Peer Review Team Report to the Commission

This report presents the findings of the peer review team representing the NAEYC Commission on the Accreditation of Early Childhood Higher Education Programs. The Peer Review Report is submitted to the primary contact at the program for review and written response. The Peer Review Report, along with the Self-Study Report and the Written Response, will be reviewed by the Commission, which will make the accreditation decision.

Institution Name, State: **Weber State University, UT**

Dates of Site Visit: **October 15-18, 2017**

Names of Peer Review Team: **Tammie Vail Shoultz McCole, Dr. Ajay Singh,**

Jayanti Tambe, Kristen Hommel-Miller

Team Chair: **Tammie Vail Shoultz McCole**

Degree Program Reviewed: **A.A.S. Early Childhood**

Overall Strengths and Commendations:

The peer review team found many areas of strength in the early childhood program.

The department faculty advising is viewed as an ongoing process. There are two advisors – an academic and faculty mentor who check in with the students regularly over the semester. Advisors use a relationship-based approach, which is evident in the Self-Study Report (pp. 39-40) and through the conversations that the review team had with students, administration, and stakeholders.

For the practicum classes, the program works in close collaboration with the Melba S. Lehner Children's School and the Weber State University Charter Academy (Lab Kindergarten) which enhances the learning opportunities for students. It was mentioned in the report and also in the meetings with faculty, students and stakeholders regarding the continual joint collaboration for practicum and student teaching. There are also specific coaching trainings for the mentor teachers at the school (Self-Study Report, pp. 24-27.

Rubrics, syllabus, and assignments included references and alignment to NAEYC Standards throughout activities that students were engaging in throughout all of the required courses for the A.A.S. degree.

Overall Areas for Commission Consideration:

Some of the concerns that the peer review team identified during the visit were in relation to the flexibility that students have to take course work out of sequence from what is recommended on the department's course map. Learning opportunities for students may not happen in coursework prior to the key assessment (Self-Study Report, pp. 16-17).

Also, students may not have experience with the different age groups or learning environments outlined in Criterion 5 (Self-Study Report, pp. 24-27).

The Accreditation Criteria: Program Context

The accreditation standards are meant to provide a shared vision for early childhood professional preparation that is developed and implemented in unique programs that are responsive to particular Candidates, faculty and communities. This unique program context is described through the framework of the twelve accreditation criteria. The rest of this report offers feedback on your program's areas of strength and areas for consideration in each criteria cluster:

- Program Identity, Role and Design

- Candidates

- Faculty

- Supportive Infrastructure and Organization of Program

Program Context

Criterion 1: The early childhood program has established a clear identity and role in its community and is responsive to community stakeholders.

Criterion 2: The early childhood program is based on a conceptual framework that is linked to the program's mission and values.

Criterion 3: The program of studies is a coherent series of courses and field experiences that promote candidate learning in relation to the NAEYC Standards and supportive skills.

Criterion 4: The teaching strategies used by program faculty reflect the characteristics, instructional methods, and evaluation strategies that are likely to promote candidate learning in relation to the NAEYC Standards and supportive skills. They reflect the current professional knowledge base and are responsive to the characteristics of the program's candidates.

Criterion 5: The program's field experiences support candidates' learning in relation to the NAEYC Standards.

Criterion 6: Programs ensure that candidates have the skills needed to gain competence in relation to the core standards.

Criterion 7: The program of study contributes to opportunities for early childhood professionals to build on prior credentials and prepare for future professional growth opportunities.

Strengths and Areas for Consideration related to Program Context

In both the A.A.S. and B.S. programs, a strength is in the creation of coaching credential courses and use of practice-based coaching model and National Center for Quality Teaching and Learning to improve individualized mentoring for each student's field experiences (Self-Study Report, pp. 11, 20, 24; faculty and stakeholder interview).

NAEYC Accreditation
of Early Childhood Higher
Education Programs

naeyc
Accreditation
Early Childhood Higher Education Programs

In both the A.A.S. and B.S. programs, the close collaboration with Melba S. Lehner Children's School and the Weber State University Charter Academy (Lab Kindergarten) enhances the learning opportunities for students through joint creation of the conceptual framework and field experiences with mentor teachers (Self-Study Report, pp. 14, 16, 30; discussed in all interviews).

At both degree levels, the department does not track the age groups with which students are completing field experience with. In discussions with the department chair and faculty, it was noted that the Melba S. Lehner Children's School enrolls children beginning at 24 months.

