1. This assessment, Diagnostic and Instructional Case Study of a Struggling Reader and Writer, is a semester-long case study that focuses on making an impact on student learning by conducting multiple assessments of a student who is struggling with reading and writing, analyzing the findings to create an individual instructional educational plan for intervention that includes goals and methods to achieve goals. Candidates then implement the plan under the supervision of the professor, conduct a post-intervention assessment, and critically reflect on the results in order to identify implications for future teaching. The case study is supervised by the professor through feedback to audiotaped lessons, videotaped lessons, individual conferences, response to ongoing report writing, and class discussion. This assessment takes place at the end of the sequence of literacy specialization courses, just before candidates begin capstone courses to complete the program. Since candidates at this point have a strong knowledge and skills base in literacy instruction, the coaching initiative is the presentation of a professional development workshop to grade-level colleagues in each candidate’s school that focuses on the essential knowledge base for teaching students with literacy difficulties. The workshop focuses on the content of the course including assessment; differentiating instruction to motivate students and meet the individual needs of readers and writers who struggle (including phonemic awareness and phonics, automatic sight word development, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) by using flexible grouping, multiple texts and materials that meet the instructional needs of these students and respond to their interests and background; creating engagement by using Cambank’s Conditions for Learning (1995) that emphasizes instruction that is meaningful for the learner, creates an expectation of success, and is supported by the teacher; and using the Gradual Release of responsibility model (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983) to explicitly teach skills and strategies by modeling and demonstrating and then follow up with guided and independent practice. The assignment also focuses on using theory and research to extend a case-study approach to address the needs of all struggling readers and writers. These extensions are emphasized in the literacy coaching professional development workshop.

2. The assessment aligns with Standard 1.1 because the theory and research section includes focuses on major theory and research of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all learners in diverse contexts with special focus on readers and writers who struggle. It also focuses on creating an environment that motivates and engages struggling readers and writers. The literacy coaching component is presenting a professional workshop that focuses on best practices for teaching readers and writers who struggle, including addressing the supports for students from diverse language backgrounds and cultures. It aligns with 1.2 because the write-up includes focus on instructional strategies and the theories that guide them (e.g., Gradual Release of Responsibility, Pearson & Gallagher, 1983). This focus is also part of the professional workshop. It aligns with Standard 1.3 because instruction focuses on fair-mindedness, ethical behavior and
empathy and communicates these important commitments in the literacy coaching professional workshop. It aligns with Standards 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 because there is strong focus on the research that undergirds reading and writing instruction that includes focusing on using a wide range of instructional practices, methods, and approaches; and using a wide range of curriculum materials. Again, the professional workshop focuses on creating a literacy curriculum for struggling readers and writers. It aligns with Standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 because candidates demonstrate comprehensive understanding and uses of use a wide range of assessment tool to identify strengths and needs in order to place students along a developmental continuum; use assessment to plan, evaluate and revise effective instruction; and communicate results of assessments to parents. Assessment is included in the professional workshop. It aligns with Standards 4.1 and 4.2 because the write up includes focus on the impact of diversities and reading and writing development, including teaching English language learners. The professional workshop includes a focus on teaching students from diverse backgrounds. It aligns with 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 because the write-up includes a section on creating a supportive physical and social environment for all struggling readers including access and uses of texts and materials, establishing routines for struggling readers, and supporting the most effective grouping practices to address the needs of struggling readers and writers. It aligns with 6.3 because candidates coach teachers in schools by developing and presenting a professional development workshop that assists and supports teachers based on all the Standards addressed in this assessment.

**Diagnostic and Instructional Case Study Report of a Struggling Reader and Writer**

(IRA Standards, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.3.)

1. **Introduction**
   Explain why you chose this student to complete your case study
   Explain what you hope to accomplish.
   Present an in-depth introduction to the student(s). Include as much background information as possible (family information, school history, test scores, report card scores, IEP, medical information [if relevant], classroom experiences with student).

2. **Beliefs and Principles**
   Use research and theory to identify your core beliefs and principles about teaching readers and writers who struggle with literacy. You must include extensive research that compares and contrasts theories of reading and language development, and refers to seminal studies to support your beliefs and principles. You must address the impact of diversities on learning to read and write, including understanding the knowledge base for teaching English language learners.

