

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

Name of Institution: **Eastern Michigan University**

Date of Review: **Spring 03**

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:**

The materials presented in the rejoinder did help to clarify what is happening and the rationale behind various decisions. It is hoped that there will be samples of all three levels of work in the near future. Totals from the aggregated data (the Michigan proficiency test) indicate that some students must occasionally submit unacceptable work, even if they then rework the assignment. In order to accurately view all levels of work a few of this level should also be included. The assessment and performance in regard to dispositions is still extremely weak.

**Standard 1: *Development, Learning and Motivation:***

Met  Not Met

*Comments:* This standard is close to being met, but it appears to lack sufficient data indicating dispositions to be accepted.

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

Met  Not Met

*Comments:*

**Standard 2b: *English Language Arts:***

Met  Not Met

*Comments:*

**Standard 2c: *Science***

Met  Not Met

**Standard 2d: *Mathematics:***

Met  Not Met

*Comments:* This standard is met, but is still a weak area. More emphasis on candidates evaluating the student learning and understanding the relationship of math to the real world would improve this area and increase compliance with the NCTM standards as well.

**Standard 2e: *Social Studies:***

Met  Not Met

*Comments:*

The planned changes and rejoinder comments should bring this standard into focus. The integration of social studies into so many other teacher preparation courses should make this a successful standard. At present it is still unclear.

<b>Standard 2f: <i>The Arts:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 2g: <i>Health Education:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 2h: <i>Physical Education:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 2i: <i>Connections Across the Curriculum:</i></b> Met <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not
<b>Standard 3a: <i>Integrating and Applying Knowledge for Instruction:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 3b: <i>Adaptation to Diverse Students:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 3c: <i>Development of Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Performance Skills:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 3d: <i>Active Engagement in Learning:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 3e: <i>Communication to Foster Collaboration:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 4: <i>Assessment for Instruction:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 5a: <i>Practices and Behaviors of Developing Career Teachers:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i> Evidence provided is minimal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 5b: <i>Reflection and Evaluation:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 5c: <i>Collaboration with Families:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
<b>Standard 5d: <i>Collaboration with Colleagues and the Community:</i></b> <i>Comments:</i> This standard is still not clearly met.	<input type="checkbox"/> Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met

## Part II: Overall Comments

**Program Strengths:**

The integration of the entire constituent group in the decision making process should make your changes more lasting, but this seems to have slightly delayed your implementation and reporting of the outcomes based program.

**Program Concerns/Weaknesses:**

Most all evidence still focuses on peer teaching and course assignments. This does not give us evidence that candidates can construct and implement learning opportunities for students.

Limited aggregated data presented.

Evidence is not drawn from samples representing a complete range of the candidates' performances.

**General Comments:**

Dispositions determined by one item on an end of program assessment seem very unreliable. This may also be reflected in the limited definition of "reflection" that has been presented. Reflection is not merely for use with candidate/student interactions.

**Summary of Program Quality:**

This report indicates that candidates are involved in many excellent activities in university classes. It is still difficult to identify the types of field experiences the candidates actually have and what is expected from them during those field experiences.

Because this program is a work in progress and changes to be made have been outlined in process if not product, it is difficult to give full approval to the program.

**Part III: Recommendation for Site Visit**

Recommendations for On-Site Team:

Be sure to examine the plan that has been presented here and to determine if data have been collected that show a variety of levels of candidate performance as well as knowledge, skills and dispositions.

**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."*