The Self-Study Report identified, at both degree levels, the lack of a course specifically focused on early childhood documentation and assessment (Self-Study Report, p. 18), as well as an increasing need for faculty knowledge and implementation of culturally relevant adult learning strategies (Self-Study Report, p. 22; discussed in faculty and student interview).

Candidates

Criterion 8: The program encourages enrollment of a diverse group of candidates who have potential to succeed as early childhood educators.

Criterion 9: The program ensures that candidates are adequately advised and supported.

Strengths and Areas for Consideration related to Candidate Enrollment and Support

At both degree levels, advising is viewed as an ongoing process. There are two advisors—an academic and faculty mentor who check in with the students regularly over the semester. As noted in the Self-Study Report (p. 39) and in all interviews, advisors use a relationship-based approach.

A variety of services offered to candidates at both degree levels: information sessions, campus orientations, dissemination of data, advising brochures, and graduation maps, involvement in campus events, health and wellness center, medical clinic, counseling services, technology assistance, regular instructors for math and writing center, library loans out laptop. These are described in the Self-Study Report on page 39 and were observed by the team during a campus tour.

The program actively recruits students who faculty feel would be a good fit for the program. This includes noticing students working in the community and general education course (Self-Study Report, page 42; administration interview).

At both degree levels, it was noted in the Self-Study Report (p. 37) and confirmed during interviews that low wages are identified as a big roadblock to recruitment of qualified candidates. In addition, in-service early childhood teachers who need college degrees for their job find it hard to fit courses and fieldwork into their work schedules.

At both degree levels, the program also self-identified (Self-Study Report, p. 41; student and faculty interviews) a need for systematic approach for communicating critical importance regarding need to meet with advisors early on.

Faculty

> **Criterion 10:** The program ensures that faculty members demonstrate the qualifications and characteristics needed to promote candidates' learning in relation to the NAEYC Standards and supportive skills.

> **Criterion 11:** Faculty responsibilities allow them to promote candidates' learning in relation to the NAEYC Standards and supportive skills.

> **Criterion 12:** Faculty members are provided with professional development that strengthens their ability to promote candidates' learning in relation to NAEYC Standards and supportive skills.

Strengths and Areas for Consideration Related to Faculty Qualifications, Characteristics, Responsibilities and Professional Development

The four full-time faculty, who teach at both degree levels, have experience and are highly qualified regarding education (Self-Study Report, pp. 44-46). Faculty at both degree levels participate actively in the MSL Children's Center. They also participate in staff meetings, staff development training sessions, and committees for the centers (Self-Study Report, p. 53; faculty and administration interviews). Full-time faculty can apply for up to $3,500 annually along with an additional $500 to support professional development including conferences and research activities (Self-Study Report, p. 55; faculty and administration interviews).

The program identified that a major challenge is filling the open early childhood tenured faculty position, as current faculty at both degree levels are often stretched in their capacity (Self-Study Report, p. 53; faculty, stakeholder, and administration interviews). Another self-identified area for growth is how to best incorporate what is learned in profession development activities in the community into all of the programs in an intentional, systematic way (Self-Study Report, p. 57; program director and faculty interviews).

Supportive Infrastructure and Organization of Program

> **Criterion 13:** The program's organization and guidance are mission driven and participatory, placing the needs of candidates as first priority.

> **Criterion 14: T**he program has sufficient resources to support its efforts to promote candidates' learning in relation to NAEYC Standards and supportive skills.

Strengths and Areas for Consideration related to Infrastructure and Organization of Program

Institution-wide, there is a shared governance policy which allows for and welcomes input from faculty and staff (Self-Study Report, p. 59; administration and faculty interviews). Prior to making final decisions for the program, all faculty and staff are provided an opportunity to express views and provide input. An example of this would be the selections of the key assessments.

The Weber State University 50/50 program hires additional candidates (across degree levels) to support faculty research and other activities. Currently four undergraduate students are employed (Self-Study Report, p. 62; interviews with faculty, students, and administration).

Faculty identified a need for ongoing training and professional development for the staff in the MSL Children's School (Self-Study Report, p. 60; interview with faculty and program director).

The department views the lower wage for faculty as a barrier for hiring another full-time faculty member (Self-Study Report, p. 64; interview with faculty and program director).

Peer Review Findings Related to the Accreditation Standards

Standard 1 Promoting Child Development and Learning: Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs are grounded in a child development knowledge base. They 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 each child.

