

# Program Report for the Preparation of School Librarians American Library Association/American Association of School Librarians (ALA/AASL) Option A

**NOTE:** This form uses the ALA/AASL standards approved by NCATE in 2010. Beginning in Fall 2012 all programs must use the new standards.

## COVER SHEET

### 1. Institution Name

Kutztown University of Pennsylvania

### 2. State

Pennsylvania

### 3. Date submitted

MM DD YYYY

03 / 11 / 2019

### 4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:

Dr. Andrea Harmer

Phone:

(610)462-6372

Ext.

E-mail:

harmer@kutztown.edu

Name of Preparer:

Dr. Michelle Sims

Phone:

(610)683-4302

Ext.

E-mail:

sims@kutztown.edu

Name of Preparer:

Professor William Jefferson

Phone:

(610)683-4757

Ext.

E-mail:

wjeffers@kutztown.edu

Name of Preparer:

Professor Roseanne Perkins

Phone:	Ext.
(610)683-4902	
E-mail:	
rperkins@kutztown.edu	

**5. CAEP Coordinator's Information:**

Name:	
Dr. Carissa Pokorny Golden	
Phone:	Ext.
(610)683-4333	
E-mail:	
pokorny@kutztown.edu	

**6. Name of institution's program**

Master of Library Science

**7. CAEP Category**

School Library Media Specialist

**8. Grade levels<sup>(1)</sup> for which candidates are being prepared**

K-12

(1) e.g. K-6, K-12, 7-12

**9. Program Type**

- ☒ Other School Personnel
- ☐ Non-licensure/non-certification degree
- ☐ Unspecified

**10. Degree or award level**

- ☒ Master's (AASL/ALA only recognizes programs at the master's level.)

**11. Is this program offered at more than one site?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

**12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered**

**13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared**

School Library Media Specialist Certification Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

**14. Program report status:**

- ☐ Initial Review
- ☐ Response to one of the following decisions: Further Development Required or Recognition with Probation
- ☒ Response to National Recognition with Conditions

**15. Is your Educator Preparation Program (EPP) seeking**

- ☐ CAEP accreditation for the first time (initial accreditation)
- ☒ Continuing CAEP accreditation

**16. State Licensure data requirement on program completers disaggregated by specialty area with sub-area scores:**

CAEP requires programs to provide completer performance data on state licensure examinations for completers

who take the examination for the content field, if the state has a licensure testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section IV. Does your state require such a test?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

SECTION I - CONTEXT

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of ALA/AASL standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

Section I not requested for re-submission - Response to Conditions.

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)

During the assessment window, there were no candidates at the graduate level who completed field experience to gain their initial certification (student teaching- 14 wks).

Several candidates on the graduate level did complete a field experience (90 hrs) as part of the extension of certification program.

3. Please attach files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)

MLS plus Initial Certification gridsheet	MLS – Extension of Instructional Certification: Pennsylvania K-12 Library Science, PA Library Media Specialist
---	---

See the **Attachment** panel.

4. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.

Candidate Information

Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.

Program:		
Master of Library Science plus Initial Certification, Pennsylvania Library Media Specialist		
Master of Library Science plus Extension of Instructional Certification, Pennsylvania Library Media Specialist		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers <sup>(2)</sup>
2017-2018	33	2
2016-2017	22	6
2015-2016	30	4

(2) CAEP uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

Faculty Information

Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program. (Please refer to the footnotes for clarification)

Faculty Member Name	Prof. Roseanne Perkins
Highest Degree, Field, &	Master of Science, Library and Information Science, Graduate School of Library and

<b>University<sup>(3)</sup></b>	Information Science, Simmons College
<b>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member<sup>(4)</sup></b>	Faculty, Graduate Program Coordinator for the Library Science Programs
<b>Faculty Rank<sup>(5)</sup></b>	Instructor
<b>Tenure Track</b>	* YES
<b>Scholarship<sup>(6)</sup>, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service<sup>(7)</sup>:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years<sup>(8)</sup></b>	
<b>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools<sup>(9)</sup></b>	

