

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of Early Childhood Education Teachers

Name of institution: XX
Date of review: March 2006

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the **National Association for the Education for Young Children (NAEYC)**.

This report is in response to a(n):

Initial Review Revised Report Response to Condition

Program(s) Covered by this Review	Program Type	Award or Degree Level(s)
Early Childhood – 4th Gr. Grade Level: Licensure category:	Initial teacher license in field	<input type="checkbox"/> Baccalaureate <input type="checkbox"/> Postbaccalaureate <input type="checkbox"/> Master's <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Endorsement, Certificate, or License (specify) _____ _____ _____

PART A—RECOGNITION DECISION (see Part G for specifics on decision)

A.1—SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Not nationally recognized

A.2—Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)¹

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

Yes No Not applicable Not able to determine

Comments: 3 years of scores on the state licensure exam, ExCET/TEsES are provided. On the required tests for the three state licenses, scores are stable or are improving. There is a good explanation of the tests, the relationship of the exams to NAEYC standards and interpretation of the scores. The overview described measures the unit has taken to improve scores, and data suggests that actions have helped.

Comment [jmj1]: Describes amount of data, meaning of data, relates test scores to NAEYC standards, and provides evidence about how data is being used to improve the program.

A.3—Summary of Strengths:

The report is well written.

Throughout the report, explanation is given of how assessments align with NAEYC standards.

For example, in the discussion of Assessment #1, TExES examination and Assessment #4, Student Teaching Evaluation, the report includes a good explanation of how these generic assessments relate to NAEYC standards.

Comment [jmj2]: Use of examples provides meaning for the previous statement about how the assessments are aligned with NAEYC standards.

The report is clear about weaknesses in program or assessments.

Alignment of the assessments is done by sub-standards, making a more specific alignment.

Data has been disaggregated for some assessments by differing certificates or rater, giving further insight into the assessment findings.

The institution should be commended for its efforts to support teacher candidates who are English Language Learners by providing mentors and incorporating interventions through Hispanic Serving Institution grants.

The unit identified “value of diversity” in its Conceptual Framework, and the program demonstrates the application of this commitment in several ways, such as offering certificates in Bilingual Generalist and English as Second Language Generalist, and the addition of courses on second language acquisition.

Comment [jmj3]: As in the case of “for example” above, the statement provides specific explanation for the claim about commitment to diversity.

¹ The 80% pass rate requirement is an NCATE requirement, and not a SPA-specific requirement. SPA decisions and comments on licensure data should be applied to what the institution has provided for Assessment #1.

The NCATE pass rate requirement is that 80% of program completers, in the most recent annual set of data, must pass the state-required licensure test that includes or is specific to content knowledge. Programs that have fewer than 10 completers in the most recent annual data set must base the pass rate on the average of three years of annual data. Programs that have fewer than 10 completers over the total of a three year period are exempt from this requirement. Reviewers should be able to determine whether the pass rate is met by looking at the Candidate/Completers chart for information on the number of candidates, and the licensure data that is supplied as Assessment #1. If a determination cannot be made from these two pieces of information, then reviewers should check the “unable to determine” box, and NCATE staff will seek clarification from the institution.

