

Reading Course Revision Support Materials

NOTE: Please include both the institution's course name and number and the Maryland State Department of Education course name for which this is equivalent.

June 2005

Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Certification and Accreditation

TIPS FOR COURSE DEVELOPMENT

1. Be sure to identify courses by referring to those named in the Reading Course Revision Guidelines for Elementary, Early Childhood and Special Education.
2. Remember that reviewers are looking for the competencies in the identified Course Revision Guidelines: performance outcomes, essential knowledge/ skill indicators. **Code (e.g., A 1.0, A 1.1, etc.)** the location of the competencies in alignment with the information provided in the guidelines.
3. Send sets of courses together, so reviewers can read them as a whole. Send **TWO** copies of each course. To assist the peer review process and maintain course anonymity, **also** send **THREE blind copies** of **each** course which do not identify your higher education institution or the course instructor. (You may use your word processor and substitute “Ideal University” and “Dr. Yor Smart” or whatever you like.)
4. If you distribute some of the performance outcomes, essential knowledge/ skill indicators into other courses, submit the other courses and **code (e.g., A 1.0, M 2.2, etc.)** reading competencies. Also, make it clear to the reviewers which course from the Reading Course Revision Guidelines is being integrated by creating and submitting a **matrix** to indicate competency placement in the courses you submit.
5. Submit institutional sets of courses, rather than individual faculty members’ courses. If departmentalized, submit courses such as early childhood, elementary education, MAT, etc. together. Courses should be submitted by the Dean or the Dean’s representative.
6. Make sure all parts of courses are consistent with one another, e.g., assignments and assessment should fit the performance objectives/essential knowledge and skills.
7. Make sure syllabi and course descriptions are thorough and clear. Reviewers will judge the course, so write convincingly.
8. You may find it advisable to start your course planning with the Reading Course Revision Guidelines competencies, so that you avoid force fitting what the reviewers are looking for with existing course.
9. For full certification programs (teacher preparation), keep in mind that your goal is to meet the semester hour requirements of the reading regulations, i.e., totals of at least 12 or 6 hours.
10. Consider creating a matrix to track the inclusion of all **coded (e.g., A 1.0, M 2.2, etc.)** competencies.

Peer Reading Course Review Committee Lessons Learned

The following information reflects the findings of the Peer Reading Course Review Committee members* as they reviewed and evaluated the March 2005, first round reading course submissions. The committee generated the following tips for higher education institutions based on their review work and also identified problems which interfered with the course approval process. This information is intended to supplement the *Tips for Course Development* document.

TIPS for IHEs

- Collaborate internally on course development so courses can be produced that relate and have a seamless programmatic connectedness.
- Consider the following suggested procedures for getting started in course development:
 1. Begin the course development process by following the performance objectives and essential knowledge and skills as identified in the course guidelines.
 2. Avoid trying to adapt existing courses.
 3. If you choose to adapt an existing course, determine the structural changes that are needed to accomplish the course requirements and make those changes.
- Ensure the course objectives are aligned with the activities and assessments.
- Create a syllabus with logical coherent flow from session to session.
- Include a brief explanation or narrative to clarify purpose and/or placement of courses if courses are related to something else, such as special education, English for Speakers of other Languages (ESOL), etc.
- **Remember: Don't expect reviewers to read your mind.**
- Remember: These are state-approved syllabi which become public documents.
- Remember: If a faculty member teaches a course that differs significantly from the approved course, it must be approved as well.

PROBLEMS FOUND

- Some syllabi were obviously “re-worked” old syllabi to conform, rather than align, with guidelines. They did not always conform.
- In some cases, there was general lack of alignment.
- Too many unrelated objectives were scheduled into in single sessions of instruction.

PROBLEMS FOUND (continued)

- Some **Essential** Knowledge/Skills areas were ignored; they must be included.
- Sessions were overloaded with content or objectives that could not be adequately addressed in the time indicated.
- Syllabi appeared to be built around the selected text, rather than the guidelines.
- Editing was not done appropriately:
 1. There was significant variation in style and format within a single course.
 2. There was a lack of professional language and detail in preparation, including typographical errors, use of jargon, etc.
 3. Bibliographic citations were not in APA or MLA format.
- In some cases, syllabi did not reflect that preparers knew that reading professionals would review them.
- Courses developed for specialty programs, e.g., Special Education, were not clearly identified.

***Note: The spring 2005 reviewers are MSDE's Reading Course Review Advisory Council. They will continue to serve as reviewers for future course submissions.**

**Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Certification and Accreditation**

SUMMARY READING COURSE APPROVAL RUBRIC

MSDE Code: _____

Course Title (and course name in Reading Course Revision Guidelines): _____

UNABLE TO DETERMINE BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED	DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS (disapproval)	MEETS REQUIREMENTS CONDITIONALLY (approval upon meeting conditions or providing additional information)	MEETS REQUIREMENTS (full approval)	COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ missing significant number of components ▪ major omissions of required content performance objectives, essential knowledge/skills ▪ too general, very unclear ▪ lack of alignment of description and other course elements such as performance objectives, assignments, assessments and materials ▪ few strategies are based on sound pedagogical scientifically based reading strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ some significant omissions in components ▪ does not include one or a small number of performance objectives, essential knowledge/skills ▪ not sufficiently clear and explicit ▪ some elements of the course are not aligned ▪ strategies are limited in number or are not based on sound pedagogical scientifically based reading strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ includes all course revision components <i>throughout</i> the document ▪ content explicitly reflects all performance objectives, knowledge/skills in course revision guidelines ▪ layout and all components of the document were clear ▪ clear alignment of description and other course elements such as performance objectives, assignments, assessments and materials ▪ all strategies are sound pedagogical scientifically based reading strategies and are comprehensive in scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪ ▪ ▪

**Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Certification and Accreditation**

UNABLE TO DETERMINE BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED	DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS (disapproval)	MEETS REQUIREMENTS CONDITIONALLY (approval upon meeting conditions or providing additional information)	MEETS REQUIREMENTS (full approval)	COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ does not incorporate a balance of scientifically based research and practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ lacks balance in incorporating scientifically based research and practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ effective balance of scientifically based research and practice 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ course is not achievable or doable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ some aspects of the course are not achievable or doable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ course is achievable and doable 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a few materials are not current 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ some materials are not current 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ materials are current 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a few materials are not aligned with essential knowledge & skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ some materials are not aligned with essential knowledge & skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ materials are aligned with essential knowledge & skills 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ does not provide performance assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ performance assessments are not authentic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ multiple authentic performance assessments 	

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION (circle):

DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS MEETS REQUIREMENTS CONDITIONALLY MEETS REQUIREMENTS

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Review Committee Member: