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).
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This report is in response to a(n):
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jn Revised Report
jn Response to Conditions Report

Program covered by this Review
BSED Human Development and Learning

Program Type
jn First teaching license

Award or Degree Level(s)
jn Baccalaureate
jn Post Baccalaureate
jn Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE Recognition of the Program(s):
jn Nationally recognized
jn Nationally recognized with conditions
jn Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation [See Part G]
jn Not nationally recognized

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)
The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comment:

Candidates are required to take the Praxis II Education of Young Children specialty test (0021). For the last three years, a 100% pass rate is reported. Reviewers are concerned, though, that the report suggests differences in the number of candidates that have completed the exam and those that have achieved passing scores. Thus, it is difficult to determine what the 100% pass rate represents. It appears to represent only those candidates for whom scores have been reported. This may not accurately portray the actuality of the pass rate for all who took the exam. For example, for the 2005-2006 year, 10 candidates (nearly 25%) had no results available. If these candidates did not pass, it could result in less than an 80% pass rate for that year. According to the report, this has occurred because some candidates have their scores sent to the state department of education rather than the university.

Summary of Strengths:

- Diverse field experience placements in rural, suburban, and urban settings.
- Field experiences attached to many courses beginning early in the program.
- A well-organized system is in place to review data collected and determine how to best use the data for purposes of program improvement.
- Assessments are conducted over several semesters, thus allowing for effective formative assessment of the program.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

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.

- Met
- Met with Conditions
- Not Met

Comment:

The components of standard one are aligned with elements of Assessment #1 (Praxis II). Given that data are available for only a portion of the candidates who took the exam, however, it is difficult to determine the strength of this evidence. Further, the data are holistic; no data specific to this standard was reported.

Assessment #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation): The section III chart suggests alignment of this assessment with this standard, but the narrative for the assessment does not indicate alignment. Clarification is needed. Data do suggest candidates are performing at acceptable levels.

Assessment #5 (Case Study): This assessment seems aligned with substandards 1.a and 1.b. The assignment is clearly described and includes multiple components; the rubric aligns generally with the various components of the assignment. The rubric does not, however, align well with the specific NAEYC substandards it is designed to evaluate. Data from two semesters suggest that candidates are
performing at the rating of 1 or 2 (meets expectations or exceeds expectations). The performance of candidates relative to the specific elements of standard one, however, cannot be determined at this time.

Assessment #6 (Infant Toddler Portfolio): This assessment involves observation of a child, forming conclusions about the child's development, and planning accordingly. The assignment focuses on all domains of development, and requires consideration of various theoretical perspectives. The assignment seems comprehensive in its focus, in relation to infants/toddlers. The rubric, though, seems to provide limited information with regard to the various components of the assignment. A single rating for each of the developmental components is obtained. The available data for two semesters indicate that candidates are performing at the rating of 1 or 2 (Expectations met with proficiency or Expectations met with distinction).

Assessment #8 (Student Teacher Portfolio): This assessment includes multiple artifacts that seem well-aligned with substandards 1.a, 1.b, and 1.c. The specific ways in which components of the portfolio are linked to the substandards are described clearly and in detail. The grading scale is based on the INTASC standards, rather than the NAEYC standards. The data provided indicate that candidates are performing at the levels of acceptable and proficient. While the specific alignments between INTASC standards and NAEYC standards are indicated in the data tables, it is difficult to determine performance in terms of individual substandards.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jœ</td>
<td>jœ</td>
<td>jœ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

The components of standard two are aligned with elements of Assessment #1 (Praxis II Education of Young Children). The content category labeled "Relationships with Families and Communities" aligns with all substandards of standard two. As noted above, however, data are reported for only a portion of candidates who completed the exam. (See additional comments related to this assessment in the Standard one comments.)

Assessment #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation): There is clear alignment of the assessment to substandards 2.a and 2.b. The specific ways in which the assessment is linked to each substandard are described in the program report. The process for gaining relevant information about the candidate's performance is clear. The assessment form is detailed, and the alignment of the domains assessed to the NAEYC standards is clear (Domain IV and Domain VI are aligned with NAEYC standard two). Data suggest that the majority of candidates performed at the level of "Acceptable" or "Proficient".

Assessment #5 (Case Study): This assessment seems aligned with substandards 2.a, 2.b, and 2.c. As noted previously, the assignment is clearly described and includes multiple components; the rubric aligns generally with the various components of the assignment. The rubric does not currently, however, align well with the specific NAEYC substandards it is designed to evaluate. Data from two semesters suggest that candidates are performing at the rating or 1 or 2 (meets expectations or exceeds expectations). It is not possible to determine from the data, however, the extent to which candidates are proficient with respect to the individual components of standard two.

