



THE UNIVERSITY *of* NORTH CAROLINA  
**GREENSBORO**

## **Continuing Accreditation Report**

for

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction  
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education**

**M.Ed. in Reading / Teacher Leadership Track  
and Reading Add-on Licensure**

**Author:  
Francine Johnston, Ed.D.**

**JUNE, 2006**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Section I: Program Overview</b> .....	1
<i>Levels Offered and Special Characteristics</i> .....	1
<i>Program of Study</i> .....	1
<i>Number of Candidates Completed the Program Since 2003</i> .....	2
<i>Enrollment Trends</i> .....	3
<b>Section II: Conceptual Framework</b> .....	4
<i>Conceptual Framework and the Knowledge Base that Informs It</i> .....	4
<i>Evaluation and Continuous Revision of the Conceptual Framework (CF)</i> .....	4
<i>Evidence of Conceptual Framework in the Program</i> .....	6
<b>Section III: Standard I – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions</b> .....	8
<i>Evidence that Candidates Meet the Specialty Area Standards</i> .....	8
<i>Evidence that Candidates Can Work with Families to Support Student Learning</i> ..	25
<i>Standard IA: Candidate Qualifications</i> .....	25
<b>Section IV: Standard II – Candidate Assessment and Evaluation</b> .....	26
<i>Individual Candidate Assessment</i> .....	27
<i>Program and Program Operations Assessment</i> .....	28
<i>Annual Review of the Program</i> .....	28
<i>Summary of Data Collected and Analyzed</i> .....	29
<i>Changes in the M.Ed. Reading Program since 2001</i> .....	30
<b>Section V: Standards III – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</b> .....	32
<i>Clinical Practice</i> .....	32
<i>Evaluation of Clinical Practice</i> .....	32
<b>Section VI: Standard IV – Diversity</b> .....	33
<i>How Diversity is Addressed in the Curriculum and in Clinical Practice</i> .....	33
<i>Faculty Diversity</i> .....	33
<i>Diversity of Candidates in the M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT program</i> .....	33

<b>Section VII: Standard V – Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</b>	<b>34</b>
<i>Program Faculty and their Qualifications</i> .....	34
<i>M.Ed. in Reading Program Coordination</i> .....	35
<i>Teaching Practices used by Faculty in the M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT Program</i> .....	35
<i>M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT faculty Involvement and Collaboration with and Service to the Public Schools</i> .....	36
<i>M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT Faculty Scholarship</i> .....	36
<i>M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT Faculty Service to the Profession</i> .....	40
<i>M.Ed. in Reading Faculty Evaluation Process</i> .....	40
<i>M.Ed. in Reading faculty Assessment of their own Effectiveness as Related to Candidate Performance</i> .....	40
<i>How Faculty Evaluations Inform Teaching, Scholarship, and Service</i> .....	41
<i>Professional Development Opportunities Provided to Faculty</i> .....	41
<i>Qualifications of Faculty</i> .....	41
<i>Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching</i> .....	42
<i>Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship</i> .....	42
<i>Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service</i> .....	44
<i>Collaboration</i> .....	45
<i>Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance</i> .....	46
<i>Unit Facilitation of Professional Development</i> .....	47
<b>Section VIII: Standard VI – Program Governance and Resources</b> .....	<b>48</b>
<i>Organizational Structure for the M.Ed. in Reading Program</i> .....	48
<i>Adequacy of Faculty and Non-faculty Personnel for the M.Ed. Reading. Program</i> .....	48
<i>Unit Leadership and Authority</i> .....	48

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Plan of Study.....	2
Table 2. The number of people who have completed this program since 2003 .....	2
Table 3. The number of teacher candidates admitted each Academic Year (between Aug and July) since the 00-01 school year .....	2
Table 4. Standards Alignment of Conceptual Framework with North Carolina and International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professional .....	7
Table 5. NC DPI Advanced Competencies.....	8
Table 6. NCDPI/IRA Standards for Reading Professionals .....	11
Table 7. Evidence of Candidates Meet the NCDPI AC Standards .....	14
Table 8. Evidence that Candidates Meet the Program Standards .....	19
Table 9. Assessment Plan .....	26
Table 10. Pass rates and number (approximate) of M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT students completing their M.Ed. Portfolio.....	29
Table 11. The aggregated pass rates for the PRAXIS II by students in the M.Ed. in Reading program since 2003 .....	29
Table 12. Changes in the M.Ed. Reading Program since 2001 .....	31
Table 13. List of Faculty in Reading Masters Program.....	34
Table 14. Teaching Practices used in CUI courses required for the M.Ed. in Reading – TLT Program .....	36
Table 15. Faculty Scholarship.....	37

## **Section I: Program Overview**

### ***Levels Offered and Special Characteristics***

The M.Ed. in Reading / Teacher Leadership Track (TLT) Program is housed in the department of Curriculum and Instruction. It is for licensed teachers with an undergraduate degree in education and two years of teaching experience who wish to pursue a Masters degree in reading and earn licensure as a reading specialist for grades K-12. Although students can go full-time, most of our students are classroom teachers who take one or two classes in the evening and in summers to complete the program over three to five years.

The program is aligned with the North Carolina Advanced Competencies of a Master Teacher (AC) and the NCDPI/IRA Standard for Reading Professionals. This 39-hour program is oriented toward improving results in teaching practice, as well as gaining critical knowledge, skills, and dispositions in action research, professional development, leadership, and working successfully with diverse learners in elementary schools. A culminating portfolio aligned with the NCDPI AC Standards is required. Information about the M.Ed. Portfolio is available in the M.Ed. Handbook, in the document box, and in an online document titled the M.Ed. Portfolio Guidelines located under M.Ed. Programs on the CUI website at <http://www.uncg.edu/cui>. Examples of M.Ed. Portfolio essays and evidence can be found in the document boxes.

Graduate students who have a masters in education can elect to earn licensure as a reading specialist by completing an add-on program of 18 hours and take the PRAXIS. These students are not required to complete an AC portfolio since they are already licensed at the M level. All program evaluation data reported below (other than portfolio data) contains both M.Ed. students and add-on students.

### ***Program of Study***

The 39-hours of Masters-level courses are divided into three strands: (a) 9 hours of Core Courses focused on the socio-cultural, and the psychological and developmental foundations for teaching, (b) 21 hours of courses that advance Pedagogical Expertise as Reading Specialists, and (c) 9 hours of coursework designed to enhance the capacity to provide Professional Development and Leadership. One elective is required under Pedagogical Expertise; probably 90% of the students take CUI 614 Word Study as their elective. All courses are offered on a regular rotation. The chart below lists the required plan of study:

Table 1. Plan of Study

**Core Courses: [9 hours]**

CUI 669 Educational Implications of Learning and Developmental Theory (3)
CUI 545 Diverse Learners (3)
ERM 605 or 604 (3) Methods of Educational Research or Educational Measurement and Evaluation

**Pedagogical Expertise Courses: [21 hours]**

CUI 615 (3) Literacy in the Early Years.*
CUI 616 (3) Literacy Development & Instruction Across the Grades*
CUI 617a (3) Diagnosis & Correction of Reading Problems*
CUI 617b (3) Advanced Strategies in Diagnosis & Correction
CUI 619 (3) Research & Programs in Reading Education
CUI 640 (3) Writing Instruction in Elementary & Middle Grades *
3 hrs. elective from CUI 614, CUI 628, or LIS 556

**Professional Development/Leadership: [9 hours]**

CUI 628 (3) Trends & Issues in Curriculum & Instruction <b>or</b> ELC 697 (3) Selected Critical Issues in American Education <b>or</b> approved substitute
CUI 675 (6) Teacher As Researcher (6 hrs. taken as two separate offerings)

\* These courses are required for the reading add-on license. In addition two more courses are elected from CUI 614, 617B or 619 for a total of 18 hours.

*Number of Candidates Completed the Program Since 2003*

Table 2. The number of people who have completed this program since 2003

Year of Graduation	Number of Completers
2006	2
2005	11
2004	3
2003	10
2002	2
2001	11

Table 3. The number of teacher candidates admitted each Academic Year (between Aug and July) since the 00-01 school year

Academic Year	Number of Candidates Admitted to the Program	Estimated # of Candidates Enrolled in the Program
2005-2006	12 (as of spring 06)	75
2004-2005	36	65
2003-2004	19	35
2002-2003	8	25
2001-2002	8	25
2000-2001	13	25

### *Enrollment Trends*

Enrollment trends in the M.Ed. in Reading Program were steady up to 2002. Each year, we admitted about 8-13 new students. However, recently we have had increasing numbers due to the No Child Left Behind Legislation and the creation of off-campus cohorts. We admitted 19 new students in the 03-04 school year and 36 in the 04-05 school year. With a new off-campus cohort starting in the fall of 2005 we expect a large number of applications by the spring/summer of 2006.

There are currently about 15 students who are actively completing the course work for the reading add-on. Four students have completed the add-on but have not applied for licensure or taken the PRAXIS yet.

## Section II: Conceptual Framework

### *Conceptual Framework and the Knowledge Base that Informs It*

The M.Ed. in Reading program has adopted the same Conceptual Framework as the Teachers Academy (see below) and aims to provide learning opportunities throughout the program to help students develop into caring, competent, and collaborative teachers who can teach successfully in diverse classrooms.

#### CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK:

*The mission of professional education at UNCG is to prepare and support the professional development of caring, collaborative, and competent educators who work in diverse settings. The mission is carried out in an environment that nurtures the active engagement of all participants, values individual as well as cultural diversity and recognizes the importance of reflection and the integration of theory and practice. UNCG's professional education programs are guided by shared commitments to: (a) equity and excellence in teaching, research, and service; (b) professional integrity and ethical deliberation in dealing with students and colleagues (university-based, school-based, and community-based); (c) the construction of a professional knowledge base through collaboration and collegiality; and (d) the dissemination of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions through the preparation and continuing professional development of teachers, principals, and other school personnel.*

#### *Evaluation and Continuous Revision of the Conceptual Framework (CF)*

The Teachers Academy Council of Program Coordinators (CPC) has discussed and reaffirmed the Conceptual Framework repeatedly since its inception in 2001. In 2005-06 a subcommittee of the CPC studied the Conceptual Framework and made several changes to the framework to ensure that it was a reflection of our current thinking. First, greater emphasis was placed on diversity, with an expanded definition and description of the multiple ways in which we are a diverse society and with a clear emphasis on our commitment to the learning of *all* students. Second, the 2001 Conceptual Framework identified four dispositions and the 2006 Conceptual Framework identifies ten dispositions. This is an attempt to align with our 2004-05 study of dispositions and the development and commitment to the ten dispositions that we measure in the new Candidate Dispositions Assessment Process rubric. Dr. Levin, who coordinates CUI Graduate Studies and the M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT program, attended those meetings and contributed to and benefited from those discussions.

