

**Course: EDEE 430, Literacy Methods II, Fall/Spring, 2010-11**  
**Signature Assignment: *Case Study of a Struggling Literacy Learner***

**e. Brief Description:** The teacher candidate informally assesses the listening, speaking, reading, writing, visualizing, and visually representing skills of a student (grades 4-6) who has been identified as a struggling literacy learner. Data is analyzed and used to develop an intervention plan. ACEI standards addressed: 1.0, 2.1, 3.2, 4.0

**Instructions to Candidates:** While drafting your case study, take into consideration the following benchmarks, which reflect both form (structure) and content of your case study. In general, you should continuously consult Laulima online Modules 5, 6, & 7, as well as your textbook, all of which will provide a framework for organizing and writing your final draft paper. **Use the following boldface headings to organize your paper:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Introduction:** The candidate clearly described a struggling literacy learner, using information gained from informal observations and the "All About Me" survey data. The description was detailed and enabled the reader to visualize the learner, who was referred to by pseudonym---NOT simply "he," "she," or "the student." (10)

\_\_\_\_\_ **Data Collection:** The candidate conducted informal assessments and described summative and formative data on the learner's oral language, listening, reading, and writing skills. The descriptions were clearly written and contained sufficient detail to illustrate the strengths and needs of the struggling literacy learner. (10)

\_\_\_\_\_ **Interpretation of Data:** The teacher analyzed the data and made determinations with regard to the learner's social, emotional, and academic strengths and needs. The candidate's interpretation was clearly written, logical, and derived from information provided in the data. (20)

\_\_\_\_\_ **Intervention Plan:** The teacher candidate used the assessment data and interpretation to design an effective, developmentally appropriate intervention plan to strengthen the struggling learner's literacy skills. The plan was organized and included specific examples of methods (skills & strategy development) and materials that would support the development of the English Language Arts. (30)

\_\_\_\_\_ **Conclusion:** The teacher candidate concluded the *Case Study* with further recommendations for individuals working with the child outside of the school environment: parents, siblings, tutors, child care providers. The recommendations were clearly written and specific. (10)

\_\_\_\_\_ **Appendix, Bibliography, & References:** The teacher candidate provided an Appendix containing student work samples, such as writing samples and the "All About Me" survey; a bibliography of books, materials, media, and technology in support of the child's continuous literacy learning, both in and out of school; all references used in the development of the case study. (10)

\_\_\_\_\_ **Conventions.** The final draft case study was: well-developed; well-organized (headings used); clearly written for the intended audience; free of spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors; typed, double-spaced in 12-pitch font. Citations were accurately formatted, using APA style. (Refer to bibliographies in your textbook for models). (10)

### Fall 2011

ACEI Standard	n =	Range of scores	Mean	Standard deviation	Students who achieved target
1.0	13	2	2	0	100% 13/13
2.1	13	1-2	1.69	.48	69% 9/13
3.2	13	1-2	1.85	.38	85% 11/13
4.0	13	1-2	1.54	.66	62% 8/13

### Spring 2012

ACEI Standard	n =	Range of scores	Mean	Standard deviation	Students who achieved target
1.0	19	2	2	0	100% 19/19
2.1	19	1-2	1.74	.45	74% 14/19
3.2	19	1-2	1.89	.32	89% 17/19
4.0	19	1-2	1.84	.37	84% 16/19

## REFLECTIONS

Data for AY 2011-12 reveals that the vast majority of candidates continue to achieve target on Standard 1, Development, Learning, and Motivation. This is due in large part to course emphasis on developmentally appropriate methods and materials. I also present information in a developmental context, illustrating how literacy teaching and learning changes from early primary through upper elementary school. This standard was assessed via the case study *Introduction*, which was a reflection of the candidate's knowledge and understanding of the case study student whom they came to know well.

Candidate performance on Standard 2.1, Curriculum: Reading, Writing and Oral Language reveals wide variations from semester to semester, ranging from a high of 95% in fall 2010 to a low of 69% in fall 2011. This standard is reflected in the candidate's *Intervention Plan*. Qualitative analysis of the plans reveals that, in general, candidates struggle with making recommendations that are research-based (e.g., cited in the course textbook or assigned readings), as well as describing substantive ways to help students improve their writing skills, in particular.

In their *Conclusion* section of the case study, candidates address the importance of the family in assisting the struggling literacy learner. Target scores on Standard 3.2, Adaptation to Diverse Students, were significantly higher (85% & 89%) during AY 2011-12 than was reported (59) in spring of 2011. I attribute this to the fact that Home-School-Community relationships is an added feature of the new 3-credit Practicum course in Block 1, therefore increasing candidate knowledge and understanding of the influences of the home culture.

Overall, candidate achievement of target on Standard 4, *Assessment*, increased significantly from the two semesters previous to spring 2012. This is attributable to my having increased course content in the area of language arts assessments, in general, writing assessment and interpretation, in particular. My reason for increased attention to writing was data-driven, after reviewing survey responses by alumni who have full-time teaching positions and who report that they did not feel prepared to teaching writing, once inside their own classrooms.

This is the first full academic year in which we implemented the new Block system. I was initially concerned that Block 1 practicum would not adequately prepare candidates to write a case study, since it is the very first practicum experience, compared to Block B practicum where the case study signature assignment was formerly housed. On reflection, I feel that the candidates came through for me. I will continue to have them submit the case study in sections and to workshop (engage in peer review) each major section, to provide continuous feedback and support. Should the faculty decide to reinstate the developmental delivery of methods courses with practicum, I would be supportive nonetheless.