Assessment #8 (Student Teacher Portfolio): This assessment includes artifacts that seem well-aligned
with substandards 2.a and 2.b. The specific ways in which components of the portfolio are linked to the substandards are described clearly and in detail. The data provided indicate that candidates are performing at the levels of acceptable and proficient. The evaluation tool focuses specifically on the INTASC standards, rather than the NAEYC standards. While the specific alignments between INTASC standards and NAEYC standards are indicated in the data tables, it is difficult to determine performance in terms of individual substandards.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**
The components of standard three are aligned well with elements of Assessment #1 (Praxis II Education of Young Children). The Assessment content category of this test aligns with all four of the substandards of standard three. (See comments noted in relation to standard one for concerns related to this assessment.)

Assessment #3 (Integrated Thematic Unit Plan): This assessment aligns with three of the four elements of standard three. Candidates are expected to develop multiple assessments aligned with learning outcomes associated with specific lessons. They also are expected to develop a plan for use of the assessment information to benefit the children's learning. Candidates must also indicate how confidentiality of student scores will be maintained. The rubric is clear, although only one item on the rubric reflects proficiency regarding responsible and effective assessment practice. The rubric does not assess candidates' performance relative to the individual components of standard three. The report indicates that plans for revision of the rubric to better align with NAEYC standards are in process. Data suggest that candidates are proficient in their abilities to plan for and utilize assessment procedures responsibly.

Assessment #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation): There is clear alignment of the assessment to substandards 3.a, 3.b, 3.c, and 3.d. The specific ways in which the assessment is linked to each substandard are described in the program report. This assessment is collaborative and is completed by the supervising faculty, the classroom teacher, and the candidate. The process for compiling the information needed to complete the assessment instrument is clear. The assessment form is detailed, and the alignment of the domains assessed to the NAEYC standards is clear (domain 3 is aligned with NAEYC standard three). Data suggest that the majority of candidates performed at the level of "Acceptable" or "Proficient".

Assessment #5 (Case Study): This assessment seems aligned with substandards 3.a, 3.b, and 3.d. The assignment is clearly described and seems to address the intent of this standard effectively. The rubric does not align well with the specific NAEYC substandards it is designed to evaluate, however. Steps are being taken by faculty to remedy this concern. Data from two semesters suggest that candidates are performing at the rating or 1 or 2 (meets expectations or exceeds expectations). The data are reported, however, as a single score (the mean of rubric component ratings). Based on the data, one cannot determine candidate performance specific to the components of standard three.
**Standard 4. Teaching and Learning.** Candidates integrate their understanding of and relationships with children and families; their understanding of developmentally 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Currently there is no strong evidence that this standard has been met. Inconsistencies and lack of clear alignments of the rubrics to the standards make it difficult to clearly interpret the data provided.

The components of standard four are aligned with elements of Assessment #1 (Praxis II). The Curriculum and instruction content category of this test aligns with the first three of the four substandards of standard four. Given that data is available for only a portion of the candidates who took the exam, however, it is difficult to determine the strength of this evidence.

Assessment #2 (Student Teaching Unit). This assessment aligns with each of the substandards of Standard 4. The descriptions of how the standards are addressed through this assessment are clear. The rubric used to evaluate each unit plan need to be more clearly aligned to the NAEYC standards. Data have been collected for the fall 2006 semester, and the data suggest that all but one of the candidates earned a rating of Proficient or Adequate (Acceptable). Given the lack of alignment, though, interpretation of the data in terms of candidate competence specific to this standard is somewhat difficult.

Assessment #3 (Integrated Thematic Unit Plan): It is stated that this assessment is aligned with all four of the substandards of standard four. The assignment involves the development of a week-long thematic unit focused on math and science, and would seem to provide clear evidence. The rubric is not aligned with the NAEYC standards, and a single score is reported. Thus, it is difficult to determine candidate performance in relation to the individual standards addressed by this assessment. Two semesters of data have been collected, and the data show that all candidates performed at the rating of "acceptable for certification", although given the issues noted, it cannot be clearly stated that this standard has been met.

Assessment #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation): There seems to be alignment of the assessment to substandards 4.b, 4.c, and 4.d. The specific ways in which the assessment is linked to each substandard are described in the program report. The data summary, however, is not congruent with the data tables, thus creating difficulties in interpretation of the information. Data for six criteria are provided, and data suggest that the majority of candidates performed at the level of "Acceptable" or "Proficient". Inconsistencies in the information, however, need to be clarified before it can be stated that the standard is met.

Assessment #5 (Case Study): This assessment seems aligned with only substandards 4.a and 4.c. The assignment is clearly described, but the rubric does not align well with the specific NAEYC substandards it is designed to reflect.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

The components of standard five are aligned with elements of Assessment #1 (Praxis II). The Professionalism content category of this test aligns with substandards of standard five. (See comments noted in relation to standard one for concerns related to this assessment.)