#### **Revised Teachers Academy CONCEPTAL FRAMEWORK adopted in 2005:**

##### **UNCG Teachers Academy Mission Statement**

*The mission of professional education at UNCG is to prepare and support the professional development of caring, collaborative, and competent educators who work in diverse settings. This mission is carried out in an environment that nurtures the active engagement of all*

*participants, values individual and cultural diversity and recognizes the importance of a strong knowledge base, reflection, and integration of theory and practice.*

*UNCG's professional education programs are guided by shared commitments to:*

- *equity and excellence in teaching, research, and service*
- *integrity and ethical deliberation in working with students, their families, and university, school and community colleagues*
- *construction of a professional knowledge base through collaboration and collegiality*
- *dissemination of professional knowledge, skills and dispositions through the preparation and continuing professional development of teachers, principals and other school personnel*

*We believe that caring, collaborative and competent professionals possess a strong knowledge base comprised of five types of knowledge:*

- *content knowledge*
- *professional knowledge and skills*
- *pedagogical content knowledge*
- *sociocultural knowledge*
- *critical and reflective knowledge and skills*

*Professional education programs at UNCG emphasize dispositions that drive application of the knowledge base and we believe that we must model and monitor these dispositions as conscientiously as we provide opportunities for building the knowledge base. Candidates should display behaviors that are:*

- *reflective*
- *ethical*
- *inclusive*
- *engaged in and committed to professional practice*
- *dedicated to life-long learning*
- *self-efficacious*
- *receptive to feedback*
- *affirming of diversity*
- *professionally responsible*
- *collaborative*

### ***Performance Expectations***

*Education is a culturally-relevant, caring enterprise that engages students, candidates, faculty, as well as school and agency partners in opportunities to collaboratively construct meaningful and productive futures. Educators must be responsive to the varied racial, ethnic, linguistic, gender, disability, and socioeconomic experiences of all learners. Therefore, all candidates must acquire content and pedagogical knowledge, utilize current evidence-based practice, and make ethical decisions in a changing and culturally diverse world. UNCG's professional education programs present candidates with opportunities to master the knowledge base, acquire the skills, and develop the dispositions that are the foundation of competent professional practice.*

### ***Evidence of Conceptual Framework in the Program***

The M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT program adopted the Conceptual Framework in 2001, embraced the revisions made in 2005-2006, and aims to provide learning opportunities to help experienced teachers in this program *develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of Master Elementary Teachers who are caring, competent, and collaborative and who can teach successfully in diverse classrooms*. Assignments and in-class activities for teachers in the program exemplify all aspects of the Conceptual Framework and develop content, professional, pedagogical, socio-cultural, critical, and reflective knowledge. For example, all teachers in the program take CUI 545 (Diverse Learners) to help them better understand the diverse backgrounds of their students. Many in-class activities and assignments require collaboration with peers and the sharing of individual teacher expertise and craft knowledge so that teachers are learning from other teachers in collaborative ways during this program. Assignments such as teacher action research projects in CUI 675 (Teacher as Researcher) help our teachers to both develop and apply their pedagogical and professional expertise and display their developing competence as teacher leaders. The application of the research literature to classroom practice is emphasized in many courses to further enhance their competence as knowledgeable educators. The Conceptual Framework is found on every course syllabus for this program since 2001 when it was first developed so that our students are well aware of our core values.

As can be seen in the table below, the M.Ed. in Reading Education-Teacher Leadership Track program is designed to align our Conceptual Framework with North Carolina and national standards so that by meeting one set of standards we are meeting other sets of standards, being true to our Conceptual Framework and providing evidence for the UNCG's Teachers Academy Portfolio Rubric.

Table 4. Standards Alignment of Conceptual Framework with North Carolina and International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professional

KEY:

**M.Ed.-AC** = NC Advanced Competencies of a Master Teacher

**NC/IRA** = North Carolina Reading Standards and International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professionals

**NB** = National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

<b>Conceptual Framework: <i>Teacher as Caring Professional</i></b>	<b>Conceptual Framework: <i>Teacher as Competent Professional</i></b>	<b>Conceptual Framework: <i>Teacher as Collaborative Professional</i></b>
M.Ed.-AC 1: Instructional Expertise AC 2: Knowledge of Learners	M.Ed.-AC 1: Instructional Expertise AC 2: Knowledge of Learners AC 3: Research Expertise AC 4: Content Knowledge	M.Ed.-AC 5: Prof. Development and Leadership
NC/IRA – Standard 1 Foundational Knowledge Standard 2 Instructional Strategies & Curriculum Materials Standard 3 Assessment, Diagnosis, and Evaluation Standard 4 Creating a Literate Environment	NC/IRA – Standard 1 Foundational Knowledge, Standard 2 Instructional Strategies & Curriculum Materials, Standard 3 Assessment, Diagnosis and Evaluation Standard 4 Creating a Literate Environment	NC/IRA Standard 4 Professional Development
NB 1: Committed to student learning NB3: Monitor student learning NB 4: Reflective practice	NB 2: Knowledge of subject matter/pedagogy NB3: Monitor student learning NB 4: Reflective practice	NB3: Monitor student learning NB 4: Reflective practice NB 5: Members of learning communities

### Section III: Standard I – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

#### *Evidence that Candidates Meet the Specialty Area Standards*

See tables below for evidence regarding how teacher candidates in the M.Ed. in Reading program meet the NC DPI Advanced Competency Standards for the Master’s Degree License, as well as the DPI Reading Standards and International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professionals. Since the later two are virtually the same, they are combined in the same table.

In the preparation of the AC portfolio students make choices about what artifacts to choose from a variety of course assignments to meet the standards. Different faculty have different assignments in many classes, so no particular assignment is designated as meeting a particular standard. The exception to this is the course sequence, CUI 617 A and B (Diagnosis and Remediation and Advanced Diagnosis and Remediation), which involves students in diagnosing and tutoring students in reading. The clinical report, that includes the assessment information as well as the intervention planned and carried out by the tutor, provides evidence for Standard 3 (NC/IRA).

Additional tables (Standards by Courses Tables 1 and 2) that can be found in the evidence box and in attached documents show how the standards are covered in individual courses and sample assignments as well as how those assignments are assessed.

Table 5. NC DPI Advanced Competencies

<b>Masters Standard 1: Instructional Expertise - The candidate demonstrates instructional expertise by applying the theoretical, philosophical, and research bases for educational practice in P-12 settings to improve student learning.</b>		
1:1 - The candidate plans, implements, and evaluates instruction that is rigorous, coherent, and consistent with a well-developed theoretical and philosophical base and best practices emerging from educational research.		
1:2 - The candidate designs and modifies instruction and learning environments based on assessment of student learning problems and successes.		
1:3 - The candidate monitors the effects of instructional actions, selection of materials, and other instructional decisions on students’ learning and behavior.		
1:4 - The candidate incorporates findings from educational literature into school and classroom strategies to improve student learning.		
1:5 - The candidate understands and links subject matter and students’ developmental and diverse needs in the context of school settings.		
1:6 - The candidate uses technology to create learning environments that support students’ learning.		
1:7 - The candidate seeks, implements, and evaluates the best pedagogical practices for the subjects taught within the context of a specific school setting.		
1:8 - The candidate demonstrates the ability to integrate literacy across the curriculum.		
	<b>Evidence</b> <td></td>	
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>

Final G.P.A. of graduates	2003/2006 N=26	100% 3.5 g.p.a. or better
AC Portfolio Standard #1	2003/2006 N=26	100% pass rate
PRAXIS II	2003-2005 N = 23	96% pass rate

<b>Masters Standard 2: Knowledge of Learners - The candidate incorporates knowledge of the nature to the learner, learning processes, variations in learning abilities and learning styles, and strategies for evaluating learning into the planning, delivery, and evaluation of instruction.</b>		
2:1 - The candidate seeks to increase understanding of and respect for differences in students, including exceptionalities.		
2:2 - The candidate designs and delivers instruction that is responsive to differences among all learners.		
2:3 - The candidate reflects on and modifies instruction that fosters student learning.		
2:4 - The candidate understands and respects differences between the learning behaviors and outcomes expected in diverse communities.		
2:5 - The candidate creates and maintains a classroom environment conducive to learning in which all learners feel welcome and can be successful.		
	<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
Final G.P.A. of graduates	2003/2006 N=26	100% 3.5 g.p.a. or better
AC Portfolio Standard # 2	2003/2006 N=26	100% pass rate
PRAXIS II	2003/2005 N=23	96% pass rate

<b>Masters Standard 3: Research - The candidate uses research to examine and improve instructional effectiveness and student achievement.</b>		
3:1 - The candidate critically reads and applies historical and contemporary educational literature, including theoretical, philosophical, and research materials.		
3:2 - The candidate uses student and school performance data to improve student learning, classroom processes, and school practices.		
3:3 - The candidate investigates educational problems through action research.		
	<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
Final G.P.A. of graduates	2003/2006 N=26	100% 3.5 g.p.a. or better
AC Portfolio Standard # 3	2003/2006 N=26	100% pass rate
PRAXIS II	2003/2005 N=23	96% pass rate

<b>Masters Standard 4: Content Knowledge - The candidate demonstrates advanced depth and breadth of knowledge and skills in the academic discipline and in education.</b>		
4:1 - The candidate analyzes and articulates relationships between and among theory, philosophy, research findings, and current practice as appropriate to the discipline.		
4:2 - The candidate analyzes and articulates relationships between and among theory, philosophy, research findings, and current practice across the disciplines.		
4:3 - The candidate demonstrates theoretical and applied advanced content knowledge.		
4:4 - The candidate understands current knowledge and trends in education.		
	<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
Final G.P.A. of graduates	2003/2006 N=26	100% 3.5 g.p.a. or better
AC Portfolio standard #4	2003/2006 N=26	100% pass rate
PRAXIS II	2003/2005 N=23	96% pass rate

<b>Masters Standard 5: Professional Development and Leadership - The candidate engages in continued professional development and provides leadership at the classroom, school, and community levels, and within the profession.</b>		
5:1 - The candidate initiates professional inquiry through reading, dialogue, reflection, professional development, and action research.		
5:2 - The candidate seeks, evaluates, and as appropriate, acts on input from educators, parents, students, and other members of the community for continuous improvement.		
5:3 - The candidate participates, formally and informally, in appropriate professional communities.		
5:4 - The candidate participates in collaborative leadership to address educational problems.		
5:5 - The candidate provides leadership in working with parents and strengthening the home-school partnership.		
	<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
AC Portfolio Standard #5	2003/2006 N=26	100% pass rate
AC Portfolio Final Reflection	2003/2006 N=26	100% pass rate

Table 6. NCDPI/IRA Standards for Reading Professionals

<b>Standard 1 Foundational Knowledge</b>		
1.1 Demonstrate knowledge of psychological, sociological, and linguistic foundations of reading and writing process and instruction.		
1.2 Demonstrate knowledge of reading research and histories of reading.		
1.3 Demonstrate knowledge of language, reading, and writing development.		
1.4 Demonstrate knowledge of cultural and linguistic diversity as they relate to the development of oral language, reading, and writing.		
1.5 Demonstrate knowledge of the major components of fluent reading (phonemic awareness, word identification, phonics, vocabulary, background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation).		
	<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
Final G.P.A. of graduates	2003/2006 N=26	100% 3.5 or better
AC Portfolio Standard #1 and #4	2003/2006 N=26	100% pass rate
PRAXIS II	2003/2005 N=23	96% pass rate

<b>Standard 2 - Instructional strategies and curriculum materials:</b>		
Candidates support reading and writing instruction by using a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, and curriculum materials.		
2.1 Candidates establish meaningful and appropriate purposes supported by instructional grouping options (individual, small-group, whole-class, and computer-based).		
2.2 Candidates identify differing stages of development, cultures, and linguistic backgrounds of learners and use a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices, to address those differences.		
2.3 Candidates facilitate effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading/writing development and from different cultural/ linguistic backgrounds by using a wide range of curriculum materials		
	<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
Final G.P.A. of graduates	2003/2006 N=26	100% 3.5 or better
AC Portfolio Standard # 2 and #3	2003/2006 N=26	100% pass rate
PRAXIS II	2003/2005 N=23	96% pass rate

<b>Standard 3 –Assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation:</b> Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading instruction.		
3.1 Uses a wide range of assessment tools and practices, including individual and group standardized tests and informal classroom assessment strategies incorporating technology as appropriate.		
3.2 Determine learners’ placements along a developmental continuum, identify learners’ proficiencies and difficulties, and initiate appropriate referrals.		
3 Use assessment information to plan, evaluate, and revise effective instruction that meets the needs of all learners, including those at different developmental stages and those from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds		
3.4 Communicate results of assessments to relevant individuals.		
	<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
CUI 617 A&B Course grade	2004/2005 N=15  2005/2006 N= 19	Fall 13% got B’s, 87% got A’s, Spring 14% got Bs, 86% got As Fall 5% got a C, 20% got a B and 75% got an A Spring 20% got a B and 80% got an A
PRAXIS II	2003/2005 N=23	96% pass rate

