

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of Early Childhood Education Teachers

Southeastern Louisiana University

July 15, 2007

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 Conditions

Program(s) Covered by this Review	Program Type	Award or Degree Level(s)
Early Childhood Education Grade Level: Pk-3	Initial teacher license in field	Baccalaureate

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)

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

- Yes No Not applicable Not able to determine

Comment: At the time of the submission of the report, only four teacher candidates had completed the exam (over a period of three years).

A.3—Summary of Strengths:

- Although numbers are small, the rate of passage on the Praxis II is a good start for a successful program.
- Extensive field work (observation, tutoring, participation, etc.) in a variety of settings totaling at least 500 hours
- Resilience of faculty, candidates, and administrators in the face of natural disaster

PART B—STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

M = Met NM = Not Met

NAEYC Standard (Initial Teacher Preparation)	Specific Program or Level: Baccalaureate	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>	M	
<p>Comment: While certain of these assessments have little relevance to this standard, it is met through data provided by Assessments 1, 2, and 4.</p> <p><u>Assessment 1 Praxis.</u> Although only four candidates have been assessed so far, and their passage rate on the Praxis II indicates that they have good content knowledge for meeting element 1a (knowing and understanding young children’s characteristics and needs) and 1b (knowing and understanding the multiple influences on development and learning).</p> <p><u>Assessment 2 (Integrated Unit Plan Assessment)</u> The assessment meets all elements of the standard. This assignment is complex and includes many components. The elements of the assignment are specified, and the scoring guide aligns with the standard and with the facets of the assignment. The scoring guide has four levels of performance, although it seems these levels could be further specified to add clarity to the application of the rubric to each of the components of the assignment. Data for 16 candidates are reported, and on the assignment elements linked to this standard, candidates scored between 3.0 and 4.0 (on a four point scale), which appears to be considered acceptable by program reporters.</p> <p><u>Assessment 3 (LCET Methods Instrument)</u> The Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching Report is a generic assessment tool for all educational placements in the state. Without being provided with rubrics that detail use of the instrument from an early childhood perspective, reviewers are unable to determine its usefulness in demonstrating how the program and its candidates meet this standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 4 (Final Student Teaching Instrument)</u> There are no rubrics provided for determining how the differences between the scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 are specifically decided. For example, what indicators would a supervisor use to determine the differences between using a skill appropriately and competently and using a skill consistently with a high degree of competence and confidence? However, the early childhood addendum to this student teaching instrument does provide support for meeting element 1c (using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging learning environments). Data are reported on only one candidate, and while the candidate’s performance met expectations, the total amount of data provides very limited information for suggesting competence relative to Standard 1.</p> <p><u>Assessment 5 (Assessment Plan)</u> While specific early childhood behavioral rubrics for interpreting evidence would be of assistance to both reviewers and candidates (see Assessment 4 comments), this is an excellent assessment. However, it does not provide evidence for meeting the elements of this specific</p>		

NAEYC Standard (Initial Teacher Preparation)	Specific Program or Level: Baccalaureate	Specific Program or Level
<p>standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 6 (Prospective Education Candidate Surveys)</u> The data provided by this instrument should be of use at the unit level. However, it does not really provide additional data supporting the program's ability to meet NAEYC Standards.</p> <p><u>Assessment 7 (Classroom Management Plan)</u> As a generic assignment, this assessment is of limited use in determining the ability of the program to meet NAEYC Standards. However, it may provide limited support for meeting element 1a. Data for a total of 13 candidates are reported; all seem to have met expectations for performance on the evaluation elements connected to 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>M</p>	
<p>Comment: Again, while other assessments may provide useful data in reviewing this program, this standard is met through Assessments 1, 2, and 4.</p> <p><u>Assessment 1 Praxis.</u> The data from the test scores provides support for element 2a (knowing about and understanding family and community characteristics). Given that the data are aggregated and do not provide subscale scores, it is difficult to determine performance relative to Standard 2. Furthermore, only four candidates had taken the exam at the time of the report submission. Given the small number of candidates represented to date and difficulty in determining the extent to which elements of Standard 2 are addressed, continued monitoring of Praxis II scores and gaining information about relevant sub-scores seems necessary.</p> <p><u>Assessment 2 (Integrated Unit Plan Assessment)</u> The assessment provides evidence for meeting element 2a. As it is only a University classroom activity, it does not meet the practical implementation elements 2b, and 2c. The scoring guide has four levels of performance, although it seems these levels could be further specified to add clarity to the application of the rubric to each of the components of the assignment. Data for 16 candidates are reported, and on the assignment elements linked to this standard, candidates scored acceptably on two of the three. Candidates scored lower than deemed acceptable on "ways to know and understand characteristics of families and the community."</p> <p><u>Assessment 3 (LCET Methods Instrument)</u> The Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching Report is a generic assessment tool for all educational placements in the state. Without being provided with rubrics that detail use of the instrument from an early childhood perspective, reviewers are unable to determine its usefulness in demonstrating how the program and its candidates meet this standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 4 (Final Student Teaching Instrument)</u> There are no rubrics provided for determining how the differences between the scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 are specifically decided. For example, what indicators would a supervisor use to determine the differences between using a skill appropriately and competently and using a skill consistently with a high degree of competence and confidence? However, the early childhood addendum to this standard student teaching instrument does provide support for meeting elements 2b (supporting and empowering families and communities through respectful, reciprocal relationships) and 2c (involving families and communities in their children's development and learning). Data are reported on only one candidate, providing limited information for determining if this standard has been met.</p> <p><u>Assessment 5 (Assessment Plan)</u> While specific early childhood behavioral rubrics for interpreting evidence would be of assistance to both reviewers and candidates (see Assessment 4 comments), this is still an excellent assessment. However, it does not provide evidence for meeting the elements of this specific Standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 6 (Prospective Education Candidate Surveys)</u> See comments under Standard 1.</p> <p><u>Assessment 7 (Classroom Management Plan)</u> As a generic assignment, this assessment is of limited use in determining the ability of the program to meet NAEYC Standards. However, it may provide limited</p>		