<b>Faculty Member Name</b>	Dr. Michelle Sims
<b>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University<sup>(3)</sup></b>	Ph.D. Education: Instructional Design for Online Learning, Capella University
<b>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member<sup>(4)</sup></b>	Faculty
<b>Faculty Rank<sup>(5)</sup></b>	Assistant Professor
<b>Tenure Track</b>	* YES
<b>Scholarship<sup>(6)</sup>, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service<sup>(7)</sup>:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years<sup>(8)</sup></b>	Bestwick, A. and Sims, M. (2017). City Planning: Play, Inquiry-based Learning, and STEAM. Presented at National Council for the Social Studies Conference in San Francisco, CA, November 17, 2017. Sims, M. (2017). STEAM Petting Zoo: Engaging Students with Gizmos and Gadgets. To be presented at Eastern Pennsylvania Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Whitehall, PA, November 4, 2017. Harmer, A., and Sims, M. (2017). STEAM Petting Zoo: Developing the 4Cs (Critical Thinking, Communication, Collaboration, and Creativity. Presented at Kutztown University as part of Dean Teitelbaum's College of Education Scholarship Brown Bag Series, March 21, 2017.
<b>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools<sup>(9)</sup></b>	PreK-4 Teaching Certification Clinical Supervision of Student Teachers

<b>Faculty Member Name</b>	Dr. Andrea Harmer
<b>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University<sup>(3)</sup></b>	Ed.D Educational Technology, Lehigh University
<b>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member<sup>(4)</sup></b>	Department Chair and Faculty
<b>Faculty Rank<sup>(5)</sup></b>	Full Professor
<b>Tenure Track</b>	* YES
<b>Scholarship<sup>(6)</sup>, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service<sup>(7)</sup>:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years<sup>(8)</sup></b>	Andrea J. Harmer, "Educational Potential for Increased Understanding of Complex Scientific Concepts using Augmented Reality," Future of Educational Technology Conference (FETC), Orlando, January 23-26, 2018. Presentation. Martin Harmer, Andrea Harmer, Chris Marvel and Amanda Krause, Tenth Anniversary of Grain Boundary Complexions, Sosman Lecture, Invited. American Ceramic Society Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, October 2017. Andrea J. Harmer, Nano in a Nutshell, A Young Student's Guide to Tool, Applications, and Careers in Nanotechnology (2016). Bloomington, IN: Authorhouse.
<b>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools<sup>(9)</sup></b>	K-12 Library Media Specialist Certification Clinical Supervision of Student Teachers

<b>Faculty Member Name</b>	Prof. William Jefferson
<b>Highest Degree, Field, &amp;</b>	

<b>University<sup>(3)</sup></b>	Master of Library Science, Clarion University
<b>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member<sup>(4)</sup></b>	Faculty, Graduate Program Coordinator for the Instructional Technology Programs
<b>Faculty Rank<sup>(5)</sup></b>	Associate Professor
<b>Tenure Track</b>	* YES
<b>Scholarship<sup>(6)</sup>, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service<sup>(7)</sup>:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years<sup>(8)</sup></b>	"Marketing a Library Science Program - Personalization with Purpose." Roseanne Perkins, William Jefferson and Jennifer Umberger. Accepted for publication in Pennsylvania Libraries: Research & Practice, February 2018. "A University Professor's Sabbatical Experience in the K-12 Classroom." William Jefferson. Accepted for publication in the Teaching Professor, February 2018. "Pairing Two Academic Programs to Strengthen Both." William Jefferson and Roseanne Perkins. Accepted for publication in Academic Leader, March 2018.
<b>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools<sup>(9)</sup></b>	K-12 Library Media Specialist Certification Clinical Supervision of Student Teachers

<b>Faculty Member Name</b>	Dr. Catherine Fuhrman
<b>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University<sup>(3)</sup></b>	University of Delaware, Newark, DE Ed.D. Educational Leadership, Curriculum, Technology and Higher Education Concentration
<b>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member<sup>(4)</sup></b>	Faculty
<b>Faculty Rank<sup>(5)</sup></b>	Instructor
<b>Tenure Track</b>	◦ YES
<b>Scholarship<sup>(6)</sup>, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service<sup>(7)</sup>:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years<sup>(8)</sup></b>	President-Elect of the Pennsylvania School Librarians Association (2019) Hempfield School District 1994 - Present Middle School Librarian 1994-2007 Library Department Supervisor 1999 - Present AASL Beyond Words Grant Jury Committee - Current PSLA Outstanding School Library Media Program - 2017 Lilead Fellow 2015/16 PSLA Outstanding School Library Individual School - 2010 Immaculata Dissertation Committee for individual Ed.D. candidates - 2019, 2014
<b>Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools<sup>(9)</sup></b>	K-12 Library Media Specialist Certification

(3) For example, PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.

(4) For example, faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

(5) For example, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

(6) CAEP defines scholarship as a systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.

Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

(7) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.

(8) For example, officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.