PART B—STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

M = Met NM = Not Met

NAEYC Standard (Initial Teacher Preparation)	Specific Program or Level ²	Specific Program or Level
<p>Standard 1. Promoting Child Development and Learning. Candidates use their understanding of young children’s characteristics and needs, and of multiple interacting influences on children’s development and learning, to create environments that are healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging for all children.</p>	<p>Met</p>	
<p>Comment: Several assessments provide adequate evidence that candidates are well prepared in how to promote child development and learning. Assessment #1 (TExES examination), #2 Thematic Unit Plan, #4 Assessment of Student Teaching, and #6 Storytime Plan and Presentation are appropriate assessments for this Standard. Assessment #1 addresses 1a, 1b, and 1c; #2 addresses 1c, #4 addresses 1a, 1b, 1c; and Assessment #6 addresses 1c. The assessments emphasize teacher candidates use developmentally appropriate practice in teaching at all age levels.</p> <p>Assessment #5 Candidate Work Sample has one semester’s data which does not support students have met this standard, but the assessment is appropriate, and with further development and student support, this assessment may provide supporting data for this standard.</p> <p>Assessment #7 Parent Brochure may or may not support this standard, depending upon which option students choose to complete. Therefore, the assessment data can not be used in support of this standard.</p>		
<p>Standard 2. Building Family and Community Relationships. Candidates know about, understand, and value the importance and complex characteristics of children’s families and communities. They use this understanding to create respectful, reciprocal relationships that support and empower families, and to involve all families in their children’s development and learning.</p>	<p>Met Conditionally</p>	
<p>Comment: Assessments #4 Assessment of Student Teaching, #6 Storytime Plan and Presentation, and #7 Parent Brochure provide evidence for this standard. Data from these multiple assessments suggest that the program is preparing teacher candidates to have an understanding of how to communicate with and involve families in children’s learning. However, Assessment #4 is the only individual assessment of teacher candidates and provides the only data for 2a, 2b, and 2c. This data is from a single item on the student</p>		

Comment [jmj4]: Reviewer provides valuable direction for future action by the program faculty.

Comment [jmj5]: As a whole, these comments provide a very clear rationale for why this standard is Met with Conditions.

² More than one column may be used for standards decisions if the program report encompasses more than one program.

NAEYC Standard (Initial Teacher Preparation)	Specific Program or Level ²	Specific Program or Level
<p>teacher evaluation rubric. Assessments #6 and #7 are not individual assignments, but are done with partners or groups, and it is unclear from the data whether there was individual accountability in the assignments and reporting of data, thus rendering the data questionable. Option 2 of the Parent Brochure assignment is an example of one-way communication, and does not demonstrate that students understand how to create reciprocal relationships with diverse families (2b). Stronger evidence is needed for this standard to be fully Met.</p>		
<p>Standard 3. Observing, Documenting, and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families. Candidates know about and understand the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment. They know about and use systematic observations, documentation, and other effective assessment strategies in a responsible way, in partnership with families and other professionals, to positively influence children’s development and learning.</p>	<p>Met</p>	
<p>Comment: Assessments #4 Student Teacher Evaluation and #6 Storytime Lesson Plan and Presentation most clearly align with this standard and provide the strongest documentation of teacher candidates’ assessment knowledge and skills. Assessment #4 provides documentation to support 3a, 3b, and 3c in the student teacher evaluation rubric, although the rubric component for 3d (understanding assessment partnerships with families and other professionals) is weak evidence, as it only addresses general family and professional partnerships. Assessment #6 provides evidence for 3b.</p> <p>Assessment #8 provides some evidence that students can assess children’s learning (3b, 3c), but the scoring guide is weak, in that it does not indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated.</p> <p>Assessment #2 Thematic Unit Plan, is listed as an assessment for this standard, but the assignment is a group project and does not include individual accountability for students’ understanding of this standard. The description of the activity does not specify that students include an assessment component in their lessons, and the rubric does not specifically evaluate candidates’ abilities to plan developmentally appropriate assessments (3a, 3b, 3c). Therefore, this assessment does not measure this standard.</p> <p>Assessment #5 Candidate Work Sample has one semester’s data which does not support students have met this standard, but the assessment is appropriate, and with further development and student support, this assessment may provide supporting data for this standard.</p>		
<p>Standard 4. Teaching and Learning. Candidates integrate their understanding of and relationships with children and families; their understanding of develop-</p>	<p>Met</p>	

Comment [jmj6]: The claim is that assessment #4 provides weak evidence, this phrase clearly supports the reviewer’s claim

Comment [jmj7]: Again, the reviewer has clearly indicated why this assessment is weak. This provides valuable direction for improvement by the program.

Comment [jmj8]: rather than just saying that Assessment #2 does not measure the standard, the comment provides clear support for the claim. This supporting rationale will be very helpful to the program in making this assessment better.