NAEYC Standard (Initial Teacher Preparation)	Specific Program or Level: Baccalaureate	Specific Program or Level
support for meeting element 2a of this standard. Data for a total of 13 candidates are reported; all seem to have met expectations for performance on the evaluation element connected to this standard.		
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.	M	
<p>Comment: The standard is met through the following assessments:</p> <p><u>Assessment 1 Praxis.</u> The test scores provide support for meeting elements 3a (understanding the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment), and 3c (knowing about assessment partnerships with families and other professionals). However, given that the data are aggregated and do not provide subscale scores, it is difficult to determine true performance relative to Standard 2. Four candidates had taken the exam at the time of the report submission, each with acceptable pass rates.</p> <p><u>Assessment 2 (Integrated Unit Plan Assessment)</u> The assessment meets elements 3a and 3d (knowing about assessment partnerships with families and other professionals). It does not meet practical elements 3b and 3c. Data for 16 candidates are reported, and on the assignment elements linked to this standard, candidates scored acceptably on two of the three. Candidates scored lower than the program deemed acceptable on “utilize assessment results to confer with parents or other professionals to determine best practice.”</p> <p><u>Assessment 3 (LCET Methods Instrument)</u> The Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching Report is a generic assessment tool for all educational placements in the state. Without being provided with rubrics that detail use of the instrument from an early childhood perspective, reviewers are unable to determine its usefulness in demonstrating how the program and its candidates meet this standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 4 (Final Student Teaching Instrument)</u> There are no rubrics provided for determining how the differences between the scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 are specifically decided. For example, what indicators would a supervisor use to determine the differences between using a skill appropriately and competently and using a skill consistently with a high degree of competence and confidence? However, the early childhood addendum to this standard student teaching instrument does provide support for meeting elements 3b (knowing about and using observation, documentation, and other appropriate assessment tools and approaches) and 3c. Scores considered acceptable are clearly stated. Data are reported on only one candidate, and while the candidate’s performance met expectations, the total amount of data provides very limited evidence to suggest competence relative to Standard 3.</p> <p><u>Assessment 5 (Assessment Plan)</u> While specific early childhood behavioral rubrics for interpreting evidence would be of assistance to both reviewers and candidates (see Assessment 4 comments), this is still an excellent assessment. It provides solid evidence for meeting elements 3b and 3c of this standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 6 (Prospective Education Candidate Surveys)</u> See comments under Standard 1.</p> <p><u>Assessment 7 (Classroom Management Plan)</u> As a generic assignment, this assessment is of limited use in determining the ability of the program to meet NAEYC Standards. As such, it does not provide evidence for meeting any of the elements of this standard.</p>		
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.	M	
<p>Comment: This standard is met through the following assessments:</p> <p><u>Assessment 1 Praxis.</u> The test scores provide evidence for meeting element 4c (understanding content in</p>		

