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).

**Cover Page**

**Name of Institution**
University of Memphis, TN

**Date of Review**
02 / 01 / 2008

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

**Program covered by this Review**
Early Childhood Licensure (Prek-3) and Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT)

**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:**

While the Praxis II (0021) test is required of all candidates, they are not required to report the results to the institution. The report narrative indicates that the passing rate of the MAT candidates is 100% over the last three years. However, not all candidates reported their scores.

The chart included in the attachment related to Assessment #1 (Praxis II) indicates that the information provided is for candidates in the BSED program rather than the MAT program.

**Summary of Strengths:**

- Diverse field experience placements in rural, suburban, and urban settings.
- 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 throughout the various levels of education and training and focused on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to be an effective teacher.

**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.

<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:**

Discrepancies between the Section III chart and the individual assessment descriptions make it somewhat difficult to determine which of the assessments are intended by the program to align with this standard. The chart suggests that Assessment #4 (student teaching evaluation) aligns with the standard, although the descriptive material associated with the assessment makes no claims related to this standard. The chart does not list Assessment #5 (Case Study), but the assessment narrative does link the assessment to this standard.

Assessment #1 (Praxis II): This assessment provides some evidence of candidates' competence in relation to substandards 1.a and 1.b. However, the data is available for only a portion of the candidates who took the exam so it is difficult to determine the strength of this evidence. Finally, the data provided are labeled BSED rather MAT program.

Assessment #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation). The narrative does not list the standards as being addressed by any component of this assessment, however, data are provided in conjunction with
Two ratings are listed for each of two semesters, both indicating acceptable performance.

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 and associated data table align with the standard. The data table provides three ratings associated with standard 1. Data from one semester suggest that candidates are meeting expectations.

Assessment #6 (Infant Toddler Portfolio): This assessment involves observation of a child, forming conclusions about the child's development and planning based on the child's observed needs. The assessment seems to align with the intent of Standard 1. The rubric, however, 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 elements of standard 1 are not linked clearly to the rubric. The available data for two semesters indicate that candidates are performing at the rating of 2 (Expectations met with distinction).

Assessment #8 (Student Teacher Portfolio): This assessment includes multiple artifacts as well as a philosophy of education 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. The grading scale is based on the INTASC standards, rather than the NAEYC standards. The data provided indicate that candidates are performing at the level of "acceptable". While the specific alignments between INTASC standards and NAEYC standards are indicated in the data tables.

**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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Assessment #1 (Praxis II): This assessment could provide evidence of candidates' competence relative to this standard, but only in relation to substandards 2.a, 2.b, and 2.c. Only a single score across all content categories of the exam is reported, however, making it difficult to tease out performance relative to individual standards. Furthermore, due to discrepancies in the data reported it is difficult to determine the extent of candidate competence. (Please see comments re: standard 1 for concerns related to this assessment.)

Assessment #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation): There is alignment of the assessment to standard 2 (2.a, 2.b, & 2.c). The specific ways in which the assessment is linked to each substandard are described in the program report, although the performance standards and levels need to align more clearly with the elements of this standard. The data table notes a single item in association with Standard 2. Data were presented for two semesters, and the data suggest that the majority of candidates performed at the level of "Acceptable" or "Proficient". Given the limited focus of the rubric and the limitations in alignment to the standard, however, the meaning of the data in terms of competences related to this standard seem uncertain.

Assessment #5 (Case Study): This assessment seems aligned with elements of standard 2. The assignment is clearly described and includes multiple components. The rubric and associated data table align with the standard. The data table provides two different performance ratings associated with this
Assessment #8 (Student Teacher Portfolio): This assessment includes artifacts that seem 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. The data provided indicate that candidates are performing at the level of "acceptable". 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 NAEYC substandards; a single rating is provided for each candidate on standard 2.

**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:**
Assessment #1 (Praxis II): This assessment could provide evidence of candidates' competence relative to this standard. Only a single score across all content categories of the exam is reported, however, making it difficult to tease out performance relative to individual standards. Furthermore, due to discrepancies in the data reported it is difficult to determine the extent of candidate competence. (Please see comments re: standard 1 for concerns related to this assessment.)

