

**Case Study Guidelines**

**Standards for Reading Professionals (2003).**

**International Reading Association (IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2 3.3, 3.4 4.1)**

**SPED/READ 8018 Reading Disabilities and the Assessment of reading**

**SPED/READ 9101 Practicum: Reading Specialist**

In the Practicum, candidates are required to write two case studies on school age students between the ages of 6 and 16 years. One case study must involve a student who is an English Language Learner. The purpose of these studies is to assess the oral language, reading, writing, and spelling achievement of the students, analyze the results of the testing, and follow the students’ development in these areas. Candidates are to test, observe, and teach the students, document the students’ progress and share the information with parents or guardians, classroom teachers and support personnel involved with the students. In addition candidates complete a pre-practica experience where a case study is completed (SPED/READ 8018). Candidates are required to reflect on this process and share in the college class (SPED/READ 8018) and with the College Supervisor and supervising practitioner (SPED/READ 9101).

The case studies must be constructed using the following information:

**Introduction (IRA 3.3)**

Collect information on the students using surveys. Candidates may use interviews, questionnaires and conferences with the students, parents and professionals. Candidates may examine (with permission) records of previous testing and of school achievement (i.e., report cards). Forms for obtaining background information are included in the text for SPED/READ 8108 (Jennings, J.H., Caldwell, J. & Lerner, J.W. (2006). *Reading problems, assessment and teaching strategies*. Boston, MA: Person Education, Inc.)

Through the information gathered write a two to three page introduction about the student focusing specifically on information critical to understanding the student’s language and literacy development.

A. Information from parent

1. age, gender, race/ethnicity, native language of the student

2 home environment

3. school environment

4. social and cultural environment

5. physical information

6. language development

B. Student Information

 (Use questionnaires for younger or older students.)

C. School Information

 1. school attendance

 2. reading performance

 a. achievement levels

 b. specific problems

 c. areas of strength and weaknesses

**Reading Analysis**

**(IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)**

Utilize surveys, observations, and informal and formal assessments to determine each student’s reading development. Include tests addressed in SPED/READ 8108 (Bader Informal Reading Inventory, D.I.B.E.L.S., WJ IIIDRB, CTOPP, Quick Phonics Screener or alternative). Address student’s entry levels for each reading component (oral language, phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, vocabulary, comprehension). Analyze results of testing and plan teaching strategies in areas of need. Base your planning on the research of Ehri, Moats, Adams, Torgesen, Carnine, Pressley, Cummins, Beringer, The National Reading Panel, and the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. Also utilize the text from SPED/READ 8017, Specialized Reading Approaches (Birsh, J.R., (2005). *Multisensory teaching of basic language skills*. Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing Co.). Candidates need to explain how the research, individual assessments, and school wide assessments were used to develop teaching strategies. Candidates need to present evidence of student progress over 12 weeks of instruction. A graph should be utilized to demonstrate growth. Formative and summative assessment evidence needs to be presented.

**Writing Analysis**

**(IRA 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)**

Over a period of 10 weeks, candidates collect six writing samples from the student and analyze his/her writing development using research by Moats, Bain, Mather and others. If age appropriate, candidates should try to collect different genres of writing to measure the student’s abilities to match genres to purposes for writing: description, informational, expository, and a personal narrative of an event (Jennings text). For the early stages of literacy development, include at least one piece of dictation using a language experience approach. Assess the ability to convey meaning. Examples of forms to analyze students’ writing can be obtained at [www.ablongman.com/jennings5e](http://www.ablongman.com/jennings5e)). Also candidates need to administer the Spelling Inventory from Spellography and the Test of Written Language addressed in SPED/READ 8019 The Assessment of Writing Skills and Writing Disabilities. Analyze spelling needs. As the candidate works with the student progress must be monitored and compared to previous spelling/writing samples to ensure that instruction is resulting in progress commensurate with the student’s progress in reading.

**Instructional Design**

**(IRA 1.4, 2.2, 2.3)**

In this section, explain the specific research-based instruction you provided in the components of reading (i.e., phonemic awareness, phonics, word study, fluency, vocabulary comprehension), writing, and spelling and the materials utilized (commercial and/or teacher-made). Each lesson plan should follow the Education Unit’s Lesson Plan Rubric and Scoring Report. Instruction should be linked to assessment data and prior analysis/reflection and should address IRA Standards 1.4, 2.2 and 2.3. In addition, an oral and written summary of each instructional session needs to be shared with personnel involved with teaching the student. Candidates need to be prepared to support classroom teachers and other support personnel by explaining and demonstrating strategies, activities, and materials used with the student.