<b>Standard 4 - Creating a Literate Environment:</b> 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.		
4.1 Use learners’ interests, reading abilities and backgrounds as foundations for the reading and writing program.		
4.2 Use a variety of high quality materials, including, but not limited to, technology-based information, non-print materials, books, and periodicals. These materials will represent multiple levels, broad interests, and varied cultural and linguistic backgrounds.		
4.3 Model and share use of reading and writing for real purposes in daily life.		
4.4 Motivate learners to be lifelong readers and writers.		
	<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
AC Portfolio standard #2	2203/2005 N=26	100% pass rate

<b>Standard 5 – Professional development:</b> Candidates view professional development as a career-long effort and responsibility		
5.1 Display positive dispositions related to reading and the teaching of reading.		
5.2 Pursue the development of professional knowledge and dispositions.		
5.3 Work with colleagues to evaluate and provide feedback on each other’s practice		
5.4 Participate in planning, implementing, and evaluating of professional development programs.		
	<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Assessments of (Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>% of Candidates Rated as Acceptable/Proficient or higher</b>
AC Portfolio Standard #5	2003/2005 N=26	100% pass rate
AC Portfolio Final Reflection	2003/2005 N=26	100% pass rate

Table 7. Evidence of Candidates Meet the NCDPI AC Standards

NCDPI AC Standards:	Where taught (course/field experience, etc.):	Evidence of learning (project/assignment/critical performances/portfolios, etc.):	Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):
<b>Masters Standard 1: Instructional Expertise - The candidate demonstrates instructional expertise by applying the theoretical, philosophical, and research bases for educational practice in P-12 settings to improve student learning.</b>			
1:1 - The candidate plans, implements, and evaluates instruction that is rigorous, coherent, and consistent with a well-developed theoretical and philosophical base and best practices emerging from educational research.	CUI 615, 615D, 616, 616D, 619, 640, 675	615: Weekly Reactions, Final Exam 615D: Final project 616: "Take 10" Project 616D Research Paper 619: Final Position Paper 640: Frame Experiment, Research Critique 675: Research project	615, 615D: Wholistic Scoring 615D, 616D, 616, 619, 640, 675: Rubrics
1:2 - The candidate designs and modifies instruction and learning environments based on assessment of student learning problems and successes.	CUI 615D 616, 616D 617, 619, 640, 675	615D: Final Project 616: Project 616D: I Tried It projects 617: Clinic Lesson Plans 619: Quickwrites 640: Frame Experiment 675: Research project	615D, 616D 616, 619, 640, 675: Rubrics 617: Observations
1:3 - The candidate monitors the effects of instructional actions, selection of materials, and other instructional decisions on students' learning and behavior.	CUI 615D, 616, 616D, 617	615D: Final Project 616: Project 616D: I tried it, Final Project 617: Clinic Lesson Plans and Email Reflections	615D, 616D, 616, 617: Rubric
1:4 - The candidate incorporates findings from educational literature into school and classroom strategies to improve student learning.	CUI 615, 615D, 616, 616D, 619, 640, 675	615: Weekly Reactions, Final Exam 615D: Book Club discussions, reading check-ins 616: Project 616D: Book Club discussions, reading check-ins 619: Position Papers 640: Frame Experiment	615D, 616D: Wholistic Scoring 616, 619, 640, 675 : Rubrics

NCDPI AC Standards:	Where taught (course/field experience, etc.):	Evidence of learning (project/assignment/critical performances/portfolios, etc.):	Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):
		675: Research project	
1:5 - The candidate understands and links subject matter and students' developmental and diverse needs in the context of school settings.	CUI 615D, 616, 616D, 619	615D: Final project 616: Project 616D: Final project, I tried it project 619: Quick Writes	615D, 616, 616D, 619: Rubric
1:6 - The candidate uses technology to create learning environments that support students' learning.	CUI 616	616: Project	616: Rubric
1:7 - The candidate seeks, implements, and evaluates the best pedagogical practices for the subjects taught within the context of a specific school setting.	CUI 615D, 616	615D: Final project 616: Project	615D: Checklist 615D, 616: Rubric
1:8 - The candidate demonstrates the ability to integrate literacy across the curriculum.	CUI 616	616: Project	616: Rubric
<b>Masters Standard 2: Knowledge of Learners - The candidate incorporates knowledge of the nature to the learner, learning processes, variations in learning abilities and learning styles, and strategies for evaluating learning into the planning, delivery, and evaluation of instruction.</b>			
2:1 - The candidate seeks to increase understanding of and respect for differences in students, including exceptionalities.	CUI 619, 545	619: Quick Writes 545: Web-based Teacher Fact Sheets	619, 545: Rubric
2:2 - The candidate designs and delivers instruction that is responsive to differences among all learners.	CUI 615D, 616, 616D, 617	615D: Final project; I tried it project 616: Project 616D: Final project 617: Clinic Lesson Plans and Email Reflections	615D: Checklist 616D, 616: Rubric 617: Rubric and observations

<b>NCDPI AC Standards:</b>	<b>Where taught (course/field experience, etc.):</b>	<b>Evidence of learning (project/assignment/critical performances/portfolios, etc.):</b>	<b>Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):</b>
2:3 - The candidate reflects on and modifies instruction that fosters student learning.	CUI 615D, 616, 616D, 617, 619, 640, 675	615D: Final project; I tried it project 616: Project 616D: Final project 619: Small Group Project 617: Clinic Lesson Plans and Email Reflections 640: Frame Experiment 675: Research project	615D, 616, 616D, 617, 619, 640 ,675: Rubrics
2:4 - The candidate understands and respects differences between the learning behaviors and outcomes expected in diverse communities.	CUI 545	545: Discussion Board Responses, Web-based Teacher Fact Sheets, Reflections	545: Rubrics
2:5 - The candidate creates and maintains a classroom environment conducive to learning in which all learners feel welcome and can be successful.	CUI 640, 675, 619	640: Frame Experiment 675: Research Project 619 Program Evaluation	Rubrics
<b>Masters Standard 3: Research - The candidate uses research to examine and improve instructional effectiveness and student achievement.</b>			
3:1 - The candidate critically reads and applies historical and contemporary educational literature, including theoretical, philosophical, and research materials.	CUI 619, 640	619: Position Paper 640: Research Critique	619, 640: Rubric
3:2 - The candidate uses student and school performance data to improve student learning, classroom processes, and school practices.	CUI 617	617: Clinic Lesson Plans and Email Reflections	617: Observations
3:3 - The candidate investigates educational problems through action research.	CUI 640, 675	640: Frame Experiment 675: Research project	640. 675 Rubrics
<b>Masters Standard 4: Content Knowledge - The candidate demonstrates advanced depth and breadth of knowledge and skills in</b>			

<b>NCDPI AC Standards:</b>	<b>Where taught (course/field experience, etc.):</b>	<b>Evidence of learning (project/assignment/critical performances/portfolios, etc.):</b>	<b>Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):</b>
<b>the academic discipline and in education.</b>			
4:1 - The candidate analyzes and articulates relationships between and among theory, philosophy, research findings, and current practice as appropriate to the discipline.	CUI 615, 615D, 619, 675	615: Research Paper and Presentation 615D: Final project 619: Position Papers 675: Research Project	615: Holistic scoring and observations 615D, 619, 675: Rubrics
4:2 - The candidate analyzes and articulates relationships between and among theory, philosophy, research findings, and current practice across the disciplines.	CUI 619	619: Position Papers	619: Rubric
4:3 - The candidate demonstrates theoretical and applied advanced content knowledge.	CUI 617	617: Clinic Lesson Plans	PRAXIS 617: Final Exam
4:4 - The candidate understands current knowledge and trends in education.	CUI 615, 619	615: Weekly Reactions to Readings, Blackboard Discussion of book 619: Small Group Projects, Quick Writes	PRAXIS 615: Holistic Scoring 619: Rubric and observation
<b>Masters Standard 5: Professional Development and Leadership - The candidate engages in continued professional development and provides leadership at the classroom, school, and community levels, and within the profession.</b>			
5:1 - The candidate initiates professional inquiry through reading, dialogue, reflection, professional development, and action research.	CUI 615, 615D, 616D, 619, 675	615: Research Paper, Final Exam – Persuasive Letter 615D: discussion board, final reflections 616D: discussion board 619: Position Papers 675: Research Journal and Project	615, 615D, 616D, 675: Holistic Scoring 619: Rubric
5:2 - The candidate seeks, evaluates, and as appropriate, acts on input from educators, parents, students, and other members of the community	CUI 617	617: Parent Interview and Clinic Report	617: Rubric

<b>NCDPI AC Standards:</b>	<b>Where taught (course/field experience, etc.):</b>	<b>Evidence of learning (project/assignment/critical performances/portfolios, etc.):</b>	<b>Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):</b>
for continuous improvement.			
5:3 - The candidate participates, formally and informally, in appropriate professional communities.	CUI 615, 615D, 616, 616D, 619, 640, 675	615: Research paper and presentation 615D: Discussion board, attendance of state reading conference 616: Project 616D: Book Club project and discussions 619: Small Groups Project 640: Research Groups 675: Writing Groups	615: Observation 616: Rubric 619: Observation 615D, 616D, 640, 675: Holistic
5:4 - The candidate participates in collaborative leadership to address educational problems.	CUI 675	675: Research Groups	Observation
5:5 - The candidate provides leadership in working with parents and strengthening the home-school partnership.	CUI 615D, 617	615D: Discussion board, book club project 617: Clinical Report for Parents, Handout for parents, Interactions with parents	615D, 617: Holistic scoring 617: observation

Table 8. Evidence that Candidates Meet the Program Standards

Program Standards: IRI/ DPI	Where taught :	Evidence of learning (project, assignment, etc.):	Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):
<b>Standard 1 Foundational Knowledge</b>			
1.2 Demonstrate knowledge of psychological, sociological, and linguistic foundations of reading and writing process and instruction.	CUI 615, 615D, 616D, 617,	615: Weekly Reaction Papers on Assigned Reading, Research Paper, Final Exam 615D: monthly reading charts, discussion board postings 616D: monthly reading charts, discussion board postings 617: Clinical Teaching	PRAXIS 615, 615D, 616D: holistic Assessment 617: Observations, Final Exam
1.6 Demonstrate knowledge of reading research and histories of reading.	CUI 615, 619, 640, 675	615 Weekly Reactions, Research Paper 619 Position Papers	PRAXIS, 615: Wholistic Assessment, 619: Rubric
1.7 Demonstrate knowledge of language, reading, and writing development.	CUI 615, 615D, 616, 616D,, 640	615: Weekly Reactions, Final Exam 615D: monthly reading charts, discussion board postings, final project 616D: monthly reading charts, discussion board postings, final project 640:	PRAXIS 615 Wholistic Assessment 615D, 616D: holistic Assessment, rubric

