collection process for CAEP-accredited courses  
• Submit program improvement report to OACI based on faculty analysis of the data provided by that office |
|                    | LSLS Program Coordinator will work with CAEP-accredited program coordinators and course instructors to monitor assessment data collection process.  
Reading Endorsement Coordinator and TESOL Endorsement Coordinator will generate the program improvement report and submit to OACI. |
| **By February 15** | • Review selected, aggregated data from Fall semester teaching evaluations to identify issues relative to course design, course sequencing, and overall program effectiveness |
|                    | LSLS strand-specific faculty will analyze selected teaching evaluation data from Fall semester.  |
| **By March 15**    | • Review all strand-specific course syllabi and assessments to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes (P-1) and the program's |
|                    | LSLS faculty will review strand-specific course syllabi and assessments.  |
accreditation body; revise syllabi and assessments as necessary
• Initiate Student Satisfaction Survey for current LSLS students
• Identify faculty vacancies and send search requests to Unit Head

LSLS faculty committee will initiate Student Satisfaction Survey for current LSLS students.
LSLS faculty will identify faculty vacancies and program needs (including annual adjuncts and/or facilitators); LSLS Program Coordinator will send requests to Unit Head.

By April 15

• Review the LSLS Program Assessment Plan, and update planning documents as necessary (e.g., Curriculum Map, Methods and Measures, Assessment Infrastructure)
• Use all data collected during the academic year to analyze multi-year patterns/trends and make program-level adjustments; generate end-of-year report
• Monitor assessment data collection process for CAEP-accredited courses
• Initiate Program Satisfaction Survey for LSLS graduates and alumni
• Collect/update data on employment rates and locations of recent graduates and alumni

LSLS faculty will review and revise the Program Assessment Plan, using data to analyze multi-year patterns/trends and initiate program-level adjustments.
LSLS Program Coordinator will generate end-of-year report.
LSLS Program Coordinator will work with CAEP-accredited program coordinators and course instructors to monitor assessment data collection process.
LSLS faculty committee will initiate Program Satisfaction Survey for LSLS graduates and alumni, including collecting/updating employment data.

Administrative Support:

• Ongoing assessment of selected, aggregated teaching evaluation data and annual survey data are time-intensive processes that require assistance from a qualified Graduate Assistant (GA) or designated Staff employee in the School of Education (SoE). The LSLS Program Coordinator will seek support from the Unit Head in order to (a) fund the GA position or (b) determine an appropriate SoE Staff employee to assist with LSLS program data collection, management, and dissemination.
• The LSLS Program Coordinator and CAEP-accredited Program Coordinators (Reading Endorsement, TESOL Endorsement) will continue to work with the OACI personnel to ensure program alignment with our accrediting body (CAEP).

• Any program modifications in eCurriculum or on the Program, School, or College web pages will be made in coordination with the SoE Unit Head, the SoE Director of Graduate Studies, Student Support Services personnel, and appropriate personnel in the Dean’s Office and the Graduate School, as required.
IV. Findings

Here you will describe and explain in this section any multi-year patterns and trends that your assessment efforts have identified, including a description of any relevant relationships to national standards.

Our LSLS Program that houses the Literacy strand and the Second Language Studies strand is designed to meet the International Literacy Association’s 2010 Standards for Reading Professionals and the international TESOL Standards, respectively. The coursework of the two strands aligns well with the given Standards. The near 100% pass rate of the OAE tests attests to the effectiveness of our Program. With respect to the student outcomes of the core courses (i.e., LSLS 7053, LSLS 7054, and LSLS 7057), they have consistently demonstrated excellence. Specifically, during the 2015-2016 academic year, LSLS 7053 showed that 100% exceeded the criteria; the majority of the students enrolled in LSLS 7054 successfully met the criteria; and 98% of the students enrolled in LSLS 7057 have met the criteria (54.5% exceeded and 43.5% met the criteria).

V. Use of Findings

In this final section, you will describe how your program intends to make use of the program-level assessment data it has gathered.

- How will this information be presented to and discussed among the faculty?
  The assessment data will be shared with the LSLS faculty via email during the summer and at the Program faculty meeting in Fall 2016. In the Program meeting, ideas and thoughts for improvement will be brainstormed. For example, adding a “peer-review” piece to the literature review and proposal writing assignments for LSLS 7057 will be discussed. How to make more explicit connections between the weekly readings and the final project or term paper will also be discussed so that students take advantage of these connections to produce quality work. Each year, we will have a brief conversation about the way that LSLS 7057 dovetails with the MEd Culminating Project so that all faculty and the instructor are on the same page.

- How might this data or these discussions result in review and possible revision of course or program learning outcomes and pedagogical strategies?
This yearly assessment has two strengths. First, it will be a basis for CAEP/SPA report. Second, it provides a data point for possible revision of the courses, if necessary.

This assessment review process encourages the LSLS faculty to be more cognizant of the number of students enrolled in our Program. There is a possibility that we bolster enrollment by creating a robust plan for recruiting students into our graduate certificate (GC) and Master’s programs as well as leveraging the existing pathways from the GCs to the Master's degree. Another area to work on is to have specific courses developed as an elective with the primary purpose of drawing in new students, focusing on timely candidate concerns and practicality.

It would also be great to get regular reports from those who market our Programs in the field, as they have a good sense of what sorts of skills/knowledge school districts need for their teachers. This could not only inform decision related to course development, but also is strategic and targeted.