	☒ THE PEER REVIEW DID NOT IDENTIFY SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.		☐ THE PEER REVIEW IDENTIFIED SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.
A. LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES TO SUPPORT KEY ELEMENTS	☐ Strong learning opportunities are provided for the key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ Learning opportunities are aligned with key elements of this standard.	☐ Learning opportunities need significant improvements to help candidates learn and practice in relation to the key elements of this standard.
B. KEY ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO KEY ELEMENTS	☐ The designated key assessments are well aligned with all key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ The designated key assessments (including rubrics and instructions to candidates) are aligned with key elements of this standard and describe program expectations for candidates' growth and competence in relation to the standard. • The categories of content are the same or consistent • The span or range of knowledge is equivalent and • The cognitive demands and skill requirements are congruent with those described in the standard.	Assessment tools do not: ☐ Provide clear alignment with key elements of the standard. ☐ Describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations.
C. DATA ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE	☐ Aggregate data on candidate performance from key assessments related to this standard are presented in the Self-Study Report in a way that is clear and meaningful.	☐ The program has aggregate data related to this standard. ☒ The program does not have aggregate data related to this standard but has a written data collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report.	☐ The program does not have data related to this standard or a written collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report. ☐ NA – Assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the Standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).
D. USE OF CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE DATA	☐ The program is using candidate performance data related to the standard to improve the program and to help candidates succeed in the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☐ The program has analyzed candidate performance data related to this standard and has reflected on implications for teaching and learning. ☒ The program has a written plan regarding how they will analyze candidate performance data related to this standard and reflect on implications for teaching and learning.	☐ The program is not yet using data to improve student teaching and learning related to the standard and does not have a written plan for using data in this way. ☐ NA – The program does not have data related to this standard (Indicator C), or assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).

Reviewer Comments for Standard 1 Ratings

Names of Key Assessments Submitted for this Standard:

Key Assessment 1: Child Development Observation – CHF 2500
Key Assessment 3: STEM Family Activities – CHF 2670 (not listed in Overview Chart but listed in
    assignment instructions and rubric)
Key Assessment 4: Case Study – CHF 2600
(Key Assessment 5: Webbing Observation – CHF 2620 is listed on Overview Chart but not in the
    assessment itself; the program director indicated this was a typo).

Comments on Learning Opportunities to Support Key Elements:

Some learning opportunities identified in the Curriculum Chart (Self-Study Report, pp. 66-72) happen
prior to or during the same semester as key assessment coursework. These include:
- Key Element 1a: In CHF 2500, students complete observations of preschool- and kindergarten-age children. In CHF 1500, students write a paper based on reality experiences in different life stages.
- Key Element 1b: In CHF 2500, students complete a closed-book essay. In CHF 1500 students write a paper based on reality experiences in different life stages.
- Key Element 1c: In CHF 2500, students reflect on a children's novel, including developmental theories, characteristics, and milestones. In CHF 2620 students write plans, implement them, and then reflect on developmentally appropriate child-directed learning experiences.

In addition to these, the team noted there were additional learning opportunities that had the potential to
or would take place after the key assessment because of individualized student enrollment patterns.

Comments on Key Assessments Related to Key Elements:

Key Assessment 1 – Child Development Observation. Students complete a one-hour observation of
young children using an anecdotal record form using objective language. Inclusion of child development
theory is expected to be discussed in the comments are of the form. There is alignment with Key
Elements 1a and 1b. Key Element 1c is not aligned as the students do not create anything in this project
beyond an observation paper (Self-Study Report, p. 81).

Key Assessment 3 – STEM Family Activities. Students create two activity kits, math and science, which
must include a variety of different items in order to make it self-contained so parents will not need to add
items. Additionally they write a rationale for the instructor outlining DAP, theory support, and how the
activity is engaging for families. This is the first semester for this course, and family participation is
optional. There is alignment with Key Element 1c (Self-Study Report, p. 97).

Key Assessment 4 – Case Study. Students complete two case studies which allow them to synthesize
information learned throughout their coursework and apply the information to a "real-life" situation. There
is alignment with Key Elements 1a and 1b (Self-Study Report, p. 104).

Comments on Data on Candidate Performance:

The ECE faculty have a plan to use their online learning platform to aggregate data by element per key
assessment in order to access usable student data.

Comments on Use of Candidate Performance Data:

Faculty clearly understand the need to analyze the data to inform and guide teaching and learning in relation to the standards.

Standard 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.