(9) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, in-service training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

## SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the ALA/AASL standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

**Please provide following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters each field)**

	Type or Form of	When the Assessment Is
--	-----------------	------------------------

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment <sup>(10)</sup>	Assessment <sup>(11)</sup>	Administered <sup>(12)</sup>
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	Pennsylvania Library Media Specialist Praxis Certification Exam including Subscores	State Licensure Exam	Prior to Certification
Assessment #2: Assessment of content knowledge in the field of school librarianship (required)	Comprehensive Digital Portfolio	Rubric	While completing LLT 585
Assessment #3: Assessment of candidate ability to plan to meet program needs (required)	Collaborative Lesson Plan	Rubric	While completing LLT 574
Assessment #4: Assessment of practicum or internship (required)	Kutztown University Faculty Supervisor's Assessment of Candidate's Performance	Rubric	While completing LLT 598/599 or LLT 590
Assessment #5: Candidate effect on student learning (required)	Spring 2018-Fall 2018 Student Teacher's Reflections of Teaching Experience (Initial cert) and KU LLT Checklist of Experience for Interns (Extension of cert) Spring 2019 Reflective Paper - Candidate's self-assessment of impact on student learning	Rubric	While completing LLT 598/599 or LLT 590
Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses ALA/AASL standards (required; see note in Section IV)	Library Media Center Technology Plan	Rubric	While completing LLT 560
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses ALA/AASL standards (optional)	Library Media Center Budget Plan	Rubric	While completing LLT 540
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses ALA/AASL standards (optional)	Creative Book Report	Rubric	While completing LLT 520

(10) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

(11) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

(12) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

## SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

For each ALA/AASL standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple ALA/AASL standards.

**Standard 1: Teaching for Learning.** Candidates are effective teachers who demonstrate knowledge of learners and learning and who model and promote collaborative planning, instruction in multiple literacies, and inquiry-based learning, enabling members of the learning community to become effective users and creators of ideas and information. Candidates design and implement instruction that engages students' interests and develops their ability to inquire, think critically, gain and share knowledge.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
1.1 Knowledge of learners and learning.								
1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1.3 Instructional partner.								
1.4 Integration of twenty-first century skills and learning standards								

**Standard 2: Literacy and Reading.** Candidates promote reading for learning, personal growth, and enjoyment. Candidates are aware of major trends in children's and young adult literature and select reading materials in multiple formats to support reading for information, reading for pleasure, and reading for lifelong learning. Candidates use a variety of strategies to reinforce classroom reading instruction to address the diverse needs and interests of all readers.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
2.1 Literature								
2.2 Reading promotion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.3 Respect for diversity								
2.4 Literacy strategies								

**Standard 3: Information and Knowledge.** Candidates model and promote ethical, equitable access to and use of physical, digital, and virtual collections of resources. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of a variety of information sources and services that support the needs of the diverse learning community. Candidates demonstrate the use of a variety of research strategies to generate knowledge to improve practice.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
3.1 Efficient and ethical information-seeking behavior								
3.2 Access to information								
3.3 Information technology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.4 Research and knowledge creation								

**Standard 4: Advocacy and Leadership.** Candidates advocate for dynamic school library programs and positive learning environments that focus on student learning and achievement by collaborating and connecting with teachers, administrators, librarians, and the community. Candidates are committed to continuous learning and professional growth and lead professional development activities for other educators. Candidates provide leadership by articulating ways in which school libraries contribute to student achievement.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
4.1. Networking with the library community								
4.2 Professional development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3 Leadership								

#### 4.4 Advocacy

**Standard 5: Program Management and Administration.** Candidates plan, develop, implement, and evaluate school library programs, resources, and services in support of the mission of the library program within the school according to the ethics and principles of library science, education, management, and administration.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
5.1 Collections								
5.2 Professional ethics	✓	✓	□	□	□	✓	✓	□
5.3 Personnel, funding, and facilities								
5.4 Strategic planning and assessment								

## SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

**DIRECTIONS:** The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. Taken as a whole, the assessments must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. The key assessments should be required of all candidates. Assessments, scoring guides/rubrics and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides/rubrics to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements [each relating to specific SPA standard(s)], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a cumulative score.

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas to be aligned with the elements in CAEP Standard 1:

- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare one document that includes the following items:

(1) A two-page narrative that includes the following:

- A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
  - A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
  - A brief analysis of the data findings;
  - An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording;
- and

(2) Assessment Documentation

- The assessment tool itself or a rich description of the assessment (often the directions given to candidates);
- The scoring guide/rubric for the assessment; and
- Charts that provide candidate data derived from the assessment.

