

**Program Report for the  
Initial Preparation of Early Childhood Teachers  
National Association for the Education for Young Children (NAEYC)**

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION**

**C O V E R   S H E E T**

**Institution** Howard University School of Education    **State** Washington, DC

**Date submitted** February 1, 2008

**Name of Preparer** Department of Curriculum and Instruction (Fang Wu, Ph.D.)

**Phone #** (202)806-7343    **Email** f\_wu@howard.edu

**Program documented in this report:**

**Name of institution's program (s)** Early Childhood Education

**Grade levels for which candidates are being prepared** Pre-K through 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade

**Degree or award level** Master of Art in Teaching (MAT)

**Is this program offered at more than one site?**    **Yes**     **No**  
If yes, list the sites at which the program is offered \_\_\_\_\_

**Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared**

Early Childhood Initial Teacher License, Washington, DC

**Program report status:**

- Initial Review**
- Response to a Not Recognized Decision**
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions**
- Response to a Deferred Decision**

**State licensure requirement for national recognition:**

NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section III. Does your state require such a test?

**Yes**     **No**

## SECTION I—CONTEXT

### 1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of NAEYC standards

Howard University School of Education's Early Childhood Teacher Education Program is designed to meet the licensure requirements for the District of Columbia for teaching Pre-K to 3<sup>rd</sup> grades. Housed in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, the Early Childhood Teacher Education Program consists of two initial certification programs. The first initial certification program is the five-year, dual-degree program (152 credit hours) through which the candidate may obtain a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree in human development and a Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) degree in early childhood education. Successful completion of all program requirements will lead to initial teaching certification for Pre-K to 3<sup>rd</sup> grades in the District of Columbia. The second initial certification program is a two-year graduate degree program (36 credit hours) through which the candidate may earn a Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) degree in early childhood education. Successful completion of all program requirements will also lead to initial teaching certification for Pre-K to 3<sup>rd</sup> grades. Currently, most early childhood education candidates graduate from the five-year program.

Guided by the NAEYC's Standards for initial licensure programs, the Early Childhood Teacher Education Program at Howard University is committed to produce teacher candidates who are well versed in developmentally appropriate practice for young children. The program expects all teacher candidates to demonstrate an understanding of child development as well as its implications in teaching practices, to demonstrate a mastery of strategies and methods for teaching children ages 0-8, to demonstrate an understanding of and respect for children's diverse family backgrounds, and to demonstrate practical knowledge and skills of educational assessment and evaluation.

In addition, as an essential component of a Historically Black Institution, the Early Childhood Teacher Education Program embraces a philosophy of cultural diversity and pluralism that is consistent with NAEYC's principles of developmentally appropriate practice. Teacher candidates are prepared with competencies needed to provide total education to young children. Special emphasis is placed on practical experiences and methodological strategies for teaching ethnic minority and underserved children in urban schools. The program's primary knowledge base is grounded in the philosophies, theories, and applications of developmentally appropriate practices. The program's knowledge base also includes the cultural inferences and contributions from relevant Afro-American scholars such as Dr. James Comer, his conceptual framework, and his model of effective schools for black children. Therefore, the program's goal of excellence and appropriateness of teacher preparation is achieved not only in terms of academics and competency mastery, but also from a perspective of ethnic respect as well as cultural compatibility.

**2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships**

All Early Childhood candidates in the initial certification programs must fulfill a prescribed number of hours in the field, which include guided observation (O), participation (P), and student teaching internship (two placements). For clarity, the clinical experiences required for each program will be summarized separately in a tabular format.

Five-year Early Childhood Education Program (B.S. and M.A.T.)

Candidates in the five-year program must fulfill minimum requirements of field/clinical experience through the courses listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Field experience requirements for candidates in the five-year Early Childhood Education Program.

<b>Year in Program</b>	<b>Required for Courses</b>	<b>Number of Hours</b>
Year 2	ECED160 Introduction to Early Childhood Education ELEM 025 Field Work & Seminar	10 hrs (O)
Year 3	ECED191-Curriculum and Instructional Design in ECE Classroom ECED193-Instructional Strategies for ECE Teachers	10 hrs (O)
Year 4	EDUC395-Educative Value of Play	10 hrs (O)
Year 5 1 <sup>st</sup> semester	EDUC295-Theories and Perspectives in Child Development EDUC375-Integrated Methods and Technology I EDUC376-Integrated Methods and Technology II	260 hrs (O&P)
Year 5 2 <sup>nd</sup> semester	EDUC296-Internship: Pre-primary (Infancy to K) EDUC297-Internship: Primary (Grades 1 <sup>st</sup> – 3 <sup>rd</sup> )	420 hrs (clinical internship)

Two-year Early Childhood Education Program (M.A.T.)

Candidates in the two-year program must fulfill minimum requirements of field/clinical experience through the courses listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Field experience requirements for candidates in the two-year Early Childhood Education Program.

<b>Required for Courses</b>	<b>Number of Hours</b>
EDUC295-Theories and Perspectives in Child Development	10 hrs (O)
EDUC395-Educative Value of Play	10 hrs (O)
EDUC375-Integrated Methods and Technology I EDUC376-Integrated Methods and Technology II	200 hrs (O&P)
EDUC296-Internship: Pre-primary (Infancy – Kindergarten) EDUC297-Internship: Primary (Grades 1 <sup>st</sup> – 3 <sup>rd</sup> )	420 hrs (clinical internship)

The guided observations focus on all aspects of early childhood curriculum such as teacher-student interaction, classroom environment plan, play as a learning medium, instructional strategies used by teachers, and peer social interaction, etc. Candidates in the 5-year program are also required to visit different early childhood education institutions such as Head Start program, Montessori program, and Howard University early childhood programs.

The internship for the early childhood education candidates consists of 12 weeks of full-time student teaching experience. Most candidates are placed in DCPS schools with a few exceptions in schools in Fairfax County, Virginia or Prince George’s County, Maryland. During the internship each candidate must complete two six-week placements, one in a classroom with children ranged in age from infancy to kindergarten, and another with students in first, second, or third grade.

**3. Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program**

For clarity, the admission, retention, and exit requirements for the two initial certification programs will be described separately below.

**Five-year M.A.T. Program**

All candidates must fulfill all of the following requirements in order to be admitted and retained in the program, and to exit the program with expected degree as well as certification.

***Pre-admission Requirements***

- Must be enrolled in the Department of Human Development and Psychoeducational Studies in the School of Education in the approved five-year major area (Human Development major)
- Must earn a grade of "B" or better in ECED 160 Introduction to Early Childhood Education and EDUC 020 Educational Psychology

***Formal Admission Requirements***

- Must be formally admitted to the teacher certification program by the second semester of the junior year

- Must have a 2.7 grade point average (GPA) for formal admission
- Must have the recommendation of the major department/departmental adviser
- Must pass all three parts of the PRAXIS I: Academic Skills Assessments Examination prior to the beginning of the junior year

***Retention Requirement***

- Maintain a minimum of 2.7 GPA overall and 3.0 in all professional courses (ELEM, ECED, and EDUC) at both undergraduate and graduate levels

***Exit Requirements***

- Pass the graduate Expository Writing examination
- Pass the graduate Comprehensive Examination
- Pass the PRAXIS II test in early childhood education
- Successfully complete an action research paper
- Successfully complete a professional portfolio
- Successfully complete the Clinical Internship

**Two-year M.A.T. Program**

All candidates must fulfill all of the following requirements in order to be admitted and retained in the program, and to exit the program with expected degree as well as certification.

***Admission Requirements***

- An official transcript of all College/University courses completed with a minimum undergraduate cumulative GPA of 2.7 on a 4.0 scale
- Passing scores of Praxis I tests (reading, writing, and mathematics)
- Possessing a Bachelor's degree in a related field
- Three letters of recommendation

***Retention Requirement***

- Maintain a minimum of 3.0 GPA in all required courses.

***Exit Requirements***

- Pass the graduate Expository Writing examination
- Pass the graduate Comprehensive Examination
- Pass the PRAXIS II test in early childhood education
- Successfully complete an action research paper
- Successfully complete a professional portfolio
- Successfully complete the Clinical Internship

**4. Description of the relationship of the program to the unit's conceptual framework**

The mission of the School of Education (the Unit hereafter) is to prepare professional educators and human development specialists in teaching, research, service delivery, policy, and advocacy. The conceptual framework, which guides the work of the Unit, sets ultimate unit goals with respect to preparation of educators. All programs in the Unit, including the Early Childhood Teacher Education programs, are designed to prepare candidates to function as reflective educators/practitioners, competent researchers, educational leaders, and change agents. More specifically, the Unit listed seven demonstrable student learning outcomes, which include:

- 1) the ability to think critically
- 2) the ability to analyze and solve problems
- 3) the ability to make ethical decisions
- 4) the ability to apply knowledge by linking theory and practice
- 5) knowledge and understanding of self, history, and community
- 6) the ability to assume leadership roles in the global community
- 7) a demonstration of knowledge, sensitivity, and skills in working with diverse populations

The Unit's conceptual framework is considered adequately universal in guiding all teacher certification programs in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I), the home department of Early Childhood Teacher Education programs. C&I is committed to the preparation of candidates who are well versed in their teaching fields and have strong teaching abilities. The seven student learning outcomes listed above provide a clear vision for the best attributes that the Unit expects its candidates to possess, which offers guidance to the Early Childhood Education programs in designing, implementing, and evaluating its courses of studies.

#### **5. Indication of whether the program has a unique set of program assessments and the relationship of the program's assessments to the unit's assessment system**

There are several assessments that serve evaluation purposes for all comparable academic programs in the Unit, including the Early Childhood Education program. Examples of such assessments include Master's Degree Comprehensive Examination and Graduate Expository Writing Examination. In addition, as the only department in the Unit that prepares teacher candidates, C&I also has a set of assessments that are universally conducted with candidates in its certification programs. Such assessments include Praxis I & II examinations, professional portfolio, Teacher Candidate Evaluation Instrument, and an action research project. The Early Childhood Education initial certification programs are no exception. However, the content in each assessment are program-specific whenever it is applicable.

In addition to the universal assessments implemented throughout the Unit, there are also program-specific assessments built in professional courses to assess candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the field of early childhood education. Such assessments include unit plans, classroom design project, parent newsletters, and bulletin board design/construction.

#### **EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROGRAM FOR THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT MAJOR**

The Human Development Major requires thirty (30) credit hours. The student may earn the Bachelor of Science degree in four years with a minimum total of 128 credit hours. The Master of Art in Teaching (MAT) degree program in Early Childhood Education requires a minimum of 24 credit hours in the fifth year.

##### **FIRST YEAR-Teacher preparation hours plus major**

(15)		(16)	
ENGL 002	Freshman English (3)	ENGL 003	Freshman English (3)
MATH 006	College Algebra I (3)	COMP 001	Life Science (3)
PHED 002	Swimming (1)	MATH 010	College Algebra II (3)
PHED 159	Health Science (1)	PHED ____	Physical Education (1)
PSYC 050	Intro to Psychology (3)	ARTH 161	Art Appreciation (3)



2. Students must earn a grade of "B" or better in **ECED 160 Introduction to Early Childhood Education** and **EDUC 020 Educational Psychology**.
3. Students must take the PRAXIS I: Academic Skills Assessments Examination prior to the beginning of the junior year. (Information about PRAXIS is available in Room 104, School of Education). Students must go to Center for Academic Reinforcement (CAR) in Room 110 of ASB Building for pre-test before they take the Praxis I tests.