Assessment #3 (Integrated Thematic Unit): This assessment aligns effectively with three of the four elements of Standard 3. 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, however, does not align clearly with NAEYC standards. Furthermore, only one item on the rubric reflects proficiency regarding responsible and effective assessment practice. The report indicates that plans for revision of the rubric to better align with NAEYC standards are in process. Data suggest that candidate performance is "acceptable for certification" or "exemplary for certification." A single rating is provided for each candidate, which presumably focuses on overall performance, not standard-specific performance.

Assessment #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation): There appears to be alignment of the assessment to each element of standard 3. The connections between standard 3 and specific performance standards/indicators is clear. The rubric is clear, with distinct performance levels, although only two rubric items seem to associate with the intent of Standard 3. Data were presented for two semesters, and the data suggest that the majority of candidates performed at the level of "Acceptable" or "Proficient".

Assessment #5 (Case Study): This assessment is aligned well with Standard 3. The assignment is clearly described, and the rubric and associated data table align with the standard. The data table provides four different performance ratings associated with this standard. Data from one semester suggest that candidates are performing at the rating or 1 or 2.

**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>
</table>

**Comment:**

Assessment #1 (Praxis II): This assessment could provide some evidence of candidates' competence relative to this standard. However, only a single score across all content categories of the exam is reported and discrepancies in the data make it difficult to determine the extent of candidate competence. (Please see comments above for concerns related to this assessment.)

Assessment #2 (Student Teaching Unit). This assessment seems to align with the substandards of Standard 4. While there are three distinct levels of performance for each of the criteria for scoring, they are not clearly aligned to NAEYC standards, nor is the competence level/rating assigned consistent across criteria. For some criteria the levels are noted as "A, B or C", and for others the levels are noted as "1, 2, 3". Furthermore, the narrative is not congruent with the data table nor the rubric. The summary indicates all candidates were rated 1 or 2, yet the table suggests that one candidate earned a rating of "0" on one of the criteria. The summary suggests seven subcategories evaluated within the rubric, yet the rubric and the data table seem to indicate eight subcategories. Thus, there are clear inconsistencies between the narrative and the rubric, as well as the data table. Data have been collected for two semesters, and the data suggest overall that candidates earned a rating of Proficient or Adequate.

Assessment #3 (Integrated Thematic Unit): Although the rubric does not align clearly with NAEYC standards there is some alignment with standard 4. Data suggest that candidate performance is "acceptable for certification" or "exemplary for certification." Because scores are not disaggregated it is not possible to determine candidate performance relative to standard 4.

Assessment #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation): This appears to be a generic student teaching assessment so it does not always reflect the NAEYC philosophy of teaching and learning. However, it does provide some alignment with NAEYC standards. The data table notes 7 item scores associated with this standard. Data (2 semesters) suggest that the majority of candidates performed at the level of "Acceptable" or "Proficient".

Assessment #5 (Case Study): This assessment is aligned partially with Standard 4. The assignment is clearly described, and the rubric and associated data table align with the standard. Data suggest acceptable ratings.

While there is some evidence of candidate's knowledge of teaching and learning, better alignment between the standards and evidence and clearer alignments to rubrics seems necessary before the standard can be met.

**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>
</table>
Comment:
Assessment #1 (Praxis II): This assessment provides some evidence of candidates' competence relative to this standard. Only a single score across all content categories of the exam is reported, however, making it difficult to tease out performance relative to individual standards. Discrepancies in the data also make it difficult to determine the extent of candidate competence.

Assessment #2 (Student Teaching Unit). This assessment seems to align partially with the substandards of Standard 5. While there are three distinct levels of performance for each of the criteria for scoring, they are not clearly aligned to NAEYC standards, nor is the competence level/rating assigned consistent across criteria. As noted in the comments associated with standard 4, there are clear inconsistencies between the narrative and the rubric, as well as the data table. Data have been collected for two semesters, and the data suggest overall that candidates earned a rating of Proficient or Adequate (Acceptable). Inconsistencies among the pieces of the attachment need to be corrected, to allow reviewers to more clearly determine what the assessment and data illustrate.