NAEYC Standard (Initial Teacher Preparation)	Specific Program or Level ²	Specific Program or Level
mentally effective approaches to teaching and learning; and their knowledge of academic disciplines to design, implement, and evaluate experiences that promote positive development and learning for all children.		
<p>Comment: There are multiple assessments to document teacher candidates' mastery of this standard. Assessments #1 TExES examination, #2 Thematic Unit Plan, #4 Assessment of Student Teaching, and #6 Storytime Plan and Presentation seem to most closely align with this standard and provide the strongest evidence of candidate mastery of this standard (4a, 4b, 4c, 4d).</p> <p>The rubric for Assessment #3 Student Teaching Portfolio is weak in alignment with this standard and is global in nature. It appears to assess whether the required items were included, as opposed to assessing the quality of the specific portfolio artifacts and the data does not provide strong evidence for this standard.</p> <p>Assessment #5 Candidate Work Sample has one semester's data which does not support students have met this standard, but the assessment is appropriate, and with further development and student support, this assessment may provide supporting data for this standard.</p> <p>Assessment #8, Literature-based Activity, provides limited evidence that students can plan a developmentally appropriate activity (4b, 4c), but the scoring guide is weak, in that it does not indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated.</p>		
<p>Standard 5. Becoming a Professional. Candidates identify and conduct themselves as members of the early childhood profession. They know and use ethical guidelines and other professional standards related to early childhood practice. They are continuous, collaborative learners who demonstrate knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives on their work, making informed decisions that integrate knowledge from a variety of sources. They are informed advocates for sound educational practices and policies.</p>	<p>Met Conditionally</p>	
<p>Comment: Assessments #3 Student Teaching Portfolio and #4, Assessment of Student Teaching, provide the strongest evidence for this standard. These assessments include rubric items for "professionalism" (5a), "professional development activities" (5c), and "reflection" (5d). Assessment #4 has multiple evaluation points (formative - approximately every two weeks, and summative - end of semester) and multiple evaluators (mentor teacher and university supervisors), and training is done on the use of both forms to ensure validity and reliability. However, there are elements of this standard that are not assessed in any of the program assessments. Assessment rubrics do not specifically evaluate teacher candidates' use of ethical guidelines (5b) or their advocacy skills (5e). Assessments #6 and #7 are given as examples of candidates'</p>		

Comment [jmj9]: As a result of this reviewer's comments, the program knows exactly what they need to do to make this a better assessment of this standard.

Comment [jmj10]: Rather than just saying that Assessment #8 as a weak assessment of this standard, the reviewer explains how it is weak. This is so helpful to the program.

Comment [jmj11]: One thing to keep in mind is that not all key elements must be clearly met in order for the standard to be met. In this case this is a close call as it appears that the standard is met substantially.

NAEYC Standard (Initial Teacher Preparation)	Specific Program or Level ²	Specific Program or Level
<p>abilities to be informed advocates, but advocacy skills are not evaluated on assessment rubrics, and therefore yield no data on advocacy skills.</p> <p>Assessment #5 Candidate Work Sample has one semester's data which does not support students have met this standard, but the assessment is appropriate for students' abilities to reflect upon practice, and with further development and student support, this assessment may provide supporting data for this standard.</p> <p>Assessment #6 is listed as an assessment for this standard in terms of reflection skills, but the rubric does not include an evaluation of students' reflection skills and therefore provides no data for this standard.</p>		

Comment [jmj12]: This rationale provides clear direction to the program faculty on how to make Assessments #6 and #7 better.

Comment [jmj13]: See comment just above.

PART C—EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1—Candidates' knowledge of content. NAEYC standards addressed in this entry could include (but are not limited to) Standards 1, 2, and 4. Information from Assessments #1 and #2 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on content knowledge.)

The Assessments used by the Program are appropriate for evaluating candidates' knowledge of content of children's development and learning and teaching in the content areas. Assessments #1 (TEXES Examination), #2 Thematic Unit, and #6 (Literacy lesson) provide adequate evidence of candidates' knowledge of this content. However, some assessments provided are group work and not individual assessments, thus making the data questionable for individual students.