The responses for e, f, and g (above) should be limited to the equivalent of five text pages each, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides/rubrics may go beyond five pages.

**Note:** As much as possible, combine all of the files for one assessment into a single file. That is, create one file for Assessment 4 that includes the two-page narrative (items a – d above), the assessment itself (item e above), the scoring guide (item f above), and the data chart (item g above). Each attachment should be no larger than 2 mb. Do not include candidate work or syllabi. There is a limit of 20 attachments for the entire report so it is crucial that you combine files as much as possible.

Please name files as directed in the guidelines for preparing a SPA Program Report found on the CAEP web site at: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedure>

**1. State licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge.** ALA/AASL standards addressed in this entry could include any or all of standards 1-5. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge (Answer Required)

**Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV**

Assessment 1 - Pennsylvania Library Media Specialist Praxis Certification Exam including Subscores.pdf

See the **Attachment** panel.

**2. Assessment of content knowledge in the field of school librarianship.** ALA/AASL standards addressed in this assessment could include any or all of standards 1-5. Examples of assessments include comprehensive



examinations, GPAs or grades, portfolio tasks,<sup>16</sup> comprehensive projects, or collaborative instruction (including staff development). (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 2_2 Portfolio Development Guidelines Spring 2018.docx	Assessment 2_3 Comprehensive Portfolio Rubric.pdf
Assessment 2_1 Comprehensive Portfolio Narrative	

See the **Attachment** panel.

(13) For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included

**3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan to meet the needs of the school librarianship program. ALA/AASL standards that could be addressed in this assessment include any or all of standards 1-5. Examples of assessments include comprehensive planning activities (grants, website development, budget, collection development, program evaluation). (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

Assessment 3_1 Collaborative Lesson Plan Narrative.docx	Assessment 3_2 Collaborative Lesson Plan Rubric.pdf
Assessment 3_3 Collaborative Lesson Plan Data Table	

See the **Attachment** panel.

**4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. ALA/AASL standards that could be addressed in this assessment include any or all of standards 1-5. The assessment instrument used in the internship or other clinical experiences (practicum, field experience, etc.) should be submitted. (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment_4 - Kutztown University Faculty Supervisor's Assessment of Candidate's Performance.pdf
---

See the **Attachment** panel.

**5. Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on the creation of supportive learning environments for student learning. ALA/AASL standards that could be addressed in this assessment include any or all of standards 1-4. Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, and collaborative instruction. (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 5 Reflective Paper
-------------------------------

See the **Attachment** panel.

**6. Additional assessment that addresses ALA/AASL standards. (Answer Required)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 6 Technology Plan	Assessment 6 Technology Plan Rubric
------------------------------	-------------------------------------

See the **Attachment** panel.

**7. Additional assessment that addresses ALA/AASL standards. (Optional)**

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 7 Budget Assignment Narrative and Rubric.pdf
---

See the **Attachment** panel.



8. Additional assessment that addresses ALA/AASL standards. (Optional)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 8 Creative Book Report Narrative .pdf	Assessment 8 Creative Book Report Rubric.pdf
--	--

See the **Attachment** panel.

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

Content Knowledge

While we haven't focused solely on Praxis results in our Response to Conditions report, the fact that our candidates are generally performing at or above state and national standards suggests that our program is providing the required foundational content knowledge for success in this profession. However, after careful scrutiny of the CAEP reviewers conditions, the department faculty as a whole recognized that we needed to improve consistency with regard to our assignment documentation and our assessment tools (rubrics strongly aligned to AASL standards) to ensure we are communicating program expectations to candidates consistently, which in turn affects their performance. Thus, we rewrote directions, improved rubrics by strongly aligning to AASL standards, improved departmental communications, and emphasized the use of Taskstream for the purpose of data collection and analysis.

After our careful analysis and interpretation of the data since our initial review, the evidence showed that while our candidates' Praxis scores are excellent, we acknowledge that improving both candidate performance and the program itself is an ongoing process. Based on the evidence with regard to Content Knowledge, moving forward we will recommend that our candidates complete the Praxis Examination in the final semester of the program, after they have completed all core course work and assessments. We will also encourage candidates to take the practice test for the Praxis prior to taking the exam. This planned change should improve candidates' subscores across all categories in the Praxis (licensing) exam.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill and Dispositions

Through our work in completing this overall program assessment, the evidence again confirmed our need to constantly update our curriculum and instruction to improve our candidates' performance to reflect the dynamic and evolving nature of the library media profession. This need was primarily evident when analyzing candidates' instruction and its impact on student learning, especially instruction that facilitated access to information in multiple formats for diverse student populations.

