

NAEYC EARLY CHILDHOOD
ASSOCIATE DEGREE ACCREDITATION

March 31, 2013

Harold Washington College, Illinois
SELF-STUDY REPORT
FOR
ACCREDITATION RENEWAL

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| THE ACCREDITATION CRITERIA AND STANDARDS | 3 |
| PART ONE:..... | 5 |
| PROGRAM CONTEXT | 5 |
| Criterion 1: Mission and Role in the Community..... | 5 |
| PROGRAM DESIGN | 7 |
| Criterion 2: Conceptual Framework..... | 7 |
| Criterion 3: Program of Studies | 9 |
| Child Development - Pre-School Education..... | 11 |
| Associate in Applied Science (AAS) | 11 |
| Details: Associate in Applied Science (AAS) | 11 |
| Program General Requirements | 12 |
| Program Core Requirements | 12 |
| Program Elective Requirements | 12 |
| Criterion 4: Quality of Teaching | 18 |
| Criterion 5: Quality of Field Experiences..... | 20 |
| Field experiences chart: Types of programs and age ranges..... | 21 |
| C. CANDIDATES | 23 |
| Criterion 6: Qualifications and Characteristics of Candidates | 23 |
| Criterion 7: Advising and Supporting Candidates | 26 |
| D. FACULTY..... | 28 |
| Criterion 8: Qualifications and Composition of Faculty | 28 |
| Criterion 9: Professional Responsibilities | 36 |
| Criterion 10: Professional Development..... | 39 |
| E. SUPPORTIVE INFRASTRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF PROGRAMS | 41 |
| Criterion 11: Program Organization and Guidance..... | 41 |
| Criterion 12: Program Resources | 44 |
| PART TWO | 47 |
| PROGRAM CONTENT..... | 47 |
| AND OUTCOMES | 47 |
| F. LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES..... | 47 |
| G. ASSESSMENTS AND EVIDENCE OF CANDIDATE OUTCOMES | 55 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Documentation of each key assessment | 56 |
| Key Assessment 1: Observation and Interpretation Rubric..... | 56 |
| Key Assessment #1 Observation and Interpretation: Assignment Description..... | 58 |
| Key Assessment #1 Observation and Interpretation Rubric..... | 60 |
| Key Assessment #1 Observation and Interpretation: Data Results..... | 62 |
| Key Assessment 2: Documentation Rubric | 63 |
| Key Assessment #2 Assignment Description: Teacher Research Project | 65 |
| Key Assessment #2: Documentation Rubric | 66 |
| Key Assessment #2: Documentation Rubric Results..... | 68 |
| Key Assessment 3: Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric..... | 69 |
| Key Assessment #3 Lesson Plan Analysis: Assignment Description..... | 71 |
| Key Assessment #3: Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric..... | 74 |
| Key Assessment #3: Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric Results | 76 |
| Key Assessment 4: Reflection Rubric | 77 |
| Key Assessment #4 Reflection: Assignment Description | 79 |
| Key Assessment #4: Reflection Rubric | 80 |
| Key Assessment #4: Reflection Rubric Results..... | 81 |
| Key Assessment 5: Practicum Portfolio Rubric | 82 |
| Key Assessment #5 e-portfolio: assignment description | 84 |
| Key Assessment #5: Practicum Portfolio Rubric | 89 |
| Key Assessment #5 Practicum Portfolio Rubric | 93 |
| Key Assessment 6: Philosophy Rubric..... | 94 |
| Key Assessment #6: Philosophy: Assignment Description..... | 96 |
| Key Assessment #6 Philosophy Rubric..... | 98 |
| Key Assessment #6: Philosophy Rubric Data results | 100 |
| HWC Child Development Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning..... | 101 |
| Then and Now | 103 |

THE ACCREDITATION CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

PART ONE: PROGRAM CONTEXT

A. PROGRAM IDENTITY

Criterion 1: Mission and Role in Community

The early childhood associate degree program has established a clear identity and role in its community and is responsive to community stakeholders.

B. DESIGN OF PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM

Criterion 2: Conceptual framework

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

Criterion 3: Program of Studies

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: Quality of Teaching

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: Quality of Field Experiences

The program's field experiences support candidates' learning in relation to the NAEYC standards.