Assessment #4 (Student Teaching Evaluation): There is alignment of the assessment to standard 5. The connections between standard 5 and specific performance standards/indicators noted on the assessment instrument are clear. The data table notes 4 item scores associated with this standard. Data (2 semesters) suggest that the majority of candidates performed at the level of "Acceptable" or "Proficient".

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 5. The data presented in the report were collected from the third time point; one semester of data was 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, however. The data provided indicate that candidates are performing at the levels of acceptable and proficient, although the data are limited to a single rating. 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 based on this single rating.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content
The assessments that provide evidence relative to knowledge of content are Assessments #1, 2, 6, and 8. While there are issues associated with Assessments #1 and 2 (as noted in the standard specific comments), there is clear potential for both to provide necessary evidence. The infant toddler portfolio and the student teaching portfolio are clearly linked to content knowledge, but lack of alignment of the rubrics and data to the standards make it difficult to determine competence in terms of content knowledge.
C.2. Candidates's ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Primary evidence associated with candidates' understanding and application of knowledge, skills and dispositions is provided by Assessments #2, 3, 4, 7, and 8. Assessment #7 provides a clear assessment of candidate dispositions, while Assessments #2, 3, 4, and 8 provide evidence of candidates' competence in terms of pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills. The data associated with Assessments #2, 3, 4 and 8, however, seem to provide only partial evidence of the strength of candidates' performance due to difficulties with alignment of the rubric to the NAEYC standards, as well as inconsistencies within the narrative (Assessment #2).

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

There seems to be weak evidence in this area, since evidence is aligned with choosing appropriate assessments and communicating assessment results to parents/families. No evidence was found related to how candidates were impacting the learning of students in the field, and though there was a description linking at least reflection of the candidate related to their impact on student learning, this was not evident in any rubric or data.

Assessment #5 did not clearly demonstrate any evidence other than using assessment to understand developmental needs of the child in the study.

Assessments #6 & #8 again focused more on choosing appropriate assessments and communicating assessment results. Assessment #8 seems to have the potential to provide evidence, but the structure of the rubric and the data provided don't currently provide solid information relative to this competence.

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 program report is quite specific about processes for review of data and planning for improvements to the program. This was made evident through specific course references and alignment with NAEYC language. Following are specific examples derived from the report.

- Review of data has yielded the following concerns: candidate performance relative to understanding of diverse student learning, communication of student progress and reflection. In response to these concerns, faculty have integrated within courses more experiences that focus on understanding and application of knowledge related to assessment, diverse learners and environments.

- Concerns about candidates' abilities related to family and community relationships have resulted in program modifications, although ongoing assessment has yielded continuing concerns. Means are being sought to better address these issues.

- Concerns about the lack of alignment between assessment rubrics and the NAEYC standards and substandards are in the process of being addressed.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

Attention to the following will strengthen the effectiveness of assessments associated with this report:
PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:
Clarification of expectations regarding Praxis II are needed. The report initially suggests that passing scores on Praxis II (0021) are a prerequisite for admission to the Teacher Education Program. In another section within the report, the reader is led to believe that passing Praxis II scores is a condition of exiting the program. Thus, it is confusing as to the specific time point that candidates must complete the Praxis II exam.

Inconsistencies within the report in terms of grade levels (prek-3 vs. prek-4) should be corrected.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:
Praxis II results have been somewhat confusing in this report. The program needs to clarify the discrepancies between the numbers of candidates completing the exam and those passing. The program claims a 100% passing rate, yet in some academic years, 25-50% of candidates might not have reported their results. It seems there is no way to accurately determine the passage rate with incomplete data such as that reported.

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:
1. 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.
2. 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.
3. The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS
The program is recognized through:

MM  DD  YYYY
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.

MM  DD  YYYY
09  /  15  /  2009

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Praxis Results are used as evidence it is important that all scores are reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater alignment of the assessments with the components of standard 4, as well as the rubrics and data, are necessary to allow for clear interpretation of the evidence provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 2 has some confusing evidence that needs to be described more clearly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please click "Next"**

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