3. **Diagnosis of Literacy Difficulties**
   Identify all assessments conducted to develop a diagnosis of the student’s literacy difficulties. You must include the following assessments:
   - Student interviews and/or surveys
   - Parent interviews and/or surveys
   - Qualitative Reading Inventory sight word knowledge
   - Informal reading assessments (including running record with miscue analysis and comprehension assessment) (e.g., Developmental Reading Assessment, QRI)
   - Writing assessment (using ERB rubric)
   - Spelling/decoding assessment (e.g. dictation, Developmental Spelling Assessment)
4. **Individual Instructional Education Plan (Goals and Instructional Methods to Achieve Goals)**
   Based on a synthesis of assessments, identify instructional goals and intervention plan that will increase student(s) literacy achievement in reading and writing, including study skills and test-taking strategies. Instructional plan must focus on all aspects of a comprehensive intervention reading and writing program. All instruction to achieve goals must focus on authentic reading and writing instruction (including reading/writing connections) that teaches essential skills and strategies in appropriately leveled texts. **You must include uses of technology that will increase literacy achievement.**

5. **Instruction**
   Based on your instructional plan, you must provide weekly tutoring of a minimum of one hour per week for ten weeks that focuses on the components of your Individual Instructional Education Plan. You must keep an on-going process journal that reflects on your instruction. Instruction must include working 1:1 with the student as well as addressing instructional needs during your small group and large group instruction. You must document your use of multiple instructional methods that use multiple texts and curriculum materials. You must focus on routines that support literacy learning for struggling readers. Instruction must be guided by Pearson & Gallagher’s Gradual Release of Responsibility model and Cambourne’s Condition for Learning.

6. **Results**
   Conduct a final informal reading assessment and writing assessment to determine progress. Report in detail on your findings. Document all increases in achievement. Create a reflective portfolio with the student that represents literacy growth.

7. **Recommendations to Parents, Classroom Teacher, Consulting Teacher(s), Principal, and Other Support Personnel**
   In parent-friendly language, make recommendations for ways parents can work with their child at home to increase literacy. Include annotated list of recommended books. Include annotated list of Internet sites designed to increase literacy achievement. Copies will be distributed to parents, classroom teacher(s), consulting teacher, and other support personnel.

8. **References**
   Use APA style

9. **Final Reflection**
   Look back over the whole supervised case study project and critically examine what you learned about effective instruction for readers and writers who struggle with implications for your teaching.

10. **Literacy Coaching: Professional Workshop**
    Completion of professional workshop report to support classroom teachers to:
    • Understand theory and research that should guide the teaching of struggling readers and writers
    • Learn essential instructional methodologies that increase motivation and achievement
    • Learn essential assessment information (purposes, principles, practices, interpretation)
    • Understand how diversity impact on literacy development and methods for implementing responsive pedagogy, including strategies for teaching English language learners
Understand how to create an exemplary literate environment that supports all learners, including struggling readers and writers.

Candidates will work together at appropriate grade levels to develop the workshop and create a teacher-friendly handout.

Candidates will rehearse the workshop in class prior to conducting it on site in school.

Candidates will create a teacher-friendly handbook that follows the following guidelines:

**Workshop Handout Guidelines**

1. Cover page includes:
   - Title of workshop that will attract attendees
   - Workshop presenter(s) name(s)
   - Workshop presenter(s) current teaching position, including school and district. For presenters not currently teaching, include certification(s)
   - Our program name: St. Thomas Aquinas College Graduate Literacy Program
   - Our course name: Diagnosing and Teaching Students with Literacy Difficulties
   - My name and title as professor of the course: Professor: Dr. Michael L. Shaw
   - Semester, Year

   Feel free to include any borders or graphics

2. Pages that provide teacher-friendly information based on the IRA Standards addressed in the assessment, including curriculum and instruction, assessment, diversity, and creating a literate environment.

3. Pages that provide tools that you have effectively used which teachers can use/adapt with their own classes (e.g., graphic organizers, response forms, check lists/rubrics).

4. Professional Resources that teachers can use to learn more about diagnosing and teaching students with literacy difficulties, including exemplary web sites.