C. CANDIDATES

Criterion 6: Qualifications and Characteristics of Candidates

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

Criterion 7: Advising and Supporting Candidates

The program ensures that candidates are adequately advised and supported.

D. FACULTY

Criterion 8: Qualifications and Composition of Faculty

The program ensures that faculty demonstrates the qualifications and characteristics needed to promote candidates' learning in relation to the NAEYC standards and supportive skills.

Criterion 9: Professional Responsibilities

Faculty responsibilities allow them to promote candidates' learning in relation to the NAEYC standards and supportive skills.

Criterion 10: Professional Development

Faculty are provided with professional development that strengthens their ability to promote candidates'

E. SUPPORTIVE INFRASTRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF PROGRAM

Criterion 11: Program Organization and Guidance

The program's organization and guidance are mission-driven and participatory, placing the needs of candidates as its first priority.

Criterion 12: Program Resources

The program has sufficient resources to support its efforts to promote candidates' learning in relation to NAEYC standards and supportive skills

PART TWO: PROGRAM CONTENT AND OUTCOMES

F. LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

The program provides learning opportunities that explore key elements of the NAEYC Accreditation Standards and the Supportive Skills for associate degree programs. These learning opportunities are connected to and prepare candidates for assessment.

G. ASSESSMENTS AND EVIDENCE OF CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

The program assesses and is documenting evidence of candidate performance related to the NAEYC Standards and Supportive Skills for associate degree programs. Data collected on candidate performance is used to make ongoing improvements in the program that respond to documented candidate needs.

The Standards

Standard 1: Promoting child development and learning

Standard 2: Building family and community relationships

Standard 3: Observing, documenting, and assessing to support young children and families

Standard 4: Using developmentally effective approaches to connect with children and families

Standard 5: Using content knowledge to build meaningful curriculum

Standard 6: Becoming a professional

The Supportive Skills

Supportive Skill 1: Self-assessment and self-advocacy

Supportive Skill 2: Mastering and applying foundational concepts from general education

Supportive Skill 3: Written and verbal communications skills

Supportive Skill 4: Making connections between prior knowledge/experience and new learning

Supportive Skill 5: Identifying and using professional resources

PART ONE: PROGRAM CONTEXT

Criterion 1: Mission and Role in the Community

The City Colleges of Chicago (CCC) of District 508 is the largest community college system in Illinois and one of the largest in the nation, with 5,800 faculty and staff serving 120,000 students at seven campuses and thirteen satellite sites city-wide. CCC is currently in the midst of a collaborative effort to review and revise programs and practices to ensure students leave CCC college-ready, career-ready and prepared to pursue their life's goals. Over the past two years, since 2010, the City College system has undertaken a district-wide reorganization effort—Reinvention. Reinvention builds upon City College's historic goals of providing life-changing opportunities and education for the diverse populations we serve, but expands from there to include four specific goals designed to further facilitate the personal, professional, and academic growth of our diverse student body. <http://www.ccc.edu/menu/Pages/About-City-Colleges.aspx>

Harold Washington College (HWC), one of the 6 CCC institutions offering a Child Development Program, is a learning-centered, urban institution of higher education offering accessible and affordable opportunities for academic advancement, career development and personal enrichment. The college is committed to upholding high institutional and academic standards and to understanding and improving student learning. <http://www.ccc.edu/colleges/washington/menu/Pages/Mission.aspx>

The HWC Child Development Program's mission is to facilitate the learning processes of adults as they build an academic and professional knowledge base in Child Development and Early Childhood Education in order to serve young children and their families in a diverse metropolitan community.

To accomplish this mission, the HWC Child Development Program:

1. Promotes child development and learning;
2. Provides opportunities to understand and strengthen family and community relationships;
3. Provides opportunities to hone observation, documentation and assessment strategies to support young children and families;
4. Emphasizes teaching and learning as parallel processes;
5. Models and reinforces the utilization of the National Association for the Education of Young Children's (NAEYC) Code of Ethical Conduct;
6. Promotes recognition of and respect for diversity related to culture, language, and ability;
7. Provides a wide range of field experience opportunities that enhance understanding of child development;
8. Provides models of, and opportunities for, reflective supervision;
9. Provides a rich academic and professional environment.

