

Annual Report

Master of Arts in Early Childhood Education

**Graduate School of Education and Professional
Development**

December 2011



MARSHALL UNIVERSITY

Marshall University Annual Report

For purposes of program review, the academic year will begin in summer and end in spring.

Program: Master of Arts in Early Childhood Education

College: Graduate School of Education and Professional Development

Date of Last Program Review: February 2011

I. **CONSISTENCY WITH UNIVERSITY MISSION**

The Master of Arts in Early Childhood is offered by the College of Education and Human Services (COEHS) on Marshall University's Huntington Campus and by the Graduate School of Education and Professional Development (GSEPD) on Marshall University's South Charleston Campus. This program is also available online.

Program Goals: The goal of the Early Childhood Education program is to provide a coordinated, sequential program of study in an identified area of education. The program provides candidates with a foundation in research, evaluation, instructional methods, technology, human development and learning. This foundation supports knowledge, skills and understanding developed through concentrated study in a specialized area. The program is designed to produce trained teachers as specialists.

COEHS/GSEPD Mission Statements: The mission of the College of Education and Human Services is to meet the academic needs of educators and other professional personnel in the area of human services. This mission is accomplished through curricula planning and faculty organization. The College provides education and services for a society that is open, complex, demanding, and evolving. The Graduate School of Education and Professional Development provides an array of degree and professional development programs, continuing education opportunities and services designed to address the needs of the adult learner. Generally, students served by the School are mid-career professionals who are committed to continuing their career and professional development within the state, region or local community. The School provides professional/technical expertise for the service area and is actively involved in addressing educational, mental health and social issues at the regional and state level.

Connections to the Mission of Marshall University: The missions of the COEHS and GSEPD relate to several elements of the mission of Marshall University, including but not limited to: providing affordable, high quality graduate education appropriate for the state and the region; providing

services and resources to promote student learning, retention, and academic success; fostering faculty, staff, and student outreach through service activities; making instruction available throughout Marshall's service area using all appropriate modes of delivery; promoting economic development through research, collaboration, and technological innovations; and educating a citizenry capable of living and working effectively in a global environment.

II. ACCREDITATION INFORMATION

- A. **Name and description of the accreditation organization:** Early Childhood Education is part of Marshall University's Professional Education Unit (PEU). The PEU is accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).
- B. **Most recent year program accredited:** The most recent NCATE review occurred in October 2004.
- C. **Accreditation status:** The 2004 review resulted in the PEU receiving "regular" continuing accreditation (see Attachment 1). The next accreditation visit will occur fall 2012.
- D. **Attached copy of organization's report to the University:** NA
- E. **Deficiencies:** No major deficiencies were noted (see Attachment 1).
- F. **Provide 1 hard copy of the most recent self-study report to the Office of Assessment and Program Review:** A copy of the NCATE report is on file in Marshall University's Office of Academic Affairs.

III. PROGRAM STATEMENT on Adequacy, Viability, Necessity and Consistency with University/College Mission

A. ADEQUACY

- 1. **Curriculum:** The Early Childhood Education Program is designed to extend the capabilities of the professional educator to function as a generalist in education and as a specialist in Early Childhood Education. The curriculum is designed to provide candidates with a broad base of developmental, experiential, and pedagogical theory and practice. The 39 credit hour program is divided into three components (see Table 1), including: 1) a general education core with courses in advanced instructional strategies, educational evaluation, technology integration, human development, and research (15 hours); 2) the early childhood specialization with Options 1 and 2 exploring language and cognitive development,

administration of early childhood programs and day care centers, adult involvement, and field experiences (18 hours); and 3) the capstone experience (6 hours). Program offerings and requirements are influenced by the following professional societies: National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE).

Table 1. Required Courses and Sample Electives

Courses Required in Major	Sample Electives
<p>Core Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDF 621 Educational Research and Writing OR EDF 625 Qualitative Research in Education • EDF 616 Advanced Studies in Human Growth and Development • EDF 612 Educational Evaluation • CI 623 Instructional Models and Assessment Techniques OR CI 624 Advanced Instructional Strategies • CIEC 534 Applications Software in the Classroom Curriculum Area OR CIEC 600 Instructional Design and Technology OR CIEC 635 Using the Internet in the Classroom 	
<p>Area of Emphasis Requirements (Option 1*)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CI 631 Current Influences on Early Childhood Education • CI 632 Early Childhood Programs • CI 633 Adult Involvement in Early Education • CI 634 Language and Cognition in Early Childhood • CIRG 653 Literacy Acquisition • EDF 513 Human Growth and Development Birth-8 	
<p>Area of Emphasis Requirements (Option 2**)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CI 630 Practicum in Early Childhood Education • CI 632 Early Childhood Programs • CI 633 Adult Involvement in Early Education • CI 634 Language and Cognition in Early Childhood • FCS 535 Administration of Day Care Centers • EDF 513 Human Growth and Development Birth - 8 	
<p>Capstone Experience Requirements***</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CI 690 Capstone Experience • approved elective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CI 559 Multicultural Influences in Education • CI 690 Capstone Experience • CISP 510 Introduction to Instructional Practices for Exceptional Children

*Option 1 is designed for those who are already licensed Early Childhood (PreK-K) teachers.

**Option 2 is designed for those who are licensed Elementary Teachers without the endorsement in Early Childhood Education.

***The capstone experience requirements may also be met through completion of two advisor approved electives and a comprehensive exam.

2. **Faculty:** The MA in Early Childhood is supported by 15 full-time and nine part-time faculty (see Table 2). The program is coordinated by Dr. Bizunesh Wubie on the South Charleston campus and Dr. Janet Dozier on the Huntington campus. Dr. Mary Jo Graham also serves as a primary instructor of early childhood courses. The remaining full-time faculty teach supporting core and capstone courses within the degree.

Table 2. Full-time and Part-time Faculty

Name	Degree & University	Assignment	Rank	Tenure Track
Sandra Bailey	EdD in Educational Administration, West Virginia University	Faculty & Coordinator of Master of Arts in Teaching and Post Baccalaureate Teacher Certificate Programs	Professor	Yes
Steve Banks	PhD in Educational Psychology, University of Tennessee	Faculty and Coordinator of Educational Foundations and Technology	Associate Professor	Yes
Nega Debela	PhD in Sociology of Education/Language Education, University of Adelaide	Faculty & Coordinator of Teaching English as a Second Language	Professor	Yes
Janet Dozier	EdD in Curriculum and Instruction, West Virginia University	Faculty & Coordinator of Early Childhood Education	Professor	Yes
Mary Jo Graham	Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction, Ohio University	Faculty	Professor	Yes
Lisa Heaton	Ph.D. in Instructional Technology, University of Virginia	Faculty and Program Director in Elementary and Secondary Education	Professor	Yes
Edna Meisel	EdD in Curriculum and Instruction, West Virginia University	Faculty & Coordinator of Math through Algebra I	Assistant Professor	Yes
Fred Pauley	PhD in Higher Education Administration, University of Connecticut	Faculty & Coordinator of Elementary Science	Professor	Yes
Sam Securro	EdD in Educational Psychology, West Virginia University	Faculty	Professor	Yes
Fran Simone	PhD in English Education, Duke University	Faculty	Professor	Yes
Jim Sottile	EdD in Educational Psychology, West Virginia University	Faculty and Assistant Chair of the School of education	Professor	Yes
Linda Spatig	EdD, University of Houston	Faculty and Coordinator of Advanced Educational Studies	Professor	Yes
George Watson	EdD in Curriculum and Instruction, West Virginia University	Faculty and Chair of the School of Education		Yes
Nancy Wilson	EdD in Educational	Faculty	Professor	Yes

	Administration, West Virginia University			
Bizunesh Wubie	Ph. D in Curriculum and Instruction with emphasis in Early Childhood Education, University of Toronto, Canada	Faculty & Coordinator of Early Childhood Education	Associate Professor	Yes
Charles Bethel	EdD in Educational Administration, West Virginia University	Adjunct		No
Kathryn Burgess	MA School Counseling, Marshall University	Adjunct		No
Deborah Clark	EdD in Curriculum and Instruction, Marshall University	Adjunct		No
Deborah Gallaher	MA, Concord University	Adjunct		No
Barbara Holmes	EdD in Curriculum and Instruction, Marshall University	Adjunct		No
Barbara Siers	MA in Special Education, Marshall University NBCT Early Childhood Generalist	Adjunct		No
Leah Sparks	MA in Elementary Education, Marshall University	Adjunct		No
Leonard Walker	MA in Elementary Education, Marshall University	Adjunct		No
Peggy A. Witt	MA in Early Childhood Education, Marshall University	Adjunct		No

3. Students:

- a. **Entrance Standards:** Admission to the Master of Arts in Early Childhood Education requires submission of the graduate application for admission, completion of a baccalaureate degree from an accredited college/university, submission of transcripts with at least a 2.5 undergraduate GPA, consideration of any prior graduate course work, and submission of test scores from either the Graduate Record Exam (with 800 minimum combined Verbal and Quantitative score) or Miller Analogies Test (with 387 minimum scaled score). While each applicant is evaluated based on the above stated criteria, there is some flexibility in considering applicants for Provisional admission, noting that superior performance in one area may compensate for failing to meet requirements in another area. Since the ECE certificate and degree may also lead to added endorsements for licensed

West Virginia teachers, applicants must provide documentation of their teaching credentials.

- b. **Entrance Abilities:** One new student was admitted to the MA in Early Childhood Education with an undergraduate GPA of 2.80 and a combined Verbal/Quantitative GRE score of 650 (see Table 3).

Table 3. Students' Entrance Abilities

Year	N	UGPA	GRE Verbal	GRE Quant	MAT
2010-2011	1	2.80	330	320	

- c. **Exit Abilities:** Two students graduate with an MA in Early Childhood Education with an average graduate GPA of 3.64 (see Table 4). Praxis II (licensure exam for PreK-K teaching endorsement) scores are not available.

Table 4. Students' Exit Abilities

Year	N	GGPA	Praxis II
2010-2011	2	3.64	not available

4. Resources:

- a. **Financial:** The Early Childhood Education program is housed in the Professional Education Unit (PEU) that includes the College of Education and Human Services (Huntington) and the Graduate School of Education and Professional Development (South Charleston). Financial resources available to the GSEPD during FY 2011 are shown in Table 5. Reductions in the base budget have been offset with funds received from a variety of external sources, including third party contracts and grants. These resources have allowed the PEU to remain fiscally viable during a period of reduced state appropriations.

Table 5. State appropriated and other financial resources

Area	FY 2011
Personal Services*	3,721,513
Operating Expenses*	136,688
Equipment*	0
Faculty Development	56,669
Technology	92,534
Third party contracts	858,524
Grants	580,727

*State appropriated funds

- b. **Facilities:** Campus based courses are offered from Jenkins Hall (COE - Huntington) and the Academic Center (GSEPD - South Charleston). Jenkins Hall offers office space for faculty within the School of Education and classroom space including the availability of Internet and multimedia resources. Jenkins Hall also houses the Learning Resource Center, the Susan Runyan Maier Distance Learning Classroom, and the Reading Center Classroom. Marshall University also has an Early Education Center which is a nationally accredited laboratory. The laboratory is administered by a full-time director assisted by a faculty advisor and two graduate students who are certified early childhood teachers. The Center consists of a large classroom, library, and playground. The Center is also equipped with an observation room, parent/teacher computer lab and early childhood resources. In Huntington, candidates also have access to the University library, theater and arts, science laboratories, and athletic facilities, etc.

In South Charleston the administration building (GC) has 40,000 square feet and houses faculty and staff offices, two computer labs, 5 classrooms with equipment for multimedia classroom presentations, 2 traditional classrooms, a poly-com classroom for conferencing, and a bookstore. The Robert C. Byrd Academic Center (AC) is also located on the South Charleston campus. The academic center has 24,000 square feet and contains a library, the Byrd Center for Manufacturing Technology, two distance learning electronic classrooms, a poly-com classroom for conferencing, a WIMBA classroom, 4 classrooms with equipment for

multimedia classroom presentations and 5 traditional classrooms.

Courses are also offered at off-campus facilities including the Higher Education Center in Beckley, the Mid-Ohio Valley Center in Pt. Pleasant, and the Harless Center in Gilbert.

Currently, the available classroom facilities, clinical spaces, and computer labs are adequate to support the MA in Early Childhood Education.