#### **Formal Admission Requirements (Third Year)**

1. Students will be formally admitted to the teacher certification program by the second semester of the junior year. Application should be made by October 1 of the junior year for December admission. Applications are available in the Office of Teacher Education and office of Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Room 203, ASA Building.
2. Students will be required to write an essay on their reason(s) for wanting to enter the teaching profession. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction will interview the applicants.
3. Students must have a 2.7 grade point average (GPA) for formal admission or 2.5 for provisional admission.
4. Students must have the recommendation of their major department/departmental adviser.
5. Students must meet the requirements for Praxis I examination in order to be admitted into the program. Passing Praxis I scores must be in accordance with the requirement of the state in which each applicant is seeking certificate. Below is the Praxis I passing scores required in the District of Columbia.

<b>Test Format</b>	<b>Scores</b>
Reading (paper & pencil)	172
Writing (paper & pencil)	171
Mathematics (paper & Pencil)	174

#### **Retention in Teacher Education programs**

1. Students will be assigned an academic adviser in HDPES for undergraduate study and an adviser in C&I for graduate study in the fifth year. Students are expected to maintain contact with their advisers.
2. Students must maintain a minimum of 2.7 GPA overall and 3.0 in all professional courses (ELEM, ECED, and EDUC) at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

#### **Admission to Graduate School (Fifth Year)**

Admission to the School of Education graduate program (i.e., fifth year of study) requires a formal application through the Office of Graduate Admissions. Minimum GPA requirement for full admission: 2.7. This application process should be implemented in the semester prior to receiving the Bachelor's degree. It will adhere to regular admissions criteria for the School of Education.

Further information may be obtained from the Chairman of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (Room 203, ASA) or from the Director of Teacher Education.

#### **Exit Requirements**

- Successful completion of the Expository Writing examination
- Successful completion of graduate comprehensive examination
- Successful completion of PRAXIS II test
- An action research paper
- A professional portfolio

**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**  
**EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION**  
*Master of Arts in Teaching Degree (M.A.T.)*

**PURPOSE**

The Master of Arts in Teaching Degree (M.A.T.) in Early Childhood Education is designed to develop professional expertise leading to initial certification for grades pre-kindergarten through third grade. This program is especially constructed for candidates who possess an undergraduate degree without practical experiences in teaching. The course of study enables the candidate to acquire skills in instructional strategies, early intervention, knowledge of curriculum development, and early childhood program administration.

**TIME INVESTMENT**

Completion of the M.A.T. degree requires approximately two years of full-time study. Courses are available during the afternoon and primarily the early evening. Required field based courses, however, are offered during the day in order to provide the maximum amount of clinical experiences in schools and centers.

**COURSE WORK**

Foundations	6 hours
Research and Statistics	6 hours
Area of Specialization ( <i>Required Courses</i> )	18 hours
Internship	6 hours
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>36 hours</b>

**ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

- Minimum undergraduate cumulative GPA of 2.7 on a 4.0 scale
- An accurate and complete graduate program application packet that consists of the following items:
  - An autobiographical sketch
  - A statement of interest of at least 300 words
  - An official transcript of all College/University courses completed
  - Three letters of recommendation
  - Passing scores of Praxis I tests (reading, writing, and mathematics) in accordance with the requirements of the state in which the applicant is seeking certificate.
- Application deadlines: Fall deadline Feb. 15<sup>th</sup>, Spring deadline Nov. 1<sup>st</sup>

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

Contact:

Early Childhood Program Coordinator  
Department of Curriculum and Instruction  
School of Education, Howard University  
2441 Fourth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20059

**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**  
**EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION**  
*Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) Degree*  
**36 Hours**

**FOUNDATIONS** (6 semester hours required. Select one course from each area.)

Psychological Foundations

- HUDE 220     Advanced Educational Psychology (3) or  
EDUC 290     Theories and Perspectives of Child Development (3)

Sociological Foundations

- EDAP 231     Multicultural Education (3) or  
EDUC 367     Diversity in Teacher Education (3)

**RESEARCH SKILLS** (6 semester hours required)

- HUDE 205     Introduction to Statistical Methods (3)  
EDUC 379     Research in Curriculum and Teaching (3)

**AREA OF SPECIALIZATION** (18 semester hours required)

- EDUC 224     Introduction to Assessment and Measurement in Teaching (3)  
EDUC 262     Literature for Children and Adolescents (3)  
EDUC 267     Diagnosis and Evaluation of Exceptional Children (3)  
EDUC 289     Introduction to Teacher Education (3)  
EDUC 375     Integrated Methods & Technology I: Early Childhood (3)  
                  (*Reading, Language Arts, and Social Studies*) with Field  
                  Experience  
EDUC 376     Integrated Methods & Technology II: Early Childhood (3)  
                  (*Science and Math*) with Field Experience  
EDUC 395     Educative Value of Play (3)

**INTERNSHIP** (6 semester hours required)

- EDUC 296     Internship (3): Pre-primary (Infancy through Pre-K)  
EDUC 297     Internship (3): Primary (K-3)

**EXIT REQUIREMENTS**

- Successful completion of the Expository Writing examination
- Successful completion of graduate comprehensive examination
- Successful completion of PRAXIS II tests as required by the program
- An action research paper
- A professional portfolio

## SECTION IV— EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

The assessments listed in Section II are used to assess all teacher candidates in the Early Childhood Teacher Education Program prior to their completion in the program. Some assessments are universal in the Unit (i.e., #2) or in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (i.e., #3, #4, #5, and #6). Other assessments (i.e., #1 and #7) are program-specific, which further demonstrates how the program addresses the NAEYC standards. These assessments will be discussed briefly below with supporting evidence and data interpretation.

### ASSESSMENT #1 PRAXIS II: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (0020)

#### **General Description of the Assessment**

Praxis II Test is required by the District of Columbia for teacher certification in Early Childhood Education. Candidates in the program must meet the District’s passing scores of 520 in order to be certified to teach children in Pre-K to 3<sup>rd</sup> grade levels. The Early Childhood Test (0020) consists of 120 multiple-choice questions that can be further divided into six categories. These categories examine candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the areas such as nature of the growth/development of young children, factors that influence individual growth and development, applications of developmental an curriculum theory, planning and implementing curriculum, evaluating/reporting student progress and effectiveness of instruction, and understanding of professional and legal responsibilities. In year 2006-2007, there was a total of four (4) candidates completed the Praxis II Early Childhood Education exam. All candidates successfully passed the District’s passing score with an average score of 625.

#### **Alignment with NAEYC Standards**

As described in the above section, Praxis II Early Childhood Education test (0020) consists of six categories. These categories have a full-range alignment with NAEYC standards as seen in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Alignment between categories of test items on Praxis II (0020) and NAEYC standards.**

Praxis II Categories	Aligned with NAEYC Standards
Nature of the growth/development of young children	1
Factors that influence individual growth and development	1, 2
Applications of developmental an curriculum theory	1, 4
Planning and implementing curriculum	4
Evaluating/reporting student progress and effectiveness of instruction	3
Understanding of professional and legal responsibilities	5

#### **Brief Analysis of Data Findings**

In the academic year 2006-2007 there were four program completers in the Early Childhood Teacher Education Program, two from the five-year program and the other two from the two-year graduate program. Because of the small number of completers in the past academic year, in order to demonstrate program effectiveness, three years of Praxis II test scores are provided in Table 4 on the next page.

**Table 4: Three years of candidate performance data on Praxis II Early Childhood Education Exam (0020), n=18.**

Year of Data	Number of Completers	Number with Passing Score	Score Range	Average Score	% of Completers Passing
2006-2007	4	4	550-660	625	100
2005-2006	4	4	630-670	656	100
2004-2005	10	10	550-720	626	100

To summarize, in the past three years 18 candidates completed the Early Childhood program; eighteen of them (100%) passed the District of Columbia required scores for licensure.

**Interpretation of How the Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards**

The 100% passing rate in the last three academic years demonstrated candidates' competency in the field of early childhood education, which is also a strong indicator of the program effectiveness in educating the early childhood teachers. As shown in Table 5, Praxis II Early Childhood Education Exam (0020) is a comprehensive examination which covers a wide range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are required for early childhood educators. The six categories in Praxis II 0020 aligned well with all five of the NAEYC standards.

In the year of 2006-2007, a total of four program completers took and passed the District of Columbia licensure requirement (required passing score: 520). Analyses of individual candidate's performance on the six categories are presented in the table below, which further demonstrates that the program completers successfully met the NAEYC standards.

**Table 5. Candidate scores by category on Praxis II Early Childhood Education Exam (0020) for academic year 2006-2007 with institutional average (n=4\*).**

Test Category/ NAEYC Standard #	Candidate Score %				Institutional Average Score %
	Candidate 1	Candidate 2	Candidate 3	Candidate 4	
Nature of the growth/development of young children / #1	30/36 83%	21/36 58%	29/36 80%	33/36 91%	28.5 78%
Factors that influence individual growth and development / #1, #2	8/12 67%	9/12 75%	9/12 75%	12/12 100%	9.5 79%
Applications of developmental and curriculum theory / #4	9/13 69%	5/13 39%	10/13 77%	12/13 92%	9 69%
Planning and implementing curriculum / #4	29/36 81%	25/36 69%	28/36 78%	32/36 89%	28.5 79%
Evaluating/reporting student progress and effectiveness of instruction / #3	12/14 86%	8/14 57%	11/14 79%	13/14 93%	11 79%
Understanding of professional and legal responsibilities / #5	4/8 50%	4/8 50%	5/8 62%	7/8 87%	5 63%

\* The sub-scores by test category are available to the institution in academic year 2006-2007 only.

Although the data presented above was generated from a very small sample (n=4), it does reveal several trends that demonstrate the program strengths and areas for improvement. For example, the data indicates that three out of four 2006-2007 candidates were strong in five of six content categories of Praxis II Early Childhood Education Exam (0020). Those categories include understanding the nature of growth and development of young children, understanding the factors influence child development, understanding the applications of developmental and curriculum theories, understanding of planning and implementing curriculum, and understanding of evaluating/reporting student progress and effectiveness of instruction. These test results demonstrate that the 2006-2007 cohort of candidates successfully met the NAEYC standards 1, 2, 3, and 4. One area of improvement as revealed by the data is the category of understanding professional and legal responsibilities (NAEYC standard 5). Compared to the passing rate of the other five content categories, all four candidates were relatively less proficient in this area, which suggests program improvement to help future candidates in meeting the standard 5 with greater success.

## **ASSESSMENT #2 MASTER’S DEGREE COMPREHENSIVE EXAM**

### **General Description of the Assessment**

As one of the program’s exit requirements, all candidates must pass the Master’s Degree Comprehensive Exam in order to receive the Master of Arts in Teaching degree. The comprehensive exam is a three-hour, three-question essay examination. It is a universal degree requirement in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, which is designed primarily to test candidates’ ability to synthesize and apply knowledge of theory and practice to the resolution of problem(s) in their areas of specialization, including the Early Childhood Education program. Candidates who are advanced in their coursework or are within one semester of graduation may take the comprehensive examination. If a candidate fails the exam in the first attempt, he/she will have a second, and last, opportunity to take the exam in a subsequent semester.

Each response to a question on the Comprehensive Exam is scored by at least two faculty members, both in and outside of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, who are specialized in the content area covered by the question(s). The responses are rated according to a grading rubric with a continuum from 1 (unacceptable) to 5 (excellent). The grading rubric is used universally in the Department for program consistency. Comprehensive Exam questions, however, are program-specific. Candidates must receive a minimum score of 3 on all three questions in order to pass the exam.