5. List of exemplary web sites that teachers can use to increase motivation and achievement for readers and writers who struggle.

6. Anything else you think will be helpful.

7. Keep handouts to a manageable number of pages. The impact is often lost if too much is included.
We will use the following workshop evaluation form to receive constructive Feedback:

**Professional Development Workshop Evaluation**

Presenter(s) Name(s):
Workshop Title:

SA=Strongly agree  A=Agree  N=Neutral  D=Disagree  SD=Strongly Disagree

1. The presenter(s) were enthusiastic and motivated me to want to learn.

   SA  A  N  D  SD

2. The presenter(s) were effective communicators.

   SA  A  N  D  SD

3. The presenter(s) communicated important information and/or strategies that I can use to enrich literacy learning with my class.

   SA  A  N  D  SD

4. The presenter(s) provided handouts that I can use with my students.

   SA  A  N  D  SD

5. The presenter(s) effectively explained and demonstrated what was being taught.

   SA  A  N  D  SD

6. The presenter(s) personalized the workshop by sharing personal experiences, including student artifacts.

   SA  A  N  D  SD

7. The presenter(s) engaged me by providing hands-on involvement.

   SA  A  N  D  SD

8. The presenter(s) engaged me in worthwhile discussion.

   SA  A  N  D  SD

9. The presenter’s handout provided a strong research base and provided helpful resources.

   SA  A  N  D  SD

10. The professional development workshop was well organized.

    SA  A  N  D  SD

11. This was an excellent professional development workshop.

    SA  A  N  D  SD

Comments or suggestions to support learning (use back as needed):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Indicator</th>
<th>1 Indicator Not Met</th>
<th>2 Indicator Partially Met</th>
<th>3 Indicator Met</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **STANDARD 1**   | • Inaccurate or incomplete evidence of ability to explain, compare, contrast, and critique major theories related to language development and learning to read. (1.1) (1 point)  
  • Inaccurate or incomplete evidence of summarizations of seminal reading research studies with their impact on reading instruction. (1.2) (1 point)  
  • Inaccurate or incomplete evidence of ability to model fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior (1.3) (1 point)  
  • Professional workshop does not sufficiently address the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers (1 point). | • Basic evidence of ability to explain, compare, contrast, and critique major theories related to language development and learning to read. (1.1) (2 points)  
  • Basic evidence of summarizations of seminal reading research studies with their impact on reading instruction. (1.2) (2 points)  
  • Basic evidence of ability to model fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior (1.3) (3 points)  
  • Professional workshop basically addresses the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers (2 points). | • Comprehensive, detailed evidence of ability to explain, compare, contrast, and critique major theories related to language development and learning to read. (1.1) (3 points)  
  • Comprehensive, detailed evidence of summarizations of seminal reading research studies with their impact on reading instruction. (1.2) (3 points)  
  • Comprehensive, detailed evidence of ability to model fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior (1.3) (3 points)  
  • Professional workshop comprehensively addresses the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers. (3 points) |       |
| **STANDARD 2**   | • Does not demonstrate understanding of the research that undergirds reading and writing curriculum in order to develop and implement curriculum to meet the needs of struggling readers and writers. (2.1) (1 point)  
  • Does not use research implement appropriate instructional practices, approaches, and methods to best meet the needs of struggling readers and writers | • Basically demonstrates understanding of the research that undergirds reading and writing curriculum in order to develop and implement curriculum to meet the needs of struggling readers and writers. (2.1) (2 points)  
  • Basically uses research implement appropriate instructional practices, approaches, and methods to best meet the needs of struggling readers and writers | • Comprehensively demonstrates understanding of the research that undergirds reading and writing curriculum in order to develop and implement curriculum to meet the needs of struggling readers and writers. (2.1) (3 points)  
  • Comprehensively uses research implement appropriate instructional practices, approaches, and methods to best meet the needs of struggling readers and writers |       |

