

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

Name of Institution: **Eastern Michigan University**

Date of Review: **Fall 02**

State: **MI**

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)

General Comment:

It appears that candidates have extensive classroom/field experience however there is little evidence presented that demonstrates actual performance. No data from student teaching is presented. The time line states that data have been collected by faculty since the year 2000, leaving a question of where it is and of what it consists.

Standard 1: *Development, Learning and Motivation:*

Met Not Met

Comments:

Information presented focuses on excellent content knowledge and skills with some attention to dispositions, but there is no focus on learning opportunities that support individual students' development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation. Good assessment plan integrating unit plans and diversity project. The Standard 1 review lacks a clear definition of how candidates are performing based on a full range of proficiency levels. No supporting data is given. Limited aggregated data provided for candidate performance on this standard. Distinctions between levels of performance is not clear.

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

Met Not Met

Comments: Rubrics or scoring guides were insufficient to determine any range of candidate proficiency. Percentages of students passing various assignments were presented without range of scoring, expectations or evidence of student performance.

Standard 2b: *English Language Arts:*

Met Not Met

Comments: Rubrics or scoring guides were insufficient to determine any range of candidate proficiency. Percentages of students passing various assignments were presented without range of scoring, expectations or evidence of student performance. Evidence of candidate knowledge does not indicate ability to present to children in a learning environment.

Summarized Findings2

Standard 2c: Science

Met Not Met

Comments: Good content review. Need to use information from assessment system. Work samples from candidates should be included that demonstrate proficiency levels. Limited aggregated data given based on Michigan State Test. Biological science seems to be missing from the requirements cited, but is an essential part of this standard.

Standard 2d: Mathematics:

Met Not Met

Comments: Good review of content. Limited aggregated data presented from Michigan Competency Test. Data is needed to show how this program uses information from the assessment system to evaluate candidate performance. No evidence to show how candidates know and are able to help children understand mathematics. Lacks evidence of candidates' work samples that show proficiency levels. The transition from an input to a performance model is unclear on this standard.

Standard 2e: Social Studies:

Met Not Met

Comments: Content understanding presented in a minimal manner. The review lacks evidence drawn from samples representing candidates' performance across all proficiency levels. No examples given. No aggregated data presented.

Standard 2f: The Arts:

Met Not Met

Comments: It is not clear that the variety of arts cited in the standard are included in the program. There was not evidence to support candidate achievement on this standard. There was no method of differentiating levels of achievement.

Standard 2g: Health Education:

Met Not Met

Comments: There was not evidence to support candidate achievement on this standard. There was no method of differentiating levels of achievement.

Standard 2h: Physical Education:

Met Not Met

Comments: There was not evidence to support candidate achievement on this standard. There was no method of differentiating levels of achievement.

Standard 2i: Connections Across the Curriculum:

Met Not Met

Comments: The heavy reliance on the literacy course here could be a strength since it would allow instructors to collect data and demonstrate candidate achievement across content areas and performance levels.

Standard 3a: Integrating and Applying Knowledge for Instruction:

Met Not Met

Comments:

Standard 3b: Adaptation to Diverse Students:

Met Not Met

Comments:

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

Met Not Met

Comments: There is no evidence to support that this particular aspect of candidate performance is occurring. Rubrics and evidence of levels of performance are needed.

Summarized Findings3

Standard 3d: *Active Engagement in Learning:* Met Not Met

Comments: There is no evidence to support that this particular aspect of candidate performance is occurring. Rubrics and evidence of levels of performance are needed.

Standard 3e: *Communication to Foster Collaboration:* Met Not Met

Comments:

Standard 4: *Assessment for Instruction:* Met Not Met

Comments: There is no evidence to support that this particular aspect of candidate performance is occurring. Rubrics and evidence of levels of performance are needed. The variety of assessment types is not clearly included in the instructional materials presented.

Standard 5a: *Practices and Behaviors of Developing Career Teachers:* Met Not Met

Comments:

Evidence provided is minimal and does not discriminate between levels of performance. In addition to candidate evidence, rubrics or scoring guides are needed.

Standard 5b: *Reflection and Evaluation:* Met Not Met

Comments: Evidence provided is minimal and does not discriminate between levels of performance. In addition to candidate evidence, rubrics or scoring guides are needed.

Standard 5c: *Collaboration with Families:* Met Not Met

Comments: Evidence provided is minimal and does not discriminate between levels of performance. In addition to candidate evidence, rubrics or scoring guides are needed.

Standard 5d: *Collaboration with Colleagues and the Community:* Met Not Met

Comments: No data given that targets standard.

Part II: Overall Comments

Program Strengths:

Many good course assignments.

When they appeared, definitions for defining rubrics or criteria that differentiate three levels of candidates' proficiencies were excellent.

Program Concerns/Weaknesses:

There is an over reliance on the results of basic skills tests to attempt to demonstrate many candidate proficiencies. The focus of these tests is narrow and merely indicates candidate knowledge, not the ability to use that knowledge to create educational experiences for children. The scores do not also indicate dispositions.

Summarized Findings⁴

Almost all course related evidence focuses on peer teaching and course assignments. This does not present evidence that candidates can construct learning opportunities for students. Limited aggregated data presented. Evidence is not drawn from samples representing range of the candidates' performances. Samples of the different levels of performance are required to support each standard.

In general there was little aggregation of data and rubrics or scoring guides seemed to be vague or missing. The use of percentages of students passing assignments and tests is only useful if the full range of performances are documented with candidate evidence demonstrating the levels cited.

There was little evidence of subject matter integration.

General Comments:

The e-portfolio needed more direct links from course requirements and scoring guides to candidate work with differentiated levels.

Accessible information to clarify how program targets each standard; however, rubrics and assessment plan should be supported with real data and evidence of candidate performance. Aggregated data should be provided.

Although the state has established guides for inclusion of diversity, it is not always clear that the content is included in field experiences or student teaching.

Summary of Program Quality:

This report indicated that candidates are involved in many excellent activities in university classes. It was extremely difficult to determine precisely what kinds of field experiences the candidates actually have and what is expected from them during those field experiences with samples of work from the candidates.

It appears that candidates have adequate input from instructors, but it is unclear whether they can provide learning experiences for students.

Part III: Recommendation for Site Visit

Recommendations for On-Site Team:

Look for evidence of candidate work collected and assessed with differentiated scoring. Examine aggregated evidence in addition to the basic skills tests utilized in this document.

Part IV: ACEI's Decision

Program Nationally Recognized

Program Not Nationally Recognized

Summarized Findings5

□ 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.”*