**Recommendations**

**(IRA 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1)**

Based on the results of assessments and instruction, candidates state recommendations to further develop the student’s skill in the components of reading and in writing and spelling. Specifically candidates state next steps. Utilize the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, texts used in the Reading Specialist program, and research in both language development and learning to read in order to state objectives, instructional steps and activities. List materials and books to use with the student. Consider the student’s interests and reading levels. Communicate orally and in writing the recommendations to appropriate school personnel and parents. Assist the classroom teacher and support personnel in selecting materials that match the reading level, interest, and cultural and linguistic background of the student.

When making recommendations, candidates must clearly identify the research in language development, learning to read, and written language.

Additional Assignment Requirement

1. Written report demonstrates organization and cohesion as well as correct grammar, usage and spelling
2. Report is written using APA style
3. Appendices are provided and research sources are documented in a reference section
4. Student writing samples are included
5. Individual test protocols and analyses of results are included
6. Confidentiality is maintained

Evaluation

The Case Study is evaluated using the Case Study Rubric. Any work deemed unacceptable or failing will need to be reviewed with the instructor/advisor/supervisors and will require a resubmission with revisions.



**Case Study Rubric**

The following rubric is designed to evaluate the candidates work on the case study assignments. It is given to the candidates prior to the beginning of the assignment.