Moving forward, our plan is to ensure that all candidates document their efforts to provide differentiated instruction to diverse learners in multiple ways, and through multiple formats, including using emerging technologies, before they instruct in the classroom. To accomplish this goal, we are redoubling our efforts in this area, particularly for candidates who are practicing teachers and are extending their instructional certification by interning in a library media center setting.

Furthermore, because school librarianship can be an insular field of practice, and the evidence shows a lack of necessary networking as a school/professional partner, we will emphasize and require candidate participation in professional organizations, online collaborative activities, and face-to-face communities of practice with like-minded professionals. These planned changes should improve candidates' performance on instruction for diverse student populations and improve their performance as professionals in the field. These planned changes, especially with regard to networking, should also improve our programs' visibility in the library media profession.

### Impact on Student Learning

While it is clear that our candidates are performing effectively in their student teaching and internship experiences in the field, the evidence shows that the reflection on those activities, especially with regard to their impact on student learning, has been less substantial. Moving forward, our candidates will be expected to develop thoughtful reflections on their teaching activities with a particular emphasis on improving their teaching and the achievement of their students. Candidates will be required to perform pre-assessments and a post-assessments during their instruction to document the impact on their students' learning.

In addition to the newly designed Assessment 5, the Reflective Paper, the department faculties will focus extra attention on instructional methods courses that involve lesson planning and lesson delivery to ensure we are providing additional and adequate opportunities for candidates to improve and assess their impact on student learning. These planned changes should improve candidates' performance with regard to impact on student learning and improve the field experience and MLS program overall.

### Summary

The faculties of the Kutztown University Department of Library and Learning Technologies recognize this overall CAEP assessment exercise has illuminated areas in our program where minor improvements and major changes were warranted. We have addressed the conditions set forth by CAEP and implemented the necessary changes to strengthen and improve the effectiveness of our program. The changes we have implemented have made the program not only stronger, but more clearly aligned to AASL standards and, as a result, our candidates' feedback has been positive and their performance as educators improved. In addition, our program reputation has improved, as indicated by our frequent requests for our MLS graduates across PA and surrounding Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states.

## SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

**For Revised Reports:** Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Revised Report are available on the CAEP website at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur>

**For Response to Conditions Reports:** Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the conditions cited in the original recognition report. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions Report are available on the CAEP website at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur>

(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

---

### Response to CAEP Report Conditions

This document provides an overview of Kutztown University's College of Education MLS Graduate Program to prepare Pennsylvania School Library Media Specialists. For each assessment 1-8, this document reports the CAEP Conditions, the Response to CAEP Conditions and the Effects of the Response for National Recognition. The original reviewers reported that the Kutztown University Master of Library Science program is engaged in thoughtful, purposeful analysis of program courses, and assessments with a goal of continued program improvement. They further reported that the program has provided examples of data collection and analysis to inform program change and improvement, and demonstrates that assessment data are systematically and comprehensively reviewed by faculty.

The conditions set forth by CAEP after our last review are outlined in this document, along with a careful and systematic response to the conditions, and the response effect on the candidates' improved learning experiences, and confirm our further commitment to the goal of continued program improvement.

Overall, in response to the conditions by the CAEP reviewers, we have included the Master of Library Science program of study that outlines the courses (with titles) and the experiences required for candidates (Initial or Extension of PA Certification) to complete the program. See Section I.

Furthermore, we want to re-emphasize that ALL eight assessments are completed by ALL candidates in the program, although the length of time required for Assessment #4: Assessment of practicum or internship varies based on the candidates' certification pursuit of either Initial Certification or Extension of an existing instructional certification to include library media certification.

Additionally, we have ensured that all references to Assessments Section II mirror the names of assessments in Section IV.

Additionally, we have provided all instructions to students for each assessment (assignment directions). See Section IV.

And finally, we have revised all assessments and rubrics as noted each standard to ensure that assessments and rubrics align and that rubrics further reflect a qualitative difference in candidate performance at each level. See Section IV.

Please see below for specific Conditions, Response to Conditions, and Effect of Response for each Assessment 1-8.

### Assessment 1: Praxis, including Subscores

#### Assessment 1 Conditions:

Overall, the report did not provide conclusive evidence of candidate content knowledge. Subscores for licensure test data were not provided.