5. **Assessment Information:**

- a. **Provide summary information:** Assessment of the MA in Early Childhood Education is based on six standards outlined by the NAEYC. Table 6 shows the alignment of assessments to standards and includes benchmarks and results for the 2010-2011 school year. Assessment results include:
- No data available for Praxis II: Pre-Kindergarten Education which is the state licensure exam
 - 89% of students meet or exceed expectations on the Case Study: Developmental Aspects of a Child in an Early Childhood Education Classroom assigned in EDF 513
 - 100% of students meet or exceed expectations on the Reflection Paper: Exploring Your Own Current Practices in Assessment and Planning for Improvement assigned in CI 632
 - 100% of students meet or exceed expectations on the Final Practicum Performance Assessment in CI 630
 - 100% of students meet or exceed expectations on the Reflection Paper: Candidate's Teaching Effect/Impact on Children assigned in CI 630
 - 100% of students meet or exceed expectations on the Report on Field-Based Interaction with Diverse Children assigned in FCS 535

Table 6. Assessment Summary

Program Level				
Standards	Assessments	Benchmarks	Results	Actions
1. Promoting Child Development and Learning. Candidates use their understanding of young children's characteristics and needs, and of multiple interacting influences on children's development and learning, to create environments that are healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging for all children.	Praxis II Case Study (EDF 513) Project on Diversity (FCS 535)	Minimum score of 590 Students meet or exceed expectations Students meet or exceed expectations	2010-2011 scores not available 89% of students (8 of 9) meet or exceed expectations 100% of students (5 of 5) meet or exceed expectations	refer to Plans for Improvement in section 5c
2. Building Family and Community Relationships. Candidates know about, understand, and value the importance and complex characteristics of children's families and communities. They use this understanding to create respectful, reciprocal relationships that support and empower families, and to involve all families in their children's development and learning.	Praxis II Case Study (EDF 513)	Minimum score of 590 Students meet or exceed expectations	2010-2011 scores not available 89% of students (8 of 9) meet or exceed expectations	
3. Observing, Documenting, and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families. Candidates know about and understand the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment. They know about and use systematic observations, documentation, and other effective assessment strategies in a responsible way, in partnership with families and other professionals, to positively influence children's development and learning.	Praxis II Case Study (EDF 513) Reflection Paper (CI 632)	Minimum score of 590 Students meet or exceed expectations Students meet or exceed expectations	2010-2011 scores not available 89% of students (8 of 9) meet or exceed expectations 100% of students (8 of 8) meet or exceed expectations	

Program Level				
Standards	Assessments	Benchmarks	Results	Actions
4. Teaching and Learning. Candidates integrate their understanding of and relationships with children and families; their understanding of developmentally effective approaches to teaching and learning; and their knowledge of academic disciplines to design, implement, and evaluate experiences that promote positive development and learning for all children.	Praxis II	Minimum score of 590	2010-2011 scores not available	
	Case Study (EDF 513)	Students meet or exceed expectations	89% of students (8 of 9) meet or exceed expectations	
	Final Practicum Performance Assessment (CI 630)	Students meet or exceed expectations	100% of students (3 of 3) meet or exceed expectations	
	Reflection Paper (CI 630)	Students meet or exceed expectations	100% of students (3 of 3) meet or exceed expectations	
5. Becoming a Professional. Candidates identify and conduct themselves as members of the early childhood profession. They know and use ethical guidelines and other professional standards related to early childhood practice. They are continuous, collaborative learners who demonstrate knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives on their work, making informed decisions that integrate knowledge from a variety of sources. They are informed advocates for sound educational practices and policies.	Praxis II	Minimum score of 590	2010-2011 scores not available	
	Case Study (EDF 513)	Students meet or exceed expectations	89% of students (8 of 9) meet or exceed expectations	
	Reflection Paper (CI 632)	Students meet or exceed expectations	100% of students (8 of 8) meet or exceed expectations	
	Final Practicum Performance Assessment (CI 630)	Students meet or exceed expectations	100% of students (3 of 3) meet or exceed expectations	

b. **Other Learning and Service Activities:** Not applicable

c. **Plans for Program Improvement:** Careful review of data from 2010-2011 has revealed two areas for program improvement: (1) content knowledge and (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Content knowledge. Overall 89% of candidates met or exceeded expectations on the Case Study: Developmental Aspects of a Child in an Early Childhood Education Classroom. However, when specific elements of the related rubric are considered candidates were below expectations in preparing the Introduction (11%), Literature Review (11%), Data Analysis (22%), Conclusions (11%), and Spelling/Grammar (11%). And, although 100% of

candidates met or exceeded expectations on the Project on Diversity, when specific elements of the rubric are considered candidates were below expectations in preparing the Literature Review (20%). Faculty are paying particular attention to improving instruction on elements where performance was low. Related actions include revising course syllabi and associated content/assignments.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions. Overall 100% of our students met or exceeded expectations on their Reflection Paper exploring current practices in assessment and planning; however, a closer look at the rubric reveals that 12.5% of candidates were below expectations when reflecting on assessment practices, identifying problems, and planning for improving assessments. Faculty are exploring new strategies to improve candidate performance in terms of assessing and improving student learning.

- d. **Graduate and Employer Satisfaction:** Based on the most recent PEU survey of graduates from 2005-2009, respondents felt that their preparation was *good* (3) to *excellent* (4) related to 10 program outcomes, including:
- Understand and apply current knowledge (3.59)
 - Demonstrate skills in research (3.53)
 - Demonstrate attitudes/skills to function in school/community (3.45)
 - Understand and apply technology (3.22)
 - Understand and apply human growth and development (3.45)
 - Understand children with special needs and provide assistance in the least restrictive environment (3.14)
 - Understand diversity and related implications (3.14)
 - Communicate with constituent groups (3.34)
 - Demonstrate self-direction (3.68)
 - Commitment to continued professional growth (3.69)
6. **Reviews:** The last five year program review (dated February 2011) resulted in “continuation of the program at the current level.”

B. VIABILITY

1. **Articulation Agreements:** There were no formal agreements with other institutions during this review period.

3. **Off-Campus Classes:** There were no off-campus classes during this review period.
3. **Online Courses:** Online courses and enrollments are included in Table 7. Option 2 of the Master of Arts in Early Childhood is available online.
4. **Service Courses:** Service courses used by the MA in ECE are included in Appendix VI. These include the core, elective, and capstone requirements for completing the MA.
4. **Program Course Enrollment:** Across required courses within the specialization in early childhood education there was a total headcount of 82 enrollments during 2010-2011, including: CI 630 (3), CI 631 (18), CI 632 (8), CI 633 (16), CI 634 (21), EDF 513 (11), and FCS 535 (5). Program enrollments by semester for required, service, and elective courses are outlined in Table 7.

Table 7. Program Enrollments for Required, Service, and Elective Courses

Course Number	Course Name	Required/ Elective/ Service	Delivery Method	Location	2010-2011		
					Su	Fa	Sp
CI 559	Multicultural Influences in Education	E + S	O	Huntington So. Chas.		20	
CI 623 OR	Instructional Models and Assessment Techniques	R + S	O	So. Chas.	21	20	24
CI 624	Advanced Instructional Strategies		Td	So. Chas.	12	25	9
CI 630	Practicum in Early Childhood Education	R	O	So. Chas.		3	
CI 631	Current Influences on Early Childhood Education	R	O	So. Chas.		18	
CI 632	Early Childhood Programs	R	O	So. Chas.	8		
CI 633	Adult Involvement in Early Education	R	O	So. Chas.		16	
CI 634	Language and Cognition in Early Childhood	R	O	So. Chas.			21
CI 690	Capstone Experience	E + S	O	So. Chas.	13	7	13
CIEC 534 OR	Applications Software in the Classroom Curriculum Area	R + S	H + O	So. Chas.	60	66	92
CIEC 600	Instructional Design and Technology		H + O	So. Chas.	6	43	
CIEC 635	Using the Internet in the Classroom		H + O	So. Chas.	11	20	21
CIRG 653	Literacy Acquisition	R + S	Td + H	Huntington So. Chas.		12	18
CISP 510	Introduction to Instructional Practices for Exceptional Children	E + S	Td + O	Huntington So. Chas.	17	34	39
EDF 513	Human Growth and Development Birth – 8	R	H + O	So. Chas.		11	
EDF 612	Educational Evaluation	R + S	Td + O	Huntington So. Chas.	41	70	44
EDF 616	Advanced Studies in Human Growth and Development	R + S	Td + H + O	Huntington So. Chas.	32	54	61
EDF 621 OR	Educational Research and Writing	R + S	Td + H + O	Huntington So. Chas.	43	87	79
EDF 625	Qualitative Research in Education		Td + H	Huntington So. Chas.		31	7
FCS 535	Administration of Day Care Centers	R	O	So. Chas.			5

Required/Elective: Required = R; Elective = E, Service = S

Delivery Method: Traditional = Td, Online = O, Hybrid = H

5. **Program Enrollment:** The following program enrollment data is based on the Current Majors report available in MU B.E.R.T. for Fall 2010. There were 14 students enrolled in the MA in Early Childhood Education and 19 students enrolled in the MA in Elementary Education with Early Childhood Education as an area of emphasis for a total of 33 students.
 7. **Enrollment Projections:** The teacher shortage, state and national education policy, and the population of over 100,000 children under the age of five in West Virginia suggest that enrollment in the PreK-K program should rise steadily during the next five years. However, demand for the certificate program in ECE will likely exceed that in the associated MA in ECE.
- C. NECESSITY:** NOTE: If your program is accredited, please refer to the appropriate page numbers in your accreditation report. Provide a **narrative summary** for each of the following items in addition to requested appendices.
1. **Advisory Committee:** The Educational Personnel Preparation Advisory Committee (EPPAC) is mandated by WV Department of Education Policy 5100. EPPAC covers the design, delivery, and evaluation of programs for the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. EPPAC includes personnel from P-12 schools, faculty within the PEU, faculty from arts and sciences who work with teacher preparation, representatives from the WV Department of Education, teacher education candidates, and community members involved with education.
 - 2-3. **Graduates/Job Placement:** Nearly all candidates admitted to the specialization in Early Childhood Education are already employed as professional educators and participate in graduate education on a part-time basis to upgrade skills and/or to acquire new skills or licensure.

Local school systems and the WV Department of Education routinely provide information about employment opportunities. Faculty provide recommendations for program graduates seeking other or new employment in addition to providing recommendations for candidates seeking admission to EdS, EdD/PhD programs. Faculty maintain contact with employers and graduates through the delivery of staff development, courses for licensure renewal, continuing education programs, and through clinical/field-based placements. Supporting data for Appendix VIII are not currently available.

IV. RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (If applicable) Not applicable

Attachment 1
Detailed Assessment Reporting
New data for 2010-2011 appears in green

Assessment 1

**Assessment 1: Licensure Assessment: Praxis II: Pre-Kindergarten Education
State Licensure Assessment**

1. Brief description of the assessment and its use in the program:

Praxis II: Prekindergarten Education (0530) Content-Based Assessment Test is developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS). It contains 100 multiple choice questions. For teachers who are in the early childhood education advanced programs and who seek on endorsement to teach in pre-kindergarten settings, passing this test with a score of 590 is a requirement by the state of West Virginia

2. Description of how this assessment specifically aligns with NAEYC standards:

Praxis II: Pre-K Education (0530) has two major categories or content areas: I) Development of Young Children and Contribution of Theory to Educational Practices; and II) Planning, Implementing and Evaluating Instruction for Young Children (ETS Praxis Series, 2008, p.1). As these two major categories or areas indicate, the test is designed to assess candidate’s knowledge of child development theories, curriculum, educational practices and assessment methods in the content areas. Under each one of these categories, sub-categories are listed. Looking at the major content categories and the sub-categories, this test aligns with all the NAEYC core standards as shown in the following table

Table 1 : Alignment of Praxis Test with NAEYC Core Standards (CSs)

Major Categories and Sub-categories of the Praxis Test	CSs
Development of Young Children and Contribution of Theory to Educational Practices : (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cognitive Development: Concept, skills and language..... • Physical development..... • Personal and Social development..... • Major streams of developmental theory: cognitive, behaviorist and social learning theories..... • Major streams of curriculum theory..... 	CS 1, 3 CS 1 CSs 1, 2,, 5 CS 1, 2, 4 CSs 1, 4
Planning, Implementing and Evaluating Instructions for Young Children: (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and implementing appropriate curriculum..... • Management of the physical learning environment..... • Behavior management issues..... • Assessment procedures and effective communication about a child’s total developmental progress..... • Professional and legal responsibilities of the pre-k teacher..... 	CSs 4, 3, 2, 5 CSs 1, 4, 5 CSs 1, 4, 5 CSs 1, 3, 2 CSs 5, 4, 2

3. Candidate data derived from the assessment and brief analysis of the data findings.

**3.1. Candidate Data:
WV Passing Score: 590**

Table 2: Candidates and Scores at Marshall University Level

Year	MU 06/07	MU 07/08	MU 08/09	MU 09/10
Candidates	5	5	10	18
Highest Score	770	780	780	810
Lowest Score	670	620	680	530
Median Score	735	710	710	700
Pass Rate	100%	100%	100%	94%

Major Categories/Elements:

- I. **Development of Young Children and Contribution of Theory to Education Practices (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**
- II. **Planning, Implementing, & Evaluating Instruction for Pre-K Children (CSs, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)**

Table 3: Average % of Correct Responses at the Institution and State Levels

Test Category & NAEYC Standards	Institution Average % Correct 06-07	Institution Average % Correct 07-08	Institution Average % Correct 08-09	Institution Average % correct 09/010	State-Wide Average 06-07	State-Wide Average 07-08	State-Wide Average 08-09	State-Wide Average 09-10
I. (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	79%	74%	73%	75%	73%	74%	75%	73%
II. (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	87%	85	90%	85%	80%	82%	84%	82%

Quartile Report Based on Test Categories:

Quartile Report for 2007-2008

Test Category	1 st quartile	2 nd quartile	3 rd quartile	4 th quartile	Total
I.	1-11%	5-56%	3-33%	0-0%	9-100%
II.	1-11%	3-33%	2-22%	3-33%	9-100%

Quartile Report for 2008-2009

Test Category	1 st quartile	2 nd quartile	3 rd quartile	4 th quartile	Total
I.	0-0%	6-60%	4-40%	0-0%	10-100%
II.	0-0%	2-20%	7-70%	1-10%	10-100%

Quartile Report for 2009-10

Test Category	1 st quartile	2 nd quartile	3 rd quartile	4 th quartile	TOTAL
I.	2 - 11%	6 - 33%	7 - 39%	3 - 17%	18 - 100%
II.	2 - 11%	7 - 39%	2 - 11%	7 - 39%	18 - 100%

3.2. A brief analysis of data findings:

As shown in table 2, in each of the first three years (06/07, 07/08, 08/09), the median score of the candidates is above the 590 passing score of the state of West Virginia. Actually, for the three years, 590 is the lowest score for all candidates. Also, in each of the first three years, the passing rate is 100%. In 2010, although the lowest score is 530, the median score is 700 which is way above the state requirement.

When it comes to the average percentages of correct response at the institution level and State-Wide average level, as shown in table 3, for category I (Development of Young Children and Contribution of Theory to Education Practices), except in 2008/2009 where the average percent of correct responses for the institution was 73 and the average percent of correct responses for the state was 75, in all other years (06/07, 07/08, 09/10), the average of correct responses of the institution was either equal to the statewide average or more than the State-Wide average. For example, in 06/07 the average of correct responses for the institution was 79, while the state wide average was 73. Also, in 2010, while the average of correct responses for the institution was 75%, the average of correct response for the state was 73%. For category II (Planning, Implementing & Evaluating Instructions for Pre-K Children), as can be seen in table 3, in each of the four years (06/07, 07/08, 08/09, 09/10), the average of correct responses for the institution was more than the statewide average.

