

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

Name of Institution: Southern Connecticut State Univ.

Date of Review: Spring 2003

State: Connecticut

Location: Main Campus
 Alternative Location

Review Type: Initial
 Rejoinder

Name of Program Reviewed:

Classification:

Elementary Education
 Combined (specify):
 Elementary/Special Education
 Elementary/Early Childhood
 Elementary/ _____

Grades Levels Prepared For: _____

Level:

Baccalaureate
 Post-Baccalaureate, Initial
 Master's, Initial

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:*

Met Not Met

Comments: The standard is at acceptable but would be strengthened with the addition of more performance-based data. The rubrics are thoughtful but other evidence is needed.

Standard 2a: *Central Concept, Tools of Inquiry, and Structures of Content:*

Met Not Met

Comments:

Standard 2b: *English Language Arts:*

Met Not Met

Comments: This is an area of strength.

Standard 2c: *Science*

Met Not Met

Comments: Continue to collect performance-based data.

Standard 2d: *Mathematics:*

Met Not Met

Comments: Continue to collect performance-based data.

Standard 2e: *Social Studies:*

Met Not Met

Comments: Content experiences seem strong. Continue to collect performance-based data.

Standard 2f: *The Arts:*

Met Not Met

Comments: There is an explanation of the lack of arts emphasis based on the limitations of the State of Connecticut parameters. However, if the arts are truly integrated as the statements describe, there needs to be evidence of their significance in the curriculum in some performance-based data. The data for this is not evident, nor does the explanation indicate that plans to collect this data exist.

- Standard 2g: Health Education:** Met Not Met
Comments: The explanation of the outcomes is helpful. Data on the success of the performance-based assessments are not included.
- Standard 2h: Physical Education:** Met Not Met
Comments: The explanation for this standard notes preparation in physical activity as an integrate portion of the curriculum. The explanation that teachers work with specialists in the field is not sufficient
- Standard 2i: Connections Across the Curriculum:** Met Not Met
Comments: While weaknesses in connections are noted, the use of integrated curricula classes with field components that have appropriate rubrics do indicate the intention of data collection and aggregation.
- Standard 3a: Integrating and Applying Knowledge for Instruction:** Met Not Met
Comments: The emphasis on learner outcomes and portfolio rubrics indicate that the program intends to provide additional data to support the assessment of the candidates.
- Standard 3b: Adaptation to Diverse Students:** Met Not Met
Comments: Additional performance-based data is needed to strengthen this area. The content information appears to be adequate.
- Standard 3c: Development of Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Performance Skills:** Met Not Met
Comments: The use of inquiry and problem solving is indicated on the rubric for the Portfolio indicating the intent to collect and aggregate data on performance in this area.
- Standard 3d: Active Engagement in Learning:** Met Not Met
Comments: The quality of the field experiences and the integrated methods classes with rubrics seem to indicate planned progress.
- Standard 3e: Communication to Foster Collaboration:** Met Not Met
Comments: This is misplaced in the document. It also is not clear how data is collected, although outcomes are given. Performance-based activities are included, but data is not available.
- Standard 4: Assessment for Instruction:** Met Not Met
Comments: It is not clear how this is addressed. Appendix S is not provided in the rejoinder.
- Standard 5a: Practices and Behaviors of Developing Career Teachers:** Met Not Met
Comments: There appears to be a plan to use the rubrics and the portfolio for data collection. Demonstration of how the data will be collected and aggregated would strengthen this area.
- Standard 5b: Reflection and Evaluation:** Met Not Met
Comments: The rejoinder (pp. 45-47) indicates performances and objectives that are planned.
- Standard 5c: Collaboration with Families:** Met Not Met
Comments: There seems to be awareness of the importance of working with families in the outcomes. This would be strengthened by additional data and work samples of how candidates foster this collaboration.

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

Met Not Met

Part II: Overall Comments

Program Strengths:

Standard 2: *English Language Arts Standard* shows progress toward performance-based assessment. The portfolios are evaluated at specific benchmarks and guidance is given. There is evidence to suggest that the standard bridges from the liberal arts and sciences, to professional coursework and to school age children. Further data gathering and assessment is in the plan for future assessment.

Standard 3a: *Integrating and Applying Knowledge for Instruction:* Evidence indicates that candidates know learning theory and apply it in courses and in their student teaching. Additional data on performance is expected.

Field experiences connected to subject areas provide positive opportunities for candidate growth. The strength of the language arts experiences is also evident in the connections in the field experiences. Assessment of the program is on going. The responses from candidates appear to be in use as a tool for on-going assessment and program improvement.

Program Concerns/Weaknesses: Additional performance-based data needs to be collected and aggregated to strengthen the program, particularly in areas such as Science, Math, Social Studies, and the Fine Arts; and strengthened further in Standard 3b:*Adaptation to Diverse Students*. While some of these areas received a “Met” they are in need of further attention.

General Comments: The rejoinder indicates that the previous review was carefully considered. The compilation of information was thoughtfully arranged, although one section seemed out of order and Appendix S was missing. It might be helpful to be consistent in the terms of “student” or “candidate.” A table of contents would be appreciated. The development of the rubrics and alignment with the standards is commendable. The program will be strengthened with more evidence of data collection.

Summary of Program Quality: The strengths of the Language Arts and Communications areas need to serve as models for building further performance-based strengths to other areas of the curriculum, including the Fine Arts.

Part III: Recommendation for Site Visit

Recommendations for On-Site Team: Ascertain the degree of attainment of the program to use performance-based data to impact program improvement and candidate performance. Candidate performance data needs to be collected and aggregated to provide solid evidence of program quality.

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.”*