In 2013 we have made some changes to the language in our mission including changing the word "urban" to "metropolitan" because we feel it more closely describes our community. We have added explicit language in our mission regarding diversity and we now emphasize reflective supervision as well as the concept that our program provides a parallel learning process: students consider their own development as adults while learning about child development and applying developmentally appropriate practices in early childhood education.

Indicators of strength

The HWC Child Development Program has a unique position in the CCC system. Because it is located in the heart of downtown Chicago students come to this campus from all areas of the city. Therefore, the community this program serves is the entire Chicago Metropolitan area. This is different compared to its sister colleges across the CCC District. We have partnered with early childhood settings in all neighborhood areas of the city in order to develop relationships within the community to better serve our students as they complete the Practicum experience. This is an ongoing process.

The HWC Child Development program has a strong Advisory Council with members from large early childhood agencies in the city representing Head Start and PreK programs as well as home care providers. The Council also has members from various colleges and universities; institutions to which our students transfer. Finally, the Council includes representatives from the Chicago Children's Museum, and the Chicago Center for Early Education <http://www.uic.edu/educ/cfl/ccee.html> . This Advisory Council represents the diversity of the city as well as the diversity of the early childhood field, and it provides the program with state-of-the-art information about the many branches of the profession as well as current events in the city, state, and country.

The HWC Child Development Program has maintained a strong partnership with Erikson Institute serving as an internship placement for graduate students as well as serving as pilot faculty for various Erikson programs including the Early Math Project. In addition, Full-time and adjunct faculty members from HWC serve on various boards including the Illinois Association for Early Childhood Teacher Education (ILAECTE), both the Illinois and national Associate Degree Early Childhood Teacher Educators groups (ACCESS), as well as the Heartland Equity and Inclusion Project (HEIP), and the Tinkering Lab of the Chicago Children's Museum. Clearly, the early childhood leaders in the City of Chicago as well as the State of Illinois invest in the HWC Child Development Program, but also seek partnership with the program as it has a strong presence in the early childhood community within the city and state.

PROGRAM DESIGN

Criterion 2: Conceptual Framework

Our program operates under the belief that learning takes place in multiple and varied contexts. Much like Urie Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Model of Human Development, we understand that each student has reciprocal interactions with multiple layers of influence including individual learning styles, academic experience, culture, family, work and home environments, as well as the current political climate and social norms. A microcosm of these layered contexts of learning is the community of the HWC Child Development Program itself. Learning takes place as the individual learner engages in coursework and field experiences; relationships with faculty, tutors, and fellow students; opportunities to learn and apply the NAEYC standards, supportive skills, and Code of Ethical Conduct; dispositions of CARE including Curiosity, Articulation, Respect, and Ethics; and an inquiry stance to the teaching and learning process - all in order to support young children and their families in a diverse community.

A fundamental concept, which supports all work that we do in the HWC Child Development Program, is to focus on and be intentional about children and families. We follow NAEYC's Code of Ethical Conduct, supplement for Early Childhood Adult Educators, in that "we embrace the central commitment of the field of early care and education to the healthy development and welfare of young children. Everything we do in our role as educators of adults is intended to further this ultimate commitment".
<http://www.naeyc.org/about/positions/pdf/ethics04.pdf>

Indicators of strength

Our conceptual framework is closely linked to the mission of the program which aligns with NAEYC standards and places student learning at the center of everything we do. Adult students bring their own rich history to the learning process and our conceptual framework puts their learning in the center of our model with circles of influence layered outward, like petals of a flower.

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/wp7ncu3guns9vjw/Conceptual%20Framework%20lotus%20flower%2003-13-13.pdf>

During the current renewal process, the team agreed that the framework itself had not necessarily changed since the original self-study in 2006, and the fundamental concepts remain foundational to this program. However, the conceptual framework has not necessarily been a living document informing our practice. Instead, it has remained carefully archived in the original self-study report without review these past years. At the time of the original self-study, we experimented with designing a graphic representation of our framework, but struggled with the process and ultimately settled for the narrative explanation without a graphic. In 2013, in an effort to make the conceptual framework more of a living document, we have drafted a visual

representation of the conceptual framework in an effort to make it more alive and easier to refer to in daily practice, but also in the decision-making process.