GED 3326/3626 CASE STUDY RUBRIC

IRA STANDARDS: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2.2) (1 point)</th>
<th>(2.2) (2 points)</th>
<th>(2.2) (3 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ØDoes not use research to critically examine instructional materials in order to use quality texts and materials to meet the needs of all students. (2.3) (1 point) ØProfessional workshop does not address the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers.</td>
<td>ØBasically uses research to critically examine instructional materials in order to use quality texts and materials to meet the needs of all students. (2.3) (2 points) ØProfessional workshop basically addresses the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers.</td>
<td>ØComprehensively uses research to critically examine instructional materials in order to use quality texts and materials to meet the needs of all students. (2.3) (3 points) ØProfessional workshop comprehensively addresses the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD 3</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION</th>
<th>Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ØInaccurate or incomplete understanding of research to demonstrate important principles, purposes, and practices for assessing the reading performance of all students in order to plan effective instruction, monitor progress, and communicate information, including online assessments. (3.1) (1 point) ØLittle, or no, evidence of ability to administer and interpret diagnostic assessments for struggling readers, including English language learners. (3.2) (1 point) ØLittle, or no, evidence of ability to use assessment analysis to plan and implement instruction for all students, including struggling readers. (3.3) (1 point) ØProfessional workshop does not address elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers.</td>
<td>ØBasic understanding of research to demonstrate important principles, purposes, and practices for assessing the reading performance of all students in order to plan effective instruction, monitor progress, and communicate information, including online assessments. (3.1) (2 points) ØBasic evidence of ability to administer and interpret diagnostic assessments for struggling readers, including English language learners. (3.2) (2 points) ØBasic evidence of ability to use assessment analysis to plan and implement instruction for all students, including struggling readers. (3.3) (2 points) ØProfessional workshop basically addresses the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers.</td>
<td>ØComprehensive understanding of research to demonstrate important principles, purposes, and practices for assessing the reading performance of all students in order to plan effective instruction, monitor progress, and communicate information, including online assessments. (3.1) (3 points) ØComprehensive, detailed evidence of ability to administer and interpret diagnostic assessments for struggling readers, including English language learners. (3.2) (3 points) ØComprehensive, detailed evidence of ability to use assessment analysis to plan and implement instruction for all students, including struggling readers. (3.3) (3 points) ØProfessional workshop comprehensively addresses the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD 4</td>
<td>DIVERSITY</td>
<td>Candidates create and engage students in literacy practices that develop understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD 5</td>
<td>LITERATE ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD 6</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates view professional learning and leadership development as a career-long effort and responsibility.</td>
<td>●Little, or no, evidence of exhibiting leadership in professional development by planning, implementing, and evaluating professional development initiatives (6.3) (1 point)</td>
<td>●Organization and presentation of ideas is limited. ●Significant spelling, grammar, and/or mechanical errors. ●Does not follow APA format. (1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●Does not create effective routines for all struggling readers and writers. (5.3) (1 point) ●Does not use effective grouping practices to meet specific needs of struggling readers and writers. (5.4) (1 point) ●Professional workshop does not address the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers.</td>
<td>●Some evidence of exhibiting leadership in professional development by planning, implementing, and evaluating professional development initiatives(6.3) (2 points)</td>
<td>●Organization and presentation of ideas is effective; professional presentation. ●Few spelling, grammar, and/or mechanical errors. ●Mostly follows APA format. (2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●Basically uses effective grouping practices to meet specific needs of struggling readers and writers. (5.3) (2 points) ●Professional workshop basically addresses the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers.</td>
<td>●Comprehensive evidence of exhibiting leadership in professional development by planning, implementing, and evaluating professional development initiatives. (6.3) (3 points) ●Professional workshop comprehensively addresses this element. To plan, implement, and evaluate a professional development workshop.</td>
<td>●Organization and presentation of ideas is exemplary with great clarity and cohesiveness; professional presentation. ●No spelling, grammar, and/or mechanical errors. ●Follows APA format. (3 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creates effective routines for all struggling readers and writers. (5.3) (3 points) ●Comprehensively uses effective grouping practices to meet specific needs of struggling readers and writers. (5.4) (3 points) ●Professional workshop comprehensively addresses the elements listed above to support and assist classroom teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(REVISE) Above Standard: 46-48 points; At Standard: 42-45 points; Approaching Standard: 39-41 points; below Standard: < 39 points candidates required to meet with professor to develop plan for achieving At Standard rating.