When we look at the quartile report for 07/08, in category I (Development of Young Children and Contribution of Theory to Education Practices), 67% of the candidates are within the first and second quarter. In Category II (Planning, Implementing, & Evaluating Instruction for Pre-K Children), 47% are within the first and second quartile. In 08/09, in category I, 60% of the candidates are within the first and second quartiles. In category II, only 20% of the candidates are within the first and second quartile while 80% of the candidates are within the third and fourth quartiles. In 09/10, in category I, 44% of the candidates are within the first and second quartiles while 56% of them are within the third and the fourth quartiles. In category II, 50% of the candidates are within the first and second quartiles while 50% of them are within the third and fourth quartiles.

4. Interpretation of how these data provide evidence for meeting standards :

As shown in table 1, the two major categories of the Praxis test, i.e. Development of Young Children and Contribution of Theory to Educational Practices and Planning, Implementing and Evaluating Instruction for Pre-K Children and their sub-categories align with all NAEYC standards (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). On the other hand, as indicated under 3.2, out of the four years of data, in three consecutive years the median test score of our candidates is above the 590 passing score of the state of West Virginia. Furthermore, the passing rate for the three years is 100%. As also stated under 3.2, for category I, except in 08/09, the average percentage of correct responses of our candidates was either equal to the state-wide average or more than the state-wide average. When it comes to category II, in each of the four years the average percentage of correct responses of our candidates was more than the state-wide average. This data certainly provide evidence that our candidates met all the NAEYC standards. However, despite the fact that our candidates did well in their overall test performance, according to the quartile report, there is a

noticeable weakness in category 1 except for 2010 where 44% of the candidates were within the first and second quartiles and 56% of them are within the third and the fourth quartiles.

5. Assessment documentation :

Since Praxis: II: Pre-Kindergarten education is administered by Educational Testing Service (ETS) we do not have the assessment tool and the scoring guide. In fact, as stated in the NAEYC template (Feb. 2008), the assessment tool and scoring guide are not required for reporting state licensure data

Assessment 2

Assessment 2: Content Knowledge in Early Childhood Education: Case Study on Developmental Aspects of a Child in Early Childhood Education Classroom: Course: EDF: 513: Human Growth and Development: Birth-8

1. Brief description of the assessment and its use in the program:

This case study is the culminating requirement to EDF 513: Human Growth and Development: Birth-8. It is designed not only to assess candidates' content knowledge on young children's developmental domains, characteristics, needs and the multiple factors influencing their development and learning, but also to assess candidates' practical research skills in early childhood classroom settings. Through this assessment, candidates are required to explore the physical, cognitive, linguistic, social and emotional domains of a single child within the age range of 3-5 years with particular emphasis on the child's characteristics, needs and the influencing factors in his/her development and learning.

2. Description of how the assessment specifically aligns with NAEYC standards:

The main NAEYC standard addressed by this assessment is core standard 1 which has to do with promoting child development and learning. However, directly or indirectly, the assessment also addresses the other NAEYC core standards (2, 3, 4, 5). To put it in specific terms, in conducting this case study, among other things, candidates are required to perform the following: **a)** Review literature for greater understanding of children's domains of development, characteristics, needs and learning (1a, 1b ; 4b, 4c) ; **b)** Interview a parent in order to understand the contextual background of the parent and the child under the case study (2, 1); **c)** Observe the child, interact with him/her and document information for more understanding of the child's characteristics, learning and development (1, 3, 4) ; and **d)** write a case study report with the following sub-titles: **1) Introduction** where the rationale of the case study, the methods of data collection and the major finding/findings are clearly stated (1a, 1b, 1c; 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d); **2) Literature Review** where current research information on the developmental and learning aspects of children within the age range of the child under the case is discussed (1a, 1b, 1c ; 3, 4, 5); **3) Reflection on Factors Influencing Learning in Early Childhood Education Classroom** where the environment of the classroom, the types of curriculum, the involvement of families and the candidate's role as a teacher are discussed as important factors influencing the child's development and learning (1a, 1b, 1c, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d,; 2a, 2c; 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d). **4) Data Analysis** where data collected through literature review, parent interview, observation and reflection on classroom contextual factors are synthesized/analyzed to provide information on the child's developmental and learning situations (1, 2, 3, 4, 5); **5) Conclusion** where the candidate summarizes the major contents of the case study, states the major finding/findings, reflects on what she/he thinks has learned by conducting this particular case study and indicates how he/she may use it in his/her future work as a teacher and as an advocate for children and their families (1, 2, 3, 4, 5); **6). References** where current research resources are listed (3, 5); **7) Attachments:** candidates are also required to attach **parent interview questions and responses** (1, 2, 3) and **observation and interaction notes** (3, 4). For details of how the assessment aligns with NAEYC's standards, please see the instructions and the scoring guide under 5a and 5b respectively.

3. Candidate data derived from the assessment and a brief analysis of the data findings :

3.1. Data:

Semester: Fall 2008 Candidates= 16

Score Data by Assessment Criteria/Elements, Fall of 2008

Criteria :	Points	Below Expectations Points		Meets Expectations Points		Exceeds Expectations Points	
1. Introduction	10	N = 1 6.25%	< 8	N =6 37.5%	8-8.9	N =9 56.25%	9.1-10
2. Literature Review	25	N = 2 12.5%	< 20	N =6 37.5%	20-22.5	N =8 50%	22.75-25
3. Data Analysis	30	N =2 12.5%	< 24	N=6 37.5%	24-27	N =8 50%	27.3-30
4. Conclusion	15	N = 2 12.5%	< 12	N=7 43.75%	12.13.5	N =7 43.75%	13.65-15
5. Reference and Citations	5	N = 1 6.25%	< 4	N =6 37.5%	4-4.5	N= 9 56.25%	4.55-5
6. Spelling, Grammar and Fonts	5	N = 1 6.25%	< 4	N=5 31.25%	4-4.5	N= 10 62.5%	4.55-5
7. Attachments	10	N=2 12.5%	< 8	N=5 31.25%	8-8.9	N =9 56.25%	9.1-10

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the criteria means in relation to NAEYC Standards

Semester: Fall 2009 Candidates= 12

Score Data by Assessment Criteria, Fall of 2009

Criteria :	Points	Below Expectation Points		Meets Expectation Points		Exceeds Expectation Points	
1. Introduction	10	N = 1 8.33%	< 8	N =4 33.33%	8-8.9	N =7 58.33%	9.1-10
2. Literature Review	25	N = 1 8.33%	< 20	N =5 41.66%	20-22.5	N = 6 50%	22.75-25
3. Data Analysis	30	N =2 16.66%	< 24	N= 4 33.33%	24-27	N =6 50%	27.3-30
4. Conclusion	15	N = 2 16.66%	< 12	N=3 25%	12-13.5	N =7 58.33%	13.65-15
5. Reference and Citations	5	N = 1 8.33%	< 4	N =5 38.46%	4-4.5	N= 6 58.33%	4.55-5
6. Spelling, Grammar and Fonts	5	N = 1 8.33%	< 4	N=6 33.33%	4-4.5	N= 5 38.46%	4.55-5
7. Attachments	10	N =1 8.33%	< 8	N=4 33.33%	8-8.9	N =7 58.33%	9.1-10

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the criteria means in relation to NAEYC Standards

Semester: Fall 2010

Candidates= 9

Score Data by Assessment Criteria, Fall of 2010

Criteria :	Points	Below Expectation Points	Meets Expectation Points	Exceeds Expectation Points
1. Introduction	10	N = 1 11.11% < 8	N = 4 44.44% 8-8.9	N = 4 44.44% 9.1-10
2. Literature Review	25	N = 1 11.11% < 20	N = 3 33.33% 20-22.5	N = 5 55.55% 22.75-25
3. Data Analysis	30	N = 2 22.22% < 24	N = 2 22.22% 24-27	N = 5 55.55% 27.3-30
4. Conclusion	15	N = 1 11.11% < 12	N = 2 22.22% 12-13.5	N = 6 66.66% 13.65-15
5. Reference and Citations	5	N = 0 0% < 4	N = 4 33.33% 4-4.5	N = 5 55.55% 4.55-5
6. Spelling, Grammar and Fonts	5	N = 1 11.11% < 4	N = 2 22.22% 4-4.5	N = 6 66.66% 4.55-5
7. Attachments	10	N = 0 0% < 8	N = 3 33.33% 8-8.9	N = 6 66.66% 9.1-10

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the criteria means in relation to NAEYC Standards

Overall Assessment Score for the Fall of 2008

Candidates= 16

Global Data, Fall of 2008

Semester & Year	Does not Meet Expectations Below 80	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
Fall 2008	N = 2 12.5%	N = 6 37.5%	N = 8 50%

Overall Assessment Score for the Fall of 2009

Candidates = 12

Global Data, Fall of 2009

Semester & Year	Below Expectations Below 80	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
Fall 2009	N = 1 8.33%	N = 5 41.66%	N = 6 50%

Overall Assessment Score for the Fall of 2010

Candidates = 9

Global Data, Fall of 2010

Semester & Year	Below Expectations Below 80	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
Fall 2010	N = 1 11.11%	N = 2 22.22%	N = 6 66.66%

3.2 Brief Analysis of the data findings :

Based on the score data by assessment criteria/elements for the **fall of 2008**, the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations for criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are 93.75%, 87.5%, 87.5%, 87.5%, 93.75%, 93.75% and 87.5%, respectively. In three criteria (1, 5, 6), 93.75% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. That means more than 87.5% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations.

Based on the score data by assessment criteria for the **fall of 2009**, the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations for criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are 91.66%, 91.66%, 83.33%, 83.33%, 91.66%, 91.66%, 91.66%, respectively. In five criteria (1, 2, 5, 6, 7), 91.66% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. That means more than 83.33% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations in the seven scoring criteria.

Based on the score data by assessment criteria for the **fall of 2010**, the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations for criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are 88.88%, 88.88%, 77.77%, 88.88%, 100%, 88.88%, and 100%, respectively. In two criteria (5 and 7) 100% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. That means more than 77.77% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations in the seven scoring criteria.

When it comes for the overall assessment score, as shown in the overall assessment score table for the **fall of 2008**, 2 (12.5%) candidates scored below expectations while 93.75% met or exceeded expectations. As shown in the overall assessment score for the **fall of 2009**, 1(8.33%) candidate scored below expectations while 91.66% candidates met or exceeded expectations. Similarly, as the overall assessment score table for 2010, shows only 1 (11.1%) of the candidates scored below expectation while 88.88% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations.

4. Interpretation of how these data provide evidence for meeting standards

Based on the rubric/scoring guide which reflects NAEYC standards (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), in the fall of 2008, the score data by assessment criteria show that more than 87.5% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. Also, in the fall of 2009, the score data by assessment criteria show more than 83.33% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. Furthermore, the fall 2010 score data by assessment criteria shows 88.88% of the candidates met or exceeds expectations. In fact, the mean score for each assessment element is 90.47%. Therefore, the overall data for the three semesters provide evidence that not only do candidates have content knowledge on young children's developmental domains, characteristics, needs and the multiple factors influencing their development and learning, but also have demonstrated practical research skills in early childhood classroom settings. In other words, more than 87.5% of the candidates in the fall of 2008, more than 83.33% of the candidates in the fall of 2009 and more than 77.77% of the candidates in fall semester of 2010 met or exceeded

expectations in their performance on the seven criteria/elements listed and described under the description of assessment alignment with NAEYC standards.

As shown in the global data for the fall of 2008 and the fall of 2009, the percentage of candidates who did not meet expectations is low, i.e., 12.5% and 8.33%, respectively. However, this does not mean that we ignore these percentages. It is our plan to examine each scoring element where candidates scored below expectations and improve the contents of the course, the teaching and assessment methods in order to improve candidate and program performances.

Assessment documentation:

a) Assessment Tool : Case Study on Developmental Aspects of a Child

Description of the Assessment: Instructions

As you know, understanding theories and practices of child development and learning is a major corner stone of becoming a specialist in early childhood education. As experienced teachers and as graduate candidates, we believe that you are familiar with theories and practices of child development and learning. Through this assessment tool, you are required to demonstrate your understanding of young children's developmental domains, characteristics, needs and the various influencing factors of their development and learning by exploring the characteristics and the developmental aspects of a single child within the age range of 3-5 and write a report of 10-12 pages, excluding the reference and attachments pages. In doing so please carefully follow the following instructions:

A. Instructions for Data Collection (Literature Review, Parent Interviews, Observations, and Interactions)

- Choose and focus on a child in your classroom and secure the consent of her/his parent that you are going to conduct a case study on her/him;
- Make a thorough review of literature on the developmental domains (physical, cognitive, linguistic, social and emotional development) and the characteristics and needs of children who are within the age of range of the child you chose for your case study. For example, if the child you chose is 4 years old, you need to examine what the current research literature says about the physical, cognitive, linguistic, social and emotional development, characteristics and needs of typical four year old children and record important theories and research results (CSs 1, 3)
- Examine documents that you may have on the child including kinds of activities that the child was able to learn previously (CSs 3, 4)
- Conduct an interview with one parent of the child and collect contextual information on the child and the parent. The information may include but not limited to: a) Whether or not the parent is single; b) Racial and cultural background; c) Economical and educational status; c) Whether or not the child has siblings; d) The parent's beliefs and

commitment in being involved in the care and education of her/his child in early childhood education setting or at home (CSs 2, 1)

- Make thorough observations on the child, at least for three hours, and document information on the physical, cognitive, linguistic, social and emotional status of the child. The information may include but not limited to: the child's weight and height, the kinds of classroom activities she/he likes most, her/his participation in classroom activities, her/his language skills, how she/he interacts socially with other children and adults in the classroom, how she/he expresses her/his emotions in terms of curiosity, timidity, comfort, discomfort, laughter, happiness or sadness, how she/he communicates linguistically, etc. (CSs 3, 1)
- Talk/converse and interact with the child and document more information on her/his characteristics, needs, and linguistic skills/abilities (CSs, 3, 4)

