

NCATE
Review Report on Association Standards
Summarized Findings
Association for Childhood Education International

Name of Institution: **Southern Connecticut State University** Date of Review: **Spring 2002**

State: **Connecticut** Location: Main Campus Review Type: Initial
 Alternative Location Rejoinder

Name of Program Reviewed: **Education** Grades Levels Prepared For: **_1-6_**

Classification:	Level:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elementary Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Baccalaureate
<input type="checkbox"/> Combined (specify):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Post-Baccalaureate, Initial
<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary/Special Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Master's, Initial
<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary/Early Childhood	
<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary/ _____	

Part I: Analysis of the Evidence Provided for Each Standard:

(Comments added for each standard *not* met or for noteworthy items)

Standard 1: *Development, Learning and Motivation:* **Not Met**

Comments:

Although the report indicates that candidates receive many opportunities to gain an understanding of this standard (PSY 210, EDU 539, and SED 481) and to use it in a classroom setting during student teaching, no aggregated data to demonstrate candidate performance was presented nor was a comprehensive plan for assessing candidate performance in the elements of the standard presented. Scoring rubrics and examples of candidate performance across proficiency levels were also not included.

Standard 2a: *Central Concept, Tools of Inquiry, and Structures of Content:* **Not Met**

Comments:

The narrative section of the report for this standard outlines the opportunities candidates have to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the elements of this standard. However, there were no rubrics, examples of candidate performances across levels, aggregated data, or performance plan given.

Standard 2b: *English Language Arts:* **Not Met**

Comments:

The report indicates that teacher candidates have the opportunity to develop the understandings needed to meet this standard through EDU 301 and EDU 506. However, it appears that they only utilize it with students during student teaching. Because there was no comprehensive plan for assessing candidate performance in the elements of the standard, no rubrics or other assessment formats, no aggregated data, and no examples of candidate performance across levels, this standard was not met.

Standard 2c: *Science* **Not Met**

Comments:

Although the program appears to offer candidates some background in the area of science (6 hours), they choose the courses they want to take from either life or physical sciences. This seems to limit the breadth of their science background. They also take EDU 503, a science methods courses, but it appears that they only work with students in this area during student teaching. The report indicates that the candidates learn about a variety of science programs and projects. The narrative also briefly describes assignments candidates complete in the elementary science methods class. No data are presented indicating how these assignments are used in assessing candidate performance in the standard, and no plan to assess candidate performance in the standard is presented. There is also no aggregated data or examples of candidate or student performance for this standard.

Standard 2d: *Mathematics:*

Not Met

Comments:

The narrative section of the report for this standard indicates that candidates learn a variety of methods to teach mathematics to children in EDU 504. No plan is presented to indicate how the faculty assesses or will assess candidate performance in the standard, nor are currently available data displayed. No evidence of candidate or student performances across levels is included.

Standard 2e: *Social Studies:*

Not Met

Comments:

Candidates complete a methods course in the social studies (EDU 505). From the information presented, it is not clear how the candidates' knowledge in the major concepts and modes of inquiry of the social studies are or will be assessed, nor is it clear how candidates are assessed in their ability to assist 1-6 students in learning about the social studies. It appears that they only have teaching experiences with students during student teaching. No data are presented for this standard; no plan for assessing candidate performance is outlined. No evidence of candidate or student performances across levels is included.

Standard 2f: *The Arts:*

Not Met

Comments:

Candidates are not required to take a core course in the arts. They have a choice of a fine arts course or foreign language course. Methods courses for teaching the arts to children (EDU 501 and 502) are offered, but not required. The candidates are encouraged to observe specialists during student teaching. No data are given to indicate candidates' proficiency in the elements of the standard nor is a plan presented which shows how candidates will be assessed. No evidence of candidate or student performances across levels is included.

Standard 2g: *Health Education:*

Not Met

Comments:

The report indicates that candidates take one health course (SHE 203) but actual teaching of health lessons appears to be limited to in-class assignments. No documentation or aggregated data for this standard was found. No plan to assess candidate proficiency in teaching health was shown.

Standard 2h: *Physical Education:*

Not Met

Comments:

There is no required course for teaching p.e. to students. The reviewer assumes that candidates teach p.e. during student teaching, however, no evaluation in classroom settings is indicated, and no samples of

student or candidate work at any level are included. An assessment plan for candidates' performance in the standard is not outlined.

Standard 2i: *Connections Across the Curriculum:*

Not Met

Comments:

The narrative section of the report for this standard outlines a strong philosophical position supporting the integration of content from a variety of disciplines into real-world learning experiences for students. The report does not indicate how candidates specifically apply this standard in the classroom nor present a plan to assess candidates in the elements of the standard. No currently available data are shown, nor candidate performance documentation included.

Standard 3a: *Integrating and Applying Knowledge for Instruction:*

Not Met

Comments:

The program appears to have a solid, philosophical foundation in child development and learning theory; much of the professional course work in which candidates enroll emphasizes the elements of this standard. The course work requires candidates to assimilate State standards into instructional planning. No plan for assessing candidate performance for this standard is shown and no currently available date is presented.

Standard 3b: *Adaptation to Diverse Students:*

Not Met

Comments:

Candidates appear to have the opportunity to learn multiple techniques for working with diverse children, notably in EDU 506 and SED 481 and carry them out during student teaching. The SED 481 course prepares candidates to work with students with exceptionalities, but the report does not indicate whether and in what capacity they actually work with these children (unless they happen to be included in student teaching classrooms). No plan is outlined for measuring candidate proficiency in the elements of the standard nor is currently available evidence presented.