Program Standards: IRI/ DPI	Where taught :	Evidence of learning (project, assignment, etc.):	Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):
1.8 Demonstrate knowledge of cultural and linguistic diversity as they relate to the development of oral language, reading, and writing.	CUI 619, 545	619: Quick Writes 545: Discussion Board Responses and Position Paper	PRAXIS 619, 545:Rubrics
1.9 Demonstrate knowledge of the major components of fluent reading (phonemic awareness, word identification, phonics, vocabulary, background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation).	CUI 615, 615D, 616, 616D, 617	615 Weekly Reactions, Final Exam 615D: Reading charts, discussion board, final project 616: “Take 10” Project: Implementation of 10 strategies across the semester to aid in students’ comprehension of informational and other texts 616D: Reading charts, discussion board, final project 617: Clinic Lesson Plans, Recommendation Handouts	PRAXIS  615, 615D, 616D: Wholistic Assessment 615D, 616D, 616: Rubric 617: Observations, Final Exam
<b>Standard 2 - Instructional strategies and curriculum materials:</b> Candidates support reading and writing instruction by using a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, and curriculum materials.			
2.1 Candidates establish meaningful and appropriate purposes supported by instructional grouping options (individual, small-group, whole-class, and computer-based).	CUI 615, 619	615: Weekly Reactions 619: Quick Writes	615: Wholistic Assessment 619: Rubric

Program Standards: IRI/ DPI	Where taught :	Evidence of learning (project, assignment, etc.):	Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):
2.2 Candidates identify differing stages of development, cultures, and linguistic backgrounds of learners and use a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices, to address those differences.	CUI 615, 615D, 616, 616D, 619	615: Weekly Reactions 615D: Reading charts, discussion board, final project 616: “Take 10” project 616D: Reading charts, discussion board, final project, I tried it 619: Class Presentations and Position Papers	615, 615D, 616D: Wholistic Assessment 616, 616D: Rubric 617: Observation
2.3 Candidates facilitate effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading/writing development and from different cultural/ linguistic backgrounds by using a wide range of curriculum materials.	CUI 615, 615D, 616, 616D, 619	615: Weekly Reactions 615D: final project 616: “Take 10” project— 616D: final project, I tried it project 619: Final Position Paper	615: Wholistic Assessment 615D, 616, 616D, 619:Rubric
<b>Standard 3 –Assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation:</b> Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading instruction.			
3.1 Uses a wide range of assessment tools and practices, including individual and group standardized tests and informal classroom assessment strategies incorporating technology as appropriate.	CUI 617	617: Case Study, Clinical Report and Assessment Folder	617: Rubric, Final Exam
3.3 Determine learners’ placements along a developmental continuum, identify learners’ proficiencies and difficulties, and initiate appropriate referrals.	CUI 616D, 617, 619	617: Case Study and Clinical Report, Assessment Folder 619: Responses during discussion	619: Rubric, Observation 617: Rubrics

Program Standards: IRI/ DPI	Where taught :	Evidence of learning (project, assignment, etc.):	Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):
3.3 Use assessment information to plan, evaluate, and revise effective instruction that meets the needs of all learners, including those at different developmental stages and those from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds	CUI 616D, 617, 619	616D: Final report 617: Clinical Report, Clinic Lesson Plans and Lesson transcriptions 619: Small Group Presentations	616D: Rubric 617: Rubric, Clinical observations by supervisor 619: Observation
3.5 Communicate results of assessments to relevant individuals.	CUI 617	CUI 617: Clinical Report	617: Rubric
<b>Standard 4 - Creating a Literate Environment:</b> 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.			
4.2 Use learners' interests, reading abilities and backgrounds as foundations for the reading and writing program.	CUI 615D, 616, 616D, 617, 619, 640	615D: final report, book club projects 616: "Take 10" Project 616D: final report, I Tried It report 617 Clinic Lesson Plans and Transcription 619: Quickwrites 640: Student Writer Interview/ Survey	617: Observation and rubric 615D, 616, 616D, 619: Rubrics 640:

Program Standards: IRI/ DPI	Where taught :	Evidence of learning (project, assignment, etc.):	Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):
4.2 Use a variety of high quality materials, including, but not limited to, technology-based information, non-print materials, books, and periodicals. These materials will represent multiple levels, broad interests, and varied cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	CUI 617, 619	616: Take 10 Project 617: Clinic Lesson Plans 619: Position Papers	617: Observations 616, 619: Rubric
4.5 Model and share use of reading and writing for real purposes in daily life.	CUI 615, 615D, 616, 616D, 640	615: Weekly Reactions 615D: Personal reading plans 616: Take 10 Project 616D: Personal reading plans 640:	615, 615D, 616D: holistic Assessment 616: Rubric
4.6 Motivate learners to be lifelong readers and writers.	CUI 615D, 616, 616D, 640	615D: Personal reading plans 616: Take 10 Project 616D: Personal reading plans 640: Autobiography, Childhood Memories, Snapshots, Writing Groups	615D, 616D: holistic Assessment 616: Rubric 640: Rubrics and Observation
<b>Standard 5 – Professional development:</b> Candidates view professional development as a career-long effort and responsibility.			

<b>Program Standards: IRI/ DPI</b>	<b>Where taught :</b>	<b>Evidence of learning (project, assignment, etc.):</b>	<b>Assessment tool (rubrics/tests/observations, etc.):</b>
5.5 Display positive dispositions related to reading and the teaching of reading.	CUI 615, 615D, 616, 616D, 617	615: Classroom discussion and group work 615D: discussion board, final report 616: Take 10 Project 615D: discussion board, final report 617: Clinical work with students, parents, and colleagues: Lesson transcription	615: Observations 615D: holistic assessment, rubrics 616: Rubric 616D: holistic assessment, rubrics 617: Observation and rubric
5.6 Pursue the development of professional knowledge and dispositions.	CUI 615, 615D, 616, 616D, 619	615: Research Paper and Oral Presentation 615D: attendance of state reading conference 616: Take 10 Project 616D: final report 619: Three position papers	615: Observation 615D: checklist 616, 616D, 619: Rubric
5.7 Work with colleagues to evaluate and provide feedback on each other's practice	CUI 615D, 616D, 619, 640, 675	615D: Discussion board 616D: Discussion board 619: Small collaboration groups 640: Writing Groups 675: Research Groups	615D, 616D: holistic assessment 619, 640, 675: Observation
5.8 Participate in planning, implementing, and evaluating of professional development programs.	CUI 619	619: Final Position Paper	69: Rubric

### *Evidence that Candidates Can Work with Families to Support Student Learning*

**Working With Parents:** Working with parents is specifically addressed in CUI 617 A & B (Diagnosis and Correction of Reading Problems). Graduate students are assigned children to work with during a weekly on-campus reading clinic. They are responsible for contacting the parents and maintaining communication with them across two semesters. They collect information from the parents about their children's developmental and academic histories, prepare a brochure or handout for the parents about how they can work with their children at home, provide booklists for extra reading, invite the parents to observe tutoring sessions and write a detailed clinical report. After each tutoring session graduate students are expected to meet briefly with parents about the child's progress and provide materials to work with during the coming week. Of course, since most of our graduate students have current teaching positions, they work with parents in many other capacities that are beyond the expectations of our program.

**Product of Learning:** The M.Ed. Portfolio, organized around the North Carolina Advanced Competencies of a Master Teacher (AC), is the major exit criteria for students in the M.Ed. in Reading program. This standards-based portfolio is evaluated independently by two UNCG faculty members and one school partner (an administrator, Curriculum Facilitator, or a National Board Certified Teacher) during the final semester in the program. The M.Ed. Portfolio consists of reflective essays addressing each AC and is supported with accompanying evidence from M.Ed. course assignments and projects, lesson/unit plans, etc. Students select evidence that supports the standard so evidence varies. Teachers in this program complete an Action Research project during the two-semester of CUI 675. In addition, students take a Praxis exam to qualify for a reading specialist license. Examples of M.Ed. Portfolio artifacts from graduates of the program rated as good to excellent can be found in the document boxes.

### *Standard 1A: Candidate Qualifications*

**Program admission criteria:** Candidates applying to the M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT program are required to take the GRE exam for admission to Graduate School. Average scores for prospective teachers admitted to this program range between 400-500 for Verbal, 400-500 for Quantitative, and 4.0 for Writing (on a scale of 1-6). This pattern of scores has remained consistent for the past 5 years. Applicants must also have a 3.0 or higher undergraduate GPA, or will be admitted provisionally with GPA above 2.75. The typical provision is to maintain a 3.0 GPA for the first 9 hours in the program, which virtually all provisionally-admitted students are able to meet. Dispositions are assessed prior to admission through required letters of recommendation (usually from administrators and co-workers) and/or interviews with the program coordinator.

### Section IV: Standard II – Candidate Assessment and Evaluation

The basic assessment plan for the M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT program includes three points when candidates are assessed and advised:

Table 9. Assessment Plan

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Admission to Program</b>	<b>Midway in Program</b>	<b>End of Program</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>
<b>Grades</b>	Minimum 3.0 GPA in undergraduate work	Maintain 3.0 GPA in M.Ed. classes	Maintain 3.0 GPA	
<b>GRE scores</b>	Verbal: 400-500 Quant: 400-500 Writing: 4.0 or better			
<b>Dispositions</b>	3 letters of recommendation Dispositions discussed at Orientation Meeting	Discussed at signing of Plan of Study if concerns arise	Reflections/essays in M.Ed. Portfolios	
<b>Plan of Study</b>	Plan of Study and Program Expectations discussed at Orientation Meeting	Reviewed with Advisor and signed by 12 hours	Reviewed with Advisor and signed in final semester	
<b>M.Ed. Portfolio</b>	Information available on CUI Dept. website	Portfolio requirements reviewed by Advisor at POS meeting, in CUI 656, and CUI 675	Portfolio Scored by 2 UNCG faculty and 1 school partner (NBCT or administrator)	
<b>Other</b>		Individual course assignments evaluated by instructors		
<b>Candidate Satisfaction</b>		Course evaluations (every course, every semester)	Course evaluations (every course, every semester)	Survey completed at end of 2 <sup>nd</sup> year (TA)
<b>Licensure Status</b>				TA keeps record of licensure applications

### *Individual Candidate Assessment*

Advisors and course instructors monitor M.Ed. students' progress through the program in the following ways:

- (a) Every new student in the program is assigned a faculty member as an advisor. Dr. Johnston currently advises the vast majority of students, but Dr. Miller and Dr. Salas have some as well. Advisees are always available by phone, email, drop in, or by appointment.
- (b) Advisors meet with and sign each student's Plan of Study by the time s/he has taken 18 hours, if there is a change in the Plan of Study, and at the start of the final semester in the program.
- (c) Instructors make suggestions on their course syllabus about how their class assignments meet specific M.Ed.-ACs.
- (d) The M.Ed. Portfolio Guidelines are in the M.Ed. Handbook and in a separate document, which are both available on the CUI website at <http://www.uncg.edu/cui> called the M.Ed. All the M.Ed.-ACs, details about how to construct the M.Ed. Portfolio, rubrics, and sign-off forms are in the M.Ed. Portfolio Guidelines and the M.Ed. Handbook available in this online handout. Copies of these documents are also in the document box.
- (e) Advisors provide support/advice for completion of the M.Ed. Portfolio and then assess it. Advisors are willing to read drafts of portfolio entries and provide verbal and written feedback until the student is comfortable with the format expected for the essays. Mastery of the competencies for the M.Ed. Portfolio is expected and support is provided until it is achieved. This results in passing rates of 100% on the portfolios but it is rare that a student needs a second chance.
- (f) Support for completing the M.Ed. Portfolio is also offered during CUI 675 (Teacher as Researcher) and students generally complete their M.Ed. Portfolio and present it at the end of the course to peers and other invited guests.
- (g) Academic progress is assessed on every assignment and through course grades. Students in this program must maintain a 3.0 GPA in their coursework and can have no more than two grades of C in any course, which is very rare.
- (h) Because teachers in this program are already licensed and employed, dispositions are assessed prior to admission through evaluation of required letters of recommendation and/or interviews with the program coordinator. We do not have a formal mechanism for assessing dispositions or performance in the field for this program in the same way we do for programs that lead to initial teacher licensure because the teachers in this program are evaluated by their site administrators on the job. Teachers who enter the program have proven to be excellent graduate students and seem to be competent teachers based on the excellent work they do throughout this program. These are teachers who have self-selected to get a Masters degree in order to become better teachers and to learn more about their craft.
- (i) Because teachers in this program apply a lot of what they learn in the M.Ed. courses to their classrooms, there is a continuous feedback loop from the schools back to the University about the effectiveness and relevance of what is being taught and what teachers are experiencing in their classrooms. Advisors and course instructors learn from conversations and from reviewing the M.Ed. Portfolios what assignments are particularly useful to students' learning and development as master teachers.