B. Instructions for Writing the Report:

- **Introduction:** Have an introductory section which includes: a) Compelling reason/reasons as to why you conducted this case study; b) The major issues raised in the study; c) Procedure of data collection; and d) major finding/findings of the case study (1a, 1b, 1c; 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d)
- **Literature Review:** Have a literature review section where you provide current research literature information on the nature of the physical, cognitive, linguistic, social and emotional domains, characteristics and needs of children who are within the age range of the child you chose for your study (1a, 1b, 1c ; 3, 4, 5)
- **Factors Influencing Learning in Early Childhood Education Classroom:** Have a section where you describe the arrangement of the classroom, the type of curriculum, the involvement of families and your role as a teacher as important factors influencing children's learning and development (1a, 1b, 1c, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d,; 2a, 2c; 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d).
- **Analysis:** Based on the data you collected through literature review, parent interview, observations and interactions, synthesize, analyze and reflect your perspectives on the developmental domains, i.e. physical, cognitive, linguistic, social and emotional domains, her/his characteristics and needs of the child under your case study. While analyzing, it is important to underscore the following: a) The relationship of the information you collected on the child and current research literature on child development; b) The relationship of factors such as classroom arrangement, family involvement, types of activities in classroom (curriculum) and your professional skill as a teacher with that of the child's learning situations; c)) The results that you have found by conducting this case study including how you may use your finding/findings for your current and future work with children and families (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5).
- **Focus and Consistency:** While analyzing issues, be **focused, consistent** and **orderly** in the flow of ideas
- **Citation Styles:** Use **APA** style citations. For information on APA style of citations and [Plagiarism](#) please see the syllabus;
- **Pseudonyms:** to protect privacy, please do not use the real name of the child, parents or the community. Instead, please use pseudonyms;
- **Conclusion:** Write a conclusion which includes: a) summary on the major contents of the case study report; b) The finding/findings that you come up with; c) What you think you

have learned by conducting this case study; and c) How you may be using your finding/findings in your current or future work in terms of improving your teaching, curriculum, advocacy and relationship with families (1, 2, 3, 4, 5);

- **References:** Have a reference section which includes a **minimum of 8 resource materials;** (CSs 3, 5)
- **Spelling Check:** Check spelling and grammar before submission;
- **Attachments:** Have the following attachments at the end of your paper: a) Parent interview questions and responses (1, 2, 3); b) Observation and interaction notes (3, 4);
- **Font:** Use Verdana **font.**

b) Scoring Guide (Rubrics)

Scoring Elements & NAEYC's Standards	Below Expectations (0-79)	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
Introduction 10 points (1a, 1b, 1c; 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d)	Candidate did not state or vaguely stated the following: a) The rationale or the justification of the case study which is to explore the physical, cognitive, linguistic, social, and emotional domains of the child under the case study with particular emphasis on his/her characteristics, needs and learning/development influencing factors ; b) The methods of data collection (literature review, parent interview, observation and interaction); and c) The major finding/findings of the study (< 8 points)	Candidate, meaningfully, stated: a) The rationale or the justification of the case study which is to explore the physical, cognitive, linguistic, social and emotional domains of the child under the case study with particular emphasis on his/her characteristics, needs and learning/development influencing factors; b) The methods of data collection (literature review, parent interview, observation and interaction); and c) The major finding/findings of the study (8- 8-9 points)	Candidate not only provided a compelling rationale as to why she/he conducted the case study, but also clearly and thoughtfully articulated the methods of data collection and the major finding/findings of the case study (9.1-10 points)
Literature Review: 25 points (1a, 1b, 1c; 3, 4, 5)	The literature review text has two or more of the following shortcomings: a) The overall content of the literature review section does not demonstrate candidate's understanding of young children's developmental domains, characteristics, needs, and ways of children's learning within the age range of the child under the case study; b)The description on the developmental domains, characteristics and need of children within the age range of the child under the case study does not reflect current research information; b) many or all of the developmental domains are not raised and discussed; c) The characteristics needs, and ways of children's learning within the age range of the child under the case study are not raised and discussed or are poorly discussed. (< 20 points)	The literature review text shows that: a) candidate has a good understanding of developmental domains, characteristics, needs, and children's learning who are within the age range of the child under the case study; b) most of the information on the developmental domains, characteristics, needs and learning of children reflects current research results; c) most of the developmental domains are raised and discussed; d) candidate has provided adequate information on characteristics and needs of children within the age range of the child under the case study.(20-22.5 points)	The literature review text shows that: a) the candidate has an in-depth understanding and knowledge of the developmental domains, characteristics, needs and learning of children within the age range of the child under the case study; b) almost all of the information on the developmental domains, characteristics and needs of children reflects current research results; c) All of the developmental domains are raised and discussed excellently; d) candidate has provided rich and very relevant information on characteristics and needs of children within the age range of the child under the case study (22.75-25 points)

Data Analysis: 30 points (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	Candidate did not demonstrate or vaguely demonstrated skills and knowledge in analyzing, synthesizing, relating and articulating data collected through literature review, parent interview and observation to provide information on the child's developmental domains, characteristics, needs and contextual factors that impact his/her learning (< 24 points)	Candidate demonstrated a reasonable amount of knowledge and skills in analyzing, synthesizing, relating and articulating data collected through literature review, parent interview and observation and provide adequate information on the child's developmental domains, characteristics, need and the contextual factors that impact his/her learning. (24-27 points)	Candidate not only has an extensive content knowledge and skills in analyzing, synthesizing, relating and articulating the data, but also she/he demonstrates thoughtful articulation skill on the nature of the child's developmental domains, characteristics, needs and the contextual factors that impact his/her learning. (27.3-30 points)
Conclusion: 15 points (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	In the conclusion candidate did not include or vaguely included two or more of the following: a) the summary of the case study ; b) the finding/findings of the study; c) reflection on what the candidates thinks has learned by conducting this particular case study; d) plan of using what the candidates learned in his/her current and future work as a teacher and as an advocate for children and families. (<12 points)	In the conclusion candidate has included the following: a) the summary of the case study ; b) the finding/findings of the study; c) reflection on what the candidate thinks he/she has learned by conducting this particular case study; d) plan of using what the candidates learned in his/her current or future work as a teacher and as an advocate for children and families (12-13.5)	The summary of the case study, the finding/findings of the case study, what the candidate thinks he/she has learned from the study and the plan of using them in his/her current or future work as a teacher and advocate for children and families are not only articulated excellently, but also are supported by practical examples. (13.65-15 points)
References and Citations) 5 points (3, 5)	The references and the citations have the following shortcomings: a) The majority or all of the references do not reflect current research information; b) The titles of the majority of the references listed do not seem to be relevant to the topic of the case study; c) the citation does not follow APA style of citations. (< 4 points)	The majority or the references listed reflect current research information; b) The titles of the majority of the references listed seem to be relevant to the topic of the case study; c) the citation does follow APA style of citations (4-4.5 points)	Almost all of the references listed reflect current information. Also, almost all of the titles of the resource materials are relevant to the topic of the case study and the citations clearly follow APA style of citations. (4.55-5 points)
Spelling, Grammar and Fonts 5 points	There are numerous errors in spelling and grammar and the fonts are not based on the instruction. (<4 points)	There are few errors in spelling and grammar and the fonts are appropriate (4-4.5)	Almost no errors are found in spelling and grammar and the fonts are appropriate (4.55-5)
Attachments (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 10 points	The attachments have one or more of the following shortcomings: a) Nothing is attached to the case study report; b) The attachment does not include parent interview questions and the responses of the parents in verbatim; c) The attachment does not include observation and interaction notes. (<8 points)	Based on the instruction, all the required texts are attached (8- 8-9 points)	Not only all required texts are attached, but they are very orderly and well organized (9.1-10 points)
Total points: 100			

Assessment 3

Assessment 3: Candidate Ability to Plan: Exploring Own Current Practices in Assessment and Planning for Improvement Course: CI: 632: Early Childhood Education Programs

1. Description of the assessment and its use in the program:

Our candidates are experienced, licensed teachers. As much as possible, we relate major course requirements to the candidates' own actual practices in their classrooms in order to enrich/increase their knowledge and skills in their teaching professions. "Exploring Current Practices in Assessment and Planning for Improvement" is the culminating assignment for course CI: 632: Early Childhood Education Program. It is designed to assess candidates' ability to plan for improving assessment methods in their classrooms in order to improve their classroom instructions. In doing so, among other things, they are required to explore and reflect on their current/past assessment practices and identify problems that need improvements. (For details, please see the instructions and the rubrics under 5 (a) and 5 (b) of this assessment). (not a very clear description of the assessment)

2. Description of how the assessment aligns with NAEYC standards:

As this assessment emphasizes candidates' reflection, exploration and understanding of their current or past experience in **assessing children and plan for improvement**, it mainly aligns with NAEYC's core standards 3 (CS 3) and CSs 5. In the process of working on this assignment, candidates are required to perform five major activities that reflect all NAEYC's core standards as follows: **1) Review literature** to have an in-depth understanding of the goals for assessing young children, the concept of developmentally appropriate assessment, the concept of culturally and linguistically responsive assessment, the issue of parent partnership in assessment, the techniques or the components of assessment and the relationship of assessment with curriculum contents and instructional methods (1, 2, 3, 4, 5); **2) Reflect on Candidate's Own Current or Past Experience in Assessment** with particular emphasis on the types of assessment methods, justification for using them, how they are administered, how results are used in improving instructions and contents and how they are shared with families (CS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5); **3) Identify Problems** in terms of whether or not the assessment methods accommodate special needs children (1a), whether or not they are developmentally appropriate (1a, 1b, 1c), the effectiveness of collaboration among teachers, families or others in the assessment process (2a, 2b, 2c), and whether or not the assessment methods meet the West Virginia State Early Learning Standards (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5); **4) Plan for Improvement**: For this, among other things, candidates are required to state their roles in the assessment improvement process (CS 5), to identify teachers, supervisors, families, community representatives, administrators and other professionals willing to get involved in the improvement of the assessment methods (5c), to state the method/methods they will be using to share ideas, concerns/problems on the current or past assessment methods (5^c), to draft a tentative time-line for the various activities that may be performed in improving the assessment methods and to indicate financial implications if it is applicable; **5) Write Conclusion** by summarizing the major contents of the reflection paper

with particular emphasis on the problems identified, the plan for improvement and what the candidates think that they have learned by working in this particular assignment(CS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

3. Candidate data derived from the assessment and brief analysis of the data findings

3.1. Data :

Semester: Summer 2008

Candidates= 11

Score Data by Assessment Criteria/Elements, Summer of 2008

Criteria/Elements & NAEYC Standards :	Points	Below Expectations Points		Meets Expectations Points		Exceeds Expectations Points	
1. Literature Review (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	20	N = 1 9.09%	< 16	N=6 54.54%	16-18	N=4 36.36%	18.2-20
2. Reflection on Assessment Practices (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	30	N = 2 18.18%	< 24	N =5 45.45%	24-27	N = 4 36.36%	27.3-30
3. Identification of Problems (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	15	N = 0 0%	< 12	N=7 63.63%	12-13.5	N = 4 36.36%	13.65-15
4. Plan for Improving Assessment (CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5)	35	N = 3 27.27%	< 28	N=6 54.54%	28-31.5	N =2 18.18%	31.85-35

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the criteria means in relation to NAEYC Standards

Semester: Summer 2009

Candidates= 19

Score Data by Assessment Criteria/Elements, Summer of 2009

Criteria/Elements & NAEYC Standards :	Points	Below Expectations Points		Meets Expectations Points		Exceeds Expectations Points	
1.Literature Review: (CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5)	20	N = 2 10.52%	< 16	N = 9 47.36%	16-18	N =8 42.10%	18.2-20
2. Reflection on Assessment Practices: CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	30	N = 4 21.05%	< 24	N = 8 42.10%	24-27	N =7 36.84%	27.3-30
3. Identification of Problems : (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	15	N =1 5.26%	< 12	N= 10 52.63%	12-13.5	N =8 42.10%	13.65-15
4. Plan for Improving Assessment: (CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5)	35	N = 2 10.52%	< 28	N=8 42.10%	28-31.5	N =9 47.36%	31.85-35

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the criteria means in relation to NAEYC Standards

Semester: Summer 2010

Candidates= 8

Score Data by Assessment Criteria/Elements, Summer of 2009

Criteria/Elements & NAEYC Standards :	Points	Below Expectations Points	Meets Expectations Points	Exceeds Expectations Points
1.Literature Review: (CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5)	20	N = 0 0%	N = 3 37.5%	N =5 62.5%
2. Reflection on Assessment Practices: CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	30	N = 1 12.5%	N = 2 25%	N =5 62.5%
3. Identification of Problems : (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	15	N =1 12.5%	N= 3 37.5%	N =4 50%
4. Plan for Improving Assessment: (CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5)	35	N = 1 12.5%	N= 1 12.5%	N =6 75%

Overall Assessment Score for the Summer of 2008

Candidates= 11

Global Data, Summer of 2008

Semester & Year	Below Meet Expectations Below 80	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
Summer 2008	N=1 9.09%	N = 6 54.54.%	N = 4 36.36

Overall Assessment Score for the Summer of 2009

Candidates = 19

Global Data for the summer of 2009

Semester & Year	Below Expectations Below 80	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
Summer 2009	N =2 10.52%	N = 9 47.36%	8 42.10%

Overall Assessment Score for the Summer of 2010

Candidates = 8

Global Data for the summer of 2010

Semester & Year	Below Expectations Below 80	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
Summer 2010	N =0 0%	N = 2 25%	6 75%

3.2. A Brief Analysis of the Data Findings:

As shown in the summer of 2008 score data table by assessment elements, the percentages of candidates who met or exceeded expectations in elements 1, 2, 3 and 4 are 90.90%, 81.81, 100% and 72.72%, respectively. Based on these data, the element where low number of candidates met or exceeded expectations is element 4 which has to do with planning for assessment improvement. In this element only 72.72% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. However, the mean score for each assessment element is 86.53%.