	☒ THE PEER REVIEW DID NOT IDENTIFY SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.		☐ THE PEER REVIEW IDENTIFIED SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.
A. LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES TO SUPPORT KEY ELEMENTS	☐ Strong learning opportunities are provided for the key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ Learning opportunities are aligned with key elements of this standard.	☐ Learning opportunities need significant improvements to help candidates learn and practice in relation to the key elements of this standard.
B. KEY ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO KEY ELEMENTS	☐ The designated key assessments are well aligned with all key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ The designated key assessments (including rubrics and instructions to candidates) are aligned with key elements of this standard and describe program expectations for candidates' growth and competence in relation to the standard. • The categories of content are the same or consistent • The span or range of knowledge is equivalent and • The cognitive demands and skill requirements are congruent with those described in the standard.	Assessment tools do not: ☐ Provide clear alignment with key elements of the standard. ☐ Describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations.
C. DATA ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE	☐ Aggregate data on candidate performance from key assessments related to this standard are presented in the Self-Study Report in a way that is clear and meaningful.	☐ The program has aggregate data related to this standard. ☒ The program does not have aggregate data related to this standard but has a written data collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report.	☐ The program does not have data related to this standard or a written collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report. ☐ NA – Assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the Standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).
D. USE OF CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE DATA	☐ The program is using candidate performance data related to the standard to improve the program and to help candidates succeed in the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☐ The program has analyzed candidate performance data related to this standard and has reflected on implications for teaching and learning. ☒ The program has a written plan regarding how they will analyze candidate performance data related to this standard and reflect on implications for teaching and learning.	☐ The program is not yet using data to improve student teaching and learning related to the standard and does not have a written plan for using data in this way. ☐ NA – The program does not have data related to this standard (Indicator C), or assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).

Reviewer Comments for Standard 2 Ratings

Names of Key Assessments Submitted for this Standard:

Key Assessment 3: STEM Family Activities – CHF 2670
Key Assessment 4: Case Study – CHF 2600
(Key Assessment 6: Structure and Process Quality Observation – CHF 2600 is listed on the overview
        chart but not in the assessment itself; the program director indicated this was a typo).

Comments on Learning Opportunities to Support Key Elements:

Some learning opportunities identified in the Curriculum Chart (Self-Study Report, pp. 66-72) happen
prior to or during the same semester as key assessment coursework. These include:
- Key Element 2a: In CHF 2600, students complete a paper focusing on teaching practices that
  support individual, cultural, and linguistic diversity.
- Key Element 2b: In CHF 2600, students participate in an in-class discussion about individualized
  and culturally responsive practices.
- Key Element 2c: In CHF 2670, in the online classroom there is prior classwork and student
  discussions.

In addition to these, the team noted there were additional learning opportunities that had the potential to
or would take place after the key assessment because of individualized student enrollment patterns.

Comments on Key Assessments Related to Key Elements:

Key Assessment 3 – STEM Family Activities. Students create two activity kits, math and science, which
must include a variety of different items in order to make it self-contained, parents will not need to add
items. Additionally they write a rationale for the instructor outlining DAP, theory support, and how activity
is engaging for families. This is the first semester for this course, and family participation is optional. At
this point there is partial alignment to Standard 2c because the students may not have involvement with
families for this project (Self-Study Report, p. 97).

Key Assessment 4 – Case Study. Students complete two case studies which allow them to synthesize
information learned throughout their coursework and apply the information to a "real-life" situation. There
is alignment with Key Elements 2a, 2b, and 2c (Self-Study Report, p. 104).

Comments on Data on Candidate Performance:

The ECE faculty have a plan to use their online learning platform to aggregate data by element per key
assessment in order to access usable student data.

Comments on Use of Candidate Performance Data:

Faculty clearly understand the need to analyze the data to inform and guide teaching and learning in
relation to the standards.

Standard 3 Observing, Documenting and Assessing to Support Young Children & 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 support children's development and learning.

	☒ THE PEER REVIEW DID NOT IDENTIFY SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.		☐ THE PEER REVIEW IDENTIFIED SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.
A. LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES TO SUPPORT KEY ELEMENTS *s*	☐ Strong learning opportunities are provided for the key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ Learning opportunities are aligned with key elements of this standard.	☐ Learning opportunities need significant improvements to help candidates learn and practice in relation to the key elements of this standard.
B. KEY ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO KEY ELEMENTS	☐ The designated key assessments are well aligned with all key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ The designated key assessments (including rubrics and instructions to candidates) are aligned with key elements of this standard and describe program expectations for candidates' growth and competence in relation to the standard. • The categories of content are the same or consistent • The span or range of knowledge is equivalent and • The cognitive demands and skill requirements are congruent with those described in the standard.	Assessment tools do not: ☐ Provide clear alignment with key elements of the standard. ☐ Describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations.
C. DATA ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE	☐ Aggregate data on candidate performance from key assessments related to this standard are presented in the Self-Study Report in a way that is clear and meaningful.	☐ The program has aggregate data related to this standard. ☒ The program does not have aggregate data related to this standard but has a written data collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report.	☐ The program does not have data related to this standard or a written collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report. ☐ NA – Assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the Standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).
D. USE OF CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE DATA	☐ The program is using candidate performance data related to the standard to improve the program and to help candidates succeed in the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☐ The program has analyzed candidate performance data related to this standard and has reflected on implications for teaching and learning. ☒ The program has a written plan regarding how they will analyze candidate performance data related to this standard and reflect on implications for teaching and learning.	☐ The program is not yet using data to improve student teaching and learning related to the standard and does not have a written plan for using data in this way. ☐ NA – The program does not have data related to this standard (Indicator C), or assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).