**IRA Standards for Reading Professionals**

**1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1**

**SPED/READ 8018**

**SPED/READ 9101**

**Name:**

**IRA Standard 1: Foundational Knowledge**

| **Critical Elements** | **Comprehensively Meets Standard****3 Points** | **Acceptable Meets Standard****2 Points** | **Does Not Meet Standard****1 Point** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard 1.1**Demonstrate knowledge of psychological, sociological, and linguistic foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction | * Sophisticated references made to major theories.
* Candidate explained major theories compared and contrasted and/or critiqued instructional procedures for oral language, reading, writing and spelling.
* Candidate addressed instructional practices that the student was involved in in relationship to scientific research.
 | * Adequate references made to major theories.
* Meaningfully explains and critiques theories in relation to instructional practice.
 | * Does not refer to major theories and does not explain, compare, contrast, and/or critique the theories.
 |  |
| **Standard 1.2** Demonstrate knowledge of reading research and histories of reading. | * Candidates are able to synthesize the research in reading and explain how it has impacted instruction for the student.
* Research is concise and well articulated.
 | * Research is stated and applied in narrative in relation to instructional practices.
 | * Research is not stated or is misrepresented in terms of its relationship to instructional practices.
* Statements are not clear or well documented.
 |  |
| **Standard 1.3**Demonstrate knowledge of language development and reading acquisition and the variations related to culture and linguistic diversity. | * Candidates demonstrate sophisticated ability to identify, explain, and compare and contrast the theories and research in language development and learning to read.
* Clear documentation is provided regarding monolingual students and second language learners in terms of the research in oral language, reading, writing and spelling.
 | * Candidates adequately identified the theories and research in the areas of language development and learning to read.
* Some documentation provided regarding first and second language learners.
 | * Does not identify, explain, compare, and/or contrast the theories and research in the areas of language development and learning to read for first and second language learners.
* No documentation provided.
 |  |
| **Standard 1.4**Demonstrate knowledge of the major components of reading (phonemic awareness, word identifications, and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation and how they are integrated in fluent reading. | * Utilized assessment data research findings, and instruction to determine if students were integrating phonemic awareness, word identification, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation, and fluent reading.
* Cited the research base for the instructional practices
 | * Compared and contrasted some findings to determine if students were integrating the components of reading.
* Limited linking of findings to instructional strategies.
* Some referenced to research.
 | * Did not compare and contrast findings to determine if students were integrating the major components of reading.
* The findings were not linked correctly to instructional practices.
* Did not cite research or cited incorrect sources.
 |  |
| **Standard 2.2**Use a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices, for learners at differing stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds. | * Selected instructional practices, approaches and materials including technology that were based on research, and linked to assessment results, implemented these, evaluated the results and explained to appropriate school personnel how they were implemented and the results of the implementation.
* Candidates explained/modeled (for colleagues, paraprofessional and other support personnel) how to select and use a wide range of evidence-based instructional methods and techniques for all students.
* Cited a broad research base.
 | * Selected and explained instructional methods, implemented these, but did not explain results.
* Shared instructional practices and materials with colleagues, how to select them and implement them but was unable to share the results of implementation.
* Cited a research base.
 | * Did not select instructional methods and techniques based on research and/or did not explain, demonstrate or provide information for colleagues, paraprofessionals or other support personnel.
* Minimal research
 |  |
| **Standard 2.3**Use a wide range of curriculum materials in effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. | * Selected and developed a wide range of curriculum materials that are aligned with assessment results for learners at various stages of development.
* Documented entry levels in terms of development of the components of reading.
* Explained and demonstrated for classroom teachers and paraprofessionals how to select and use an array of curriculum materials for all learners that are research- based.
* Cited a broad research base for curriculum materials.
 | * Selected and used curriculum and teacher made materials related to assessment data.
* Made recommendations that would assist classroom teachers in selecting and making appropriate materials that are based on research evidence.
* Did not demonstrate the use of the materials with students.
* Cited a broad research base for curriculum materials.
 | * Did not select or make appropriate materials.
* Did not explain or demonstrate curriculum materials for colleagues, classroom teachers, or paraprofessionals.
* Failed to cite research evidence.
 |  |
| **Standard 3.1**Use a wide range of assessment tools and practices that range from individual and group standardized tests to individual and group informal classroom assessment strategies, including technology-based assessment tools. | * Selected and administered appropriate formal and informal tests based on surveys, observations and prior data.
* Administered and analyzed and interpreted all assessment data related to students strengths and weaknesses in the components of reading.
* Made specific recommendations for instructional practices and curriculum materials.
* Explained/demonstrated for classroom teachers and paraprofessionals how to administer (where appropriate) assessments and how to interpret results in terms of instructions.
 | * Selected appropriate tests based on prior information.
* Administered and analyzed tests related to student’s strengths and weaknesses.
* Made some recommendations for instructional practices and curriculum materials.
* Explained the results of the assessments to classroom teachers and paraprofessionals but did not model test administration where appropriate.
 | * Selected appropriate tests based on prior information.
* Administered and analyzed test results based on students’ strengths and weaknesses.
* Did not make sufficient recommendations for instructional practices and curriculum materials.
* Did not explain assessment results or model for classroom teachers and paraprofessionals.
 |  |