As can be seen in the summer of 2009 score data table by assessment elements, the percentages of candidates who met or exceeded expectations in elements 1, 2, 3 and 4 are 89.46%, 78.94%, 94.73% and 89.46%, respectively. Here, the element where a smaller number of candidates met or exceeded expectations is element 2 which has to do with reflection on assessment practices. In this element only 78.94% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations while 21.05% did not meet or exceeded expectations. But, the mean score for each element is 88.14%.

As shown in the summer of 2010 score data table by assessment elements, the percentages of candidates who met or exceeded expectations in elements 1, 2, 3, and 4 are 100%, 87.5%, 87.5%, 87.5%, respectively. The mean score for each assessment element is 90.62%.

With regard to the overall assessment score, as can be seen in the overall assessment score table for the summer of 2008, 1 candidate (9.09%) scored below expectations. In the overall score of the summer of 2009, 2 candidates (10.52 %) scored below expectations. But, when it comes to the overall score, in the summer of 2008, 90.90% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations while in the summer of 2009, 89.46% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. *As the global data for the summer of 2010 shows all the candidates met or exceeds expectations.*

4. Interpretation of how the data provide evidence for meeting standards:

As discussed under 3.2, in summer of 2008 and in the summer of 2009, the mean score for each element is 86.53 and 88.14, respectively. In the summer of 2008, more than 86.53% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations and the summer of 2009, more than 88.14% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. Furthermore, when it comes to the global data, as shown in the overall assessment score table for the summer of 2008, 90.90% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. For the summer of 2009, 89.46% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. *As can be seen from the global data table, in the summer of 2010, 100% of the candidates met or exceeded expectations.* Therefore, both the score data by assessment elements and the global data certainly provide evidence for meeting NAEYC standards. Despite this, however, when we look at the score data by assessment elements in both 2008 and 2009, there were candidates who did not meet expectations in one or more elements. For example, in the fall of 2008, 3 candidates (27.27%) scored below expectations in element 4 (Plan for improving assessment) and in the fall of 2009, 4 candidates (21.05%) scored below expectations in element 2 (Reflection on Assessment Practices).

5. Assessment documentation :

- a) **Assessment Tool** : Candidate Ability to Plan: Exploring Own Current Practices in Assessment and Planning for Improvement

Instructions for Candidates

Assessment is an integral part of your daily activities that enables you assess the children in your classroom in order to know their strengths, progresses and needs and be able to improve the contents and the methods of your instructions (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). As the culminating requirement of this course, you are required to explore your current/past practices of assessment in your classroom in order to identify problems and plan for improvement. In other words, this particular assignment is designed to assess your knowledge and skills in identifying problems in your current/past practices of assessing children in your classroom and plan for improvement. In doing so, please follow the following instructions. Also, make sure to read and understand the grading rubrics which are provided following the instructions.

1. **Literature Review:** Have a literature review section where you review and discuss the issues of developmentally appropriate assessments, culturally and linguistically responsive assessments, parent partnerships in assessment, components or techniques of assessment methods and the link between assessment and curriculum (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). For this, among other literature, it is very important to read the textbook (Catron & Allen, 2008, pp. 139-155) and the "Joint Position Statement of the National Association for the Education of Young Children" (NA EYC) and the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (NAECS/SDE) in this website : <http://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/positions/pscape.pdf> (retrieved on 10/4/2010). Furthermore, it is important to read the West Virginia State Early Learning Standards in this link : <http://www.wvdhhr.org/oss/pieces/ta/documents/wv%20elsf.pdf> (retrieved on 6/29/2010). Make sure that your literature review has a sense of beginning and ending ;
2. **Reflection on Current or Past Experience in Assessment:** Have a section where you reflect your real/actual picture of your current/past assessment practices. While writing this reflection, articulate what kind of assessment methods you are using currently or used before, why you are using them or used them, how you assess individual and groups of children, how you use the assessment results to improve your teaching methods and the content of what you teach and how you communicate the assessment results with families (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ;
3. **Problem Identification:** In this section, please raise the following questions to yourself and reflect on the answers for each question: a) Do the assessment methods that I am using or have used accommodate special needs children? (1a, 1b); Are the assessment methods that I am using or used before developmentally appropriate? Are the assessment methods

responsive to cultural, racial and linguistic differences? (1a, 1b, 1c) ; c) Is my communication on assessment results with families effective enough? (2a, 2b, 2c) ; d) Is there effective collaboration among teachers, families, children or others in the assessment process? (2a, 2b, 2c)7) ; e) Do the assessment methods meet the West Virginia State Early Learning Standards? (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5);

4. **Planning for Improvement:** In this section, please clearly discuss what you think are the problems that need improvement in your current/past assessment methods and articulate your plan for improving your assessment methods (CS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). In doing so, please provide answers to the following questions: a) To whom and why would you share your knowledge of assessment in general and the problems of your current assessment methods in particular? (Teachers, administrators, families and other professionals?) ; b) What method/methods do you use in sharing your ideas and concerns on assessment? (Meetings, conferences, electronic web page, bulletins or others?) ; c) Whom do you involve in the improvement of the assessment and why? (Teachers, families, supervisors, community representatives, administrators and other professionals?) ; d) What do you think your role should be in the improvement of the assessment and why? (coordinator of the assessment improvement committee, chair of the assessment improvement committee, advocate of best assessment methods for young children?) (CS 5); e) Please make a time-line for the various activities you may be doing in your plan of improving the assessment methods; f) Do you think improving your assessment method needs financing? If so, where do you think the source would be?
5. **References:** Have a reference section with a minimum of eight reference materials. (CS 5)
6. Please make sure that you use APA style of citations when you cite sources (CS 5).

Scoring Guide: Rubrics

ELEMENTS & NAEYC's STANDARDS	Below Expectation (Below 80)	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
<p>Literature Review: CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5 20 points</p>	<p>The literature review has two or more of the following shortcomings: a) No literature review is provided on the goals for assessing children in early childhood classroom settings or the review of literature provided is irrelevant and unrelated; b) No literature review is done on developmentally appropriate assessment and culturally and linguistically responsive assessment or the review of literature provided does not show the candidate's understanding of the concepts; c) No review is made on the issue of parent partnership in assessment or the review on this issue is not clear; d) No review is done on the techniques or the components of assessment or the review done has no relationship with components of assessment; e) No review is done on the relationship of assessment with curriculum contents and instructional methods or the review done is unrelated to the topic. < 16</p>	<p>Candidate has provided reasonably well written review of literature on at least four of the following issues: a) Goals of assessing young children in early childhood education classroom settings; b) The concept of developmentally appropriate assessment and culturally and linguistically responsive assessment; c) The issue of parent partnership in assessment; d) The techniques or the components of assessment; e) The relationship of assessment with curriculum contents and instructional methods (16-18)</p>	<p>Candidate has provided a thorough and informative literature review on all of the following issues with excellent command of language and flow of ideas: a) Goals of assessing young children in early childhood education classroom settings; b) The concept of developmentally appropriate assessment and culturally and linguistically responsive assessment; c) The issue of parent partnership in assessment; d) The techniques or the components of assessment; e) The relationship of assessment with curriculum contents and instructional methods (18.2-20)</p>
<p>Reflection on Assessment Practices: CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (30 points)</p>	<p>The reflection has two or more of the following shortcomings; a) Does not show or vaguely shows the types of assessment that candidates is using currently or used in the past; b)No justifications are provided as to why candidate is using or used the particular assessment methods; c) No explanation is provided on the administration of the assessment methods or the explanation provided is not clear; d) No reflection is provided as to how candidate uses the results of the assessment in improving instructional lessons and contents of curriculum or the reflection is not clear; e) No reflection is provided as to how candidate shares the results of the assessment with parents/families or the</p>	<p>The reflection on at least four of the following issues is adequately and reasonably articulated: a) Types of assessment that candidates is using currently or used in the past; b) Justifications as to why candidate is using or used the particular assessment methods; c) The administration of the assessment methods; d) How candidate uses the results of the assessment in improving instructional lessons and contents of curriculum; e) How candidate shares the results of the assessment with parents/families. (24-27)</p>	<p>The reflection not only thoroughly addresses each of the issues that the candidate is expected to reflect on, but also demonstrate candidate's in-depth understanding of her/his current/past practices as far as assessing young children in early childhood classroom setting is concerned. (27.3-30)</p>

	reflection provided is vague. (< 24)		
Identification of Problems : CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (15 points)	Discussions on two or more of the following issues are not provided or the ones provided do not clearly show the nature of the problems in the candidate's current/past assessment practices: a) Whether or not the assessment methods accommodate special needs children; b) Whether or not the assessment methods are developmentally appropriate; c) Whether or not the assessments methods are culturally and linguistically responsive; d) The effectiveness of collaboration among teachers, families or others in the assessment process; and e) whether or not the assessment methods meet the West Virginia State Early Learning Standards (< 12)	Candidate has discussed at least four of the following and clearly identified the problems that the assessment methods have: a) Whether or not the assessment methods accommodate special needs children; b) Whether or not the assessment methods are developmentally appropriate; c) Whether or not the assessments methods are culturally and linguistically responsive; d) The effectiveness of collaboration among teachers, families or others in the assessment process; e) Whether or not the assessment methods meet the West Virginia State Early Learning Standards (12-13.5)	Candidate not only thoughtfully and excellently discussed all the issues that need to be discussed and identified problems, but also the contents of his/her discussions shows his /her in-depth understanding of issues related to assessing young children in early childhood education classroom settings. (13.65-15)
Plan for Improving Assessment: CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5 (35 points)	The information provided on the plan for improving the assessment methods has two or more of the following short comings: a) The role of the candidate in the improvement process is not discussed at all or the discussion provided has no clarity; b) The need for involving others like teachers, families, supervisors, community representatives and administrators in the improvement process is not raised and discussed or the discussion provided on this issue does not give much sense; c) How the candidate shares his/her ideas, concerns and problems on the current or past assessment methods with families, teachers, supervisors and community members in order to get their inputs is not at all discussed or the discussion provided on this matter lacks clarity; d) No tentative time-line for the various activities that may be performed in improving the assessment methods is provided; e) The issue of financial implication is not raised and discussed. (< 28)	Candidate has provided reasonable and adequate information on his/her plan of improving the assessment by focusing, at least, on four of the following: a) His/her role in the assessment improvement process; b) The need for involving teachers, supervisors, families, community representatives, administrators and other professionals in the improvement of the assessment methods; c)) How he/she shares his/her ideas, concerns and problems on the current assessment methods with families, teachers, supervisors and community members in order to seek their inputs in the improvement; d) Tentative time-line for the various activities that may be performed; e) Financial implication and the source of the finance if applicable (28-31.5)	Through very clear and concise statements candidates demonstrated orderly, well organized and informative plan for improving his/her current assessment methods by considering all of the following: a) His/her role in the assessment improvement process; b) The need for involving teachers, supervisors, families, community representatives, administrators and other professionals; c)) How he/she shares his/her ideas, concerns and problems on the current assessment methods with families, teachers, supervisors and community members in order to seek their inputs in the improvement; d) Tentative time-line for the various activities that may be performed; e) Financial implication and the source of the finance if applicable (31.85-35)

Assessment 4
Assessment 4: Assessment of Field-Based Experiences: Final
Practicum Performance Assessment
Course: CI: 630: Early Childhood Education Practicum

1. Description of assessment and its use in the program:

This assessment is designed to assess the overall field-based practical and theoretical performance/experience of candidates. It examines candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions in five major performance measuring elements. Although these five performance measuring elements are interrelated, for the sake of emphasis, they are divided into: a) professionalism; b) knowledge in unit/lesson planning; c) knowledge and skills in instruction/implementation; d) knowledge and skills in classroom management; and e) knowledge and skills in assessing young children.

2. Description of how this assessment specifically aligns with NAEYC Standards:

In this practicum performance assessment tool, although the major standards reflected are standards 5 and 4, for each one of the five major performance measuring elements, sub-elements are identified that align with all NAEYC standards (CSs) as follows:

Professionalism: Enthusiasm, preparedness, commitment to profession and lifelong learning; knowledge in NAEYC core policies and code of ethical conduct; knowledge in the state of WV ECE policies; respect to children and families, communication skills, ability to lead, collaboration with staff and families and sensitivity to diversity (CSs 5, 2, 1)

Unit/Lesson Planning: Knowledge in lesson/unit format, clarity and appropriateness of goals/objectives, instructional methods, assessment methods, educational materials, consideration of ages individual needs, and diversity (culture, language, disabilities/special needs) (CS 1, 4, 5)

Implementation/Instructions: Communication (gesture, movements, tone of voice, word and statements choice, proximity, eye contact) interaction, demonstration, motivating and attracting attentions, encouraging participation, creativity and exploration, sensitivity to individual needs and diversity, relationship with families and ability to reflect after each lesson based on the lesson reflection checklist (CSs 4, 1, 2, 3, 5)

Classroom Management: Physical (arrangement of materials, spaces, learning centers, wall pictures, children's work products, parent's area) ; social (consistency in rules and procedures, smoothness in transition from activities to activities, respectfulness in relationships between children and adults (CSs, 1, 2, 4, 5)

Assessment: Observing children, asking questions, noticing behavioral change, asking parents, documenting sample products of activities and events, analyzing and assessing what is observed and documented for improving lessons (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

3. Candidate data derived from the assessment and brief analysis of the data findings :

3.1. Data :

Semester: Fall 2009

Candidates= 7

Score Data by Performance Measuring Elements, Fall of 2009

Performance Measuring Elements & NAEYC Standards :	Points	Needs Improvement (Below 80%)	Points	Meets Expectations (80-90%)	Points	Exceeds Expectations (91-100%)	Points
1. Knowledge and Skills in Professionalism (CSs 5, 2, 1)	20	N = 0 0%	< 16	N = 2 28.57%	16-18	N = 5 71.42%	18.2-20
2. Knowledge and Skills in Lesson Planning (CSs 1, 4, 5)	10	N = 0 0%	< 8	N = 3 42.85%	8-9	N = 4 57.14%	9.1-10
3. Knowledge and Skills in Instruction/Implementation (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	40	N = 0 0%	< 32	N = 2 28.57%	32-36	N = 5 71.42%	36.4-40
4. Knowledge and Skills in Classroom Management (CSs 1, 2, 4, 5)	10	N = 0 0%	< 8	N = 2 28.57%	8-9	N = 5 71.42%	9.1-10
5. Knowledge and Skills in Assessment (CSs 1, 3, 4, 5)	20	N = 1 14.28%	< 16	N = 4 57.14%	16-18	N = 2 28.57%	18.2-20

Please see the rubrics as to what each of these measuring elements mean in relation to NAEYC standards

Semester: Spring 2010

Candidates= 11

Score Data by Performance Measuring Elements, Spring of 2010

Performance Measuring Elements & NAEYC Standards :	Points	Needs Improvement (Below 80%)	Points	Meets Expectations (80-90%)	Points	Exceeds Expectations (91-100%)	Points
1. Knowledge and Skills in Professionalism (CSs 5, 2, 1)	20	N = 0 0%	< 16	N = 3 27.27%	16-18	N = 8 72.72%	18.2-20
2. Knowledge and Skills in Lesson Planning (CSs 1, 4, 5)	10	N = 0 0%	< 8	N = 2 18.18%	8-9	N = 9 81.81%	9.1-10
3. Knowledge and Skills in Instruction/Implementation (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	40	N = 1 9.09%	< 32	N = 4 36.36%	32-36	N = 6 54.54%	36.4-40
4. Knowledge and Skills in Classroom Management (CSs 1, 2, 4, 5)	10	N = 0 0%	< 8	N = 4 36.36%	8-9	N = 7 63.63%	9.1-10
5. Knowledge and Skills in Assessment (CSs 1, 3, 4, 5)	20	N = 3 27.27%	< 16	N = 5 45.45%	16-18	N = 3 27.27%	18.2-20

Please see the rubrics as to what each of these measuring elements mean in relation to NAEYC standards.