(j) The culminating M.Ed. Portfolio is evaluated independently by two UNCG faculty members and one school partner (either the candidate's administrator, or a National Board Certified Teacher) based on a rubric that focuses on (1) the quality of the reflective essays and (2) the supporting evidence provided.

(k) Finally, students finishing this program apply to the Teachers Academy for the M license after completing all coursework successfully, successfully passing the assessment of their M.Ed. Portfolio, and completing the PRAXIS II exam,.

### ***Program and Program Operations Assessment***

Teachers in the M.Ed. program have the opportunity to provide feedback about their courses and instructors through the required course evaluation process at the end of every semester. We also get feedback through informal conversations before, during, and after classes, in the open-ended comments in course evaluations, and in writing in their reflective essays in their M.Ed. Portfolios. If an adjunct instructor is not meeting our standards that person is advised by the CUI Department Chair of the problems identified by the students and may not be asked to teach again in this program. If a full-time faculty member receives negative course evaluations the CUI Department Chair works with that person and may reassign them to other courses where they are more effective. Both of these situations are very rare. The main feedback we get from the students in this program is that they really learn a lot from their instructors, that their teaching practices change as a result of what they have learned, and that they develop into teacher who are leaders in their schools and who see the value of theory and research – both scientific research related to teaching and learning, and their own action research efforts as result of learning about and completing action research projects.

### ***Annual Review of the Program***

Beginning in the fall of 2005 faculty met once each semester to discuss the program. The chair of the Reading Committee, Dr. Francine Johnston, calls this meeting and minutes are posted on the department website and are available in the evidence box. This committee discusses potential program changes and makes decisions about them. Review of this program also occurs several times a year when M.Ed. Portfolios are reviewed in fall, spring, and summer and when course evaluations are returned to faculty. The review of M.Ed. Portfolios each semester provides us with feedback about the program and the quality of the M.Ed. Portfolios has reinforced our observations that we have excellent teachers enrolled in the program. See examples of several recent M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT portfolios in the document box that were rated between good and excellent.

We depend a lot on feedback from students received informally throughout the program and on formal course evaluations for every course every semester as the best way to gather any evidence for improving our program. Informally we assess dispositions based on classroom discussions, observations of interactions during group work, and on their written assignments and reflections. We also infer their success in the field when grading assignments that require them to develop and teach lessons/units in order to try out new ideas about content and pedagogy. Using their written reflections, examples of student work, and instructional plans allows us to infer how successful these experienced teachers are at implementing new strategies learned in their courses. The teachers in this program do a lot of

reflective writing and instructors use this as vehicle for responding to teachers about their dispositions as well as practices. Ultimately, evaluating the M.Ed. Portfolios allows us to see what kinds of evidence (in the form of course assignments) these teachers feel have contributed to their mastering the competencies in the M.Ed.-ACs and developing into Master Teachers.

***Summary of Data Collected and Analyzed***

Based on grades, as can be seen in AC charts provided earlier, all the M.Ed.-TLT students taking the required core courses in this program (CUI 669, 545, 622, 656, 675, and ERM 604 or 605) have received excellent grades with 96-100% receiving B or better grades in these courses over the past 5 years. In fact, more than 90% of these students earn grades of A or A- in these required courses. The passing rate on the M.Ed. Portfolio for the M.Ed.-Reading Education-TLT students has always been 100%. In fact, no one has been asked to redo their portfolio after the assessment process begins because anyone who is at all unsure about our expectations meets with their advisor and can request advisors to read drafts of their AC essays. We seek mastery of each AC and ask teachers to revise and resubmit any essays that appear to be weak before we do any actual scoring of their M.Ed. Portfolio entries. Furthermore, in CUI 675, the instructor provides time in class for students working on their M.Ed. Portfolios to get peer feedback, and also provides direct feedback on initial essays until the student is on track and understands our expectations. Once a student is on the right track they do quite well on the remainder of their M.Ed. Portfolio essays. Therefore the pass rates for the M.Ed. Portfolio have been 100% every year for the past several years. However, we have recently changed our scoring on the M.Ed. Portfolio Rubric to quantify the scores so that we can gather numeric (ratings of 1-6) rather than qualitative ratings on these portfolios in the future.

Table 10. Pass rates and number (approximate) of M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT students completing their M.Ed. Portfolio

<b>Spring, Summer, and Fall 2003</b>	<b>Spring, Summer, and Fall 2004</b>	<b>Spring, Summer, and Fall 2005</b>	<b>Spring 2006</b>
N=11 Portfolio pass rate= 100%	N=3 Portfolio pass rate= 100%	N=11 Portfolio pass rate= 100%	N=2 Portfolio pass rate= 100%

Table 11. The aggregated pass rates for the PRAXIS II by students in the M.Ed. in Reading program since 2003

<b>Number who have taken the Praxis II between March 2003 and April 2005</b>	<b>Number who have passed Praxis II</b>	<b>Percentage who have passed Praxis II</b>
23	22	96%

Out of the 23 people who have taken the PRAXIS, two have been unsuccessful. One of these took it twice and passed with a score of 610. The passing score for North Carolina is 570. The other student did not retake it. This leaves us with a passing rate of 96%. The mean for UNCG scores on the Reading Specialist test are 632 (using students' highest score only).

### ***Changes in the M.Ed. Reading Program since 2001***

Course evaluations as well as reflections from the final portfolio provide feedback to faculty who teach courses for the reading masters program. Students' choices of artifacts for inclusion in the final portfolio offer insights about what classes and assignments students find most important in their professional growth. We pay particular attention to the final reflection in which our students assess the overall program and its impact upon their teaching.

Modifications are made regularly to syllabi in response to faculty changes, student needs, and changes in the literacy field. Discussions between faculty who teach in the masters program are informal but frequent as we share ideas about readings, websites, videos, etc. Slight changes have also been made to the program although we have not yet formally changed the requirements. Nearly all students take CUI 614 (Word Study for phonics, spelling and vocabulary) which is listed as an elective on the plan of study. We are now offering a CUI 628 (Issues in CUI) course on Literacy Learning for ESL's that we will start offering on a regular basis. These changes reflect the growing need for reading teachers to know more about phonics and children who are not native speakers of English. The table below describes some specific changes we have made:

Table 12. Changes in the M.Ed. Reading Program since 2001

Problem	Change to Program
Two candidates did not pass the PRAXIS on their first attempt. Other students expressed concerns about passing the PRAXIS.	Require a textbook for CUI 617A&B that provides a overview of reading problems and instructional strategies and give a multiple choice final exam that simulates the PRAXIS exam.
Students who took the PRAXIS reported that many questions deal with knowledge of phonics terms	All students are encouraged to take CUI 614 which is listed as an elective. In this course they will complete a study guide and take a phonics quiz to assure knowledge of terminology
Students taking the clinical course (617) were not always well prepared to work with students who had reading problems	More stringent attention to Plans of Study so that students take foundations courses (615 and 616) before taking 617.
Teachers work with increasingly larger numbers of students who are learning English as a second language	Dr. Salas, developed a new course offered in the summer of 2005 entitled Literacy Instruction for English Language Learners. This is a course students can elect to take under the CUI 628 number.
Need for more content directed toward Middle School and High School teachers since license is for K-12	Try an experimental course under 628 entitled adolescent literacy. New faculty member Colleen Fairbanks will offer a new course in the fall of 06
Identified standard #4 (IRA) as an area where students need a better portfolio artifact	Require an assignment in CUI 675 which asks students to complete an assessment of their class room environment
Current Portfolio assessment did not offer a means for collecting data on the success of our students in meeting the AC competencies	Approved new portfolio assessment form that assigns scores of 1-6 for each area

## **Section V: Standards III – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

### ***Clinical Practice***

Candidates in the M.Ed. in Reading program must complete CUI 617 A & B which are clinical courses. The fall course (617 A) focuses upon diagnosing students with reading problems. Parents from the surrounding area can register their children for 6 weeks of clinic, during which time each child is thoroughly assessed by a graduate student using a variety of informal instruments. Some tutoring also takes place as a way to verify the assessment results. In the spring semester (617 B) the focus is more upon correction of reading difficulties and the same children return for 12 weeks of tutoring. The tutoring lasts for one hour. After tutoring the graduate students meet as a class to talk about their tutoring and to learn more about intervention strategies and principles.

### ***Evaluation of Clinical Practice***

Graduate students working with children in the clinic are supervised by the faculty member in charge of the class. This takes place as the faculty member observes for short periods each week during the tutoring session. The number of graduate students in the clinic is kept small (15 - 20) so that regular close supervision is possible. Students send a weekly email report to the faculty member to facilitate communication about what took place, what questions arose, and what suggestions might be offered. Graduate students also turn in their lesson plans twice during the semester for evaluation and feedback by the supervisor. A final clinical report written for the parents is used as a culminating evaluation of the graduate student's clinical work.

## **Section VI: Standard IV – Diversity**

### ***How Diversity is Addressed in the Curriculum and in Clinical Practice***

Graduate students in the M.Ed. in Reading program take one course that focuses specifically on diversity: CUI 545-Diverse Learners. This course provides content knowledge about diversity and strategies for meeting the needs of diverse learners. However, all CUI courses address issues related to diversity through readings and assignments. CUI 617 A & B are designed to specifically prepare graduate students to assess children and then offer differentiated instruction in reading based upon their identified needs as well as interests and culture in a clinic that operates on campus. The clinic offers scholarships to children who need tutoring and cannot afford to pay the fee. As a result we have a diverse group of children that includes African Americans and children of low SES homes.

### ***Faculty Diversity***

The higher education faculty in the School of Education who teach the courses these students take are fairly diverse with regard to race/ethnicity and gender. For example, in the CUI Department the students in the M.Ed., in Reading Education program are very likely to have Dr. Cooper or Dr. Baber for CUI 545 (Diverse Learners), or Dr. Rachel Salas for CUI 616 or 628 (Reading Across the Grades or Trends and Issues in Curriculum and Instruction). These faculty members are all women of color and the percentage of minority tenure-track faculty in the CUI Department is 25%. In addition Drs. Miller and Duffy are male faculty members who teach courses in this program.

### ***Diversity of Candidates in the M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT program***

In the last five years we have had 2 male students, 3 African Americans, and 1 Asian student. This does not suggest a great deal of diversity but reflects the lack of diversity across campus in graduate programs, especially education. Our off-campus cohorts will hopefully attract more teachers who might not come to campus for their masters degree. We attempted to get a motion passed by the Graduate School that would eliminate the GRE for classroom teachers applying for their masters in education. We did this in an effort to attract students who might not otherwise seek their masters. Unfortunately this proposal was rejected by the Graduate School.