### **Alignment with NAEYC Standards**

The comprehensive nature of the exam ensures that the assessment of knowledge and skills through the exam is aligned with the NAEYC standards. Each of the three questions focuses on a main area including child development theories to practice, curriculum planning, and instructional strategies. Built into the questions are also elements related to children’s social as well as familial background and using assessment as part of the instructional strategies. The alignment between the Comprehensive Exam questions and NAEYC standards is presented in Table 6 below.

**Table 6: Alignment between the Comprehensive Exam questions and the NAEYC standards.**

<b>Comprehensive Exam Questions</b>	<b>Aligned with NAEYC Standards</b>
Child development theories to practice	1, 2, 4, 5
Curriculum planning	1, 2, 3, 5
Instructional strategies	1, 3, 4

### **Brief Analysis of Data Findings**

In the academic year of 2006-2007 four program completers took and passed the comprehensive exam. Among them, two candidates took the exam as their second attempt (i.e., who failed the exam in previous semester/year). Table 7 below provides a summary of the comprehensive exam results.

**Table 7: Summary of Comprehensive Exam results by candidate by question category (N=4).**

Candidate No.	Question Category			Candidate Average Score*
	Theory	Curriculum	Strategies	
1**	3.2	3.25	3.15	3.2
2**	3.00	3.10	3.00	3.03
3	3.85	3.7	3.85	3.8
4	3.8	4.5	4.2	4.17
<b>Program Average</b>	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.7

\* Exemplary—4 to 5; Proficient—3 to 3.9; Fail—below 3.

\*\* Candidates who took the comprehensive exam on their second attempt

As shown in Table 7, all four candidates successfully passed the comprehensive exam. Among them, one candidate (#3) received an overall average score of 4.17 (exemplary) and three other candidates received an average score of 3 or higher (proficient). The passing rate of this cohort of candidate is 100%.

Two candidates in this cohort had failed their first attempt to pass the comprehensive exam. Remedial efforts were made to help enhance these candidates' proficiency in professional knowledge and skills as well as in problem solving abilities and information processing efficiency. Individual consultations, study questions, and recommended readings are some examples of the remedial efforts offered by the program. These remedial efforts were proven effective as both candidates successfully passed the comprehensive exam at the "Proficient" level on their second attempt. Table 8 below compares the candidates' test results between the first and second attempts, which indicates improvement in all three test areas.

**Table 8. Comprehensive Exam test score comparison between two attempts (N=2).**

Candidate No.	Question Category						Overall Average Score	
	Theory		Curriculum		Strategies		1 <sup>st</sup> Attempt	2 <sup>nd</sup> Attempt
	1 <sup>st</sup> Attempt	2 <sup>nd</sup> Attempt	1 <sup>st</sup> Attempt	2 <sup>nd</sup> Attempt	1 <sup>st</sup> Attempt	2 <sup>nd</sup> Attempt		
1	2.5	<b>3.0</b>	3.25	<b>3.25</b>	2.9	<b>3.15</b>	2.9	<b>3.2</b>
2	2.7	<b>3.0</b>	2.25	<b>3.10</b>	2.45	<b>3.0</b>	2.5	<b>3.03</b>

### **Interpretation of the How the Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards**

As stated previously in the description of this assessment, the comprehensive exam is designed primarily to test candidates' ability to synthesize and apply knowledge of theory and practice to the resolution of problem(s) in their areas of specialization; in this case, the field of early childhood education. The design of the comprehensive exam reflects the program's commitment to the preparation of professional early childhood teachers under the guidance of the Unit's conceptual framework. Specifically, the comprehensive exam intends to assess candidate's ability to think critically; to analyze and solve problems; to make ethical decisions; to link theory to practice; as well as to demonstrate knowledge, sensitivity and skills in working with diverse

populations including children of color and children in urban schools. In other words, the comprehensive exam is a holistic assessment of the program completers' learning outcomes.

Because of the comprehensive nature of the exam questions, and since these questions are aligned with the NAEYC standards (see Table 6), the 100% passing rate demonstrates the program's effectiveness in meeting the program standards. Individual differences among the candidates' exam results, however, suggest future program improvement such as providing more differentiated teaching and advisement to individual candidates throughout their tenure in the program.

Sample comprehensive exam questions and grading rubrics are enclosed in Appendices C and D.

## Appendix C. Assessment 2

### Comprehensive Examination Early Childhood Education Spring 2007

1. Select two (2) theorists from the list provided below. Briefly but clearly explain one (1) significant theoretical concepts initiated by each theorist of your choice. Discuss the implications and applications of these concepts in the 21<sup>st</sup> century early childhood classrooms. Include in your discussion a critique on the relevance of each chosen theory in meeting the needs of black children, under-privileged children, or children with disabilities. Discussions must be research based.
  - a) Urie Bronfenbrenner
  - b) Erik Erikson
  - c) Sigmund Freud
  - d) Howard Gardner
  - e) Abraham Maslow
  - f) Jean Piaget
  - g) Burrhus Frederic Skinner
  - h) Lev Vygotsky
2. In the context of the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2002, address the following topics in your discussion:
  - a) The importance of early literacy for young children's future success in school and the impact of early literacy on children's lifelong development. Discussion must be research based.
  - b) Three (3) effective teaching strategies for helping young children, especially children from low SES background, develop their early literacy skills through early childhood education programs. Justify the effectiveness of these strategies by providing supporting research evidence and/or specific theoretical concepts.
3. Identify a group of children between 3 to 7 years of age (may use a mixed-age group, but its age range must be clearly defined). Identify and briefly describe a classic or well-liked, well-used children's book (example: *Brown Bear, Brown Bear, What Do You See*; *Where the Wild Things Are*, *Rainbow Fish*, etc.). Design an integrative unit plan that consists of at least four (4) individual activity/lesson plans based on this book. The following components must be included in this unit:
  - a) Learning goals or state standards (brief) that will be met by the unit
  - b) Learning objectives of the unit
  - c) A clear explanation of the inter-connection (or integrative nature) among the activities/lessons included in the unit
  - d) A brief description of each activity/lesson
  - e) An assessment plan to evaluate how well the learning objectives of the unit are achieved by children
  - f) Justify the design of the unit plan through supporting learning and/or child development theories. Use research evidence to strengthen your argument.

**Appendix D. Grading Rubrics for Master’s Degree Comprehensive Exams**

<b>Criteria (with Weight)</b>	<b>Excellent -5</b> (Broad wealth of knowledge, excellently presented)	<b>Good-4</b> (Accurate, general knowledge, well presented)	<b>Fair-3</b> (Moderate knowledge, adequately expressed)	<b>Poor -2</b> (Limited conceptual understanding, inadequately expressed)	<b>Unacceptable-1</b> (Lack of conceptual understanding, poor presentation)
<b>Relevance of Information Presented</b> (2)	Response is <b>clear, focused,</b> and <b>entirely relevant</b> to the question.	Response is <b>clear</b> and <b>relevant</b> to the question. (non-essential)	Response is <b>comprehensible</b> and sufficiently <b>pertinent</b> to the question <b>to reveal basic</b> <b>knowledge</b> of key concepts, theories, and information.	Response includes <b>limited</b> and <b>marginal</b> <b>information</b> or <b>misapplies</b> important facts, concepts, or principles.	Response includes <b>irrelevant or inaccurate</b> <b>information</b> or <b>misapplies</b> important facts, concepts, or principles.
<b>Understanding and Application</b> (3)	Response is <b>comprehensive,</b> <b>insightful</b> and provides relevant <b>information beyond</b> <b>what is asked for</b> (e.g., extensions, generalizations).	Response indicates <b>very good</b> <b>grasp and insight of key</b> <b>concepts, theories, and</b> information.	Response, although brief, displays <b>good grasp of</b> <b>concepts or insight.</b>	Response demonstrates <b>questionable</b> <b>understanding</b> of key concepts, terms, and theories.	Response indicates <b>limited</b> <b>knowledge base</b> or <b>misunderstanding</b> of the question.
<b>Structure and Supporting Examples</b> (2)	Response presents ideas in <b>coherent, logical order</b> with <b>clear transitions</b> between ideas and <b>multiple examples</b> that provide convincing support for these ideas/arguments.	Response <b>effectively</b> <b>develops ideas,</b> contains <b>no</b> <b>major gaps,</b> and includes enough detail to provide <b>adequate support for ideas.</b>	Response contains <b>limited</b> <b>detail or few examples</b> that provide convincing support for ideas/arguments made.	Response is <b>weak in logic,</b> <b>coherence, and provision</b> <b>of supporting examples.</b>	Response includes <b>ramblings, in accurate</b> <b>facts or information, and</b> <b>poor, if any, examples.</b>
<b>Referencing</b> (1)	Response includes <b>5 or more</b> <b>different citations</b> from current research or educational literature.	Response includes <b>4 different</b> <b>citations</b> from current research or educational literature.	Response includes at least 3 <b>different citations</b> from current research or educational literature.	Response contains <b>no</b> <b>more than 2 different</b> <b>citations</b> from current research or educational literature.	Response contains <b>no</b> <b>more than 1 citation</b> from current research or educational literature.
<b>Writing</b> (2)	Response <b>meticulously</b> <b>observes rules of grammar,</b> <b>organization, and writing</b> <b>mechanics.</b>	Response is basically <b>well</b> <b>written;</b> however, an <b>occasional error of</b> <b>grammar and writing</b> <b>mechanics</b> may be present.	Response meets <b>minimal</b> <b>standards</b> with regard to writing <b>organization,</b> <b>clarity, grammar, and</b> <b>mechanics.</b>	Response contains <b>poor,</b> <b>unorganized writing.</b>	Response is so problematic with regard to writing organization, grammar and mechanics that is <b>virtually</b> <b>incomprehensible.</b>

**Total Question Score<sup>4</sup>:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reader Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>4</sup> Steps to calculate total question score: 1) multiply each scale score by its criterion weight; 2) add 5 weighted scores; 3) divide the sum by 10.

## ASSESSMENT #3 INTEGRATIVE UNIT PLAN

### General Description of the Assessment

The Unit Plan is the key assessment of the integrated methods courses, which consists of the development of a unit context, scope and sequence, five daily lesson plans, and a reflection journal. The Unit Plan is assessed with a standard-based rubric.

Instructional planning is an integral part of the early childhood education program. Planning is required in all phases of the Early Childhood Education program, which starts in the first introduction course and continues through the program in methods courses, clinical field practice, and the internship. Prior to their clinical internship, teacher candidates in early childhood education program are required to take two graduate level integrated methods courses—*EDUC282/375 Integrated Methods and Technology I: Reading, Social Studies, Language Arts*, and *EDUC283/376 Integrated Methods and Technology II: Math & Science\**. These courses emphasize an integrated approach to teaching using a variety of instructional methods appropriate for students in grades pre-K to 3<sup>rd</sup>. Both courses include the use of educational devices and technology, such as computers, audio-visuals, and field placement experiences.

Candidates enroll in the integrated method courses simultaneously in the semester prior to student teaching. Candidates are expected to develop a unit plan for each integrated methods course, which are used to assess candidates' planning ability. The unit plan is designed to show candidate's understanding and application of the major concepts and principles of research, learning theories, and child development toward the development of teaching methods and instructional planning skills for the teaching of reading, language arts, social studies, mathematics and science with the integration of technology, health, and physical education.

Each unit plan is to be fully integrated across all subjects (reading, language arts, social studies, mathematics and science, along with the integration of technology, health, and physical education). Candidates collaboratively develop lesson/unit plans with course instructor/university supervisors and classroom teachers that meet the developmental needs of students in grades K-3. While implementing the lessons, candidates keep a reflection journal that helps them to reflect as well as focus upon the overall effectiveness and impact of their teaching. The reflection journal is a mechanism for candidates to make improvements in their performance and to provide instructors evidence of candidates' dispositions for working with all children, especially the urban learner. The reflection journal is included as a component of the unit and is assessed using the unit rubric.