Semester: Fall 2010 Candidates= 3

Score Data by Performance Measuring Elements, Fall of 2010

Performance Measuring Elements & NAEYC Standards :	Points	Needs Improvement (Below 80%) Points	Meets Expectations (80-90%) Points	Exceeds Expectations (91-100%) Points
1. Knowledge and Skills in Professionalism (CSs 5, 2, 1)	20	N = 0 0% < 16	N = 1 33.33% 16-18	N = 2 66.66% 18.2-20
2. Knowledge and Skills in Lesson Planning (CSs 1, 4, 5)	10	N = 0 0% < 8	N = 0 0% 8-9	N = 3 100% 9.1-10
3. Knowledge and Skills in Instruction/Implementation (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	40	N = 0 0% <32	N= 0 0% 32-36	N = 3 100% 36.4-40
4. Knowledge and Skills in Classroom Management (CSs 1, 2, 4, 5)	10	N = 0 0% < 8	N= 0 0% 8-9	N = 3 100% 9.1-10
5. Knowledge and Skills in Assessment (CSs 1, 3, 4, 5)	20	N=0 0% < 16	N= 1 33.33% 16-18	N= 2 66.66% 18.2-20

Please see the rubrics as to what each of these measuring elements mean in relation to NAEYC standards.

Overall Assessment Score for the Fall of 2009

Number of Candidates= 7

Global Data, Fall of 2009

Semester & Year	Below Expectations (Below 80%)	Meet Expectations (80-90%)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100%)
Fall 2009	None	N=3 (42.85%)	N=4 (57.14%)

Overall Assessment Score for the Spring of 2010

Candidates= 11

Global Data for the Spring of 2010

Semester & Year	Needs Improvement (Below 80%)	Meet Expectations (80-90%)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100%)
Spring 2010	None	N= 4 (36.36%)	N=7 (63.63%)

Overall Assessment Score for the Fall of 2010
Candidates= 3

Global Data for the Fall of 2010

Semester & Year	Needs Improvement (Below 80%)	Meet Expectations (80-90%)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100%)
Fall 2010	None	N= 1 (33.33%)	N=2 (66.66%)

3.2. Brief analysis of data findings:

As shown in the score data by performance measuring elements table for the Fall of 2009, in each of the 4 elements (1, 2, 3, 4), the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations is 100%. In element 5 (Knowledge and Skills in Assessment), the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations is 85.71%. The mean/average percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations in each element is 97.14%

The score data by performance measuring elements table for the spring of 2010 shows that in each of the three elements (1, 2, and 4), the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations is 100%. In element 3 (Knowledge and Skills in Instruction), the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectation is 90.91%. The element where more candidates scored below expectation is element 5 (Knowledge and Skills in Instruction). In this element, the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations is 72.72%. However, the mean/average percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations in each element is 92.72%, which is way above the minimum requirement of 80%. When it comes to the overall assessment score for both semesters (fall 2009 and spring 2010) none of the candidates scored below expectations. **Also, as the score data by performance measuring elements for the fall of 2010 shows, none of the candidates scored below the required expectations. In fact, in each of the five elements, 99.99% of the candidates met or exceeded expectation.**

4. Interpretation of how these data provide evidence for meeting standards

As described earlier under number 2 of assessment 4, the five performance measuring elements align with all NAEYC standards. As indicated under 3.2 of this assessment, the mean/average percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations in each element in the fall of 2009, in the spring of 2010 **and in the fall of 2010** are 97.14% , 94.54% **and 99.99%**, respectively. Also, the overall assessment score for each semester shows that none of the candidates scored below expectations. Therefore, the data certainly provide evidence for meeting NAEYC standards.

5. Assessment documentation:

a) Description of the assessment:

As stated earlier, this assessment termed as “Final Practicum Performance Assessment” is designed to assess the overall field-based practical and theoretical performance/experience of candidates in terms of their knowledge, skills and dispositions in five major performance measuring elements which have to do with professionalism, unit/lesson planning, instruction/implementation, classroom management and assessment of children. Before they start the practicum, they are given written scoring guide which includes these five major performance elements and their sub-elements (Please see the scoring guide in the following page)

b) Scoring Guide/Rubrics

PERFORMANCE MEASURING ELEMENTS, SUB-ELEMENTS & NAEYC CORE STANDARDS (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT Below 80%	MEET EXPECTATIONS (80-90%)	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS (91-100%)
I: Knowledge and Skills in Professionalism (CSs 5, 2, 1) =20 Pts	Point	Point	Point
Sub-elements: Enthusiasm, preparedness, commitment to profession and lifelong learning; knowledge on NAEYC code of ethical conduct; knowledge on the state of WV ECE policies; respect to children and families, communication skills, collaboration with staff and families and sensitivity to diversity including special needs children	Candidate demonstrated few or none of the sub-elements listed under professionalism (<16)	Candidate demonstrated adequate sub-elements listed under professionalism (16-18)	Candidate clearly demonstrated almost all sub-elements under professionalism (18.2-20)
II: Knowledge and Skills in Lesson Planning (1, 4, 5) = 10 Pts			
Sub-elements: Knowledge on lesson/unit format, clarity and appropriateness of goals/objectives, instructional and assessment methods, consideration of ages individual needs, and diversity (culture, language, disabilities/special needs)	Demonstrated limited or none of the sub-elements under lesson planning (<8)	Demonstrated adequate sub- elements listed under lesson planning (8-9)	Demonstrated almost all sub-elements listed under lesson planning (9.1-10)
III: Knowledge and Skills in Instruction/Implementation(CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)= 40 pts			
Sub-elements: Communication(gesture, movements, tone of voice, word and statements choice, proximity, eye contact) interaction, demonstration, motivating and attracting attentions, encouraging participation, creativity and exploration, sensitivity to individual needs and diversity and ability to reflect after each lesson based on the lesson reflection checklist	Demonstrated few or none of the sub-elements under instructions (<32)	Demonstrated adequate sub-elements listed under instruction (32-36)	Demonstrated almost all sub-elements listed under instruction (36.4-40)
IV: Knowledge and Skills in Classroom Management(CSs 1, 2, 4, 5) = 10 Pts			
Sub-elements: Physical (arrangement of materials, spaces, learning centers, wall pictures, children’s work products, parent’s area; social (consistency in rules and procedures, smoothness in transition from activities to activities, respectfulness in relationships between children and adults and among children	Demonstrated limited or none of the sub-elements listed under classroom management (<8)	Demonstrated adequate sub-elements listed under classroom management (8-9)	Demonstrated almost all sub-elements listed under classroom management (9.1-10)
V: Knowledge and Skills in Assessment (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) = 20 Pts.			
Sub-elements: Observing children, asking questions, documenting events, noticing behavioral change, looking at sample children’s work, asking parents and analyzing and assessing what is observed and documented for improving lessons.	Demonstrated limited or none of the sub-elements listed under assessment (<16)	Demonstrated adequate sub-elements listed under assessment (6-18)	Demonstrated almost all sub-elements listed under assessment (18.2-20)

Assessment 5

Assessment 5: Candidate Effect on Children's Learning: Reflection Paper on Candidate's Teaching Effect on Children's Learning

Course: CI: 630: Early Childhood Education Practicum

1. Description of assessment and its use in the program:

CI: 630 is a practicum course where candidates are required to conduct practical teaching in classrooms. Apart from the practical teaching, candidates are required to perform various written works in order to relate their practices to theories. This assessment tool which is termed as "Reflection Paper on Candidate's Teaching Effect on Children" is a major assessment method designed to enable candidates to reflect/describe the effect/impact they think that they make on children's learning as the result of their teaching during their practical teaching in the classroom.

2. Description of how this assessment specifically aligns with NAEYC Standards:

As this assessment has to do with reflecting on the effect/impact of candidates' teaching on children's knowledge, skills and behaviors, it specifically aligns with NAEYC's core standard 4 and 5 (CSs 4, 5). However, in the process of writing this reflection paper, candidates are required to demonstrate in-depth knowledge and understanding of children's characteristics and how they think they learn (CSs 1, 4). In doing so, they are required not only to cite examples of activities that they think make impacts on the children's knowledge, skills and behaviors, but also how they assess the children in order to know the effect of their teaching (CS 3). Furthermore, they are particularly required to reflect on how their teaching impacts special needs children and the way they involve parents/families in the teaching/learning process (CSs 4, 2). In short, candidates are required to write a reflection paper titled as "**Impacts/Effects of My Teaching on Children.**" This reflection paper needs to have the following sub-topics/elements:

1) Abstract: In the abstract, candidates need to state the objectives of the reflection paper, the method of data collection and the major impact/effects that they think they have made on the children as the result of their practicum experience (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5); **2) Description of the Practicum Center:** For this, among other things, candidates need to describe the contextual aspects of the center such as the historical background, the facilities, the classroom arrangement, the nature of the curriculum, the age and the number of children, the number of teachers and their qualifications and the issue of parents' involvement and its relationship with children's learning (Cs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5); **3) My Philosophy/Belief on How Children Learn:** Here candidates need to reflect on their beliefs/theories on how young children learn by comparing their beliefs with developmental theories of Piaget, Vygotsky and Bronfenbrenner (CSs, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5); **4) Specific Impacts That I Made the Children:** here candidates are required to describe the types of specific effects/impacts that they think they make on the knowledge, skills and behaviors of young children, how they think they make the impacts and how they assess the children to know the effects of their teaching (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). Please see the instructions under 5 (a) for the details of issues that need to be raised for this particular section.

3. Candidate data derived from the assessment and brief analysis of the data findings:

3.1. Candidate Data:

Semester: Fall 2009

Candidates= 7

Score Data by Assessment Elements, Fall of 2009

Elements & NAEYC Standards	Points	Below Expectations (Below 80)		Meets Expectations (80-90)		Exceeds Expectations (91-100)	
		Points	Points	Points	Points	Points	Points
1. Abstract (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	10	N = 0 0%	<8	N = 3 42.85%	8-9	N = 4 57.14%	9.1-10
2. Description of the Practicum Center (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	25	N = 0 %	<20	N = 3 42.85%	20-22.5	N = 4 57.14%	22.75-25
3. My Philosophy/Belief on How Children Learn (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	25	N = 1 14.28%	<20	N= 3 42.85%	20-22.5	N = 3 42.85%	22.75-25
4. Specific Impacts That I Made on the Children (CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5)	40	N = 2 28.57%	<32	N= 3 42.85%	32-36	N = 2 28.57%	36.4-40

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the element means in relation to NAEYC Standards

Semester: Spring 2010

Candidates= 11

Score Data by Assessment Elements, Spring of 2010

Elements & NAEYC Standards	Points	Below Expectations (Below 80)		Meets Expectations (80-90)		Exceeds Expectations (91-100)	
		Points	Points	Points	Points	Points	Points
1. Abstract (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	10	N = 0 0%	<8	N = 6 54.54%	8-9	N = 5 45.45%	9.1-10
2. Description of the Practicum Center (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	25	N = 0 0%	<20	N = 5 45.45%	20-22.5	N = 6 54.54%	22.75-25
3. My Philosophy/Belief on How Children Learn (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	25	N = 1 9.09%	<20	N= 4 36.36%	20-22.5	N = 6 54.54%	22.75-25
4. Specific Impacts That I Made on the Children (CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5)	40	N = 3 27.27%	<32	N= 5 45.45%	32-36	N = 3 27.27%	36.4-40

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the element means in relation to NAEYC Standards

Semester: Fall 2010

Candidates= 3

Score Data by Assessment Elements, Fall of 2010

Elements & NAEYC Standards	Points	Below Expectations (Below 80)		Meets Expectations (80-90)		Exceeds Expectations (91-100)	
		Points	Points	Points	Points	Points	Points
1. Abstract (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	10	N = 0 0%	<8	N = 2 66.66%	8-9	N = 1 33.33%	9.1-10
2. Description of the Practicum Center (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	25	N = 0 %	<20	N = 1 33.33%	20-22.5	N = 2 66.66%	22.75-25
4. My Philosophy/Belief on How Children Learn (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	25	N = 0 0%	<20	N= 0 0%	20-22.5	N = 3 100%	22.75-25

4. Specific Impacts That I Made on the Children (CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5)	40	N = 0 0%	<32	N= 1 33.33%	32-36	N = 2 66.66%	36.4-40
--	----	-------------	-----	----------------	-------	-----------------	---------

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the element means in relation to NAEYC Standards

Semester: Fall 2009

Candidates= 7

Global Data, Fall of 2009

Semester and Year	Below Expectations (Below 80)	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
Fall 2009	None	4 (57.14%)	3 (42.85%)

Semester: Spring 2010

Candidates= 11

Global Data, Spring of 2010

Semester and Year	Below Expectations (Below 80)	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
Spring 2010	None	6 (36.36%)	5 (63.63%)

Semester: Fall 2010

Candidates= 3

Global Data, Fall of 2010

Semester and Year	Below Expectations (Below 80)	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceeds Expectations (91-100)
Spring 2010	None	1 (33.33%)	2 (66.66%)

4.2 Data Analysis:

As indicated in the score data table by assessment elements for the Fall of 2009, the percentages of candidates who met or exceeded expectations for each of the elements, i.e., elements 1, 2, 3 and 4 are 100%, 100%, 85.70% and 71.42%, respectively. The element in which low numbers of candidates met or exceed expectations is element 4 (The reflection on the specific impact that the candidates made on the children). However, the mean score for each element is 89.28. Furthermore, as shown in the global data for this semester, none of the candidates scored below expectations.