Assessment #3 (Integrated Unit Plan): While the section III chart shows this assessment as aligning with this standard, the narrative and data associated with this assessment show no such alignment.

Assessment #7 (Dispositions Checklist): This checklist is designed to measure elements of professional conduct, and is administered at three time points during the program. Faculty in specific courses evaluate each student and then meet with each student to review ratings. If necessary, students are counseled and a plan for improvement is developed. The assessment process has been thoughtfully designed and clearly aligns with standard five. The data presented in the report were collected from the third time point; two semesters of data were included in the report. The data suggest that candidates are performing in an acceptable manner.

Assessment #8 (Student Teacher Portfolio): This assessment includes reflections and a philosophy of education that seem well-aligned with substandards 5.a, 5.c, and 5.d. The specific ways in which components of the portfolio are linked to the substandards are described clearly and in detail. The grading scale is based on the INTASC standards, rather than the NAEYC standards. The data provided indicate that candidates are performing at the levels of acceptable and proficient. While the specific alignments between INTASC standards and NAEYC standards are indicated in the data tables, it is difficult to determine performance in terms of individual substandards.

**PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE**

**C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content**

The Assessments that provide data linked to knowledge of content are Assessments #1, 2, 6 and 8. With greater alignment between the components of the relevant standards and rubrics, these assessments have the potential of providing evidence.

**C.2. Candidates's ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions**

The assessments which provide the relevant data are Assessments #2, 3, 4, 5, and 7. Rubrics and data associated with Assessments 2 and 3, however, are not well aligned with the standards and thus do not seem to provide strong evidence. Assessments 4, 5, and 7 seem to provide clearer evidence in relation to these competencies. Assessment 7 is particularly strong (dispositions assessment). Greater alignment of rubrics to the components of relevant standards, however, would provide stronger evidence of competencies.

**C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning**

The assessments which have the potential to provide evidence are Assessments #2, 4, and 5. While each of these has an assessment component, it is not clear at this time that there is a strong focus on candidate impact on student learning. With some restructuring of the assessments and rubrics, Assessments 6 and
8 also have some potential for providing evidence of student learning. According to the report, this is an area that the faculty are seeking to strengthen.

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)

Several examples of ways in which the data have influenced the program have been included within the program report. Detailed findings and plans for modification are focused on content knowledge; professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and evidence of student learning. Examples are provided below.

- Review of the data has led faculty to the conclusion that some assessments need to be more closely aligned with the NAEYC standards and substandards.
- Additional experiences focused on knowledge related to assessment, as well as diverse learners and environments are being included in relevant courses.
- Despite earlier program improvements instituted in the spring of 2007, faculty see the need for additional strategies focused on better promoting candidates' abilities concerning family and community relationships.
- Beginning in the fall of 2007, Praxis II subscore data will become available, thus allowing for more specific analysis of candidate performance on NAEYC standards.
- Course content in specific courses has been modified to strengthen the focus on diverse student populations.
- Discussions are in process regarding strategies for providing stronger evidence of student learning through assessment.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

As the program report suggests, further development of the rubrics so that each aligns more fully with the elements of each of the NAEYC standards would provide more specific data, which then can be used to more clearly indicate program strengths, as well as to facilitate program improvement. Language that more clearly links to the intent of each of the NAEYC substandards will allow more accurate collection and interpretation of data.

Greater attention to assuring the sections of the report are congruent is needed. Due to inconsistencies, determining which standards were intended to align with each assessment proved somewhat difficult.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

None.

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

Efforts to gain access to Praxis II subscores and to require candidates to report scores to the university should be encouraged. Such data could provide valuable information about specific content knowledge and candidate performance overall. Requiring submission of scores to the appropriate body within the
university will provide more accurate data to all regarding actual candidate performance on this measure.

 PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- Program is nationally recognized. The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision 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 accreditation decision 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 decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

- Program is nationally recognized with conditions. 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 below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

- The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

02/01/2010

Subsequent action by the institution:* To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below. The program has up to two opportunities to address conditions within an 18 month period. The range of possible deadlines for submitting reports are 4/15/08, 9/15/08, 2/1/09, 4/15/09, or 9/15/09. Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 2/1/09 submission date.

*Note: for this semester only, programs who have been cited as Recognized with Conditions for a second time have been given one more opportunity to submit another Response to Conditions report. The report may be submitted April 15, 2008; Sept. 15, 2008, or Feb. 1, 2009.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

09/15/2009

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

If the Praxis II is used as evidence, scores need to be reported for all candidates.

Greater alignment between assessments, rubrics, and data with the components of standard 4 need to be
This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.