The conceptual framework places each student's unique academic and professional journey at the center of the teaching/learning process. In order to support our diverse student population, the HWC Child Development Program incorporates the HWC definition of human diversity into all practices within the program:

Human Diversity describes variations within the full range of cognitive, behavioral and psycho-social practices through which human beings share life in common spaces. Experiences of diversity include race, ethnicity, gender, religion, socio-economic status, sexual orientation, physical attributes and disabilities, age, health, language, education, political beliefs and other differences in cultural expression and tradition.

Members of our full-time faculty team served on the committee that wrote this definition. It is the foundation on which we build our relationships with students and our discussions of relationships with young children, their families, and the community.

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

Our challenge is to keep the conceptual framework at the forefront of what we do on a regular basis. In the graphic model draft, we have attempted to create a visual representation of our conceptual framework that considers Bronfenbrenner's traditional concentric circle model by illustrating the layers of context. Our new lotus flower model represents a more organic, growing image with petals for the various contexts of student learning. This image seems to serve our framework in that the flower has a solid foundation, but in order to remain a living thing it must still have room to grow new layers while shedding others. This is how we see our program - as a growing, layered organism that centers on student learning in order to serve young children, their families, and the community.

Criterion 3: Program of Studies

Based on the program's mission to facilitate the learning of adults as they prepare to serve children and families in the community, the ten core courses listed below are designed to address both the academic and practical needs of students in a developmentally appropriate model that considers the whole experience of the adult learner.

Since 2006, HWC has been using Master Course Syllabi with standard course objectives and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for all ten core courses. The District-wide Child Development Curriculum Committee considered re-numbering the courses in order to create a more logical sequence but decided against this based on recommendations from the Advisory Council, which indicated that changing course numbers can create problems for students wishing to transfer. Instead, the committee decided to focus on proper advising and creating resources for students to help them determine their own course of study based on their overall goals.

In 2013 what has changed is the process of students intentionally collecting portfolio artifacts as they progress through the program. Students collect artifacts including observations, lesson plans, newsletter articles, assessments/documentation, reflections, and philosophy papers across all courses (101, 107, 109, 120, 143, 149, 201, 262, and 258). During the CD 258 course, students begin to develop their Practicum Portfolio, which is based on the six standards, their key elements, and the supportive skills. This system has gradually developed over the past several years and is now focused on students developing their e-portfolios in the form of a website they design. Once in the Practicum, students spend time refining their reflective narratives and explaining how their artifacts serve as evidence of their knowledge and application of the 6 standards.

Indicators of strength

The Coordinator designs and maintains a 3-5 year plan for offering classes to meet the needs of day, evening, and Saturday students and the program has built 3 online offerings including CD 120, 149, and 142 which reach out to a larger pool of potential students and provide additional options for current students.

Every course in the sequence requires field experiences linked to the student learning outcomes for each course. Depending on the course, students will do a variety of activities for their field experiences including many different methods for doing observations, materials and environmental checklists, interviews, community resource assessments, environmental rating scales, data collection for teacher research, etc. Across the ten courses, students are required to do 89 observation hours and 250 practicum hours in a variety of settings serving children from birth to age eight (see Criterion Five).

During the 2012-2013 academic year the District-wide Child Development Curriculum Committee took all ten core courses through a rigorous revision including a lengthy approval process. The revisions included updated course objectives, student learning outcomes, and course descriptions that include language from the 2010 NAEYC Standards for Professional Preparation. In addition, the field experience hours were reviewed and more carefully aligned to the student learning outcomes for each course. Finally, the course sequence for the program was re-structured in such a way as to include an introductory level (107, 120, 149), an intermediate level (101, 109, 143), and an upper level (201, 258, 262, 259). The updated courses are now in the current 2012-2014 Academic Catalogue and will affect the registration process for the summer 2013 term. Another goal of the revision process was to design an application for students once they prepare to enroll for the two hundred-level courses. As of the writing of this report, a draft of the application is in place and scheduled to go into effect as of fall 2013.