When it comes to the Spring of 2010, the percentages of candidates who met or exceeded expectations for each of the four elements, i.e. elements 1, 2, 3, and 4 are 100%, 100%, 90.90%, and 72.72%, respectively. In this semester too, the element in which low number of candidates met or exceeded expectations is element 4; however, the mean score in each element is 90.90%. As the global data for this semester also shows, none of the candidates scored below expectations. **In the fall of 2010, the percentages of candidates who met or**

exceeded expectations for each of the four elements, i.e. elements 1, 2, 3, and 4 are 100%, 100%, 100% and 100%. In other words none of the 3 candidates scored below expectations.

5. Interpretation of how these data provide evidence for meeting standards:

As described under number 2 and number 5 (a), the contents of this particular assessment, i.e., assessment 5, which has to do with candidates' effects/impacts on children's learning, align with NAEYC's core standards (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). On the other hand, as described under 3.2, for the Fall of 2009, the mean score of candidates by elements is 89.28% and the mean score of candidates by elements for the Spring of 2010 is 90.90%. Furthermore, as the global data for the Fall of 2009 and the Spring of 2010 shows none of the candidates scored below expectations. **The same is true in the global data of fall 2010.** This certainly provides clear evidence that our candidates met NAEYC's standards.

5. Assessment documentation:

a) **Assessment Tool** : Reflection Paper on Candidate's Teaching Effect on Children

Instructions for Candidates

As you know, your effectiveness in teaching is evidenced by positive impacts/effects that you make on children's learning in terms of their knowledge, skills and behaviors. For this practice based written assignment, you are required to write a reflection paper of 8-10 pages on your effectiveness as a teacher in general and the impacts/changes you think you made on the children's learning in terms of making differences in their knowledge, skills and behaviors during your practicum teaching. Through this written reflection, you are expected to demonstrate your knowledge, skills and dispositions in instructing and assessing children of diverse backgrounds, preparing responsive classroom environment, involving families and articulating your teaching experience and its effects in making differences on children's learning (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). As a way of collecting data for your reflection, right from the beginning of your practicum work, you are strongly advised to write notes or to document the following: a) activities that you think impacted the children's knowledge, skills and behavior; b) sample teaching methods that you think impacted the children; c) children's sample works; d) inputs of families and other staff if any; and e) methods of assessing children. On the basis of what you have noted and your recollections, you are required to write a reflection paper on the impacts/effects of your teaching on the children by carefully considering the following instructions:

- Have an **abstract** at the beginning of your reflection paper where you state the objectives of the reflection paper, the method of data collection and the major impact/effects that you think you have made on the children as the result of your practicum experience (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
- Have a section on the description of the practicum center. The title of this section may be stated as such: **Description of the Practicum Center**. The issues you need to raise in this section need to include the historical background of the center, the kind of community it serves, the source of the budget, the number and qualification teachers and other staff, the number and the age of children, the types of curriculum and family involvement. It should

also include information on the particular classroom where you did your practicum in terms of space, educational materials and learning centers (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5);

- Write a brief reflection on your philosophy/belief on how children learn titled as: **My Philosophy/Belief on How Children Learn**. Here it is important to state your beliefs or philosophies on how early childhood age children learn by comparing it with the theories of Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky and Urie Bronfenbrenner (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5);
- Reflect in detail on the effects or impacts of your teaching on the children you taught or interacted with during this practicum in terms of their behaviors, knowledge and skills. The title of this section can be stated as **Specific Impacts That I Made on the Children**. While reflecting on this issue, the kind of questions you need to raise to yourself include the following (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5):

- Can I cite examples of activities that made the children happy, interested and enthusiastic? If so, what are some of these activities and the reactions of the children toward these activities?
- How did I encourage children to fully participate in activities?
- Did I interact and discuss issues with parents with regard to the changes that I made on children?
- Was there a time that I arranged the classroom in a particular way that made the children to be more disciplined and focused on their activities? If so how did I arrange the classroom to facilitate my teaching/learning process successfully?
- What was/were my method/methods of disciplining the children?
- Which learning/play materials I presented to the children made differences in attracting children's attention?
- Was there a time that I encouraged a shy child to speak and participate in various activities? If so, what change did I see in the child?
- Was there a time that I dealt with special needs children? What kind of experience did I have with the special needs children in the classroom if there are special needs children in the classroom? Did I see any change in their behaviors as the result of my interaction with them?
- Did I teach or interact with children who are different from the majority of the children in the classroom in terms of race, ethnicity, disability and language? If so what kind of activities did I do with them?
- Can I summarize examples of changes in the children's knowledge, skills and behaviors as the result of my teaching? If so, what kind of change did I see in the children?

***Note:** Apart from raising the above questions to yourself, you may ask the cooperating professional teacher what she thinks the children gain from your presence in the classroom during the practicum period.

- Do not use real names of children or the center. Instead, please use pseudonyms (CS 5);
- Use APA style of citations in case you cite resource materials in order to support your reflection (CS 5).
- In case you use resource materials, please have a reference section, titled as "**Reference**". Actually, as you are reflecting your experience and the changes you made on the children

during the practicum, it may not be a requirement to read literature. However, we strongly encourage you to read related literature to expand your thoughts while reflecting.

b) Scoring Guide/Rubrics :

Elements & NAEYC Standards	Below Expectation (Below 80)	Meet Expectation (80-90)	Exceeds Expectation (91-100)	Points
	Point	Point	Point	
1. Abstract (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 10 points	The objectives of the reflection paper, the method of data collection and the major impacts/effects that the candidate thought she/he has made on the children as the result of her/his practicum teaching not at all stated or poorly stated . (<8)	The objectives of the reflection paper, the method of data collection and the major impacts/effects that the candidate thought she/he made on the children as the result of her/his practicum teaching/learning process are reasonably stated (8-9)	Candidate, not only stated the requirements for the abstract, but also she/he articulated it very clearly and persuasively (9.1-10)	
2. Description of the Practicum Center (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 25 Points	The description on the practicum center did not address most of the following issues or the description is vague and disorganized: a)The historical background of the center,; b) The kind of community the center serves; c) The source of the budget; d) The number and training of teachers and other staff; e) The number and age of the children; f) The types of curriculum that the center emphasizes; g) The issue of family involvement; and h) The information on the nature of the particular classroom where she/he conducted the practicum and the impact it may make on the children's learning (<20)	The description on the practicum center clearly addressed most of the following issues: a)The historical background of the center,; b) The kind of community the center serves; c) The source of the budget; d) The number and training of teachers and other staff; e) The number and age of the children; f) The types of curriculum that the center emphasizes; g) The issue of family involvement; and h) The information on the particular classroom where she/he conducted the practicum (20-22.5)	The description on the practicum center not only raised and addressed almost all the issues that needed to be described, but it also demonstrated candidate's strong understanding of the relationship between the center's contextual factors and children's learning (22.75-25)	

<p>3. My Philosophy/Belief on How Children Learn (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 25 points</p>	<p>Candidate failed to state and describe or vaguely stated and described the following: a) Her/his beliefs with regard to the issue of how young children learn; b) Her/his roles as a teacher to enhance children's learning and development by citing practical examples; c) The differences and similarities of her/his beliefs with the theories of Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky and Urie Bronfenbrenner . (<20)</p>	<p>Candidate stated and provided a reasonably well written description on the following issues: a) Her/his beliefs with regard to the issue of how young children learn; b) Her/his roles as a teacher to enhance children's learning and development with the support of practical examples; c) The differences and similarities of her/his beliefs with the theories of Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky and Urie Bronfenbrenner (20-22.5)</p>	<p>Not only candidate stated and described her/his beliefs with regard to how young children learn, her roles as a teacher to enhance children's learning and the differences and similarities between her beliefs and theories of Piaget, Vygotsky and Bronfenbrenner, but also her/his description demonstrated her /his thorough understanding of how young children in early childhood education classroom settings (22.75-25)</p>	
<p>Specific Impacts That I Made on the Children (CS s 1, 2, 3, 4 ,5) 40 points</p>	<p>Candidate's reflection on the effects of her/his teaching on the children that she/he taught or interacted with during the practicum, failed to raise and provide description with regard to all or most of the following issues: a) providing examples of activities that made the children happy, interested and enthusiastic and describing how the children are assessed; b) Encouraging children to enable them participate in activities; c) Interaction with parent s/families in order to discuss issues with regard to the changes that the candidate made on children; d)Arrangement of the classroom in a particular way</p>	<p>Candidate's reflection on the effects of her/his teaching on the children that she/he taught or interacted with during the practicum provided a reasonably well written description with regard to most of the following issues: a) Providing examples of activities that made the children happy, interested and enthusiastic; b) Encouraging children to enable them participate in activities; c) Interaction with parent s/families in order to discuss issues with regard to the changes that the candidate made on children; d) Arrangement of the classroom in a particular way that encouraged the children to be more disciplined and more focused on their activities; e) Methods of</p>	<p>Candidate's reflection on the effects of her/his teaching on the children that she/he taught or interacted with during the practicum provided excellently written description with regard to almost all the following issues: a) Providing examples of activities that made the children happy, interested and enthusiastic; b) Encouraging children to enable them participate in activities; c) Interaction with parent or families in order to discuss issues with regard to the changes that the candidate made on children; d) Arrangement of the classroom in a particular way that encouraged the children to be more</p>	

	<p>that encouraged the children to be more disciplined and more focused on their activities; e) Methods of disciplining the children; f) Examples of educational or play materials presented that made differences in attracting children's attention; g) Encouragement of shy children; h) Dealing with special needs and diverse children; i) Summary of changes that the candidate thought she/he has made on the children during the practicum in terms of their knowledge, skills and behaviors (<32)</p>	<p>disciplining the children; f) Examples of educational or play materials presented that made differences in attracting children's attention; g) Encouragement of shy children; h) Dealing with special needs and diverse children; i) Summary of changes that the candidates thought she/he has made on the children during the practicum in terms of their knowledge, skills and behaviors (32-36)</p>	<p>disciplined and more focused on their activities; e) Methods of disciplining the children; f) Examples of educational or play materials presented that made differences in attracting children's attention; g) Encouragement of shy children; h) Dealing with special needs and diverse children; i) Summary of changes that the candidates thought she/he has made on the children during the practicum in terms of their knowledge, skills and behaviors (36.4-40)</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

Assessment 6

Assessment 6: Field-Based Interaction with Diverse Children: Interacting with and Understanding Diverse Children and Their Parents **Course: FCS: 535: Administration of Day Care Centers**

1. Description of the assessment and its use in the program:

Although it is obvious that children in the United States are becoming more and more diverse, it is not in all school settings that teachers and administrators interact and work with children of diverse backgrounds particularly as related to race, language and ethnicity. It is our belief that all candidates need to have knowledge, skills and dispositions that enable them to comfortably and efficiently handle the care and education of all children with respect and equality regardless of differences in race, ethnicity, language, special needs or other differences. This particular assessment is a major project designed to enable candidates not only to have an in-depth knowledge on the theoretical aspects of understanding diverse children, but also to be able to interact, communicate, observe and document information on them, conduct interviews with their families and write a report. (may need some additional description of the specific assessment here)

2. Description of how the assessment aligns with NAEYC standards:

Since this project has a lot to do with understanding diverse children's characteristics, needs and learning aspects, it mainly aligns with NAEYC's core standards 1 and 4. In the process of implementing this project, however, candidates perform different activities that align with all of NAEYC's standards as shown below :

- 2.1) Write a brief introduction titled as **Introduction** where candidates clearly state the objective of the project, the overall contents of the project report and the method of data collection (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5);
- 2.2) **Review current literature on diverse children and their families** in general and diverse children's teaching/learning process in early childhood classroom settings in particular, titled as **Literature Review on Diversity** (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ;
- 2.3) Provide information on the background of the children they interacted with titled as **Background of the Children**. Based on the information collected through parent interview, observation and interaction, candidates are required to provide information on each child with whom they interacted in terms of her/his age, race, gender, language, race, gender, exceptionality, economic status of the family, neighborhood, etc., and the relationship of such factors with the child's development (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ;
- 2.4) Provide description on developmentally appropriate activities that the candidate is expected to conduct with each child titled as **Description of Interactional Activities**. The description provides information on in the type of the activity or activities performed with each child, where and how the activity was conducted, the role of families, the materials used, the reaction of the child toward the activity and the nature of her/his participation in the activity (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ;
- 2.5) Provide concluding statements titled as **Final Thought** on what candidate thinks that she/he gained from this particular project and what her/his future administrative and teaching role can be in terms of creating, healthy, welcoming and supportive classroom environment for diverse children and their families (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) .