\* Because of the small number of enrolment in the early childhood education program, ECE candidates take the general methods courses along with elementary candidates. But their course works, such as unit plan and field placement, focuses on students at pre-K through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade levels. In addition, prior to taking the two general methods courses with an intensive field component, candidates in early childhood education programs also take an area-specific instructional strategy course *ECED191/EDUC212 Instructional Strategies for Early Childhood Teachers*. This course helps prepare the early childhood candidates for the graduate level general methods courses with an early childhood focus.

**Alignment with NAEYC Standards**

(For brevity some of the unit criteria have been combined)

Candidates develop and implement an integrated unit plan based on national and state standards in English language arts/reading, mathematics, science, social studies, and technology. The unit is assessed using a standard-based rubric that is aligned with NAEYC standards. Table 9 below illustrates the alignment between the Unit Plan assessment criteria and the NAEYC standards.

**Table 9: Alignment between the Unit Plan assessment criteria and the NAEYC standards.**

<b>Unit Criteria</b>	<b>NAEYC Standards</b>	<b>Explanation of Components</b>
Unit Context and Overview	1, 2, 4	Explains the context of the candidate’s classroom, school and unit. Focusing upon candidate’s knowledge of home, community, school and classroom factors
Alignment to Standards/objectives/integration	4	Identifies relevant content standards and aligns to lesson objective, Shows integration of content areas
Scope and Sequence: Lesson and unit coherence	4	Shows how lessons are organized and flow toward moving students toward achieving objectives
Daily Lesson Plans	4	Variety and Integration of instructional strategies, resources, and assignments, and lesson content
Accurate representation of content	4, 5	Content knowledge is clearly and accurately presented
Developmentally appropriate	1, 2, 4	Lessons contain activities which are developmentally appropriate for subject and grade level
Use of Technology	4	Available technology is used to enhance student learning
Differentiation of instruction	1, 4	Instruction is varied to meet the needs of all learners.
Modifications for special needs students	1, 4	Instruction is appropriately modified to meet the needs of all learners
Professionalism: Credits	5	Professionalism is demonstrated by credit given for ideas or resources of others
Assessment	3, 4	All lessons contain an assessment including pre and post) which is aligned with objective(s) of lesson
Analysis of data	3, 4	Includes analysis of data displayed in tables or graphs
Reflection	4, 5	Consists of reflection journal that provides an avenue for professional growth by reflecting upon the impact of student learning

**Brief Analysis of Data Findings**

The unit assessment rubric consists of two sections. Section I focuses upon curriculum, planning, and instruction. Section II focuses upon assessment of student learning and reflection. Four indicators—“Exceeded,” “Met,” “Partially Met,” and “Not Met”—are applied to evaluate the unit plan in meeting each criterion outlined in Table 9.

Summary of the unit plan assessments of the early childhood candidates is presented in Table 10. As can be seen from Table 10, all but one average score of the assessment categories achieved the level of “indicator exceeded.”

**Table 10. Unit Rubric Assessment Summary for Early Childhood Education Candidates 2006-2007 (N=3\*)**

<b>Section I Curriculum, Planning, and Instruction</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Average Points (N=3)</b>	<b>Rating Category</b> 3-4 Indicator Exceeded 2-2.9 Indicator Met 1-1.9 Indicator Partially Met 1-.9 Indicator Not Met
Knowledge of home, community, school and classroom factors	4	Indicator Exceeded
Alignment with state and national standards	4	Indicator Exceeded
Instruction aligned with objectives	4	Indicator Exceeded
Accurate representation of content	4	Indicator Exceeded
Lesson and unit coherence	4	Indicator Exceeded
Variety of instructional strategies, resources, and assignments	4	Indicator Exceeded
Developmentally appropriate	4	Indicator Exceeded
Use of technology	3.7	Indicator Exceeded
Differentiation of instruction	3.7	Indicator Exceeded
Modifications for special needs students	2.7	Indicator Met
Credits and references	3	Indicator Exceeded
<b>Section II Assessment of Student Learning and Reflection</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Average Points (N=3)</b>	<b>Rating Category</b> 3-4 Indicator Exceeded 2-2.9 Indicator Met 1-1.9 Indicator Partially Met 1-.9 Indicator Not Met
Formative assessment	4	Indicator Exceeded
Pre- and Post-Assessment	3	Indicator Exceeded
Evidence of student learning	3.3	Indicator Exceeded
Analysis of data	3	Indicator Exceeded
Implications for future teaching	4	Indicator Exceeded
Reflective essay	4	Indicator Exceeded
<b>Total average</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>Indicator Met</b>

\* One program completer took the methods course in the previous academic year (2005-2006) hence not included in the report here.

In addition, two candidates received cumulative scores in the score range of 58-63 (Indicator Met) and one in the range of 63-68 (Indicator Exceeded). The average of the scores for the total unit (sections I & II) was 62.3 (Indicator Met). See Table 11 for details.

**Table 11. Unit Rubric Assessment Summary for Individual Early Childhood Education Candidates 2006-2007 (N=3)**

<b>Candidate</b>	<b>Section I Subtotal Score</b>	<b>Section II Subtotal Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
1	41	21	62
2	42	22	64
3	40	21	61

For the section II of the unit that specifically addresses candidates' impact on student learning, all candidates received a score in the range of 21-24 (Indicator Met).

### **Interpretation of How the Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards**

The data presented here indicates that candidates in the early childhood education program are proficient in the areas of curriculum planning, teaching, assessment, and reflection. For example, all candidates received scores either in the "indicator exceeded" or "indicator met" in areas of curriculum, planning, and instruction. This was especially evident in areas such as candidates' knowledge of contextual factors that impact learning as well as alignment with state and national standards, lesson objectives, differentiated and varied instruction and assessment.

The assessment of the unit plan is a holistic evaluation of the early childhood candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions as a professional educator. Candidates' successful completion of this project provides strong evidence indicating the effectiveness of the early childhood education program in meeting NAEYC standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

The Integrated Unit Rubric is enclosed in Appendix E.

Appendix E. Assessment 3

**INTEGRATED UNIT RUBRIC for INTEGRATED METHODS I & II**

**Section I**

**Curriculum, Planning, and Instruction**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Program: \_\_\_\_\_

Course: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Indicator (NAEYC Standard #)</b>	<b>Indicator Exceeded (4)</b>	<b>Indicator Met (3)</b>	<b>Indicator Partially Met (2)</b>	<b>Indicator Not Met (1)</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Knowledge of home, community, school and classroom factors</b> (NAEYC #2)	Thorough understanding of the characteristics of the school, home, classroom, and community factors and how these characteristics impact students' learning	Good understanding of the home, school, classroom, and community factors and how these characteristics impact students' learning	Some understanding of the school, school system classroom, and community factors	Insufficient understanding of the school, school system classroom, and community	
<b>Alignment with state and national standards</b> (NAEYC #3, #4)	All objectives are aligned with state and national standards  Standards, lesson objectives, and assessments are clearly aligned and linked to specific performances, products, and outcomes	Most objectives are aligned with state and national standards  Each lesson plan has clearly written standards, lesson objectives, and assessments that are aligned with instruction and learning activities	Some objectives are aligned with state and national standards  Some standards and lesson objectives are in need of development and clearer alignment with each other	Few objectives are aligned with state and national standards  Standards and lesson objectives are either missing, unclear, and disconnected from each other	
<b>Instruction aligned with objectives</b> (NAEYC #3, #4)	All lessons, activities, and assignments are linked to objectives	Most lessons, activities, and assignments are linked to objectives	Some lessons, activities, and assignments are linked to objectives	Few lessons, activities, and assignments are linked to objectives	

<b>Indicator (NAEYC Standard #)</b>	<b>Indicator Exceeded (4)</b>	<b>Indicator Met (3)</b>	<b>Indicator Partially Met (2)</b>	<b>Indicator Not Met (1)</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Accurate representation of content</b> (NAEYC #4)	All content knowledge is clearly and accurately presented; knowledge goes beyond what is presented in the textbook and reflects the major ideas of the discipline.	Most content knowledge is clearly and accurately presented; knowledge goes beyond what is presented in the textbook and reflects the major ideas of the discipline.	Some content knowledge is presented; knowledge occasionally goes beyond what is presented in the textbook, and reflects the ideas of the discipline	Little content knowledge is presented; knowledge does not go beyond what is presented in the textbook	
<b>Lesson and unit coherence</b> (NAEYC #4)	All lessons are logically organized and move students toward achieving objectives; opportunities for practice and review are included	Most lessons are logically organized and move students toward achieving objectives; opportunities for practice and review are included	Some lessons are logically organized and move students toward achieving objectives; some opportunities for practice and review are included	Lessons are not logically organized and do not move students toward achieving objectives; opportunities for practice and review are few or not included	
<b>Variety and Integration of instructional strategies, resources, and assignments</b> (NAEYC #4)	Uses a variety of instructional strategies, resources, and assignments; whole group, small group, & individual instruction utilized  Clear integration of content is evident	Uses some variety of instructional strategies, resources, and assignments; whole group, small group, & individual instruction utilized  Some integration of content is evident	Uses little variety of instructional strategies, resources, and assignments; little variation from whole group instruction  Little integration of content is evident	No variety in instructional strategies, resources, and assignments; relies heavily on textbook and whole group instruction  No integration of content is evident	
<b>Developmentally appropriate</b> (NAEYC #1, #2, #4)	All lessons contain activities which are developmentally appropriate for subject and grade level and have been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment	Most lessons contain activities which are developmentally appropriate for subject and grade level and have been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment	Some lessons contain activities which are developmentally appropriate for subject and grade level and some have been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment	Lessons are not developmentally appropriate for subject and grade level and have not been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment	

<b>Indicator (NAEYC Standard #)</b>	<b>Indicator Exceeded (4)</b>	<b>Indicator Met (3)</b>	<b>Indicator Partially Met (2)</b>	<b>Indicator Not Met (1)</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Use of technology</b> (NAEYC #4)	Available technology is used appropriately and supports the objectives, engages learners, & encourages higher order thinking	Available technology is used appropriately and somewhat supports the objectives, engages learners, & encourages higher order thinking	Available technology is used but does little to support the objectives, engage learners, & encourage higher order thinking	Available technology is not used or is used inappropriately	
<b>Differentiation of instruction</b> (NAEYC #1, #2, #3, #4)	Instruction is differentiated in three or more lessons to meet the needs of all students	Instruction is differentiated in two lessons to meet the needs of all students	Instruction is differentiated in one lesson to meet the needs of all students	There is no differentiation of instruction	
<b>Modifications for special needs students</b> (NAEYC #1, #2, #3, #4)	Listed for each lesson & are related to specific special needs (i.e. gifted, LD, ADHD, ESL)	Listed for some lessons & are related to specific special needs (i.e. gifted, LD, ADHD, ESL)	Listed for few lessons & some are related to specific special needs (i.e. gifted, LD, ADHD, ESL)	Not listed or few listed but are not related to specific special needs (i.e. gifted, LD, ADHD, ESL)	
<b>Credits and references</b> (NAEYC #4, #5)	Credit is given for all ideas or resources of others and are included in correct APA format	Some credit is given for ideas or resources of others and are included in correct APA format	Little credit is given for ideas or resources of others and/or few are included in correct APA format	Ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment are not given	