Reviewer Comments for Standard 3 Ratings

Names of Key Assessments Submitted for this Standard:
Key Assessment 1: Child Development Observation – CHF 2500
Key Assessment 2: Reflective Log 10 – CHF 2610
Key Assessment 5: Webbing Observation – CHF 2620

Comments on Learning Opportunities to Support Key Elements:

Some learning opportunities identified in the Curriculum Chart (Self-Study Report, pp. 66-72) happen prior to or during the same semester as key assessment coursework. These include:
- Key Element 3a: In CHF 2600, students practice using multiple observational tools.
- Key Element 3b: In CHF 2500, students complete previous observations, listed in the course syllabus, prior to the key assessment.
- Key Element 3c: In CHF 2620, students complete a focused observation of an individual child behavior to enhance individualized planning.
- Key Element 3d: In CHF 2610 students sit in on a collaborative meeting to discuss a child's individual needs. There are prior weekly reflection logs in the same course.

In addition to these, the team noted there were additional learning opportunities that had the potential to or would take place after the key assessment because of individualized student enrollment patterns.

Comments on Key Assessments Related to Key Elements:

Key Assessment 1 – Child Development Observation. Students complete a one-hour observation of young children using an anecdotal record form using objective language. Inclusion of child development theory is expected to be discussed in the comments are of the form. There is alignment with Key Element 3b (Self-Study Report, p. 81).

Key Assessment 2 – Reflective Log 10. Student complete several different topic-based reflections. Week 10 focuses on the following: Trust Relationships, Follow-up on Previous Goals, Observations Task and Reflection, Short Term goals and Plan for Next Visit, Underlying Concepts for Guidance including theories, and Professionalism. There is partial alignment with Key Element 3d, as family partnership is not clearly defined (Self-Study Report, p. 88).

Key Assessment 5 – Webbing Observation. Students develop skills for observing children, practice efficient and effective methods to document observations of individual child learning within the planned curriculum, and reflect on the meaning of their specific observations. There is alignment with Key Elements 3a, 3b, and 3c (Self-Study Report, p. 110).

Comments on Data on Candidate Performance:
The ECE faculty have a plan to use their online learning platform to aggregate data by element per key assessment in order to access usable student data.

Comments on Use of Candidate Performance Data:
Faculty clearly understand the need to analyze the data to inform and guide teaching and learning in relation to the standards.

Standard 4 Using Developmentally Effective Approaches: Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs understand that teaching and learning with young children is a complex enterprise, and its details vary depending on children's ages, characteristics, and the settings within which teaching and learning occur. They understand and use positive relationships and supportive interactions as the foundation for their work with young children and families. Candidates know, understand, and use a wide array of developmentally appropriate approaches, instructional strategies, and tools to connect with children and families and positively influence each child's development and learning.

	☒ THE PEER REVIEW DID NOT IDENTIFY SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.		☐ THE PEER REVIEW IDENTIFIED SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.
A. LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES TO SUPPORT KEY ELEMENTS	☐ Strong learning opportunities are provided for the key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ Learning opportunities are aligned with key elements of this standard.	☐ Learning opportunities need significant improvements to help candidates learn and practice in relation to the key elements of this standard.
B. KEY ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO KEY ELEMENTS	☐ The designated key assessments are well aligned with all key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ The designated key assessments (including rubrics and instructions to candidates) are aligned with key elements of this standard and describe program expectations for candidates' growth and competence in relation to the standard. • The categories of content are the same or consistent • The span or range of knowledge is equivalent and • The cognitive demands and skill requirements are congruent with those described in the standard.	Assessment tools do not: ☐ Provide clear alignment with key elements of the standard. ☐ Describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations.
C. DATA ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE	☐ Aggregate data on candidate performance from key assessments related to this standard are presented in the Self-Study Report in a way that is clear and meaningful.	☐ The program has aggregate data related to this standard. ☒ The program does not have aggregate data related to this standard but has a written data collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report.	☐ The program does not have data related to this standard or a written collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report. ☐ NA – Assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the Standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).
D. USE OF CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE DATA	☐ The program is using candidate performance data related to the standard to improve the program and to help candidates succeed in the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☐ The program has analyzed candidate performance data related to this standard and has reflected on implications for teaching and learning. ☒ The program has a written plan regarding how they will analyze candidate performance data related to this standard and reflect on implications for teaching and learning.	☐ The program is not yet using data to improve student teaching and learning related to the standard and does not have a written plan for using data in this way. ☐ NA – The program does not have data related to this standard (Indicator C), or assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).