**Section VII: Standard V – Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**

***Program Faculty and their Qualifications***

The faculty who teach for the Reading Program are well qualified for their roles and model best professional practices in scholarship, service and teaching. See faculty vita for their qualifications and recent publications

Table 13. List of Faculty in Reading Masters Program

Faculty Names	Highest Degree, Discipline, University, License	Rank	Courses Taught
Dr. Gerald Duffy	Ed.D. U. of Northern Illinois, Curriculum & Instruction, NY license	Professor	CUI 619, 628
Dr. Ann Harrington	Ph.D. U of Georgia, Reading NC License Reading Specialist	Full-time Clinical Faculty	CUI 616, 619, 675
Dr. Francine Johnston	Ed.D. Reading, University of Virginia, NC License as Reading Specialist	Associate Professor	CUI 614, 615, 617, 619
Dr. Barbara Levin	Ph.D., Ed. Psych. UC-Berkeley, NC license	Professor	CUI 628
Dr. Molly Lloyd	Ph.D., Curriculum & Instruction, UNCG, NC License as Reading Specialist	Full-time Adjunct	CUI 617
Dr. Sherri Merritt	Ph.D., Curriculum and Instruction, North Carolina State University, NC License in grades 9-12, NBCT	Assistant Professor	CUI 640, 675
Dr. Dixie Massey	Ph.D., Curriculum & Instruction, UNCG, NC License	Adjunct	CUI 615, 616, 619, 675
Dr. Jewell Cooper	Ph.D., Curriculum & Instruction, UNCG, NC License	Assistant Professor	CUI 545
Dr. Sam Miller	Ph.D., Ed Psych, U. of Michigan, NC License in Elementary Education	Professor	CUI 617, 669
Dr. Kathryn Prater	Ph.D., Language & Literacy, U of Texas, TX License	Assistant Professor	CUI 628
Dr. Rachel Salas	Ph.D., Bilingual Multicultural Special Education, U of Texas, CA License	Assistant Professor	CUI 615, 616, 628
Dr. Burt Goldman	Ph.D University of Va	Professor	ERM 604, 605

### ***M.Ed. in Reading Program Coordination***

The M.Ed. in Reading is coordinated by Dr. Francine Johnston, a full-time faculty member with experience as an elementary teacher and licensure in NC as a K-12 Reading Specialist. Dr. Johnston regularly teaches CUI 615 (Literacy in the Early Years), CUI 617 A & B (Diagnosis and Correction of Reading Problems) and CUI 614 (Word Study). Her program responsibilities include corresponding with potential applicants, processing all application files, academic advising, curriculum and program evaluation, portfolio evaluations, attending Teacher Academy meetings of the Council of Program Coordinators, and any other needs of the program.

### ***Teaching Practices used by Faculty in the M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT Program***

The instructional strategies used by faculty are consistent with good pedagogical practices and with our Conceptual Framework in that they promote competence (readings, lectures, book clubs, research papers, lesson/unit plans, data analysis, action research, etc.), caring (class discussions, cooperative learning, reflective writing, case discussions, etc.) and certainly collaboration (book clubs, class discussion, online discussions, jigsaw, role plays, simulations, oral presentations, etc). In addition, all faculty in this program regularly integrate technology into their courses in several ways: use of Blackboard for online discussions and group work, incorporation of Internet resources for teaching and learning, video, PowerPoints, other software appropriate to the course, etc. Furthermore, they all use the teaching stations in our classrooms to good effect to display information, project Internet resources, access Blackboard, etc. The following chart details many of the teaching practices typically used by faculty in the M.Ed. in Reading TLT Program

Table 14. Teaching Practices used in CUI courses required for the M.Ed. in Reading – TLT Program

Methods	CUI 545	CUI 615	CUI 616	CUI 617	CUI 619	CUI 640	CUI 669	CUI 675	CUI 669
Lecture	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Readings	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Textbook	X		X	X		X	X	X	
Whole Class Discussion	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Small Group Discussion	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Online Discussion	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Research Papers	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
Lesson Plans/ Units			X	X		X			
Small Group Presentations	X	X	X		X				
Individual Presentations	X	X		X	X	X		X	
Reflective Writings	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Data Analysis				X				X	
Action Research					X	X		X	
Book Clubs	X		X				X		
Case analysis				X					
Videos	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Simulations/ Role Play			X			X		X	
Clinical Teaching				X					

***M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT faculty Involvement and Collaboration with and Service to the Public Schools***

Since our students come from a number of different schools and school systems there is no systematic way that we can work with public schools. We do advertise our reading clinic through the local schools as a way to inform principals and teachers of that service and we give scholarships to about a third of the applicants. Faculty do provide in-service presentations at schools when invited by administrators or former or current graduate students in the reading programs.

***M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT Faculty Scholarship***

The CVs of CUI Department tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, and adjuncts who teach in the M.Ed. in Reading Ed-TLT program are available in the document box. However, a few examples of recent publications and presentations of the faculty who teach courses in this program are listed in the table below:

Table 15. Faculty Scholarship

Reading Faculty	Recent Publications or Presentations
Dr. Gerry Duffy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duffy, G. G., (2005). Metacognition and the development of reading teachers. In C. Block, S. Israel, K. Kinnucan-Welsch &amp; K. Bauserman (Ed.) <i>Metacognition and literacy learning</i>, (pp. 299-314). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum</li> <li>• Duffy, G. G., (2003). Teachers who improve reading achievement: What they do and how to develop them. In D. Strickland &amp; M. Kamil (Ed.) <i>Improving Reading Achievement Through Professional Development</i>. NY: Christopher-Gordon.</li> <li>• Duffy, G. G. (2003). <i>Improving Comprehension: Ten Research-based Principles</i>, Washington, DC: National Education Association.</li> <li>• Duffy, G. G. (2003). <i>Explaining Reading: A Teacher's Resource for Teaching Concepts, Skills and Strategies</i>, NY: Guilford</li> </ul>
Dr. Ann Harrington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Massey, D. &amp; Duffy, A. (2004). The learning and perceptions of teacher researchers and facilitators in a literacy-focused, teacher-research course: A content analysis of system, learner, and spheres of influence. <i>Journal of Literacy Research, 35 (4)</i>, 1019-1050.</li> <li>• Duffy, A., Anderson J. , Durham, C. , Erickson, A. , &amp; Guion, C. , M. Ingram, M. Kirkpatrick, K. Kreger, S. Lambert, M. Lloyd, H. Reeder, W. Sink, (2003). Responding to the rhetoric: Professional educators' perspectives on reading instruction. <i>Reading Teache , 5 (7)</i>, 684-686.</li> <li>• Baumann, J. F. &amp; Duffy-Hester, A. (2002). Making sense of classroom worlds: Methodology in teacher research. M. L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson &amp; R. Barr (Ed.) <i>Methods of literacy research: The methodology chapters from the Handbook of Reading Research Volume III</i>, (pp. 1-22). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.</li> <li>• Duffy, A. (2001). Balance, literacy acceleration, and responsive teaching in a summer school literacy program for struggling readers. <i>Reading Research and Instruction 40</i>, 67-100.</li> </ul>

Dr. Francine Johnston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Johnston, F. (2006) Reconceptualizing spelling instruction as word study. In M. Kamil (Ed.) <u>Advancing Reading Instruction</u> (13-23). Greensboro, NC: SERVE</li> <li>• Bear, D., Invernizzi, M., Templeton, S., &amp; Johnston, F. (2004). <u>Words their way: Word study for phonics, vocabulary, and spelling instruction</u> (3rd Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/ Merrill Prentice Hall.</li> <li>• Johnston, F.R, . Invernizzi, M., Bear, D.,(2004). <u>Word sorts for letter name- alphabetic spellers</u>. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/ Merrill Prentice Hall.</li> <li>• Johnston, F. R. (2001) The utility of phonic generalizations: Let’s take another look at Clymer’s conclusions. <u>The Reading Teacher</u>. 55. 132-143.</li> </ul>
Dr. Sam Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gasparello, R., Mercier, S., Miller, S., Rohr, J., &amp; Duffy G. (2005). Sustaining school reform at Hunter Elementary. <i>Deep Change: Cases and Commentary on Schools and Programs of Successful Reform in High Stakes States</i>. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.</li> <li>• Miller, S. D., Duffy G. G., Rohr, J., Gasparello, R., &amp; Mercier, S. (2005). Preparing teachers for high poverty schools. <i>Educational Leadership</i>, 62, 62-65.</li> <li>• Miller, S. D. (2003). Partners-in-Reading: Using classroom assistants to provide tutorial assistance to struggling first-grade readers. <i>Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)</i>, 8, 333-349.</li> <li>• Schunk, D. H. &amp; Miller, S. (2002). Self-efficacy and adolescents' motivation. In F. Pajares &amp; T. Urban (Ed.) <i>Academic Motivation of Adolescents (Vol. II)</i>, (pp. 29-52). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.</li> </ul>
Dr. Kathryn Prater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prater, K. A., Worthy, J., &amp; Pennington, J. (2004). It's Program that looks good on paper. <i>Journal of Literacy Research</i>.</li> <li>• Prater, K. A. &amp; Worthy, J. (2002). I thought about it all night. <i>Reading Teacher</i>.</li> <li>• Prater, K. A. (2004). <i>The response to intervention of English language learners at risk for reading problems</i>. National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems, National Research Conference.</li> <li>• Prater, K. A. (2004). <i>Enhancing the Literacy and Oracy development of English Language Learners</i> National Reading Conference.</li> </ul>

Dr. Rachel Salas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salas, R.G., Tierce, M. B., &amp; Pennington, J. L. (2005). The best of multicultural children's literature for the new millennium: Great books for a culturally and linguistically diverse society and classroom. <i>International Reading Association Annual Meeting</i>. San Antonio, Tex 2005.</li> <li>• Hoffman, J., Paris, S., Patterson, B., Salas, R., &amp; Assaf, L. (2003). High-stakes assessment in the language arts: The piper plays, the players dance, but who pays the price?. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, J. Squire &amp; J. Jensen (Ed.) <i>Handbook of Research on Teaching the Language Arts</i>, (pp. 619-630). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.</li> <li>• Worthy, J., Patterson B., Salas, R., Prater, S., &amp; Turner, M. (2002). More than just reading: The human factor in reaching resistant readers. <i>Reading Research and Instruction</i>, 41 (2), 177-202.</li> <li>• Salas, R. G., Lucido, F., &amp; Canales, J. (2001). Multicultural Literature: Broadening young children's experiences. In J. Cassidy &amp; S. Garrett (Ed.) <i>Early Childhood Literacy: Programs &amp; strategies to develop cultural, linguistic, scientific and healthcare literacy for very young children &amp; their families</i>, (pp. 139-150). Corpus Christi, TX: Center for Educational Development Evaluation &amp; Research Annual Yearbook.</li> </ul>
Dr. Sandy Webb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Webb, S. J. &amp; Carlone, H. (2005). On (not) overcoming our history of hierarchy: complexities of university/school collaboration. <i>International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE)</i>.</li> <li>• Webb, S. J. (2005). <i>Navigating the third space: Negotiating meanings of diversity in a mainstream classroom</i>. Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Canada.</li> <li>• Webb, S. J. (2005). <i>Creating possibilities for participation of culturally and linguistically diverse students</i>. Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Canada.</li> <li>• Webb, S. J. &amp; Ponder, G. (2003). The Success Cycle at Hunter Elementary. <i>Journal of Curriculum and Supervision</i>.</li> </ul>

### ***M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT Faculty Service to the Profession***

As can be seen in the table above, CUI faculty who teach in the M.Ed. in Reading Education-TLT program are engaged in research and scholarly writing for publication and presentation, and they also review manuscripts for various professional journals, and are heavily involved with their professional organizations at the state and national level (e.g., AERA, IRA, NRC) By presenting at state, regional, and national conferences, publishing in a variety of research-focused and practitioner journals, and working on professional committees our faculty provide service to the profession. See the CVs of tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, and adjuncts who teach in the M.Ed. in Reading Ed-TLT program in the document box for further details.

### ***M.Ed. in Reading Faculty Evaluation Process***

All faculty and instructors who teach courses in the M.Ed. in Reading must ask students to complete course evaluations for every course every semester. These evaluations go to the CUI Department Chair and back to the faculty/instructors. If there are any “red flags” the CUI Department Chair consults with the Program Coordinator about whether or not to get someone else to teach a particular course where the students perceive problems. In addition, all faculty at the rank of assistant professor are observed by other faculty on a regular basis and all faculty teaching evaluations are reviewed by a committee of peers as part of their annual merit review. Before teaching a course, the Program Coordinator talks with new faculty/instructors about program expectations, the syllabus and correlating every assignment to the various standards (DPI/IRI, and ACs),and about other program expectations.