The institution reported an effort to better support English Language Learner teacher candidates in successful completion of the TEXES examination, with the acknowledgement that more attention should be given to this group's preparation. The institution also noted a weakness in overall candidates' knowledge in the areas of science and social studies on the TEXES examination and is working to improve this.

C.2—Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions. NAEYC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include are Standards 1-5. Information from Assessments #3 and #4 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.)

Assessments #2 (Thematic Unit), #3 (Student Teaching Portfolio), #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation), #7 Parent Brochure, and #8 (Literature Based Activity) provide multiple examples of candidates' abilities to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The data has been disaggregated and analyzed by programs and raters. Training was done with the Student Teacher Evaluation form to provide inner-rater reliability and validity.

Comment [jmj14]: This statement echoes comments made on several of the standards above and thus provides continuity for the evaluation of program report evidence.

The institution reported that efforts have been made in core courses to assess candidates' dispositions, but does not give specific information about how this is done or any data relating to these assessments. Dispositions are assessed in the Student Teaching evaluations (formative and summative), which are also part of the Student Teaching Portfolio. Data suggests that students demonstrate professional dispositions during their student teaching semester.

C.3—Candidate effects on P-12 student learning. NAEYC standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 1, 3, and 4. Information from Assessment #5 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on student learning.)

Assessment #5 (Candidate Work Sample) is the primary evidence of candidate effects on P-12 student learning. The rubric for this assessment requires that teacher candidates analyze the data of students in whole group, sub-groups, and two individuals. Data is available for one semester with candidate scores ranging from 1.4 – 2. (1 is below expectations and 2 is acceptable.) While the data suggests that the program has not yet gathered information on the candidates' effects on P-12 student learning, the assignment / rubric is a strong assessment and may provide the program with future data, given additional time for refinement and candidate support.

Comment [jmj15]: By suggesting a positive trajectory, the reviewer provides important rationale for evidence regarding candidate effects on young children's learning.

Assessment #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation) also provides some evidence of candidate impact on student learning. Candidates are required to reflect upon the impact of their lessons on student learning. Assessment data for two semesters demonstrates that candidates are able to reflect upon whether their instructional activities have a positive effect on student learning.

In other program assessments, candidates develop lesson plans that assess student learning, but the program does not require students to collect the assessment data and analyze/reflect upon the impact of their lessons, as indicated by the assignment descriptions/rubrics.

PART D—EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

The institution reported these efforts to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program:

Additional support for English Language Learners through mentors and interventions to successfully pass the TExES examination (Data suggests these changes have been effective, with median scores increasing and fewer students needing to take the exam more than one time.)

Course revision to better address EC Content Knowledge, including family relationships

Comment [jmj16]: This information provides further support for why Standard 2 was met with conditions rather than not met.

New Program emphasis on candidates' knowledge of state standards, writing learning objectives with assessments related to objectives, and using a standardized lesson plan format across the program; lesson plan format requires candidates to modify instruction for diverse learners

Addition of a required methods course for English Language Learners

Unit dispositions identified in each course with an attempt to assess dispositions in core courses

The institution reported these plans for future improvement of the curriculum:

Faculty re-evaluation of scoring guides, including examining the Candidate Work Sample assignment / rubric and assessment results to determine if data is valid and reliable

Addition of a case study (There was no discussion about why this addition is being done, in relation to identified program weaknesses or the NAEYC standards)

Current faculty discussions about how to improve candidate learning in the content areas of science and social studies, as well as to improve the faculty instruction in social studies methods courses

Improvement in the area of candidates' assessing the impact of their teaching upon student learning (There were no specific plans reported for this weakness.)

Overall, the Program reported having areas needed for improvement, but did not identify recommendations for how this improvement will occur.

PART E—AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Assessments #2 (Thematic Unit), #6 (Storytime Lesson Plan / Presentation), #7 (Parent Brochure) are group or partner assessments. This makes the data questionable, as there are many variables in group projects that can affect assessment data, and there is no individual accountability identified on the rubrics, other than group participation.