Standard 3c: *Development of Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Performance Skills:*

Not Met

Comments:

The narrative section of the report for this standard indicate that application of this standard occurs during the candidates' student teaching and is based on a foundation laid in previous coursework. No data are provided indicating candidates' proficiency in this area, and no plan for assessing candidate performance in the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills are laid out. No documentation is given for this standard.

Standard 3d: *Active Engagement in Learning:*

Not Met

Comments:

The report indicates that candidates learn and utilize these skills, however no documentation in this area is provided and no plan for assessing candidate performance in this area is supplied. No currently available evidence of candidates' proficiency was presented.

Standard 3e: *Communication to Foster Learning:*

Not Met

Comments:

Several examples of opportunities to exhibit skills related to this standard were indicated in the report. No data was presented to indicate how candidates were performing on these assignments. Candidates do reflections in several courses. Although candidates seem to communicate effectively, no plan is provided to indicate how faculty will determine candidate proficiency in the standard.

Standard 4: *Assessment for Instruction:*

Not Met

Comments:

The report indicates numerous opportunities to assess candidate performance on the elements of the standard, and they are assessed with 1-6 students mainly during the student teaching semester. Candidates develop evaluation systems in their unit plans, lesson plans, self-evaluations, and reflections in many courses, but evidence of these systems being implemented in actual classroom settings was not given. Currently available evidence of candidate proficiency in this area was not presented (student teaching evaluations, grades in specific courses/assignments, etc.) No comprehensive plan for assessing candidate proficiency was provided.

Standard 5a: *Practices and Behaviors of Developing Career Teachers:*

Not Met

Comments:

The report indicates that the program encourages candidates to join professional organizations and attend conferences. A variety of practices from philosophies and portfolios to exchanging ideas on the Internet were listed, however, documentation of these practices was not given. Currently available data (involvement in professional organizations, graduate and employer surveys, etc) were not referenced in the narrative. No comprehensive assessment plan for the elements of this standard was presented.

Standard 5b: *Reflection and Evaluation:*

Not Met

Comments:

Candidates have many opportunities to reflect and evaluate their practices in numerous courses. Reflections on specific lessons and activities are written following each one. Journals, self-evaluations, and peer evaluations are utilized in many classes. No summarization of currently available data is provided and no plan for assessing the elements of the standard is presented. No documentation of candidate performance across levels was given.

Standard 5c: *Collaboration with Families:*

Not Met

Comments:

The report indicates that candidates learn about working with families through the methods and special education courses. Candidates have opportunities to work with parents during student teaching, however, no examples or aggregated data were included. A plan for evaluating the elements of the standard was not presented.

Standard 5d: *Collaboration with Colleagues and the Community:*

Not Met

Comments:

The narrative section of the report for this standard indicates that the program provides candidates with ample opportunity to collaborate with colleagues and the community, especially with colleagues. They are encouraged to work with specialists in the student teaching settings. Neither currently available data indicating candidate performance nor a plan to gather and analyze that data was included in the report.

Part II: Overall Comments

Program Strengths:

- ï Solid liberal arts component that exposes candidates to the knowledge of subject areas they will teach.
- ï Strong integration of curriculum areas in various courses..
- ï Many assignments and learning experiences are integrated in nature.
- ï Numerous opportunities for candidates to engage in reflection and self-evaluation.

Program Concerns/Weaknesses:

- Ï No p.e., health, or fine arts methods courses.
- ï No tests and measurements course.
- ï No experiences teaching students prior to student teaching.
- Ï No performance assessment plan indicated.

General Comments:

Although the program seems to have a sound philosophy, there are curricular areas that are not required in the program, notably fine arts, physical education, and health education methods courses. Although Art for Children and Music for Children are offered, candidates do not have to take them. Faculty encourage candidates to teach or work with specialists in these areas during student teaching. A specific course in assessment is not provided for the candidates.

The integrated nature of the courses is to be commended as well as the program's emphasis on working with diverse populations.

The apparent lack of field experiences prior to student teaching gives candidates little opportunity to develop their planning, teaching, and assessing skills.

The faculty might benefit from having a consultant from ACEI help prepare their program review (or they might attend sessions at the annual study conference). The program curriculum and all course descriptions need to be included in the report.

Summary of Program Quality:

As no plan to assess candidates' proficiency in the elements of the Elementary Teacher Preparation Standards was provided, no currently available, aggregated data were presented, and no evidence of candidates' performances across levels was given, it is not possible to judge the quality of the program's candidates or the program.

Part III: Recommendation for Site Visit

Recommendations for On-Site Team:

- ï Check for assessment plan for the Elementary Teacher Preparation Standards
- ï Check for the gathering, aggregation, and summarization of currently available data
- ï Check for candidates' experiences in teaching the fine arts, p.e., and health.
- ï Check for candidates' experiences with children prior to student teaching.

Part IV: ACEI's Decision

Program Nationally Recognized

Program Not Nationally Recognized

Program Nationally Recognized, Conditionally*

* Represents the judgment of the ACEI Reviewers that currently available assessment results, coupled with plans for gathering additional information about candidate performances, constitutes a strong case for "National Recognition." In essence, the reviewers have determined that the program is expected to develop full capacity for demonstrating candidate proficiencies across the Elementary Education Standards, and to achieve unqualified "National Recognition" *within a two-year period from the date of the review.* Program faculty are expected to provide a **Supplemental Program Report** within that period, *as the basis for confirming or denying "National Recognition."*