The Praxis Content Knowledge Exam for the Library Media Specialist Certification measures candidates (n=4) knowledge of five distinct areas: Program Administration, Collection Development, Information Access and Delivery, Learning and Teaching, and Professional Development (Leadership and Advocacy). Originally, our CAEP report reported that all students had passed the Praxis Content Knowledge Exam, however we failed to provide sub scores for each category of licensure test data and consequently, we were unable to determine candidate strengths and weaknesses.

#### Assessment 1 Response to Conditions:

To correct the indicated deficiency, we collected the data for each candidate for each of the five content knowledge areas in the Praxis Content Knowledge Exam for the Library Media Specialist Certification. The data was then analyzed to determine each candidate's strengths and weaknesses. After analysis of the newly collected data, the data suggests that our program is meeting its stated goals. All candidates who were enrolled in the library science graduate program (n=4) have met the state and national standard threshold and three exceeded the thresholds. Therefore, the data suggests that the program is aligning with national standards for preparation of Library Media Specialists. A fifth candidate, who was enrolled in an Art Education program, also took the Praxis Content Knowledge Exam for the Library Media Specialist Certification (which PA allows) passed the exam, but with a lower score as compared to candidates enrolled in our program.

#### Assessment 1 Effect of Response:

From the four candidates who were enrolled in our program, we determined that two were below the national average, one in Collection Development and one in the Learning and Teaching category. This is not necessarily indicative of a problem, but we will continue to monitor the data to see if we can determine a pattern. And if a pattern emerges, we will address this and revisit the curriculum to strengthen the areas of Collection Development and Learning and Teaching. However, in the future to improve overall performance, we will recommend that all candidates take the Praxis Exam in the final semester of their graduate program.

### Assessment 2: Comprehensive Digital Portfolio

#### Assessment 2 Conditions:

The comprehensive portfolio for Assessment 2 was insufficiently documented by not providing candidates' guidelines for the portfolio and by using pass or fail indicators of candidate performance.

#### Assessment 2 Response to Conditions:

In the original report, we failed to attach the Comprehensive Digital Portfolio Guidelines, which we provide to all candidates. We have provided the Comprehensive Digital Portfolio Guidelines in this report (see Section IV, Assessment 2\_2 Portfolio Development Guidelines). The Comprehensive Digital Portfolio is developed while completing LLT 585, the Digital Portfolios course. The Comprehensive Digital Portfolio is required of all students who are completing the MLS program and is due four weeks before their intended graduation date.

We recognized and subsequently, determined that we were deficient in the evaluation of Assessment 2 because our evaluation was simply pass or fail. Since our determination of our deficiency with regard to evaluation of Assessment 2, we have designed a new rubric with five categories aligned to AASL standards (2.2, 2.3.3.1, 4.1, 5.2) for successful candidate performance (see Section IV, Assessment 2 Rubric):

- . Use a variety of strategies to promote leisure reading and model personal enjoyment of reading to create habits of creative expression and life long learning
- . Demonstrate ability to develop a collection of reading and information materials in print and digital formats that support the diverse, developmental, cultural, social and linguistic needs of p-12 students and their communities
- . Identify and provide support for diverse student information needs. Collaborate and model multiple strategies for students, teachers, and administration to locate, evaluate, and ethically use information.
- . Ability to establish connections with other libraries and to strengthen cooperation among library colleagues for resource sharing, networking, and facilitating access to information
- . Evaluate and select print, non-print, and digital resources using professional selection tools and evaluation tools to manage a quality collection according to current cataloging and classification principles.

In addition, we implemented a new procedure that includes all faculty members in a collaborative, committee-based review of each candidate's digital portfolio.

According to the data analysis of the newly revised rubric (as seen on data table in Section IV, Assessment 2, narrative), our students (n= 5) are exemplary in all areas, with the exception of their ability to participate in collaborative networks and intellectual communities of practice. Sixty percent of the students were exemplary in Category 4 and 40% were acceptable. The data suggests this is a challenge of available time, since most of our students are practicing teachers, often as solo teacher librarians and may be limited to collaboration within their buildings and districts.

To remediate this problem, we are going to emphasize this standard in our instruction and encourage students to become involved in online communities of practice and to engage in social media based outlets with like-minded professionals.

#### Assessment 2 Effect of Response:

The new rubric places more responsibility on each candidate to provide an honest reflective description of each artifact that includes the experience of creating the artifact, the significance of the artifact and how the experience will impact their future profession as a certified library media specialist.