NAEYC Accreditation
of Early Childhood Higher
Education Programs

naeyc
Accreditation
Early Childhood Higher Education Programs

Reviewer Comments for Standard 4 Ratings

Names of Key Assessments Submitted for this Standard:

Key Assessment 2: Reflective Log 10 – CHF 2610
Key Assessment 6: Structure and Process Quality Observation – CHF 2600

Comments on Learning Opportunities to Support Key Elements:

Some learning opportunities identified in the Curriculum Chart (Self-Study Report, pp. 66-72) happen prior to or during the same semester as key assessment coursework. These include:
- Key Element 4a: In CHF 2600 Classroom Structure and Process Quality Observation, students synthesize and evaluate structure to examine implications of public policy. In CHF 2600 Exploring Practices for Embracing Individual, Cultural, and Linguistic Diversity, students create a paper based on observations of diversity.
- Key Element 4b: In CHF 2600 Connecting Age Appropriate DAP and Theory, students create a paper based on DAP framework to identify characteristics of classroom quality. In CHF 2620 Individual Research Project, students create a project to develop a deeper understanding of a special-interest topic related to curriculum planning.
- Key Element 4c: In CHF 2860 Emergent Planning Project, students create, implement and reflect on lesson plans. In CHF 2610 Individual Guidance Plan Meeting and Written Report, students participate in a collaborative meeting to make decisions on a young child who needs more individualized assistance in social and emotional learning. The students then write a report on documentation, decision-making, intervention, and monitoring of challenging behaviors in a young child.
- Key Element 4d: In CHF 2610 After-Class Reflective Essays, students complete essays after class to further reflect on course content and in-class discussions. In CHF 2860 Reflective Logs, students write reflective papers on guided topics.

In addition to these, the team noted there were additional learning opportunities that had the potential to or would take place after the key assessment because of individualized student enrollment patterns.

Comments on Key Assessments Related to Key Elements:

Key Assessment 2 – Reflective Log 10. Student complete several different topic-based reflections. Week 10 focuses on the following: Trust Relationships, Follow-up on Previous Goals, Observations Task and Reflection, Short Term goals and Plan for Next Visit, Underlying Concepts for Guidance including theories, and Professionalism. There is alignment with Key Elements 4a and 4b, as the rubric outlines that students are to discuss trust relationships and sensitivity to child needs. Key Element 4d is aligned as these reflection journals are directly related to their interactions with children, family, staff in the classroom. Key Element 4c is aligned based on the foundation that CHF 2610 course focuses on DAP (Self-Study Report, p. 88).

Key Assessment 6 - Structure and Process Quality Observation – CHF 2600, students create a final exam paper. Students are required to synthesize key concepts learned throughout the course. There is alignment with Key Element 4a, as the rubric outlines students are to demonstrate accurate foundational understanding of the importance of supportive interactions (Self-Study Report, p. 116).

Comments on Data on Candidate Performance:

The ECE faculty have a plan to use their online learning platform to aggregate data by element per key assessment in order to access usable student data.

Comments on Use of Candidate Performance Data:

Faculty clearly understand the need to analyze the data to inform and guide teaching and learning in relation to the standards.

Standard 5 Using Content Knowledge to Build Meaningful Curriculum: Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs use their knowledge of academic disciplines to design, implement, and evaluate experiences that promote positive development and learning for each and every young child. Candidates understand the importance of developmental domains and academic (or content) disciplines in early childhood curriculum. They know the essential concepts, inquiry tools, and structure of content areas, including academic subjects, and can identify resources to deepen their understanding. Candidates use their own knowledge and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curriculum that promotes comprehensive developmental and learning outcomes for every young child.