The revised course sequence provides each student with a solid foundation in the introductory courses and then opportunities for in-depth study through the application of developmentally appropriate practices during the Practicum. This sequence reflects our mission to facilitate the learning processes of adults as they build an academic and professional knowledge base in Child Development because it allows students to begin the sequence without any prerequisites. The goal is to reach students where they are and begin to support academic growth as they move through the program of study. This also relates to our conceptual framework as it considers each student's unique academic and professional experiences as well as his or her personal goals within the context of the various layers of college experiences including building one's academic and professional skills over time through a reflective supervision model.

Graduation Requirements

To graduate from City Colleges of Chicago with any Associates Degree, at least one course must meet the State of Illinois Human Diversity Requirement. The Human Diversity (HD) course must be included in the total number of credits required to earn the degree and should not increase the total number of credits needed for degree completion (p. 32 Academic Catalogue 2012-2014).

General Education Requirements for an Associate of Applied Science degree (p. 52 Academic Catalogue 2012-2014)

I. GENERAL EDUCATION 15 CH
APPROVED CORE

A. COMMUNICATIONS

English 101 Required, and other English or Speech courses if applicable

B. FINE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Select one or more courses from the following disciplines: African-American Studies, Art, Fine Arts, World Language, Humanities, Literature, Music, Philosophy, Religion, Theater Art

C. MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE

Select one or more courses from the following disciplines: Astronomy, Biology, Botany, Chemistry, Computer Information Systems, Geology, Mathematics, Oceanography, Physical Science, Physics, Zoology

D. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Select one or more courses from the following disciplines: Anthropology, Business, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, Psychology, Social Science, Sociology.

E. SOCIAL/BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Anthropology 201, 202 Political Science
Economics 201, 202 Psychology
Geography Social Science 101, 102
History Sociology

The program itself as published in the catalogue:

<http://www.ccc.edu/programs/Pages/Child-Development---Pre-School-Education-Associate-in-Applied-Science.aspx>

Child Development - Pre-School Education

Associate in Applied Science (AAS)

This degree provides child development theory and practice for students who intend to go straight to work as a teacher or teacher assistant in a public or private pre-school program, child-care center or nursery school.

Graduates can also work as teacher aides or activities supervisors.

Details: Associate in Applied Science (AAS)

Credit Hours (CH) 62

Program/Plan Number 278

Offered At



Career Possibilities

Workers Preschool Teachers Teacher

Program General Requirements

15 CH

Students should refer to the [General Education Requirements](#) for AAS degrees and speak to an advisor. The A.A.S. model includes the State of Illinois Human Diversity requirement.

Program Core Requirements

35 CH

Child Development

CHLD DV101-1

Human Growth & Development I 4

CHLD DV107

Health Safety and Nutrition 3

CHLD DV109

Language Development 3

CHLD DV120

Intro to Early Childhood Education Group Care 3

CHLD DV143

Science & Mathematics for Young Children 3

CHLD DV149

Creative Activities for Children 3

CHLD DV201

Observation & Management Child Behavior 3

CHLD DV258

Principles of Pre-School Education 4

CHLD DV259-1

Practicum in Pre-School 6

CHLD DV262-1

Child, Family & Community Relations 3

Program Elective Requirements

12 CH

The three courses listed below in the Child Development and CIS disciplines are recommended for elective credit in addition to other courses recommended by a college advisor.

Child Development

CHLD DV102

Human Growth & Development II 3

CHLD DV120

Intro to Early Childhood Education Group Care 3

Total Minimum Credit Hours 62

The course descriptions below can be found in the 2012-2014 course catalog p. 188-191 <http://www.ccc.edu/departments/Documents/AcademicCatalog2012-2014.pdf>

CHILD DEVELOPMENT 101

Human Growth and Development I

This course provides a foundation in theory and principles of human development, from conception to early adolescence. There is an in-depth study of physical, social, emotional, cognitive, and language development, including children's play. Five hours observing young children in an early childhood education setting ranging in age from birth to age eight are required. Writing assignments and oral presentations as appropriate to the discipline are part of the course.