#### Assessment 3: Collaborative Lesson Plan

##### Assessment 3 Conditions:

Several of the assessments and rubrics submitted by the program need further revision in order to make them effective for the collection of standards-based data. The program should consider re-submitting this section of the report once it has collected data using revised assessments and rubrics.

##### Assessment 3 Response to Conditions:

As a result of the condition stated for Assessment 3, a new rubric was created with more robust differentiation between categories and stronger alignment to standards. New data was collected using the new rubric. See Section IV, Assessment 3, New Collaborative Lesson Plan Rubric.

##### Assessment 3 Effect of Response:

As a result of using the new Collaborative Lesson Plan Rubric, which requires more robust differentiation between categories and stronger alignment to standards, we have seen improved candidates' understanding of the AASL standards and candidates' reflection and revision on lesson plan requirements. Moving forward, we will require that candidate's lesson objectives are clearly stated, measurable, and indicate evidence of higher order thinking skills before the candidate is permitted to proceed with lesson implementation. We will further encourage candidates' innovative thinking with regard to appropriate methods and strategies to teach in the school library media classroom, particularly with diverse students populations.

#### Assessment 4: Kutztown University Field Supervisor's Assessment of Candidate's Performance during Fieldwork

##### Assessment 4 Conditions:

Provides partial evidence of candidate effects on student learning. Rubric issues with

alignment and description of performance indicators limit this evidence. At this time, the program has not provided sufficient evidence of candidate impact on P-12 student learning. Previous naming of assessment #4 was inconsistent: PDE 430 state-wide evaluation and PDE430 Student teaching clinical experience state wide evaluation.

#### Assessment 4 Response to Conditions:

A new consistent name was given to Assessment 4, Kutztown University Faculty Supervisor Assessment of Candidate's Performance.

As a result of the condition stated for Assessment 4, providing sufficient evidence of candidate impact on student learning, a new rubric was created with stronger alignment to the AASL standards, specifically:

. The candidate's Kutztown University Faculty Supervisor will look for evidence that the candidate has a command of the literature (2.1) and is familiar with a wide range of materials in youth in multiple formats and languages that support learning.

☐

. The candidate should provide evidence that they are supporting access to information in multiple formats in ways that address physical, social and intellectual barriers to access through differentiated instruction, and careful selection of materials (3.2).

☐

. The candidate should model and facilitate the effective use of current and emerging technologies by designing learning activities that use digital tools and resources to support communication, creativity and research in today's digital society (3.3).

. The candidate should also demonstrate leadership ability by articulating the role of the school media library program's impact on student academic achievement within the context of current educational initiatives in the school or district, and further communicate the ways in which the library program can enhance school improvement efforts (4.3)

☐

#### Assessment 4 Effect of Response:

New data was collected using the new rubric. See Section IV, Assessment 4, Kutztown University Faculty Supervisor Assessment of Candidate's Performance Rubric.

The revised rubric required candidates to provide sufficient evidence for each of the four competencies noted in the rubric. More specifically, the new rubric required that candidates provided strong evidence of differentiated instruction and strategies to deliver instruction in multiple formats in ways that address physical, social and intellectual barriers to access through differentiated instruction, and careful selection of materials. Candidates were acceptable in providing evidence of differentiated instruction and information in multiple formats in their selection of materials (Standard 3.2), however we would like to see more candidates in the exemplary category with regard to Standard 3.2. ☐

As a result, during instruction, and in our guidance during candidates' performance



before and during fieldwork, the faculty plans to redoubled our emphasis on providing differentiated instruction for candidates' student population and facilitating access to information in varied formats.

Assessment 5: Formerly Student Teacher's Reflections of Teaching Experience (for Initial Certification), and KU Department of LLT Checklist of Activities and Experience for Interns (for Extension of Certification). For the current reporting period, data collected Sp 2018 & Fall 2018, we only had candidates in the Extension of Certification program, therefore we used the LLT Checklist. We recognized that using two tools was problematic, thus moving forward we will be using a single assessment called the Reflective Paper, data collection starting Sp 2019.

#### Assessment 5: Conditions:

Provides partial evidence of candidate effects on student learning. Rubric issues with alignment and description of performance indicators limit this evidence. At this time, the program has not provided sufficient evidence of candidate impact on P-12 student learning. Previous naming of Assessment #5 was inconsistent: (1) Clinical student teaching & field observations, and (2) Student teacher's observations and reflections of teaching experience.