	☒ THE PEER REVIEW DID NOT IDENTIFY SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.		☐ THE PEER REVIEW IDENTIFIED SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.
A. LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES TO SUPPORT KEY ELEMENTS	☐ Strong learning opportunities are provided for the key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ Learning opportunities are aligned with key elements of this standard.	☐ Learning opportunities need significant improvements to help candidates learn and practice in relation to the key elements of this standard.
B. KEY ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO KEY ELEMENTS	☐ The designated key assessments are well aligned with all key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ The designated key assessments (including rubrics and instructions to candidates) are aligned with key elements of this standard and describe program expectations for candidates' growth and competence in relation to the standard. • The categories of content are the same or consistent • The span or range of knowledge is equivalent and • The cognitive demands and skill requirements are congruent with those described in the standard.	Assessment tools do not: ☐ Provide clear alignment with key elements of the standard. ☐ Describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations.
C. DATA ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE	☐ Aggregate data on candidate performance from key assessments related to this standard are presented in the Self-Study Report in a way that is clear and meaningful.	☐ The program has aggregate data related to this standard. ☒ The program does not have aggregate data related to this standard but has a written data collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report.	☐ The program does not have data related to this standard or a written collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report. ☐ NA – Assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the Standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).
D. USE OF CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE DATA	☐ The program is using candidate performance data related to the standard to improve the program and to help candidates succeed in the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☐ The program has analyzed candidate performance data related to this standard and has reflected on implications for teaching and learning. ☒ The program has a written plan regarding how they will analyze candidate performance data related to this standard and reflect on implications for teaching and learning.	☐ The program is not yet using data to improve student teaching and learning related to the standard and does not have a written plan for using data in this way. ☐ NA – The program does not have data related to this standard (Indicator C), or assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).

Reviewer Comments for Standard 5 Ratings

Names of Key Assessments Submitted for this Standard:

Key Assessment 3: STEM Family Activities – CHF 2670
Key Assessment 5: Webbing Observation – CHF 2620

Comments on Learning Opportunities to Support Key Elements:

Some learning opportunities identified in the Curriculum Chart (Self-Study Report, pp. 66-72) happen prior to or during the same semester as key assessment coursework. These include:

- Key Element 5a: In CHF 2620 Group Discussion Leader, students are a group discussion leader for content areas. In CHF 2860 Emergent Planning Project, students create, implement and reflect on lesson plans.
- Key Element 5b: In CHF 2670 Literacy Connections Project, students describe how children's books are connected to TEMS concepts. In CHF 2860 Emergent Planning Project, students create, implement and reflect on lesson plans.
- Key Element 5c: In CHF 2620 Learning Experience Plans, Implementation, and Self-Reflection, students write, implement, and evaluate reflections on developmentally appropriate child learning experiences. In CHF 2860 Emergent Planning Project, students create, implement and reflect on lesson plans.

In addition to these, the team noted there were additional learning opportunities that had the potential to or would take place after the key assessment because of individualized student enrollment patterns.

Comments on Key Assessments Related to Key Elements:

Key Assessment 3 – STEM Family Activities. Students create two activity kits, math and science, which must include a variety of different items in order to make it self-contained so parents will not need to add items. Additionally they write a rationale for the instructor outlining DAP, theory support, and how activity is engaging for families. This is the first semester for this course, and family participation is optional. There is alignment with Key Elements 5a and 5b. At this point there is partial alignment to Key Element 5c because the students may not have involvement with families for this project (Self-Study Report, p. 97).

Key Assessment 5 – Webbing Observation. Students develop skills for observing children, practice efficient and effective methods to document observations of individual child learning within the planned curriculum, and reflect on the meaning of their specific observations. There is alignment with Key Element 5c as the rubric outlines students are to evaluate specific implications for future curriculum planning for each individual child (Self-Study Report, p. 110).

Comments on Data on Candidate Performance:

The ECE faculty have a plan to use their online learning platform to aggregate data by element per key assessment in order to access usable student data.

Comments on Use of Candidate Performance Data:

Faculty clearly understand the need to analyze the data to inform and guide teaching and learning in relation to the standards.

Standard 6 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.