**Curriculum, Planning, and Instruction Total Points /44**

**Subsection Score \_\_\_\_\_**

**Section II Rubric  
Assessment of Student Learning and Reflection**

<b>Indicator (NAEYC Standard #)</b>	<b>Indicator Exceeded (4)</b>	<b>Indicator Met (3)</b>	<b>Indicator Partially Met (2)</b>	<b>Indicator Not Met (1)</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Formative assessment (NAEYC #3, #4)</b>	All lessons contain an assessment which is aligned with objective(s) of lesson	Most lessons contain an assessment which is aligned with objective(s) of lesson	Few lessons contain an assessment which is aligned with objective(s) of lesson or lessons include an assessment which is not aligned with objective(s) of lesson	Lessons do not contain an assessment or no assessments are aligned with objectives	
<b>Pre- and Post-Assessment (NAEYC #3, #4)</b>	re- and Post-assessments are included, appropriate, and assess all objectives	Pre- and Post-assessments are included, appropriate, and assess most objectives	Pre- and Post-assessments are included, are somewhat appropriate, and assess some objectives	Pre- and Post-assessments are not included, or are not appropriate and do not assess objectives	
<b>Evidence of student learning (NAEYC #1, #3, #4)</b>	Analysis of pre- and post-assessments includes evidence of the impact on student learning for the class for each objective and conclusions have been drawn	Analysis of pre- and post-assessments includes some evidence of the impact on student learning for the class for each objective and some conclusions have been drawn	Analysis of pre- and post-assessments includes little evidence of the impact on student learning for the class for each objective and few conclusions have been drawn	Analysis of pre- and post-assessments includes little evidence of the impact on student learning for the class for each objective and few conclusions have been drawn	
<b>Analysis of data (NAEYC #3, #4)</b>	Analysis is accurate, meaningful, and displayed in tables or graphs which are easy to understand	Analysis is mostly accurate, meaningful, and displayed in tables or graphs which are easy to understand	Analysis is somewhat accurate, meaningful, and some data is displayed in tables or graphs which are somewhat understandable	Analysis is not accurate or meaningful and/or is not displayed in tables or graphs which are easy to understand	

<b>Indicator (NAEYC Standard #)</b>	<b>Indicator Exceeded (4)</b>	<b>Indicator Met (3)</b>	<b>Indicator Partially Met (2)</b>	<b>Indicator Not Met (1)</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Implications for future teaching</b> (NAEYC #3, #4)	Many ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment are given; rationale for why these modifications would improve student learning are included	Some ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment are given; rationale for why these modifications would improve student learning are included	Few ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment are given; no rationale for why these modifications would improve student learning is included	Few ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment are given; no rationale for why these modifications would improve student learning is included	
<b>Reflective essay</b> (NAEYC #1, #3, #4, #5)	Reflective essay clearly articulates, and reflects upon the impact of student learning at every phase of unit implementation (before, during, and after instruction).	Reflective essay reflects upon the impact of student learning on all phases of unit implementation.	Reflective essay describes the impact on student learning on one or two phases of unit implementation.	Essay is unclear and does not articulate the impact of instruction on student learning on any phases of implementation.	

**Assessment of Student Learning and Reflection Total Points /24**

**Subsection Score** \_\_\_\_\_  
 20-24 Indicator Exceeded Met  
 16-20 Indicator Met  
 12-16 Indicator Partially Met  
 12-below Not Met

**Unit Total Points: 68**

**TOTAL SCORE** \_\_\_\_\_  
 63-68 Indicator Exceeded Met  
 58-63 Indicator Met  
 53-58 Indicator Partially Met  
 53-below Indicator Not Met

**ASSESSMENT #4 TEACHER CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT**

**General Description of the Assessment**

Candidates in the Early Childhood Teacher Education Program are required to take a 12-week, two-placement clinical internship in the District of Columbia public schools or schools in the surrounding districts. During their internship candidates are evaluated twice by the cooperating teachers and the university supervisor, once in the mid-term and once in the end of the placement, using the Teacher Candidate Assessment Instrument (see Appendix G). The construction of the Teacher Candidate Assessment Instrument was guided by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards. The instrument assesses each candidate’s competency in 11 areas including knowledge of subject matter, human development and learning, student diversity, instructional strategies, classroom organization, behavior management, communication, instructional planning skills, assessment, professional commitment and responsibility, and partnerships. This instrument is used universally by all programs in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction to assess teacher candidates’ performance during their clinical internship.

**Alignment with NAEYC Standards**

The alignment between the Teacher Candidate Assessment Instrument and the NAEYC Standards are presented in Table 12.

**Table 12: Alignment between the Teacher Candidate Assessment Instrument and the NAEYC Standards.**

<b>Teacher Candidate Assessment Instrument Items</b>	<b>Aligned with NAEYC Standards</b>
1. Knowledge of Subject Matter	1, 4
2. Human Development and Learning	1, 4
3. Student Diversity	1, 2, 4
4. Instructional Strategies	3, 4
5a. Classroom Organization	4
5b. Behavior Management	1, 4, 5
6. Communication	1, 4
7. Instructional Planning Skills	1, 4
8. Assessment	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
9. Professional Commitment and Responsibility	5
10. Partnerships	2

**Brief Analysis of Data Findings**

As shown in Appendix G, in the Teacher Candidate Assessment Instrument, each of the 10 INTASC standards is further divided into 4 to 10 assessment criteria that evaluate candidate’s competency or performance in greater details. The assessment instrument uses a 3-point rubric system that evaluates each candidate’s level of skill, knowledge, and disposition as a beginning teacher. The rubric consists of indicators “Target (T),” “Acceptable (A),” and “Unacceptable

(U)” as well as “Not Observed (N/O),” which indicates that the observer did not have an opportunity to observe, and to evaluate, certain candidate performance. Cooperating teachers and university supervisor evaluate each candidate once at the conclusion of the first placement, and once at the conclusion of the clinical internship. The mid-point evaluation from the cooperating teacher and university supervisor provides the candidate with constructive feedback so that improvement can be made. Each candidate will receive a total of four evaluations throughout the clinical internship experience.

The mid-term and final grades are determined independently by the cooperating teachers and the university supervisor. Each evaluator calculates the grade by summing up the “T’s” and “A’s” that a candidate receives after each evaluation. There are a total of 61 criteria in the instrument. If the candidate receives 61-56 “T’s” and “A’s”, a grade A has been achieved for the period being evaluated. Similarly, a grade B is 55-50 points, C is 49-44 points, and a D is 43-38 points. The overall grade for the clinical internship will be determined by averaging the four independent grades.

There was a total of 3 candidates in the Early Childhood Education program who completed their clinical internship in academic year 2006-2007. Data analyses findings of the Teacher Candidate Assessment Instrument are presented in Table 13 and Table 14.

**Table 13. Summary of total points received by candidate by evaluators.**

Candidate	Mid-term Assessment		Final Assessment		Grand Total Average	Final Grade
	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor		
1	58	52	58	57	56.3	A
2	60	54	60	57	57.8	A
3	44	51	55	51	50.3	B

Table 13 indicates that two of the three candidates received an overall grade A while one candidate received a grade B for their clinical internship respectively. In other words, all three candidates successfully achieved within the “Target” to “Acceptable” range for beginning teachers.

To analyze the data in greater details, candidates’ performance evaluation summary is divided into 11 areas that are aligned with the INTASC standards. Table 14 below provides evidence that further demonstrates the program’s effectiveness in meeting the INTASC standards. Information presented in the table includes number and percentage of candidates achieved at “Target” to “Acceptable” level of proficiency in meeting each standard, the maximum points available for each standard, the average score of the candidates in meeting each standard, and the average rating category the cohort of candidates achieved as a whole in meeting each standard based on the average score received.

The average rating categories are determined in the following manner: if the average score the cohort received is greater than or equals to 90% of the maximum points for a standard, the cohort is considered to have achieved at the “Target” level of proficiency; if the average score the cohort received equals to 80-89% of the maximum points for a standard, the cohort is considered

to have achieved at the “Acceptable” level of proficiency; and so on. As Table 14 demonstrates, this cohort of candidates successfully achieved at “Target” level for 9 out of 11 standards and at “Acceptable” level for the other two standards.

**Table 14. Teacher Candidate Assessment summary by INTASC standards. (N=3; 4 assessment per candidate)**

INTASC Standard (with NAEYC Standard)	Number of Candidates with Scores within “Target” to “Acceptable” Range		Points Available for Each INTASC Standard	Average Points Received for Each Standard N=3	<u>Average Rating Category</u>
	Number	%			
1. Knowledge of Subject Matter (1, 4)	3	100%	16	16	Target
2. Student Development (1, 4)	3	100%	24	22	Target
3. Diverse Learners (1, 2, 4)	3	100%	24	22	Target
4. Instructional Strategies (3, 4)	3	100%	20	20	Target
5A. Classroom Organization (4)	3	100%	16	16	Target
5B. Behavior Management (1, 4, 5)	3	100%	20	19	Target
6. Communication and Technology (1, 4)	3	100%	20	19	Target
7. Instructional Planning Skills (1, 4)	3	100%	20	20	Target
8. Assessment (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	2*	67%	36	31	Acceptable
9. Professional Commitment and Responsibilities (5)	3	100%	20	19	Target
10. Partnerships (2)	2**	67%	20	16	Acceptable

\*, \*\* None of the candidates received “Not Acceptable” rating for any of the assessment criteria listed in the instrument. Rather, the low scores that one candidate received for these two standards resulted from multiple traits/behaviors “Not Observed.”

### **Interpretation of How the Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards**

The Teacher Candidate Assessment Instrument is aligned with the INTASC standards and the NAEYC standards. This close alignment, along with the data presented in the above section, help demonstrate that candidates in the early childhood education program met both sets of standards successfully, which further indicates program effectiveness in meeting the NAEYC standards.

Although the group size of this cohort of candidates is very small (N=3), analyses of the data did reveal some areas for future program improvement. As shown in Table 14 above, this cohort of candidates is relatively less effective in meeting INTASC standard 8/NAEYC standard 3 (Assessment) and INTASC standard 10/NAEYC standard 2 (Partnership) than in meeting the other standards. More efforts must be put in to modify course content and course work prior to clinical internship to help strengthen candidates' knowledge, skill, as well as awareness in these two areas.

Currently, the Teacher Candidate Assessment Instrument is under revision to improve its scoring system, which will allow for more detailed candidate evaluation and data analyses in future.

**Howard University**  
**School of Education**  
**Department of Curriculum and Instruction**

**TEACHER CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT**  
**(EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM)**

Student: \_\_\_\_\_ Student No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester/Year: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
School System \_\_\_\_\_ Name of School: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Location: \_\_\_\_\_

School Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade / Subject: \_\_\_\_\_

**School Environment-**

**Type of Community:**

**Organization:**

*(Circle all the appropriate descriptors)*

Urban Inner-city City Suburban Rural

Self-contained Team Open Concept

Departmentalized Other

***Rubric***

**Target**

Level of the skill, knowledge, or disposition is equivalent to that of an exceptionally effective beginning teacher

**Acceptable**

Level of the skill, knowledge, or disposition is at least equivalent to that of a minimally successful beginning teacher

**Unacceptable**

Level of the skill, knowledge, or disposition observed was not acceptable for a beginning teacher.

**Not Observed (N/O)**

The skill, knowledge or disposition was not observed.