NAEYC Standard (Initial Teacher Preparation)	Specific Program or Level: Baccalaureate	Specific Program or Level
<p>early education). Only four candidates had taken the exam at the time of the report submission, however, all with acceptable pass rates.</p> <p><u>Assessment 2 (Integrated Unit Plan Assessment)</u> The assessment provides evidence for meeting elements 4c and 4d (building meaningful curriculum). The scoring guide has four levels of performance, although it seems these levels could be further specified to add clarity to the application of the rubric to each of the components of the assignment. Data for 16 candidates are reported, and on the assignment elements linked to this standard, candidates scored acceptably on all thirteen.</p> <p><u>Assessment 3 (LCET Methods Instrument)</u> The Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching Report is a generic assessment tool for all educational placements in the state. Without being provided with rubrics that detail use of the instrument from an early childhood perspective, reviewers are unable to determine its usefulness in demonstrating how the program and its candidates meet this standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 4 (Final Student Teaching Instrument)</u> There are no rubrics provided for determining how the differences between the scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 are specifically decided. For example, what indicators would a supervisor use to determine the differences between using a skill appropriately and competently and using a skill consistently with a high degree of competence and confidence? However, the early childhood addendum to this standard student teaching instrument provides support for meeting all elements of this standard. Scores considered acceptable are clearly stated. Data are reported on only one candidate, and while the candidate's performance met expectations, the total amount of data seems limited for determining competence relative to Standard 4.</p> <p><u>Assessment 5 (Assessment Plan)</u> While specific early childhood behavioral rubrics for interpreting evidence would be of assistance to both reviewers and candidates (see Assessment 4 comments), this is still an excellent assessment and it seems to provide evidence for meeting elements 4b (using developmentally effective approaches), 4c, and 4d.</p> <p><u>Assessment 6 (Prospective Education Candidate Surveys)</u> See comments under Standard 1.</p> <p><u>Assessment 7 (Classroom Management Plan)</u> As a generic educational student assignment, this assessment is of limited use in determining the ability of the program to meet NAEYC Standards. However, it may provide limited support for meeting element 4b of this standard. Data for a total of 13 candidates are reported; all seem to have met expectations for performance on the evaluation elements connected to this standard.</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>M</p>	
<p>Comment: This standard is met using data from Assessment 4.</p> <p><u>Assessment 1 Praxis.</u> The key elements in Standard 5 focus on practical application of knowledge. As Praxis II is a paper and pencil examination, it does not provide evidence for meeting this standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 2 (Integrated Unit Plan Assessment)</u> The key elements in Standard 5 focus on practical application of knowledge. As this assessment is a university classroom activity, it does not provide evidence for meeting this standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 3 (LCET Methods Instrument)</u> The Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching Report is a generic assessment tool for all educational placements in the state. Without being provided with rubrics that detail use of the instrument from an early childhood perspective, reviewers are unable to determine its usefulness in demonstrating how the program and its candidates meet this standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 4 (Final Student Teaching Instrument)</u> There are no rubrics provided for determining how the differences between the scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 are specifically decided. For example, what indicators would a supervisor use to determine the differences between using a skill appropriately and</p>		

NAEYC Standard (Initial Teacher Preparation)	Specific Program or Level: Baccalaureate	Specific Program or Level
<p>competently and using a skill consistently with a high degree of competence and confidence? However, the early childhood addendum to this standard student teaching instrument does provide support for meeting all elements of this standard. Data are reported on only one candidate, providing limited evidence that this standard has been met.</p> <p><u>Assessment 5 (Assessment Plan)</u> While specific early childhood behavioral rubrics for interpreting evidence would be of assistance to both reviewers and candidates (see Assessment 4 comments), this is still an excellent assessment and, as such, provides evidence for meeting element 5d of this standard.</p> <p><u>Assessment 6 (Prospective Education Candidate Surveys)</u> See comments under Standard 1.</p> <p><u>Assessment 7 (Classroom Management Plan)</u> As a generic educational student assignment, this assessment is of limited use in determining the ability of the program to meet NAEYC Standards. As such, it does not provide any evidence for meeting any of the elements of this standard.</p>		

PART C—EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1—Candidates’ knowledge of content

Although the numbers are limited, solid knowledge of content is shown by candidates in their passage rates on the Praxis II (0020), the Integrated Unit Plan Assessment, and the Final Student Teaching Instrument. However, because data are limited at this point, continued monitoring of results from these instruments is necessary.

C.2—Candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

This ability is shown primarily by the Final Student Teaching Instrument and the LCET Methods Instrument, which show that faculty and supervisors find candidate ability is excellent. More rubrics that assess candidate performance would help demonstrate their ability to apply their knowledge.

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

While this impact is demonstrated in the LCET Methods Instrument and the Final Student Teaching Instrument, it will be particularly evident from the Assessment Plan. Again, more performance-based focus of the assessments would strengthen this aspect of the program.

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)

Although the program has limited data available because of the small number of candidates and the interruption of what was a newly reorganized program by Hurricane Katrina, it has implemented or is planning to implement the following changes:

- An early childhood addenda to the student teaching observation assessment
- Professional development for candidates including a NAEYC-based organization
- Development of a new class in Classroom Management in Beginning Teaching in Prekindergarten-Elementary
- Refinements to the Prospective Education Candidate Survey

As no subscale data relative to the Praxis II performance of candidates were available, the program will request submission of subscale scores in an effort to more effectively determine the extent to which candidates are gaining necessary content knowledge.

PART E—AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

The program could be strengthened in the following ways:

- More discrete matching of assessments with standards. In several cases, reviewers could not determine how a given assessment applied to a standard for which it was submitted.
- Continued collection and monitoring of data. Especially given the small number of program completers, data need to be collected and monitored on an ongoing basis.
- More performance based data. Much of the data that were presented is knowledge-based, leaving performance-based elements of each standard unaccounted for.
- Development of rubrics, specifically for Assessments 4 and 5.

PART F—ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

While it is possible that all assessments submitted in a report can meet all the standards, in practice it is unlikely. In its next report, the program should be more discerning in its decisions on which assessments provide evidence for specific standards.

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

PART G—TERMS AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS FOR DECISIONS

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 other concerns noted in this report.