	☒ THE PEER REVIEW DID NOT IDENTIFY SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.		☐ THE PEER REVIEW IDENTIFIED SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS.
A. LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES TO SUPPORT KEY ELEMENTS	☐ Strong learning opportunities are provided for the key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ Learning opportunities are aligned with key elements of this standard.	☐ Learning opportunities need significant improvements to help candidates learn and practice in relation to the key elements of this standard.
B. KEY ASSESSMENTS RELATED TO KEY ELEMENTS	☐ The designated key assessments are well aligned with all key elements of this standard and support the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☒ The designated key assessments (including rubrics and instructions to candidates) are aligned with key elements of this standard and describe program expectations for candidates' growth and competence in relation to the standard. • The categories of content are the same or consistent • The span or range of knowledge is equivalent and • The cognitive demands and skill requirements are congruent with those described in the standard.	Assessment tools do not: ☐ Provide clear alignment with key elements of the standard. ☐ Describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations.
C. DATA ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE	☐ Aggregate data on candidate performance from key assessments related to this standard are presented in the Self-Study Report in a way that is clear and meaningful.	☐ The program has aggregate data related to this standard. ☒ The program does not have aggregate data related to this standard but has a written data collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report.	☐ The program does not have data related to this standard or a written collection plan that would provide data by the first Annual Report. ☐ NA – Assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the Standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).
D. USE OF CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE DATA	☐ The program is using candidate performance data related to the standard to improve the program and to help candidates succeed in the program's context (related to one or more Criteria).	☐ The program has analyzed candidate performance data related to this standard and has reflected on implications for teaching and learning. ☒ The program has a written plan regarding how they will analyze candidate performance data related to this standard and reflect on implications for teaching and learning.	☐ The program is not yet using data to improve student teaching and learning related to the standard and does not have a written plan for using data in this way. ☐ NA – The program does not have data related to this standard (Indicator C), or assessment tools will not yield data because they are not aligned with the standard or do not describe what candidates should know and do to meet program expectations (Indicator B).

Reviewer Comments for Standard 6 Ratings

Names of Key Assessments Submitted for this Standard:

Key Assessment 2: Reflective Log 10 – CHF 2610
Key Assessment 6: Structure and Process Quality Observation – CHF 2600

Comments on Learning Opportunities to Support Key Elements:
Some learning opportunities identified in the Curriculum Chart (Self-Study Report, pp. 66-72) happen prior to or during the same semester as key assessment coursework. These include:
- Key Element 6a: In CHF 2620 Teaching and Learning Philosophy, students create a teaching and learning philosophy statement to reflect on and articulate beliefs and practices as a teacher.
- Key Element 6b: In CHF 2990 Final Comprehensive Exam, students complete a closed-book capstone exam to measure learning outcomes in the Early Childhood or Early Childhood Education Program.
- Key Element 6c: In CHF 2860 Reflective Logs, students write reflective papers on guided topics. In CHF 2860 Child Profile, students document observation results for two children in different developmental domains and identify appropriate domain-specific goals to guide future teaching practices.
- Key Element 6d: In CHF 2620 Individual Research Project, students develop a project to gain deeper understanding of a special-interest topic related to curriculum planning. In CHF 2860 Child Profile, students document observation results for two children in different developmental domains and appropriate domain-specific goals to guide future teaching practice. In CHF 2990 Final Comprehensive Exam, students complete a closed-book capstone exam to measure learning outcomes in the Early Childhood or Early Childhood Education Program.
- Key Element 6e: In CHF 2600 Exam 1, students complete a closed-book exam including multiple choice, true/false, short answer, and essay questions.
- In addition to these, the team noted there were additional learning opportunities that had the potential to or would take place after the key assessment because of individualized student enrollment patterns.

Comments on Key Assessments Related to Key Elements:

Key Assessment 2 – Reflective Log 10. Students complete several different topic-based reflections. Week 10 focuses on the following: Trust Relationships, Follow-up on Previous Goals, Observations Task and Reflection, Short Term goals and Plan for Next Visit, Underlying Concepts for Guidance including theories, Professionalism. There is alignment with Key Element 6b as these reflection journals are directly related to their interactions with children, family, and staff in the classroom (Self-Study Report, p. 88).

Key Assessment 6 - Structure and Process Quality Observation – CHF 2600. Students create a final exam paper. Students are required to synthesize key concepts learned throughout the course. There is alignment with Key Element 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d, and 6e (Self-Study Report, p. 116.

Comments on Data on Candidate Performance:

The ECE faculty have a plan to use their online learning platform to aggregate data by element per key assessment in order to access usable student data.

Comments on Use of Candidate Performance Data:

Faculty clearly understand the need to analyze the data to inform and guide teaching and learning in relation to the standards.

Closing Statement

The team would like to express our appreciation for the warm and welcoming atmosphere created during the site visit. It was evident throughout our visit that the faculty work together as a team to provide quality educational opportunities for the students.

We convey our thanks to:

- The College for being a forerunner in the accreditation process and supporting the program for pursing the process.

- The program coordinator and the department for the hard work in the self-study process.

- The College for the pleasant accommodations and Dr. Qiu and her colleagues for their hospitality and coordination of our visit, and welcome to the peer review team.

We look forward to hearing about the continued growth of your program in the future.