<b>INTASC #1: Knowledge of Subject Matter</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>N/O</b>
<u>Demonstrates proficient knowledge of subject matter</u>				
<u>Encourages students to observe, question, and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives</u>				
<u>Incorporates interdisciplinary strategies that allows students to integrate knowledge and skills</u>				
<u>Demonstrates enthusiasm for subject matter</u>				

<i>INTASC #2: Human Development and Learning</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>N/O</i>
<i>Plans developmentally appropriate learning, including physical, cognitive, social, emotional, language, and aesthetic domains, play and activity</i>				
<i>Fosters social and personal growth of students</i>				
<i>Incorporates students' prior knowledge and experiences</i>				
<i>Develops students' metacognition and reflective thinking</i>				
<i>Conveys high expectations for learning and achievement</i>				
<i>Demonstrates skills needed to create, promote, and maintain a learning environment that is healthy and safe</i>				

<i>INTASC #3: Student Diversity</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>N/O</i>
<i>Constructs lessons to individual learning abilities and needs</i>				
<i>Demonstrates a personal awareness of the nature and totality of diversity</i>				
<i>Promoting students' awareness and respect for diversity</i>				
<i>Utilizes supplemental material and outside resources to provide maximal learning for all students</i>				
<i>Connects instruction to students' prior knowledge and experiences</i>				
<i>Demonstrates knowledge and skills in creating a learning environment that is respectful of differences in children's culture, language, family context, abilities or disabilities, and communities</i>				

<b>INTASC #4: Instructional Strategies</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>N/O</b>
Utilizes different roles in teaching (instructor, facilitator, coach, audience)				
Integrates media and technological resources in teaching				
<u>Reorganizes teaching strategies in response to student performance and feedback</u>				
Arranges learning activities that engage students in critical thinking and problem solving				
<u>Utilizes multiple (at least five) different instructional strategies, including learning centers</u>				

<b>INTASC #5A: Classroom Organization</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>N/O</b>
<u>Manages learning time and materials efficiently</u>				
<u>Explains routines, directions and procedures clearly; checks for understanding</u>				
<u>Appropriately paces lessons, allowing time for reflection and closure</u>				
<u>Manages duties efficiently with students assuming appropriate responsibility</u>				

<b>INTASC #5B: Behavior Management</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>N/O</b>
Creates a positive classroom climate of openness, mutual respect, support and inquiry				
Is consistently alert to student behavior				
<u>Provides students with a clear understanding of standards of conduct for various situations</u>				
<u>Remains fair, firm and consistent and shows a caring attitude toward all students</u>				
Uses positive reinforcement, re-direction, and behavior prompts leading to student self-discipline				

<b>INTASC #6: Communication</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>N/O</b>
<u>Uses appropriate and standard spoken and written language</u>				
<u>Uses levels of questioning to stimulate discussion in different ways for different purposes</u>				
<u>Supports student expression in listening, speaking, and writing</u>				
<u>Demonstrates a sensitivity to linguistics differences</u>				
<u>Uses a variety of media communication tools, including audio-visual aids and computers for instruction and enrichment</u>				

<b><u>INTASC #7: Instructional Planning Skills</u></b>	<b><u>T</u></b>	<b><u>A</u></b>	<b><u>U</u></b>	<b><u>N/O</u></b>
<u>Constructs lessons that meet curriculum goals and individual student needs</u>				
<u>Shows evidence of daily, unit and term instructional plans</u>				
<u>Writes unit plans that follow state and district guidelines</u>				
<u>Utilizes plans that meet student needs and motivate learning, including IEP</u>				
<u>Records detailed lesson plans in a plan book</u>				

<b><u>INTASC #8: Assessment</u></b>	<b><u>T</u></b>	<b><u>A</u></b>	<b><u>U</u></b>	<b><u>N/O</u></b>
<u>Uses both informal and formal assessment techniques to evaluate students' progress and achievement</u>				
<u>Communicates effectively assessment results with students and their parents or guardian(s)</u>				
<u>Uses assessment results to adjust plans for individuals, small groups and the whole class</u>				
<u>Involves students in self-assessment activities for personal goal setting</u>				
<u>Maintains useful records of student performance</u>				
<u>Demonstrates knowledge of test interpretation for diagnostic and prescriptive purposes</u>				
<u>Demonstrates knowledge of the principle of test construction</u>				
<u>Uses multiple forms of assessment, especially systematic observation</u>				
<u>Aligns instruction and assessment</u>				
<u>Demonstrates knowledge and understanding about the influence of development, culture, and language on the assessment process (i.e., design, administration, scoring, interpretation, and use of results)</u>				

<b><u>INTASC #9: Professional Commitment and Responsibility</u></b>	<b><u>T</u></b>	<b><u>A</u></b>	<b><u>U</u></b>	<b><u>N/O</u></b>
<u>Uses reflection, self-assessment and learning to evaluate the outcomes of teaching</u>				
<u>Actively seeks feedback from colleagues and builds on suggestions</u>				
<u>Develops positive rapport with faculty and staff members</u>				
<u>Demonstrates professionalism in appearance, manners, dependability, attendance and punctuality</u>				
<u>Participates in professional growth opportunities and joins professional organizations</u>				

<i>INTASC #10: Partnerships</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>N/O</i>
<i>Communicates with families</i>				
<i>Seeks to develop cooperative, reciprocal family partnerships in support of student learning</i>				
<i>Participates in school/district events</i>				
<i>Seeks to involve families and community agencies in support of student development and learning</i>				
<i>Seeks to engage in collaborative school-based activities with colleagues</i>				
<i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of family and community characteristics</i>				

- **To calculate letter grades:**
  1. Add the number of checks in the first two columns (Target and Acceptable).
  2. Use the point system to assign a letter grade.
  3. Circle the appropriate letter grade for mid-term and final assessments.
  
- **Point System:**
  - A= 61-56
  - B= 55-50
  - C= 49-44
  - D= 43-38

**Mid-Term Assessment (circle one)    A B C D F**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cooperating Teacher (print)                      Signature                      Date  
  
\_\_\_\_\_

Student Teacher / Intern (print)                      Signature  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
University Supervisor (print)                      Signature                      Date

**Final Assessment (circle one)    A B C D F**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cooperating Teacher (print)                      Signature                      Date  
  
\_\_\_\_\_

Student Teacher / Intern (print)                      Signature  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
University Supervisor (print)                      Signature                      Date

## **ASSESSMENT #5 ACTION RESEARCH PAPER**

### **General Description of the Assessment**

As one of the exit requirements, all candidates in the Early Childhood Teacher Education Programs (five-year program as well as two-year Master's program leading to a M.A.T. degree) must conduct an Action Research project during the last year of their degree program. This project aims at helping candidates meet the program and the Unit's expectations. Through the action research project, candidates may demonstrate an understanding of child development as well as its implications in teaching practices, demonstrate a mastery of strategies and methods for teaching children ages 0-8, demonstrate an understanding of and respect for children's diverse family backgrounds, and demonstrate practical knowledge and skills of educational assessment and evaluation. Furthermore, by conducting an action research, candidates will exercise their abilities to think critically, to analyze and solve problems, to make ethical decisions, to apply knowledge by linking theory to practice, and to show their sensitivity to diverse populations in public schools.

The development of an action research project consists of two critical stages. First, in the semester prior to the clinical internship, candidates construct their action research proposals in EDUC 379 *Research in Curriculum and Teaching* course. Second, the research proposal is carried out in conjunction with candidates' clinical internship in the following semester. Upon completion of the project, action research findings are presented before candidates' fellow student teachers, faculty members, and cooperating teachers at the end of the clinical internship. Research reports are graded by faculty members in the program with a rubric system (see Appendix H).

### **Alignment with NAEYC Standards**

The components of the Action Research Projects are aligned with NAEYC standards. The action research process consists of candidates conducting a needs assessment, identifying a classroom based problem or a question, collecting and analyzing baseline data, identifying an intervention, implementing a classroom intervention; formative data collection, analyses and summative data; interpretations, and implications for future teaching. Projects are evaluated on these dimensions using a 3-point rubric system that consists of indicators including "Exceeded," "Met," and "Needs Work – Resubmit." Typically, the Action Research Project is used as an evidence for meeting INTASC Standard 8: Assessment in candidates' professional portfolios.

While the research questions may vary for each candidate, the essential components of the Action Research Project are generally aligned to NAEYC standards. Table 15 below demonstrates the alignment between components of Action Research Project and the NAEYC standards.

**Table 15: Alignment between the Action Research Project and the NAEYC Standards.**

<b>Components of Action Research Project</b>	<b>Aligned with NAEYC Standards</b>
Conducting a needs assessment	2, 3
Identifying a classroom based problem or a question	3, 4
Collecting and analyzing baseline data	3
Identifying an intervention	3, 5
Implementing a classroom intervention	1, 2, 3, 4
Formative data collection	3
Analyses and summative data	3, 5
Interpretation of findings	1, 3
Implications for future teaching	3, 4, 5

**Brief Analysis of Data Findings**

There were there (3) early childhood education program completers in academic year 2006-2007. All of them conducted an action research project. Their research projects were evaluated by faculty member in the department using the rubrics enclosed in Appendix H. Table 16 and Table 17 below present findings of data analyses from Assessment 5.

**Table 16. Number of candidates received ratings under each indicator for each project component. (N=3)**

<b>Action Research Project Component (Aligned With NAEYC Standards)</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Received “Indicator Exceeded”</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Received “Indicator Met”</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Received “Indicator Needs Work – Resubmit”</b>
Needs assessment (2, 3)	2	1	0
Identification of a problem or a question (3, 4)	1	2	0
Baseline data analysis (3)	1	2	0
Intervention identification (3, 5)	1	2	0
Intervention implementation (1, 2, 3, 4)	2	1	0
Formative data collection (3)	1	2	0
Analysis & Summative data (3, 5)	0	3	0
Interpretation (1, 3)	2	1	0
Implications for future teaching (3, 4, 5)	3	0	0

**Table 17. Program summary of action research outcomes in academic year 2006-2007.  
(N=3)**

<b>COMPONENT Aligned (With NAEYC Standards)</b>	<b>Average Points (N=3)</b>	<b>Rating Category</b> Indicator exceeded (3) Indicator met (2) Indicator needs work – resubmit (1)
Needs assessment (2, 3)	2.7	Indicator met
Identification of a problem or a question (3, 4)	2.3	Indicator met
Baseline data analysis (3)	2.3	Indicator met
Intervention identification (3, 5)	2.3	Indicator met
Intervention implementation (1, 2, 3, 4)	2.7	Indicator met
Formative data collection (3)	2.3	Indicator met
Analysis & Summative data (3, 5)	2.0	Indicator met
Interpretation (1, 3)	2.7	Indicator met
Implications for future teaching (3, 4, 5)	3.0	Indicator exceeded

Findings in Table 16 show that all candidate achieved at a level of “Indicator Met” or “Indicator Exceeded” in all components of the research project. A closer look at the data reveals that, overall, in this cohort of candidates there were more “Indicator Met” than “Indicator Exceeded” level of success. In addition, in the component “Analysis & summative data” all three candidates achieve at “Indicator Met” level, which suggests room for program improvement. The program average scores in Table 17 further confirms the findings shown in Table 16. All three candidates, however, did fulfill the program’s expectation by successfully meeting or exceeding the minimum requirement of the project.

**Interpretation of How the Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards**

Conducting Action Research Projects provides opportunities for candidates to specifically focus on an instructional or classroom-based problem and to develop instructional or curricular interventions. The action research process also allows candidates an opportunity to test those interventions for impact upon student learning, meeting NCEYC standards 1, 3, & 4. Action Research Projects are also informed by the context of the school, classroom, and community. This promotes a stronger understanding of the importance of collaboration with families, colleagues, and communities, which specifically addresses NAEYC standard 2 and 5. This assessment also supports the Unit’s conceptual framework that places high value on candidates understanding and valuing diversity.