Prerequisite: Eligibility for English 101, or grade of C or better in English 100 or Consent of Department Chairperson.
200 minutes per week. 4 credit hours.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT 107

Health Safety and Nutrition

This introductory course explores practices that promote good nutrition, dental, physical and mental health, as well as safety of infants, toddlers, preschool, and school-aged children in group settings. The course has a dual emphasis on the health, safety, and nutrition of young children as well as the adult student. Health, lifestyle, preventative health, community resources, and emergency response procedures are examined. This course introduces cultural beliefs that influence health, safety and nutrition. It explores ethical and legal responsibilities of adults in protecting the emotional and physical well-being of young children. 5 observation hours observing young children in an early childhood education setting are required for the course. Writing assignments and oral presentations, as appropriate to the discipline, are part of the course.

150 minutes per week. 3 credit hours

CHILD DEVELOPMENT 109

Language and Literacy Development in Early Childhood

This course explores the developmental process of language & literacy development from birth to age eight. In addition, the course explores the relationship between language/literacy and all other domains of development. Planning for a variety of developmentally appropriate activities that support language and literacy development are explored as well as an examination of the role the environment plays and how to design a language and literacy-rich environment for young children. Bilingualism, and multiculturalism as well as the role of culture in language and literacy development and

early childhood education are explored. Eight hours observing young children in an early childhood education setting are required for this course. Writing assignments and oral presentations as appropriate to the discipline are part of the course.

Prerequisite: Grade of C or better in Child Development 101 and Child Development 120 or Consent of Department Chair.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT 120

Intro to Early Childhood Education Group Care

This introductory course is designed to familiarize students with the historic roots and philosophical foundations of early childhood care and education. The course includes an exploration of different types of early childhood programs, the role of the early childhood professional, and an examination of the student's personal qualities in relationship to expectations of the field. The course will include an examination of the role of culture in child development and anti-biased practices in early childhood education. Finally, the course defines the profession and explores the profession's Code of Ethical Conduct. Five hours observing young children in an early childhood education setting are required for the course. Writing assignments and oral presentations, as appropriate to the discipline, are part of the course.

150 minutes per week. 3 credit hours.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT 143

Science and Math for Young Children

This course explores the relationship of play to the content areas of science and math in early childhood. Planning for a variety of developmentally appropriate experiences in mathematics and scientific inquiry are explored as well as an examination of the role of the early childhood environment in supporting development. The course emphasizes the study of cognitive theory as well as observation and documentation of science and math learning in diverse early childhood settings. The course includes student reflections of their own attitudes about science and math. Eight hours observing young children in an early childhood education setting are required for the course. Writing assignments and oral presentations as appropriate to the discipline are part of the course.

Prerequisite: Grade of C or better in Child Development 101 and Child Development 120 or Consent of Department Chair.

150 minutes per week. 3 credit hours.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT 149

Creative Activities for Young Children

This introductory course explores the importance of creative activities in the early childhood curriculum and the relationship of creativity to physical, cognitive, language, social, and emotional development. Planning for a variety of developmentally appropriate, creative experiences that allow young children to play with art, music,

movement, literature, and drama is explored as well as an examination of the role of the early childhood environment on creative expression. This course emphasizes the importance of the process of creative expression and provides diverse, creative experiences for adult students so they may understand the arts as a means of communicating ideas, feelings, and cultural expression. Eight hours observing young children in an early childhood education setting are required for the course. Writing assignments and oral presentations, as appropriate to the discipline, are part of the course. 2 lecture and 2 lab hours per week. 3 credit hours.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT 201

Observation, Assessment, and Documentation to Support Young Children and Families

This course provides an examination of developmentally appropriate techniques for observing, documenting, and assessing the development of young children in order to inform curriculum planning and promote positive guidance strategies. The course emphasizes a strengths-based approach to assessment that includes building partnerships with families and professional colleagues. Self-reflection is a major component of the course as well as the examination of bias in the observation and assessment of young children from diverse backgrounds. Fifteen hours observing young children in an early childhood education setting are required for the course. Writing assignments and oral presentations as appropriate to the discipline are part of the course.