#### Assessment 5: Response to Conditions:

A new consistent name was given to the newly adopted Assessment 5, Reflective Paper. All initial and extension of certification candidates will now complete this new assessment. The description of the Reflective Paper performance indicators are now aligned with the Reflective Paper rubric. However, the adoption of this assessment tool for measuring candidates' impact on their students' learning was only recently adopted in Spring 2019. In this report (Section IV), we reported data from the previous Extension of Certification checklist assessment used in 2018, which we have since replace with the new assessment, the Reflective Paper.

#### Assessment 5: Effect of Response:

Our analysis of the data tells us that while the teachers are performing, they were not specifically documenting their impact on the students' achievement. Moving forward, the new Reflective Paper recommends and requires candidates to perform a pre-assessment and post-assessment of their students' knowledge to measure the impact of their instruction on their students learning. The reflective paper further requires candidates to discuss the lesson's impact on student learning, including possible solutions for lack of student understanding of the lesson. See Section IV, Assessment 5.

The addition of the Reflective Paper assignment provides strong evidence of candidates' impact on their students' learning.

#### Assessment 6: Technology Plan

Assessment 6: Conditions: Provides partial evidence of candidates' knowledge. Rubric and alignment issues should be addressed in order to fully document candidate knowledge.

Assessment 6: Response to Conditions:

In response to the condition, a new rubric to assess the Technology Plan was designed and developed that more closely aligned with the candidates' knowledge of technology for the library media center.

Assessment 6: Effect of Response:

The for candidates who were assessed with the newly developed rubric, all performed at the exemplary level. The Technology Plan assessment is a strong, well-developed instrument for gathering data and, based on the analysis and interpretation of the data, we are confident of our candidates' knowledge in this area. However, we plan to continue to review the instrument as school library media centers continue to evolve.

Assessment 7: Budget Plan

Assessment 7: Conditions: Provides partial evidence of candidates' knowledge. Rubric and alignment issues should be addressed in order to fully document candidate knowledge.

Assessment 7: Response to Conditions:

In response to the condition, a new rubric to assess the Budget Plan was designed and developed that more closely aligned with the standards and candidates' knowledge of realistic budget requests and advocacy for the requests for the library media center.

Assessment 7: Effect of Response:

All candidates performed at the exemplary and/or acceptable levels. The same candidate performed at the acceptable level in two categories, the role of the librarian as instructional partner, and the current budget information research. Based on the analysis and interpretation of the data, we are confident of our candidates' knowledge in this area. However, we plan to update the budget collection information sheet (part of the assignment in the field) to encourage richer data collection by candidates.

Assessment 8: Creative Book Report

Assessment 8: Conditions:

There were no specific conditions reported for Assessment 8. However, since we were re-aligning all of our previous rubrics, we also addressed any standard alignment issues with the creative book report assignment and rubric. The assignment directions for the Creative Book Report were also aligned to the standards.

#### Assessment 8: Response to Conditions:

In response to the condition, a new rubric to assess the Creative Book Report was designed and developed that more closely aligned with the standards to measure candidates' knowledge of diverse students and their needs and interests in literature. The assignment also required that students pay closer attention to this aspect when selecting, promoting, and making connections between diverse resources in a variety of formats.

#### Assessment 8: Effect of Response:

All candidates performed at the Exemplary or Acceptable levels with 78% of the candidates performing at the Exemplary level for all five areas that were evaluated. We will further stress the needs for understanding the diverse needs of candidates' students throughout our program and facilitating access to information in multiple formats.

In summary, the original reviewers reported that the "Kutztown University Master of Library Science program is engaged in thoughtful, purposeful analysis of program courses, and assessments with a goal of continued program improvement."

Since the initial review, we have carefully scrutinized the CAEP reviewers' conditions for accreditation of our MLS program. We have carefully and systematically responded to the reviewers' conditions, and analyzed the effect of these responses. Using this process has helped the faculty in the Masters of Library Science program improve all areas of instruction and ensure librarian/teacher candidates are applying the knowledge they have gained in the program to their classroom instruction. The changes we implemented over the past evaluation period have been very beneficial including emphasis on candidates' ability to differentiate instruction for diverse learners, facilitate access to information in multiple formats, and network with experts beyond their own classrooms and individual schools.

As faculty, we learned a tremendous amount about strong alignment to the AASL standards and the effect on our candidates' improved knowledge, learning experiences, and instructional practices. Additionally, the library science faculty have been able to identify areas for further growth, such as the opportunities for candidates to learn more about emerging technologies and new teaching methods through our newly redesigned, and newly realigned curriculum. We confirm our commitment to the goal of dynamic program improvement as the profession of the library media specialist evolves.

**Please click "Next"**

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.