Appendix H. Assessment #5

Action Research Project Evaluation Rubrics

Action Research Component (NAEYC Standards)	Indicator: Exceeded (3)	Indicator: Met (2)	Indicator: Needs Work Resubmit (1)	Score
<b>Needs assessment (2, 3)</b>	<p>a. Needs assessment results in specific identification of key learning need(s) of K-12 students.</p> <p>b. Needs assessment is clearly informed by the context of the school, community, and families.</p>	<p>a. Needs assessment results in identification of learning need(s) of K-12 students.</p> <p>b. Needs assessment is somewhat informed by the context of the school, community, and families.</p>	Needs assessment is poorly done and does not result in the identification of learning needs or goals.	
<b>Identification of a problem or a question (3, 4)</b>	Question is concisely & clearly stated, answerable, and is explicitly based and aligned with needs assessment as well as explicitly informed by research based best practices.	Question is stated, and is answerable and is related to needs assessments. It is informed by research based best practices.	Question is unclear, poorly stated and at this point unanswerable.	
<b>Baseline data analysis (3)</b>	<p>a. Three or more data sources relevant to context and question are used</p> <p>b. Should include both quantitative &amp; qualitative data.</p>	<p>a. Two- three data sources relevant to context and question are used.</p> <p>b. Includes both quantitative &amp; qualitative data</p>	<p>a. One or fewer data sources are used.</p> <p>b. Includes only quantitative or qualitative data</p>	
<b>Identifying an intervention (3, 5)</b>	<p>a. Literature review consists of 10 or more sources of high quality current research (theory and practice)</p> <p>b. Sources are highly appropriate to both context &amp; question.</p> <p>c. Literature review supports a clearly defined intervention.</p>	<p>a. Literature review consists of 5-9 sources of quality current research (theory and practice)</p> <p>b. Sources are highly appropriate to both context &amp; question.</p> <p>c. Literature review supports intervention.</p>	<p>a. Literature review consists of 5 or less sources of research that are uneven in quality</p> <p>b. Sources are not appropriate to context &amp; question.</p> <p>c. Literature review does not clearly support intervention.</p>	
<b>Intervention implementation (1, 2, 3, 4)</b>	<p>a. Intervention integrated into detailed, thorough lesson plan(s) (using an approved template) or lesson description(s).</p> <p>b. Highly proficient implementation of intervention is evident.</p>	<p>a. Intervention integrated in good lesson plan(s) or description(s).</p> <p>b. Good quality, accurate implementation of intervention</p>	<p>a. Intervention is not integrated into a quality lesson plan(s)</p> <p>b. Implementation is of poor quality</p>	

<b>Action Research Component (NAEYC Standards)</b>	<b>Indicator: Exceeded (3)</b>	<b>Indicator: Met (2)</b>	<b>Indicator: Needs Work Resubmit (1)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Formative data collection (3)</b>	Purposeful, regular, appropriate collection of formative data during instruction to track results of implementation.	Purposeful, periodic, appropriate collection of formative data.	Collection of data is either chaotic, random, or unorganized resulting in little data collected or non-useful data collected	
<b>Analysis &amp; Summative data (3, 5)</b>	a. Parallels baseline data collection. Data are disaggregated thoroughly & appropriately. b. Analysis of data is sophisticated & appropriate.	a. Close match to baseline data collection. b. Some disaggregation. c. A sound analysis.	a. No match to baseline data collection. b. Little or no disaggregation. c. Unsound or no analysis	
<b>Interpretation (1, 3)</b>	Insightful, thorough interpretation addresses main elements of data analysis, both aggregated & disaggregated.	b. Interpretation is sound, addresses main features of data analysis.	c. Interpretation is unclear and addresses few features of data analysis.	
<b>Implications for future teaching (3, 4, 5)</b>	a. Many ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment are given. b. Rationale for why these modifications would improve student learning are included.	a. Some ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment are given. b. Rationale for why these modifications would improve student learning are included.	a. Few ideas for redesigning unit objectives, instruction, and assessment are given. b. No rationale for why these modifications would improve student learning is included	

## ASSESSMENT #6 PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO

### General Description of the Assessment

As one of the program exit requirements, candidates in the Early Childhood Education Program must develop a professional portfolio that is organized around the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards. The INTASC standards were developed by a group of educators from across the nation and are used to assess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of teacher candidates. The professional portfolio consists of artifacts supported by self-reflections, which documents a candidate's learning and teaching over time. It is used as an evidence to demonstrate a candidate's progress throughout the program toward meeting the INTASC standards.

Candidates begin the construction of the professional portfolio early in their program. Candidates in the five-year program begin developing portfolios in their sophomore year as a part of the *ECED160 Introduction to Early Childhood Education* course. Portfolio development continues throughout the program until the completion of clinical internship. Candidates in the two-year Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T) program begin the development of their portfolio in the *EDUC282/375 Integrated Methods and Technology I: Reading, Social Studies, Language Arts*, and *EDUC283/376 Integrated Methods and Technology II: Math & Science*. The portfolio is assessed through the use of standard-based rubrics that specifically measure progress toward each INTASC standard. Cooperating teachers, faculty, and university supervisors provide input both formatively and summatively throughout the course of portfolio development. At the completion of clinical internship, portfolios are evaluated by department faculty using an INTASC standard-based rubric system (see Appendix I) and are shared in a culminating activity with peers, cooperating teachers, and faculty members in the department.

### Alignment with NAEYC standards

The INTASC standards are used to evaluate candidate professional portfolios across all programs in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Early Childhood Education candidates are no exception. The alignment between the INTASC standards and the NAEYC standards for initial certification programs is presented in Table 18 below.

**Table 18. Alignment between the INTASC Standards and the NAEYC Standards.**

INTASC Standards	Aligned with NAEYC Standards
<b>1. Content Pedagogy</b> The Teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students	1, 4
<b>2. Student Development</b> The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.	1, 4

<p><b>3. Diverse Learners</b> The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.</p>	1, 3, 4
<p><b>4. Multiple Instructional Strategies</b> The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.</p>	1, 4
<p><b>5. Motivation and Management</b> The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</p>	1, 3, 4
<p><b>6. Communication and Technology</b> The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.</p>	2, 4, 5
<p><b>7. Planning</b> The teacher plans based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
<p><b>8. Assessment</b> The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.</p>	1, 4
<p><b>9. Professional Development</b> The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.</p>	2, 5
<p><b>10. School/Community Involvement</b> The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well being.</p>	2, 5

### **Brief Analysis of Data Findings**

In the academic year 2006-2007, a total of 3 candidates in the early childhood education program completed the professional portfolio after their clinical internship experience. Data analyses were conducted based on the assessment of these candidates' portfolios. Table 19 displays the average score among the three candidates on each of the 10 INTASC standards. Rating categories (e.g., Exemplary, Proficient, and Needs Improvement) of those average scores are also displayed in Table 19 to demonstrate the level of proficiency that this cohort of candidates had achieved at the completion of their program. Findings of the data analyses indicate that, out of the 10 INTASC standards, all three candidates achieved 9 standards at the "Exemplary" level of proficiency. In the area of assessment, the average score of the candidates is 7.7, which indicates their achievement at a proficient level.

### **Interpretation of How the Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards**

The professional portfolio serves as a culminating performance assessment that demonstrates the candidate's ability to plan; instruct; assess; reflect; work with schools, communities, and families; and prepare to become a contributing member of the teaching profession. More than a snapshot of a lesson plan or unit, the professional portfolio enables candidates to document their own learning and development over time. As demonstrated in Table 19, the INTASC standards

are closely aligned with the NAEYC standards. Hence the data presented here may serve as an evidence of program effectiveness in meeting the NAEYC standards to cultivate exemplary teacher candidates.

**Table 19. Professional Portfolio Assessment Summary for Early Childhood Education Program 2006-2007 (N=3).**

<b>INTASC Standard</b>	<b>AVERAGE SCORE</b> Fall 2006-Fall 2007 (N =3) in category	<b>Rating Category</b> <u>Exemplary (8-10), Proficient (4-7),</u> <u>Needs Improvement (1-3)</u>
1. Content Pedagogy	10	Exemplary
2. Student Development	9.7	Exemplary
3. Diverse Learners	9.7	Exemplary
4. Multiple Instructional Strategies	10	Exemplary
5. Motivation and Management	8	Exemplary
6. Communication and Technology	9.3	Exemplary
7. Planning	10	Exemplary
8. Assessment	7.7	Proficient
9. Professional Development	9	Exemplary
10. School/Community Involvement	10	Exemplary

The assessment rubrics of the professional portfolio are enclosed in Appendix I.

**Appendix I. Assessment 6**

Howard University  
School of Education  
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

**INTASC STANDARDS PORTFOLIO GUIDELINES AND ASSESSMENT**

Directions: To be completed upon final assessment of teaching portfolio. This instrument is designed to record summative results of evaluation of the teaching portfolio. Indicate the level to which the student teacher has demonstrated the following competencies.

Name of Teacher Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of University Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>INTASC Standard 1</b>	<b>Criteria</b> Portfolio artifacts demonstrate:	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <b>1 - 3</b>	<b>Proficient</b> <b>4 - 7</b>	<b>Exemplary</b> <b>8 - 10</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Content Pedagogy</b> —The Teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students	Artifacts show minimal understanding of content appropriate to teaching specialty. Artifacts demonstrate few applications of the content he or she teaches.	Artifacts show understanding of content appropriate to teaching specialty. Artifacts demonstrate multiple applications of the content taught.	Artifacts show depth of understanding of content appropriate to teaching specialty. Artifacts demonstrate extensive applications of the content taught.	

INTASC Standard 2	<b>Criteria</b> Portfolio artifacts demonstrate:	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <b>1 - 3</b>	<b>Proficient</b> <b>4 - 7</b>	<b>Exemplary</b> <b>8 - 10</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Student Development</b> —The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support a child’s intellectual, social, and personal development.	Artifacts show minimal understanding of how children learn and develop Artifacts illustrate how instruction that minimally supports students’ intellectual, social, and personal development.	Artifacts show sufficient understanding of how children learn and develop.  Artifacts illustrate instruction that supports students’ intellectual, social, and personal development.	Artifacts show thorough understanding of how children learn and develop. Artifacts illustrate instruction that extends students’ intellectual, social, and personal development.	

INTASC Standard 3	<b>Criteria</b> Portfolio artifacts demonstrate:	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <b>1 - 3</b>	<b>Proficient</b> <b>4 - 7</b>	<b>Exemplary</b> <b>8 - 10</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Diverse Learners</b> —The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.	Artifacts demonstrate minimal understanding of students’ learning differences.  Artifacts illustrate minimal instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.	Artifacts demonstrate sufficient understanding of students’ learning differences.  Artifacts illustrate a multiple of instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.	Artifacts demonstrate thorough understanding of students’ learning differences.  Artifacts illustrate numerous instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.	

<b>INTASC Standard 4</b>	<b>Criteria</b> Portfolio artifacts demonstrate:	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <b>1 - 3</b>	<b>Proficient</b> <b>4 - 7</b>	<b>Exemplary</b> <b>8 - 10</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Multiple Instructional Strategies</b> —The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	Artifacts exhibit few instructional strategies.	Artifacts exhibit a multiple of instructional strategies.	Artifacts exhibit numerous instructional strategies.	
		Artifacts present little evidence of instructional focus on critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	Artifacts present sufficient evidence of instructional focus on critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	Artifacts present extensive evidence of instructional focus on critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	

<b>INTASC Standard 5</b>	<b>Criteria</b> Portfolio artifacts demonstrate:	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <b>1 - 3</b>	<b>Proficient</b> <b>4 - 7</b>	<b>Exemplary</b> <b>8 - 10</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Motivation and Management</b> —The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	Artifacts depict a learning environment that provides opportunity for individual social interaction, active engagement, and self-motivation.	Artifacts depict a learning environment that facilitates individual social interaction, active engagement, and self-motivation.	Artifacts depict a learning environment that promotes individual social interaction, active engagement, and self-motivation.	
		Artifacts depict a learning environment that provides opportunity for group social interaction, active engagement.	Artifacts depict a learning environment that facilitates group social interaction, active engagement.	Artifacts depict a learning environment that promotes group social interaction, active engagement.	