Assessments #2 (Thematic Unit Plan), #6 (Storytime Lesson Plan), #7 (Parent Brochure), and #8 (Literature-Based Activity) are not field-based assignments and are developed in isolation, without an understanding of specific children's prior knowledge and skills, needs, and interests, for which the lessons or brochure are planned. As stated in Section I: Context, the Unit's Conceptual Framework reflects a commitment to constructivism, and a key element of this theory is building upon children's prior knowledge and skills, which is not evident in these program assessments.

Assessment #8 rubric is weak, due to not identifying levels of performance for each standard.

Comment [jmj17]: The reviewer's comments below clearly support comments made about the standards.

Comment [jmj18]: Very nice connection to the program's conceptual framework.

PART F—ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1—Comments on context and other topics not covered in sections B-D:

F.2—Concerns for possible follow up by the Board of Examiners:

5 faculty are identified for the program, with no Doctoral level faculty in early childhood education. One faculty has Masters level qualifications in early childhood, and the remaining faculty have degrees in reading, science, administration, and educational psychology. Four of the faculty do possess early

childhood teaching certificates, but the program faculty do not appear to have strong qualifications in early childhood education.

The program seems weak in field experience prior to student teaching. The field experience hours for each semester are: Phase I (3 clock hours), Phase II (27 clock hours), Phase III (49 clock hours) and Phase IV-student teaching (14 weeks). While the program is constrained by state requirements in course hours in education, candidates appear to have limited classroom experience prior to student teaching. This also leads to several program assessments being done in isolated course work, rather in relationship to actual children.

Comment [jmj19]: This is clearly an area for the NCATE Board of Examiners who must address faculty qualifications as part of the NCATE review process.

Comment [jmj20]: Again, the NCATE BOE will examine field experiences as part of NCATE Standard 3, and are asked to review whether or not field experiences are sufficiently intensive and extensive for the roles for which candidates are being prepared.

PART G—TERMS AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS FOR DECISIONS³

Program is nationally recognized. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation visit in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE review on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation review, in its published materials. **National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.**

Subsequent action by the institution: None. Nationally recognized programs may not file revised reports addressing any unmet standards or areas for improvement.

Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program is recognized through [date to be filled in by NCATE]. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified above, in its published materials. **National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.**

Subsequent action by the institution: To retain accreditation, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted within 18 months of the date of this report, no later than [date to be filled in by NCATE]. The report must address the conditions specified in the box below. Failure to submit a report by the date specified above will result in loss of national recognition.

Program is not nationally recognized. Programs that retain recognition from a prior review will lose recognition at the end of the semester in which the NCATE accreditation visit is held, unless a revised program report is submitted in or before that semester.

Subsequent action by the institution: A revised report, addressing unmet standards, may be submitted within 18 months of the date of this report, no later than [date to be filled in by NCATE]. The institution may submit a new program report at any time. In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

For further information on due dates or requirements, contact program review staff at NCATE (202-466-7496).

³ If the decision is "recognized with conditions," the box at the bottom of Section G must specify the conditions or issues to be addressed in the follow-up report from the institution.

X National recognition with conditions: The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (see above for specific date):

Standard 2: Stronger assessments / rubrics and data on individual teacher candidates that address their understanding of family characteristics, knowledge of how to establish reciprocal relationships, and involve families and communities in children's learning is needed.

Standard 5: Stronger assessments / rubrics and data on individual teacher candidates that addresses their use of ethical guidelines in their practice and their skills in advocacy are needed.

Assessment #5: This assessment is key to demonstrating that candidates have an impact upon P – 12 student learning. Further semesters' data that shows candidates meet the program's expectations for this Work Sample assignment and have made an impact upon student learning is needed.

Comment [jmj21]: These conditions logically follow from the assessment of the standards and the evidence. The fullness of the reviewers comments in those sections gives clear direction to the program for changes they need to make.