| **Standard 3.2**Place students along a developmental continuum and identify students’ proficiencies and difficulties. | * Specifically identified students’ strengths and weaknesses and compared and contrasted their achievement levels with other students in the classroom.
* Documented and graphed students’ progress over the ten weeks of instruction.
* Consulted with classroom teacher, paraprofessionals and other support personnel regarding progress and documented meetings.
* Explained and demonstrated assessments and interpretive data to classroom teacher, paraprofessionals and other support personnel.
 | * Identified students’ strengths and weaknesses and compared and contrasted their achievement levels with other students in the classroom.
* Instructed students over ten weeks but did not graph progress.
* Consulted with classroom teachers, paraprofessionals and other support personnel regarding progress and documented meetings.
* Explain assessments and interpreted data but did not demonstrate the administration of appropriate tests.
 | * Did not correctly identify analyze students strengths and weaknesses.
* Did not instruct students consistently over ten weeks.
* Did not consult with appropriate colleagues or demonstrate assessment.
 |  |
| **Standard 3.3**Use assessment information to plan, evaluate, and revise effective instruction that meets the needs of all students including those at different developmental stages and those from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. | * Analyzed and interpreted all assessment data to develop a plan for reading instruction that is research- based.
* Explained and demonstrated for classroom teachers how assessment informs instruction and assisted with developing plans for “next steps.”
* Observed classroom teachers implement plans and provided support and guidance where needed.
* Assisted classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in conducting formative assessment, and collecting data, and making changes in plans if needed.
 | * Explained a plan for reading instruction but did not relate plans to all assessment data.
* Explained to classroom teachers how assessment informs instruction, made specific recommendations.
* Consulted with individual classroom teacher and paraprofessionals but did not observe classroom teachers implement plans.
 | * Did not analyze all assessment data or develop an acceptable plan based on the data for instruction.
* Did not explain or demonstrate assessments to classroom teachers or paraprofessionals.
* Did not give support to classroom teachers or paraprofessionals regarding implementation of plans.
 |  |
| **Standard 3.4**Communicated results of assessments to specific individuals, students, parents, caregivers, colleagues, administrators, policymakers, policy officials, community, etc. | * Interpreted and explained in detail the assessment results and instructional plans to students, classroom teachers, parents and other professionals involved.
* Consulted with appropriate school personnel and parents regarding students progress and gave additional support where needed.
* Cited evidence-based research for assessments and intervention plans.
* Demonstrated how assessments relate to instructional planning and demonstrated progress monitoring.
 | * Explained assessment results and instructional plans based on assessment data.
* Consulted with appropriate school personnel and parents regarding students’ progress.
* Cited evidence- based research for assessments and intervention plans.
* Did not demonstrate.
 | * Did not explain findings with parents and other professionals.
* Did not cite research.
* Did not demonstrate how assessments, instructional plans and progress monitoring relate to each other.
 |  |
| **Standard 4.1**Use students’ interest, reading abilities and backgrounds as foundations for the reading and writing program. | * Selected materials, texts and technology based on students reading levels, interests and background and shared this with appropriate personnel and parents.
* Provided specific instructional practices and appropriate materials for struggling readers and writers.
* Recommend accommodations (curriculum, materials and instruction) to classroom teachers and paraprofessionals taking in account students reading levels, interests, cultural and linguistic backgrounds.
 | * Explained the use of materials, texts, and technology based on the students reading levels, interests and backgrounds.
* Provided specific instructional practices and appropriate materials for struggling readers and writers.
* Did not recommend accommodations for the general curriculum.
 | * Did not select materials, texts and technology based on students’ interests, reading levels, and backgrounds.
 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Assignment Requirements** | **Exemplary** | **Acceptable** | **Unacceptable** | **Comments** |
| Written report demonstrates an analysis and synthesis of testing and teaching information and consulting, coaching, and demonstrating activities. | * Overall report is accurate, presents a well developed profile, strengths and weaknesses are clearly identified from data and appropriate instructional strategies are included.
* Involvement in all roles of the literacy coach is documented (assessment, instruction, consultation, demonstration and assistance. Paper is organized.
* Information is linked containing transitions.
 | * Interpretation of assessment is accurate.
* Strengths and weaknesses are clearly identified from data and appropriate instructional strategies are included.
 | * Limited analysis regarding strengths and weaknesses.
* Involvement in roles is not clearly delineated.
* Report lacks organization.
* Information is random.
* Report lacks transitions.
 |  |
| Reference is made to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. | * Analysis of students needs are related to assessment data and to appropriate Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks regarding the components of reading.
* Objectives for instruction and recommendations are based on assessment data and the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.
 | * Analysis of students needs are related to assessment data and to the Massachusetts Curriculum Framework Standards but need to be expanded.
 | * No Curriculum Framework Standards are stated or incorrect standards are listed.
 |  |
| Written report demonstrates correct grammar, usage, and spelling and use of APA style. | * Use of Vocabulary and syntax appropriate.
* No spelling or grammatical errors.
* Accurate punctuation and capitalization
* Use of APA style.
 | * Use of vocabulary and syntax appropriate.
* Some spelling and typing errors.
* Few grammatical errors.
* Few punctuation/capitalization errors.
* Use of APA style
 | * Use of vocabulary and syntax is inappropriate.
* Spelling makes a word difficult to read.
* Word usage is problematic.
* Punctuation and capitalization is inconsistent.
* Error in APA style.
 |  |
|  |  |
| **Pass** | **Fail** |
| **Points** |  | **Grade** | **Points** |  | **Grade** |
| 39-42 | = | 4.0 | 27-30 | = | 2.5 |
| 35-38 | = | 3.5 | 23-26 | = | 2.0 |
| 31-34 | = | 3.0 | 19-22 | = | 1.5 |
|  |  |  | 15-18 | = | 1.0 |