<b>INTASC Standard 6</b>	<b>Criteria</b> Portfolio artifacts demonstrate:	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <b>1 - 3</b>	<b>Proficient</b> <b>4 - 7</b>	<b>Exemplary</b> <b>8 - 10</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Communication and Technology</b> —The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.	Artifacts exhibit few communication strategies that provide support for collaboration and inquiry.	Artifacts exhibit multiple communication strategies that provide support for collaboration and inquiry.	Artifacts exhibit a variety of effective communication strategies that provide support for collaboration and inquiry.	
		Artifacts exhibit few technology tools to enrich learning opportunities.	Artifacts exhibit multiple technology tools to enrich learning opportunities.	Artifacts exhibit a variety of effective technology tools to enrich learning.	

<b>INTASC Standard 7</b>	<b>Criteria</b> Portfolio artifacts demonstrate:	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <b>1 - 3</b>	<b>Proficient</b> <b>4 - 7</b>	<b>Exemplary</b> <b>8 - 10</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Planning</b> —The teacher plans based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.	Lesson plans demonstrate minimal relationship between subject matter and Standard Course of Study.	Lesson plans demonstrate clear relationship between subject matter and Standard Course of Study.	Lesson plans demonstrate rich relationship between subject matter and Standard Course of Study.	
		Lesson plans depict weak matches among instructional goals, methods, and materials, and students' skills and abilities.	Lesson plans depict good matches among instructional goals, methods, and materials, and students' skills and abilities.	Lesson plans depict rich matches among instructional goals, methods, and materials, and students' skills and abilities.	

INTASC Standard 8	<b>Criteria</b> Portfolio artifacts demonstrate:	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <b>1 - 3</b>	<b>Proficient</b> <b>4 - 7</b>	<b>Exemplary</b> <b>8 - 10</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Assessment:</b> The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.	Artifacts manifest few formal methods used to assess what students have learned.	Artifacts manifest some formal methods used to assess what students have learned.	Artifacts manifest multiple formal methods used to assess what students have learned.	
		Artifacts manifest few informal methods used to assess what students have learned.	Artifacts manifest some informal methods used to assess what students have learned.	Artifacts manifest multiple informal methods used to assess what students have learned.	

INTASC Standard 9	<b>Criteria</b> Portfolio artifacts demonstrate:	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <b>1 - 3</b>	<b>Proficient</b> <b>4 - 7</b>	<b>Exemplary</b> <b>8 - 10</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<b>Reflective Practice and Professional Growth</b> —The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.	Reflections exhibit superficial level of self-evaluation.	Reflections exhibit satisfactory level of self-evaluation.	Reflections exhibit in-depth level of self-evaluation.	
		Artifacts exhibit little use of professional resources, technology, and colleagues to support self-development as a learner and as a teacher.	Artifacts exhibit use of professional resources, technology, and colleagues to support self-development as a learner and as a teacher.	Artifacts exhibit extensive use of professional resources, technology, and colleagues to support self-development as a learner and as a teacher.	

INTASC Standard 10	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Needs Improvement 1 - 3</b>	<b>Proficient 4 - 7</b>	<b>Exemplary 8 - 10</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<p>Portfolio artifacts demonstrate:</p> <p><b>School and Community Involvement</b>—The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well being.</p>	<p>Artifacts display no links with counselors, teachers of other classes, and activities within the school.</p>	<p>Artifacts display few links with counselors, teachers of other classes, and activities within the school.</p>	<p>Artifacts display many links with counselors, teachers of other classes, and activities within the school.</p>	
		<p>Artifacts evidence no cooperative partnerships with parents/guardians to support student learning.</p>	<p>Artifacts evidence few cooperative partnerships with parents/guardians to support student learning.</p>	<p>Artifacts evidence many cooperative partnerships with parents/guardians to support student learning.</p>	

TOTAL SCORE \_\_\_\_\_

Needs Improvement (below 75) \_\_\_\_\_ Emergent (75-85) \_\_\_\_\_ Proficient (85-95) \_\_\_\_\_ Exemplary (95-100) \_\_\_\_\_

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Program \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Portfolio Evaluator

## **SECTION V—USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE**

The Early Childhood Education (ECE) program at Howard University's School of Education is committed to the preparation of highly qualified teacher candidates. With a special focus on the urban learners, the ECE program seeks to prepare candidates who are not only effective with all children, but are particularly well versed in working with urban students, urban students with special needs, urban families, and urban communities. Howard University is located in the heart of the nation's capital in the District of Columbia. This location provides unique opportunities for practice, clinical field experiences, and enrichment opportunities, such as access to museums, the Congress, and urban communities and organizations. While the ECE program is still a small one, it is growing. The faculty and staff in the ECE program are fully dedicated to educating its candidates to become reflective educators, competent researchers, educational leaders, and change agents for the 21st century and beyond. The ECE program is guided by the mission of the university, the Unit's conceptual framework, the NAEYC standards, and other national standards, like the INTASC standards.

Since last NCATE review in 2003, the ECE program has made some modifications to enhance the rigor of its programs. These modifications will be briefly reported in the following section. The current program review provided yet another opportunity to our faculty for self-study, self-reflection, and self-modification. Based on the analyses of the assessment results presented in the previous section, we are able to identify several areas for future program improvement. Our reflections on the directions for program improvement and our future goals will be presented in the section below.

### **1. Content Knowledge**

In general, results generated by the seven assessments reported in Section IV indicate that all candidates in the Early Childhood Education program have achieved a proficient level of competency in the area of content knowledge.

In the past few years, by assessing and analyzing our candidates' performance across the curriculum, we became concerned with the content knowledge of some candidates in the early childhood education program. It is our understanding that early childhood educators are generalists whose teaching encompasses a wide range of subjects. It is also our belief that the best practice in an early childhood classroom is to teach through integrated curricula. This uniqueness of early childhood education requires teacher candidates to possess a solid knowledge base in all curriculum areas, including the basics such as mathematics, the language arts, reading, and writing. Before our last NCATE review, potential candidates could be admitted into the program provisionally without having to pass all sections of the Praxis I tests (reading, writing, and math). They were allowed up to one academic year to meet that requirement in order to remain in the program. Since 2004, however, the program ceased this practice. All potential candidates must fulfill all Praxis I requirements in order to be admitted into the program. Since the majority of our candidates are in the five-year program and their formal admission into the teacher education program is in the junior year, several measures have been taken to assist them to meet this requirement. Pre-tests are offered during the sophomore year to assess potential candidates' readiness for the Praxis I tests. Mini-courses and individualized tutoring are made available by the Center for Academic Reinforcement to those

who failed the readiness tests. The remediation continues throughout the candidates' course of study after their admission into the program. This service provides support and needed reinforcement to ensure that our candidates are proficient in content knowledge.

## **2. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions**

The assessments presented in Section IV consistently demonstrated a high level of proficiency that the candidates in Early Childhood Education program achieved in the past years. It is especially noticeable that our candidates demonstrated strong competency in pedagogical knowledge and skills across the assessments. However, a closer review and analysis across the assessments have helped us identify several areas of professional knowledge that need to be strengthened in our program.

The first area related to the understanding of professional and legal responsibilities. This part of the content knowledge has been embedded in several early childhood education courses. In addition to the textbooks, the NAEYC's position statements, such as *Code of Ethical Conduct and Statement of Commitment*, *Position Statement on Prevention of Child Abuse*, and *The Conceptual Framework for Professional Development* are among the assigned readings. However, Praxis II test results showed that most candidates in the past three years were less strong in this area than in other areas of professional content knowledge. To address this issue, we will put more efforts in helping our candidates to develop a solid understanding of their professional and legal responsibilities. But more importantly, we need to help candidates consciously apply this knowledge in their everyday practices through course work and through their clinical internships.

Similar to the professional and legal responsibilities, our candidates' knowledge of family and community relationships also needs to be further strengthened. Although the assessment results did not show a significant discrepancy between this and other areas of professional content knowledge, through the program self-study we did recognize that more explicit efforts must be put in to help candidates develop a more extensive knowledge base about families and community. One possible change is to design a comprehensive family/community project in one of the early childhood education courses. Through this project, candidates will have the opportunity to directly work with families and other members in the community. This project will also provide us a more comprehensive assessment, which will help monitor candidate learning as well as our program improvement in this area.

The third area that needs improvement is candidates' ability to understand and use assessments of student learning outcomes to strengthen student learning. Although all program candidates are required to take a 3-credit course Introduction to Assessment and Measurement in Teaching, as well as to include assessments in instructional planning, findings of our self-study suggested that candidates need more opportunities to extend their knowledge base of assessment. More specifically candidates need more opportunities to use assessment strategies to determine impact on student learning and then make needed changes in their teaching practice. One program change to help achieving this goal is already in place. Candidates now are required to conduct an action research project. The action research project consists of a wide range of assessment activities, which include assessing and reflecting upon one's practice to determine areas for improvement, developing a wide range of assessments for baseline data collection and analyses, implementing educational intervention, conducting formative data collection and analyses, and discussing implications for future practice. A new and improved rubric to capture

the nuances of candidate learning outcomes through the action research project is also being developed.

A fourth area of improvement is the development of an improved assessment instrument to measure candidates' performance during their clinical internships. While the data in this report indicates that candidates are meeting the standards, we realized that a rubric that captures more detailed variations of candidates' performance would allow for a more sophisticated analysis of data. The revised rubric will allow for a better understanding of candidates' performance in relation to the standards. It will also provide more explicit suggestions for improvement through candidates' self-assessment and assessments by their supervisors. The revision of the instrument is already in progress.

The fifth area of improvement we identified is the assessment of professional dispositions. While candidates' professional dispositions are evaluated in all early childhood courses as part of the course requirements, we need a more comprehensive measure that reflects a broader range of dispositions that early childhood educators must possess. Currently we are in the process of developing assessments that will be used throughout the candidate's program matriculation to further document candidate growth and development in this area.

### **3. Effects on Student Learning**

Candidates' effects on student learning are assessed in several ways as presented in Section IV, including the Unit Plan (Assessment 3), Action Research Project (Assessment 5), and the Professional Portfolio (Assessment 6). In all these assessments candidates must document and reflect upon the impact of their actions (e.g., lesson planning and implementation, or educational intervention) on the students. We consider these measures sufficient to assess our candidates' effects on student learning as beginning teachers.

As mentioned in the above, one major program modification having been made since our last NCATE review was to include an action research project into the program exit requirement. This change not only helped candidates to practice their knowledge and skills in the area of developing and implementing educational assessment, but also allowed for candidates to practice documenting student learning and reflect upon their own teaching practice for professional development. We will continue streamlining the action research project to ensure that effect on student learning is explicitly documented throughout the entire process.

### **4. Future Goals**

This report demonstrated the program effectiveness of the Howard University Early Childhood Teacher Education program. It also documented several areas for future program improvement. We will continue working on refining individual courses to fully align our program with the NAEYC standards. We will continue modifying the key assessments to ensure that every measure of candidate learning outcome as well as program effectiveness is focused, valid, and reliable. We will fully utilize the assessment results to support our continued effort for program improvement. We will also encourage our candidates to use these assessments constructively to enhance their own professional growth and development.