### ***M.Ed. in Reading faculty Assessment of their own Effectiveness as Related to Candidate Performance***

All faculty/instructors use the student course evaluations as an opportunity to reflect on their effectiveness. Tenure track faculty send the Chair their annual goals each year and the Chair meets with all untenured faculty to discuss their teaching, service, and research goals. Whenever a problem can be addressed or resources provided to improve a situation, then every step is taken to be proactive. Additionally, every tenure track faculty member has a mentor team who meets yearly with the candidate to discuss his or her goals. A member of the mentor team also observes their teaching and provides a written evaluation. These evaluations are submitted to the candidate and the Chair and serve as a basis for further discussions, thereby ensuring program quality. While not scheduled, the Chair discusses with each adjunct and doctoral student their teaching performance.

### ***How Faculty Evaluations Inform Teaching, Scholarship, and Service***

Tenure track faculty send the Chair their yearly goals each year and the Chair meets with all untenured faculty to discuss their teaching, service, and research goals. Whenever a problem can be addressed or resources provided to improve a situation, then every step is taken to be proactive. Additionally, every tenure track faculty member has a mentor team who meets yearly with the candidate to discuss his or her goals. Each faculty member submits an Annual Report each year to the Chair and the Merit Review Committee in which they report and reflect on their teaching, scholarship, and service. Feedback comes through the Chair in the form of a formal letter of evaluation as well as face to face meetings. Drs. Miller, Duffy, Levin, Johnston, and Goldman are tenured faculty who have met high standards for teaching, scholarship and service. Drs. Harrington, Merritt, and Cooper have been through the third year review, and the other faculty are either adjuncts or have been at UNCG less than three years.

### ***Professional Development Opportunities Provided to Faculty***

Full-time faculty who teach in the M.Ed. in Reading program regularly attend professional meetings dedicated to reading research and the improvement of teaching (NCRA, IRA, NRC, AERA) . They present at these meetings as well as attend sessions led by colleagues. Travel to these meetings is expected of tenured and tenure track faculty and is financially supported by the University. In addition, Dr. Gerald Duffy sponsors several seminars each year in which he brings nationally recognized experts in reading and/or teacher education to present their research and interact with our faculty. Participants in 2004-2005 were Dr. Sheila Valencia and Dr. Michael Kamil.

UNCG professional faculty are well qualified for their roles and model best professional practices in scholarship, service and teaching. They demonstrate a longstanding tradition of excellence in teaching, garnering awards at local and state levels. They engage in collaborative and interdisciplinary research and scholarship. They model professional service through leadership positions in professional organizations at the state, regional and national levels, and they are actively engaged within the community related to professional issues and concerns.

### ***Qualifications of Faculty***

Over 83% of the 771 full-time faculty at UNCG have earned doctorates. Minimal credentials include a master's degree and exceptional expertise in the subject area. All clinical faculty have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels they supervise student teachers and interns; several of the clinical faculty are National Board Certified teachers. DPI requires faculty who teach methods courses and/or supervise student teachers, school counselors, media specialists, and principal interns to hold a current license. [See Faculty Vitae and List of Faculty chart above].

### ***Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching***

Course syllabi reflect best professional practices in teaching and show a clear link to the conceptual framework of the Teachers Academy. Professional education faculty integrate recent research about the content fields, teaching and learning into their own professional practice.

Syllabi in all professional education courses include a statement of the conceptual framework. Assignments, rubrics, and criteria for evaluation, which are included in syllabi, indicate that faculty encourage development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions through active, project-based participation. Course syllabi also show that faculty use a variety of effective instructional strategies and teaching techniques, including the use of technology (e.g., e-reserves, threaded on-line discussions, asynchronous course offerings, and Blackboard based courses to name a few). Furthermore, course syllabi show that faculty value individual as well as cultural diversity [see Course Syllabi and chart of Teaching Practices above].

Faculty use student and peer evaluation, self-evaluation and assessment of student outcomes to determine their effectiveness and improve their practice [see Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures and Teaching Evaluation Protocols]. Evidence that speaks to the effectiveness of the professional education faculty is reflected in the fact that professional education faculty in the following departments have received awards for excellence in teaching at UNCG and other universities: Human Development and Family Studies, Counseling and Educational Development, Theatre, Curriculum and Instruction, English, Dance, Music, Educational Leadership and Cultural Foundations, Specialized Education Services, German and Russian, and Public Health Education. [See Alumni Teaching Excellence Award, Board of Governors Excellence in Teaching Award, and Faculty Vitae].

### ***Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship***

Faculty model best professional practices in scholarship as defined by the University and School of Education departments for purposes of annual faculty review and review for awarding promotion and tenure [see School of Education Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure and Guidelines for Faculty Annual Review]. Faculty vitae indicate that they are active in scholarly work related to teaching, learning and their fields of specialization. They serve as reviewers for national journals and conference proposals. Many hold leadership positions in organizations and scholarly societies at the state, national and international levels. They publish regularly in refereed journals and also write books, book chapters, teaching manuals, textbooks and other types of academic publications. Recent publications and presentations by professional education faculty include research with students, teachers, and administrators in public schools. They reflect collaborations across disciplines and institutions, and focus on a range of concerns related to the design and delivery of instruction including curriculum evaluations, co-teaching models, educational policy, educational criticism, and other relevant topics [see Faculty Vitae, Academic Affairs Annual Reports, Chart #6].

The network of Professional Development Schools provides opportunities for faculty to engage in inquiry and work with school colleagues to improve professional practice. Professional education faculty and school partners have made presentations at the annual statewide Partnership (USTEP) conference, formerly hosted by various colleges and universities during the spring semester. Professional education faculty, graduate students, and school partners also participate in the annual North Carolina Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Fall Forum.

Faculty also model best professional practices in scholarship by participating in the School of Education's semi-annual research symposium. This event features keynote speakers, poster sessions, and discussion panels focusing on key education research issues. The symposium provides an opportunity for faculty to share their research and serves as a vehicle for their students to present their own work.

Faculty also work closely with staff in research centers and affiliated organizations such as:

- Center for Educational Research and Evaluation (CERE)
- Collaborative Early Intervention National Training E-Resource (CENTe-R)
- SERVE (formerly the Southeastern Regional Vision for Education) (<http://www.serve.org/SERVE>)
- Reading Together USA (RTUSA)
- Center for School Accountability, Staff Development and Teacher Quality (CSASDTQ)

The Center for Educational Research and Evaluation (CERE) is a major educational and measurement research facility for the Triad region and the UNC system. In recent years CERE has been involved in a formative program evaluation study on the effectiveness of science and math instruction in 17 North Carolina school districts, a comprehensive psychometric analysis of early childhood reading assessments, and a program effectiveness study on the Reading Together program. The Collaborative Early Intervention National Training E-Resource (CENTe-R) is the only one of its kind in the nation, established to develop materials and guidelines for training professionals to meet the needs of infants and toddlers who are deaf and hard of hearing and their families. SERVE (formerly the Southeastern Regional Vision for Education), one of 10 national regional research and technical assistance labs, has been awarded a five-year \$37.7 million federal contract to conduct research on interventions that support improvement of southeastern schools serving pre-K through high school age students. Additional external funding for research garnered by the School of Education and its affiliated units has averaged \$17 million annually for the past 5 years. Other evidence that speaks to the scholarship and creative activity of the faculty reflected in Chart #6, faculty vitae, and Academic Affairs Annual Reports.

### *Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service*

Faculty are active in professional organizations and many have served in leadership roles during the past five years. Professional education faculty also collaborate with staff in the following centers

- Center for Early Intervention Professionals-Hearing Impairment (CEIP-HI)
- Collegium for the Advancement of Schools, Schooling and Education (CASSE)
- Piedmont Triad Education Consortium (PTEC)
- Center for Educational Studies and Development (CESD)
- Recruitment, Retention and Professional Development (RRPD)

Reading Together USA, a project that was completed in 2005-06, involved university faculty and public school personnel in training and coaching literacy coordinators in eight states. The Piedmont Triad Education Consortium annually provides professional development activities for over 5,000 teachers and administrators from 15 school districts. Through the Center for Educational Studies and Development (CESD) faculty participate each fall in the annual Children's Festival and each spring in the Piedmont Young Writer's Conference. Faculty also participate in a wide range of professional development activities offered through the School of Education's office of Recruitment, Retention, and Professional Development. .

Faculty in every professional education program and several arts and sciences departments at UNCG maintain a high level of involvement and collaboration with the public schools. In addition to the average of 150 hours per year spent in the supervision of interns and student teachers and on collaborative research projects, faculty are involved with public schools through workshops, mentoring, classroom teaching activities and technical assistance. During the 2004-2005 academic year, for example:

- Faculty served 169 clients in clinics, supported 163 internships, provided 20 consultations with public organizations and agencies, and participated in 97 educational partnerships focused on B-12 education.
- The School of Education, with the Department of Psychology, offered an ADHD symposium for parents and professionals.
- Faculty from the Department of Educational Leadership and Cultural Foundations offered an Educational Leadership Symposium, focused on teacher retention, for 100 principals.
- The School of Education established a professional development network of 27 professional education faculty members who provided professional development and other support to Piedmont Triad Schools, and established an online discussion board focused on recruitment and support of National Board Certification candidates.
- Professional education faculty offered workshops on the new North Carolina science curriculum (University/School Teacher Education

Partnership Leadership Institute), technology and school improvement for educational leaders, and assessment of initially licensed teachers (The Yopp Professional Development Institute).

- Faculty and staff hosted a computer camp for middle school girls, designed to interest girls in taking computer courses.

The Classical Studies Department (Latin) annually sponsors and participates in the North Carolina Junior Classical League Fall Forum that brings more than 600 high school students and teachers from all over the state to participate in workshops, performances and competitions. The School of Music has an annual weeklong Summer Music Camp that brings 600 middle and high school students to campus for classes and performances; music faculty and music teachers delivered the classes.

For additional evidence that demonstrates faculty modeling of best professional practices in service see faculty vitae, IHE Performance Reports, and Academic Affairs Annual Reports.

### *Collaboration*

In order to ensure meaningful partnerships, UNCG maintains close communication with school and community members and collaborates with area schools on projects related to teacher preparation and development and B-12 achievement. The dean of the School of Education regularly meets with superintendents from Triad school districts to collaborate on key issues, such as alternative licensure and support for initially licensed teachers. He also meets twice each year with the School of Education Advisory Board, which is comprised of professional educators and community leaders. All departments in the School work with some form of advisory group from the community and profession. Fifty-seven faculty members and administrators representing all UNCG licensure programs, 12 public school teachers and administrators, and 2 community members participate on the Teachers Academy Council of Program Coordinators (CPC) and the University/School Teacher Education Partnership Council (USTEP/PC). The CPC collaborated extensively to develop the Teachers Academy conceptual framework and unit assessment system, and the USTEP/PC supports Collaborative School Improvement Projects, among other activities.

As part of the formal partnership between the School of Education and the Guilford County Schools, the superintendent is an adjunct assistant professor, elementary and middle school education candidates intern in Professional Development Schools, UNCG provides mathematics courses for middle grade teachers, and UNCG enrolls Guilford County School's Education Academy high school students.