3. Candidate data derived from the assessment and brief analysis of the data findings:

3.1. Candidate Data:

Semester: Spring, 2009 (Group I)

Candidates= 9

Score Data by Assessment Elements, Spring of 2009 (Group I)

Elements & NAEYC Standards Points	Below Expectations Points	Meets Expectations Points	Exceeds Expectations Points
1. Introduction -(CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 10	N = 0 0% < 8	N = 5 55.55% 8-9	N = 4 44.44% 9.1-10
2. Literature Review on Diversity- (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 20	N = 1 11.11% < 16	N = 4 44.44% 16-18	N = 4 44.44% 18.2-20
3. The Background of the Children and Their Families (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 20	N = 0 % < 16	N = 5 33.33% 16-18	N = 4 44.44% 18.2-20
4. Description of Interactional Activities (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 40	N = 1 11.11% < 32	N = 3 33.33% 32-36	N = 5 55.55% 36.4-40
5. Final Thought (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 10	N = 0 0% < 8	N = 3 33.33% 8-9	N = 6 66.66% 9.1-10

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the element means in relation to NAEYC Standards

Semester: Spring, 2009 (Group II)

Candidates= 15

Score Data by Assessment Elements, Spring of 2009 (Group II)

Elements & NAEYC Standards Points	Below Expectations Points	Meets Expectations Points	Exceeds Expectations Points
1. Introduction (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 10	N = 2 13.33% < 8	N = 7 46.66% 8-9	N = 6 39.99% 9.1-10
2. Literature Review on Diversity 10 (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	N = 2 13.33% < 16	N = 7 46.66% 16-18	N = 6 39.99% 18.2-20
3. The Background of the Children and Their Families-(CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 20	N = 0 0% < 16	N = 7 46.66% 16-18	N = 8 53.33% 18.2-20
4. Description of Interactional Activities- (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 40	N = 2 13.33% < 32	N = 6 39.9% 32-36	N = 7 46.66% 36.4-40
5. Final Thought - 10	N = 1 6.66% < 8	N = 8 53.33% 8-9	N = 6 39.99% 9.1-10

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the element means in relation to NAEYC Standards.

Semester: Spring, 2011

Candidates= 5

Score Data by Assessment Elements, Spring of 2009 (Group II)

Elements & NAEYC Standards	Points	Below Expectations Points	Meets Expectations Points	Exceeds Expectations Points
1. Introduction (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	10	N = 0 0% < 8	N = 1 20% 8-9	N =4 80% 9.1-10
2. Literature Review on Diversity (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	10	N = 1 20% < 16	N =2 40% 16-18	N =2 40% 18.2-20
3. The Background of the Children and Their Families-(CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	20	N =0 0% < 16	N= 1 20% 16-18	N =4 80% 18.2-20
4. Description of Interactional Activities- (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)	40	N = 0 0% < 32	N=2 40% 32-36	N =3 60% 36.4-40
5. Final Thought -	10	N= 0 0% <8	N= 1 20% 8-9	N= 4 80% 9.1-10

Please see the rubrics as to what each of the element means in relation to NAEYC Standards.

Overall Assessment Score for the Spring of 2009 (Group I)
Candidates= 9

Global Data, Spring of 2009 (Group I)

Semester & Year	Below Expectations (< 80)	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceed Expectations (91-100)
Spring 2009	N=0 0%	N=4 44.44%	N=5 55.55%

Overall Assessment Score for the Spring of 2009 (Group II)
Candidates=15

Global Data, Spring of 2009 (Group II)

Semester & Year	Below Expectations (< 80)	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceed Expectations (91-100)
Spring 2009	N= 2 13.33%	N=7 46.66%	N=6 39.99%

Overall Assessment Score for the Spring of 2011
Candidates=5

Global Data, Spring of 2011

Semester & Year	Below Expectations (< 80)	Meet Expectations (80-90)	Exceed Expectations (91-100)
Spring 2009	N= 0	N=1	N=4

	0%	20%	80%
--	----	-----	-----

3.2. A Brief Analysis of the Data Findings:

The score data by assessment elements in the Spring of 2009 (Group I) show that the percentages of candidates who met or exceeded expectations for elements 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 are 100%, 89%, 100%, 89% and 100%, respectively. In element 2 (literature review), 1 candidate (11.11%) scored below expectation. Also, in element 4 (description of interactional activities), 1 candidate (11.11%) scored below expectation. However, the mean score for each element in group I is 95.6%.

The score data by assessment elements for group II show that the percentages of candidates who met or exceeded expectations for elements 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 are 86.65%, 86.65%, 100%, 86.65%, 93.32%, respectively. In 4 of the elements, i.e. elements 1, 2, 4, 5, there are candidates who scored below expectations. The percentages of candidates who scored below expectations for elements 1, 2, 4, 5 are 13.33%, 13.33%, 13.33% and 6.66%, respectively. However, the mean score for each element in group II is 90.65.

When it comes to the overall assessment score in group I, the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectation is 100% while the percentage of candidate who met or exceeded expectations in group II is 86.65%. In group II, out of the 15 candidates, 2 candidates (13.33%) scored below expectations.

In the spring of 2011, the candidates who enrolled in the course were only 5. The score data by assessment elements in this semester shows that the percentages of candidates who met or exceeded expectations for elements 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 are 100%, 80%, 100%, 100% and 100%, respectively. 1 candidate (20%) scored below expectation in 1 element, i.e. in literature review on diversity. However, as the tables for both the score data by assessment elements and the global data show, none of the five candidates scored below expectations.

4. An Interpretation of how the data provide evidence for meeting standards:

As the description on alignment under number 2 demonstrates, the five elements of this assessment align with NAEYC core standards (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). The analysis under number 3.2 shows that the mean score of the candidates in group I is 95.6% while the mean score for group II is 90.65%. **The mean score for the spring of 2011 is 95%.** Furthermore, the global data for Group I and Group II shows that the percentages of candidates who met or exceeded expectations are 100% and 86.65%, respectively, **and the percentage of candidates who met or exceeded expectations in the spring of 2011 is 100%.** In other words, the score data by assessment elements and the global data are way above the minimum requirement which is 80%. Overall, the data for group I and group II **and the data for the spring of 2011**, certainly provides evidence that NAEY's standards are met. However, as described under 3.2, particularly in group II, there are candidates who did not meet expectations in elements 1, 2, 4 and 5. As this is a concern for us, it is our plan to closely look at these elements and work for improving the performance of our candidates.

5. Assessment documentation:

a) Assessment Tool : Project on Diversity: Interacting with Diverse Children and Their Parents

Instructions for Candidates

To be effective early childhood teacher and administrator and contribute toward preparing all young children to be members of healthy, respectful and peaceful communities at local, national and international level, not only it is important to be knowledgeable on the theoretical aspects of diversity issues, but it is also very important to have firsthand experiences of interacting, teaching and dealing with children and families of different cultures, races, ethnicities, languages, special needs and socio-economic status. For this assignment, not only you are required to review current literature on diversity issues, but also to undertake a field based project which includes practical interaction with diverse children and their families in order to collect data and write report (CSs, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). As to the details of working on this project, please carefully read and follow the following instructions:

Data Collection Procedures:

- Make an in-depth review of literature on diversity in general and diverse children and their learning in early childhood classroom settings in particular (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). While reviewing literature, among other things, please read the information in the following websites :
<http://www.naeyc.org/store/node/148>
<http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/leadrshp/le0bow.htm>;
http://www.pbs.org/kcts/preciouschildren/diversity/read_activities.html
http://www.southernearlychildhood.org/upload/pdf/Valuing_Diversity_for_Young_Children.pdf <http://www.circleofinclusion.org/english/accommodating/index.html>
- Find four children of diverse backgrounds in your classroom or center who are within the age range of 3-8 as follows:
 - a) A child whose first language is not English;
 - b) A child who is racially different ;
 - c) A child with special needs or a child of exceptionality;
 - d) A child who is from a low socio-economic status.
- Get consent from their parents (CS 2, 5)
- Please note that if you don't find children of diverse background in your center, you may look for such children in your neighborhood, in your church or other places where you think you can find the particular child you are looking for. Some of you may not find children who speak languages other than English in your area. You may also not find children of different races in your area. In that case, please focus on the types of children that you are able to find in your area. But, please provide information on the types of diversity that you don't find in your area and the reason for not finding them;

- Conduct interviews with one parent of each child, not only to collect information on the contextual backgrounds of the family and the child, but also the extent of the family involvement in the care and education of the child (CSs, 1, 2, 4)
- Observe the children individually or in group, interact with them and record/write what you observed, how you interacted and the reactions of each child (CSs 3). Examples of interactions/teaching include asking questions, playing games, telling stories, presenting hands-on activities, reading books, etc. (CS s 1, 3, 4, 5)

Writing the Report:

- Have a general title for your paper. The general title may be stated as "**Interacting with and Understanding Diverse Children and Their Families**";
- Write a brief introduction titled as **Introduction** where candidate clearly states the objective of the project, the overall contents of the project and the method of data collection (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ;
- Have a literature review section titled as **Literature Review on Diversity**. Please note that it is important to discuss what the current literature says on diverse children and their families in general and diverse children's teaching/learning process in early childhood education settings in particular (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ;
- Have a section titled as **The Background of the Children and Their Families**. Here it is important to provide information on the background of each child and her/his family based on the information you collected through parent interview, observation and interaction. Please note that in this section, it is important to indicate the child's language, race, gender, disability (if applicable), economic status of the family, neighborhood where the child is residing, whether or not she/he has siblings, the preschool setting where she/he is attending and the involvement of the child's parents in his/her education and the relationship of these contexts with child's learning(CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ;
- Have a section where you provide description on developmentally appropriate activities you conducted with each child titled as **Description of Interactional Activities**. Please note that the description needs to provide information on in the type of the activity or activities you performed with each child, where and how the activity was conducted, the role of family, the materials used, the reaction of the child toward the activity, the nature of his/her participation in the activity and the evaluation method that you used in order to know what the child gained from the activity you performed (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 3, 5) ;
- Have a section where you provide concluding statements titled as **Final Thought** on what you think you gained from this particular project and what your future administrative and educational role would be in terms of creating, healthy and supportive classroom environment for diverse children and their families(CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5).
- Please make sure not to compare one child with other child (CS 5) ;
- Please use pseudonyms. In other words, please do not use actual names of the children, other persons or organizations (CS 5);
- Have a reference section with a minimum of eight resource materials (CS 5).

b) Scoring Guide/Rubrics

Elements & NAEYC Standards	Does not meet Expectation (Below 80)	Meet Expectation (80-90)	Exceeds Expectation (91-100)
Introduction (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 10 points	The diversity project report does not have introduction or the information provided in the introduction is vague in terms of stating the objective of the project, the essence and the method of data collection. (< 8)	In the introduction, the objective/objectives of the project, the essence and the method of data collection are reasonably stated (8-9)	The introduction, not only contains clear information on the objective, the essence and the method of data collection, but also has an excellent sense of beginning for the diversity project report (9.1-10)
Literature Review on Diversity (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (20 points)	The literature review has two or more of the following shortcomings: a) No literature review is done at all; b) The literature reviewed on diverse children and their families in general is vague, unrelated and disorganized; c) No literature is reviewed on diverse children's teaching/learning process in early childhood education settings or the literature reviewed on this issue is vague and unrelated ; c) Candidate's own perspective is not incorporated in the literature or is poorly incorporated (< 16)	The literature review on diverse children and their families in general and on diverse children's teaching/learning process in early childhood education classroom setting in particular is reasonably well written with the incorporation of candidate's own perspectives on teaching diverse children (16-18)	Not only the literature review is informative and excellently articulated, but also includes a lot of current theoretical and practical perspectives on diversity issues in early childhood settings. Furthermore, candidates' own perspective is clearly articulated. (18.2-20)
The Background of the Children and Their Families (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (20 points)	The background information has two or more of the following shortcomings: a) No background information is provided at all; b) The information provided on each child does not indicate all or many of such contexts: the child's age, language, race, gender, exceptionality, economic status of the family, neighborhood, whether or not the child has siblings, the child's preschool setting and the involvement of the child's parents in his/her education; c) Candidate did not raise and discuss each child's contexts and their influence on her/his development or leaning (< 16)	The background information is reasonably well written indicating the child's age, language, race, gender, exceptionality, economic status of the family, neighborhood, whether or not the child has siblings, the child's preschool setting and the involvement of the child's parents in her/his education. The influence of each child's context is also described adequately (16-18) .	Not only the background information on the children is excellently written, but also the contents of the information demonstrates candidates in-depth understanding of the impact of contextual factors on children's development (18.2-20)

<p>Description of Interactional Activities (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) 40 points</p>	<p>The description on interactional activities with the diverse children has two or more of the following shortcomings: a) No description of interactional activities is provided; b) The information provided did not raise and discuss many or all of the following: the type of the activity that the candidate performed with each child, where and how the activity was conducted, whether or not families were involved in the activity, the materials used, the reaction of the child toward the activity and the nature of his/her participation in the activity ;c) The method of evaluation for each child is not described; d)The overall description is vague and disorganized (<32)</p>	<p>The description on interactional activities with the diverse children is reasonably well written. Candidate raised and discussed the type of the activity that she/he performed with each child, where and how the activity was conducted, whether or not families were involved in the activity, the materials used, the reaction of the child toward the activity and the nature of his/her participation in the activity. The method of evaluation for each child is also well described (32-36)</p>	<p>Not only the interactional activity with each child is clearly described and articulated, but also the overall description demonstrates candidate's strong ability and skills of dealing with diverse children and their families (36.4-40)</p>
<p>Final Thought (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (10 points)</p>	<p>The final thought has two or more of the following problems: a) What the candidate thinks that she/he gained by conducting this particular project on diverse children is not provided; b) The information provided does not demonstrate that candidate has a full grasp of the idea behind the project; c) Candidate did not reflect her/his thought on the future administrative and educational role that she/he would play in terms of creating, healthy and supportive early childhood education classroom environment for diverse children and their families (<8)</p>	<p>Candidate's final thought on her interaction with diverse children is reasonably well written in terms of stating what she/he thought that she/he gained by conducting this particular project and in terms of reflecting on her/his future administrative and educational role that she/he would play to create healthy and supportive early childhood education classroom environment for diverse children and their families (8-9)</p>	<p>Not only the final thought on the candidate's interactions with the diverse children is thoughtfully and clearly articulated, but also it demonstrates her/his in-depth understanding of the theoretical and the practical aspects of working with diverse children and their families (9.1-10)</p>