The USTEP program at UNCG offers an outstanding example of collaborative efforts with public schools. Funded through the North Carolina General Assembly, the University-School Teacher Education Partnerships (USTEP) program supports the strategic involvement of school districts and communities in the preparation and development of teachers, administrators, and other education professionals at the 15 UNC

colleges/schools/departments of education. The USTEP model encompasses all five phases of teacher education (recruitment, selection, preparation, induction and career-long professional development) and involves all stakeholders in the teaching and learning process (parents, school teachers, administrators, university personnel, other community-based individuals). UNCG initially focused its USTEP efforts on improving the clinical experience of preservice teachers through expansion of UNCG's professional development school model. More recently, however, UNCG has put special emphasis on collaborative efforts to identify professional development needs of public school teachers and on providing support for lateral entry, beginning and career teachers. UNCG faculty have worked with teachers and administrators to (a) improve K-8 literacy, (b) increase the English as a Second Language knowledge and skills of classroom teachers (c) learn strategies for collaborative assessment of literacy in science and mathematics, and (d) master principles of universal instructional design for learning in inclusive classrooms. Professional education programs and their faculty maintain partnership relationships, including Professional Development Schools (PDS), with 22 school districts. UNCG faculty and personnel from area school districts were awarded approximately \$30,000 from USTEP over each of the past five years for collaborative school improvement and/or research projects. The School of Education also has explored expanded partnership structures: University faculty and public school personnel attended the Holmes Partnership Conference, participated in collaborative planning regarding professional development schools and other partnership activities, particularly with Guilford County Schools, and offered three symposia at which more than 50 school and university faculty and administrators learned about exemplar partnership programs in West Virginia, Wisconsin and Colorado.

Another outstanding example of collaboration involves the UNCG/Wachovia Teacher Mentoring Network, a three-year project funded by the Wachovia Foundation for \$719,000. This project will form in area school systems a network of master teacher mentors who will work with beginning teachers to ensure their success and foster retention [see UNCG/Wachovia Teacher Mentoring Network proposal].

In addition to these activities, the School of Education and public school personnel offer an annual Yopp Professional Development Institute for beginning teachers and the USTEP Summer Leadership Institute for career teachers, and the SOE Center for Educational Studies and Development collaborates with districts to sponsor the annual Piedmont Young Writers Conference and the annual Childrens' Festival and Health Celebration..

[See USTEP documents, IHE Reports, Academic Affairs Annual Report, Faculty Vitae,].

### ***Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance***

The university requires annual review of all faculty, including professional education faculty. The reviews include teaching, scholarship, service, and directed professional activity. More intense reviews occur at the time of tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. The University also has mandatory procedures for training, monitoring and

evaluating teaching assistants. In some cases, departments have developed additional procedures for training and evaluating teaching assistants so as to ensure that they follow the required course syllabus and understand the conceptual framework. Department chairs monitor adjunct faculty toward these same ends, and adjunct faculty must participate in the same course evaluation process as full-time faculty. [See [UNCG Faculty Evaluation documents](#) and [Guidelines for Training, Monitoring, and Evaluating Graduate Teaching Assistants](#)].

### ***Unit Facilitation of Professional Development***

Teacher education faculty in North Carolina must be licensed in the areas in which they teach. Licensure must be renewed every five years through the accumulation of professional development credits and teaching experience [see [Methods Faculty Licensure Renewal Guidelines](#)]. The university makes available grants for curriculum development, research, and travel to present at professional conferences and use of technology. The Teaching and Learning Center is available to support faculty professional development. Workshops are offered regularly. The University-School Teacher Education Partnership (USTEP) supports professional development through workshops, collaborative research grants, and travel grants ([see USTEP annual reports](#)). Through the Matching Incentive Fund, professional education and content faculty have been provided opportunities to take the Praxis II Subject Assessments; after taking the specialty area exam, faculty have met to develop blueprints for incorporating Praxis II test preparation activities in the initial licensure programs.

[See Document Box for samples of faculty research, scholarship and service]

## **Section VIII: Standard VI – Program Governance and Resources**

### ***Organizational Structure for the M.Ed. in Reading Program***

This program is one of several M.Ed. degrees offered by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction within the School of Education at UNCG. For purposes of licensure, the M.Ed. in Reading program is also a part of the Teachers Academy which makes policy decisions about all the teacher licensure programs at UNCG. The Program Coordinator for the M.Ed. in Reading Ed-TLT program, Dr. Francine Johnston, is a Professor in the CUI Department and a member of the Council of Program Coordinators for the Teacher Academy.

### ***Adequacy of Faculty and Non-faculty Personnel for the M.Ed. Reading. Program***

The majority of faculty who teach for the M.Ed. in Reading program are full-time faculty in the CUI department. Occasionally courses are taught by a doctoral student in coordination with a full-time faculty member, for example when a second section of CUI 617 was needed. There are also adjunct faculty who are former doctoral students who either took the required courses as part of their plan of study or served as a teaching assistant in the course. The advantage of having full-time faculty and former doctoral students teaching courses in this program is consistency, coherency, and longevity.

### ***Unit Leadership and Authority***

Professional education licensure programs at UNCG are housed in four professional schools (Education, Health and Human Performance, Human Environmental Sciences, Music) and the College of Arts and Sciences. The Teachers Academy serves as the administrative umbrella and governance structure for all professional education programs. The Teachers Academy is administratively located in and is completely funded by the School of Education, the designated administrative unit for professional education programs at UNCG (see School of Education Organizational Chart).

The director of the Teachers Academy is also an Associate Dean for Teacher Education and School Partnerships in the School of Education [see the School of Education Organizational Chart]. All programs involved in the preparation of teachers, principals, and other school personnel have representatives on the Teachers Academy Council of Program Coordinators (CPC); teacher representatives and relevant administrators are also on the Council [see Teachers Academy Organizational Chart].

The CPC acts as the policy-making body of the Teachers Academy, determines what matters shall be delegated to the Executive Committee, and approves changes in program requirements related to licensure [see Teachers Academy Plan of Governance, CPC minutes, and the *Undergraduate* and *Graduate Bulletin* in the general documents box]. Information related to policies and procedures for the Teachers Academy is also located at [http://www.uncg.edu/soe/newsite/teachers\\_academy/index.html](http://www.uncg.edu/soe/newsite/teachers_academy/index.html).

As mentioned previously priorities for the Teachers Academy and the School of Education include an emphasis on collaboration with members of the professional community. Thus, in addition to having school partners represented on the Teachers Academy CPC and Executive Committee, school partners also serve on the USTEP Partnership Council and Executive Committee and on various program-specific advisory committees. Further, since our last review two significant leadership partnerships have been implemented. A School of Education Advisory Committee that includes area superintendents, school administrators, and master practitioners has been meeting on a regular basis to provide feedback on School of Education programs and initiatives. And the Guilford Education Partnership with the Guilford County Schools has been established to help guide policies and priorities for university/school partnerships [see Collaborative Initiatives in the general documents box].

Unit Budget: The School of Education budget has averaged over \$6.9 million during the past five years. Significant resources have been allocated to installing technology teaching stations in all of the Curry Building classrooms (\$260,000), upgrading faculty and staff technology hardware, establishing a Teacher Resource Center (TRC), and developing an assistive technology classroom. External funding for the School of Education has averaged \$17.5 for the past five years, including state Title II funds to support NC TEACH (licensure-only) activities and funds from the NC state legislature to support USTEP program activities. One of the School's affiliated units, SERVE (formerly Southeastern Regional Vision for Education) has been awarded a five-year \$37.7 million federal contract.

## Personnel

### Faculty

Faculty loads for teaching do not generally exceed twelve hours for undergraduate teaching and nine hours for graduate teaching. This is a general guideline that is not applicable in all cases due to differences in degree offerings and the varying requirements of instructional, service, and research activity in certain areas. Faculty assignments are negotiated between faculty and the department chair/head. The teaching load for full-time adjuncts is 12 semester hours per semester. Again, this may vary in certain cases based on factors outlined above. The ratio of university supervisor to student teachers has averaged 1 to 6.4 over the past five years [see Chart #6, Policies Related to Faculty Assignment and <http://provost.uncg.edu/publications/personnel/facultyworkload.asp>].

### Non-Faculty Personnel

The Teachers Academy administrative staff includes an Associate Dean/Director who is also the licensure officer, and an assistant director who also coordinates the USTEP and NC TEACH programs. Support staff includes a full-time data manager who is responsible for maintaining a Teachers Academy database, a full-time office manager who handles general administrative tasks and processes licensure applications, and a full-time licensure advisor. Other support staff includes a part time field placement

coordinator and four part time (20 hours per week) graduate assistants who work a total of 60 hours per week.

Other non-faculty positions that strengthen teacher education at UNCG are also available. Virtually all programs in the School of Education have a sufficient number of graduate assistants and teaching assistants to support program needs. These positions are at both the masters and doctoral levels [see Graduate Assistantship and Teaching Assistantship lists in the general documents box]. A new position of Director of Recruitment, Retention, and Professional Development has been created to strengthen and expand professional partnership possibilities [see <http://www.uncg.edu/soe/newsite/offpd/indes.html>], and a newly hired Director of the Center for Educational Studies and Development has assumed an expanded role in supporting outreach activities for our education programs. In addition, a full-time coordinator of instructional technology, a consultant for distance learning, two full-time technicians, a director of the Teacher Resource Center and a fully staffed Student Advisement and Recruitment Center are available to assist teacher education faculty and students [see Instructional Resources file in the general document box].

Unit Facilities and Resources Each full-time faculty member has a private office with sufficient space to meet with students and other individuals. Rooms are available for larger meetings on a check out basis. An Associate Dean for Operations in the School of Education is responsible for space planning, including ongoing oversight of renovation and repair needs within faculty offices and classrooms.

All classrooms in the Curry Building are equipped with state of the art teaching stations for student use and modeling by faculty. Equipment includes a computer with network and Internet access, a data projector, large screen, and VCR; some of the teaching stations also have a video visualizer. Curry 304 is a state of the art technology classroom with 25 computer workstations and other equipment that serves a center for professional development. Technology workshops involving university faculty, school administrators, and teacher are held in Curry 304 on a regular basis. Curry 304 also is available to faculty for their classes and it serves as the teaching classroom for all sections of LIS/CUI 120. The Curry Building is equipped for wireless computing. See [http://www.uncg.edu/soe/newsite//instructional\\_technology/intech\\_soefacilities.html](http://www.uncg.edu/soe/newsite//instructional_technology/intech_soefacilities.html) and [http://www.uncg.edu/soe/newsite//instructional\\_technology/intech\\_so\\_equip.html](http://www.uncg.edu/soe/newsite//instructional_technology/intech_so_equip.html) for more information on technology resources for the Teachers Academy.

The Teacher Resource Center (TRC) also supports professional education programs at UNCG. Located in the Ferguson Building (adjacent to the Curry Building), it is designed for use by students and faculty in all professional education programs on campus, as well as to provide professional development for our school and community partners. The TRC houses print and non-print materials including a variety of technology resources to assist candidates and faculty in planning instructional activities on campus and in field experiences and clinical practice. Equipment available for use in the TRC as well as check out includes camcorders, digital camcorders, digital cameras, overhead projectors, an opaque projector, a smart board, and laptop computers.

See <http://www.uncg.edu/soe/trc/index.htm> provides additional information on resources available through TRC.

A number of other instructional resources are available to support teacher education at UNCG. A new assistive technology classroom has been developed to address needs identified through an extensive faculty survey (see Survey of Competencies for Including Students with Special Needs in the general documents box) and a new interdisciplinary center for e-learning has been established to facilitate the use of technology for teaching and learning (see <http://ice.uncg.edu/>). The Walter Clinton Jackson Library has significant resources to support UNCG's teacher preparation programs (see Library Resources files and <http://library.uncg.edu/>). The University Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) supports the University's instructional programs by providing instructional development activities, instructional materials, equipment, test and data scanning services, and consultation in instructional development and in the use of instructional technology (see <http://www.uncg.edu/tlc/>).