Prerequisite: Grade of C or better in Child Development 101, Child Development 107, Child Development 120, and Child Development 149, or Consent of Department Chair. Completion or concurrent enrollment in Child Development 109, Child Development 143, and/or Child Development 262 is recommended. 150 minutes per week. 3 credit hours.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT 258

Principles and Practices of Preschool Education

This class provides opportunities to plan developmentally appropriate play-based activities that support all developmental domains including physical, cognitive, language, and socioemotional development with an emphasis on designing appropriate early childhood environments that address the needs of all children. The course emphasizes the process of becoming a professional including the implementation of the NAEYC Code of Ethical Conduct and other professional guidelines as well as fostering an early childhood environment that is conducive to respecting diversity. Students will write/revise their philosophy of early care and education. Thirty hours observing young children in an early childhood education setting are required for the course. Writing assignments and oral presentations as appropriate to the discipline are part of the course.

Prerequisite: Grade of C or better in Child Development 101, Child

Development 107, Child Development 109, Child Development 120, and Child Development 143 or consent of Department Chair. Completion of Child Development 201 and/or Child Development 262 recommended. 200 minutes per week. 4 credit hours.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT 262

Child, Family and Community Relations

This course explores the importance of building positive relationships between young children, their families, the community, and the early childhood setting. It examines issues of diversity, multiculturalism, and anti-bias approaches in working with young children, their families, and the community as well as current policies, and practices that influence families. This course promotes self-reflection, cross cultural communication, and sensitivity to cultural, linguistic, and ability diversity. Five hours observing young children in an early childhood education setting are required for the course. Writing assignments and oral presentations as appropriate to the discipline are part of the course.

Prerequisite: Grade of C or better in Child Development 101 and Child Development 120 or Consent of Department Chairperson.
150 minutes per week. 3 credit hours.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT 259

Practicum in Pre-School Education

In this capstone course, students spend a minimum of 250 student teaching hours in an early childhood program under the direct mentorship of an on-site supervisor, field supervision by the course instructor, and weekly 2-hour seminar discussions with classmates. Students are expected to apply what they have learned in all previous CD courses including: engaging in positive interactions with young children, planning developmentally appropriate activities, and using appropriate assessment techniques. Students will uphold professional and ethical guidelines. Students will design and revise a Child Development Portfolio compiled of artifacts from their previous coursework and other professional experiences. An emphasis is placed on the NAEYC Standards for Professional Preparation. Two hundred and fifty student teaching hours with on-site supervision in an early childhood education setting are required for this course. Writing assignments and oral presentations, as appropriate to the discipline, are part of the course.

Prerequisite: Grade of C or better in Child Development 101, Child Development 107, Child Development 109, Child Development 120, Child Development 143, Child Development 149, Child Development 201, Child Development 258, and Child Development 262. To register for this course, all students must have Department Chair approval.
2 lecture and 10-20 lab hours per week. 3-6 credit hours.

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

At HWC, students must apply for the Practicum course up to one full semester prior to the expected start date for the Practicum. Although course objectives and student learning outcomes for the CD 259 Practicum course are the same across the District, the application process and site criteria for the Practicum have varied, which has created confusion for students who are close to graduation. As of spring 2013, the District-wide Child Development faculty group has formed a committee to investigate the Practicum application process and guidelines in an effort to create consistency across the City College system. This is the same group that designed a Child Development concentration application process. We believe that this network of full-time Child Development faculty from across the District is a medium through which individual programs may make improvements for students. This is where the program will address its challenges through the strength of the network of faculty across the District and the groundwork already established in the common course syllabi.

Criterion 4: Quality of Teaching

As it was in 2006, in 2013 we have a diverse faculty team with rigorous academic training and a wealth of professional experiences in the field. Our team has studied adult learning theory and has been working together for the past seven years to build a consistent, coherent program across all six of the City Colleges that offer Child Development courses. In 2006 the team included 3 full-time faculty positions. In 2013 the team now includes 4 full-time faculty positions. Of the eleven current adjunct faculty members nearly half have been on our team since the original self-study in 2006. Several adjunct instructors have been on the team since 2008 and just a few have been recently hired in the past academic year. We actually recruit adjunct faculty from our graduate internship relationship with Erikson Institute. During the past seven years, two full-time faculty members have been involved in mentoring graduate students from Erikson. Each of these mentees spends 15 hours per week with the faculty member learning about adult teaching, assessing learning, organizing and planning curriculum, and supporting students.

Indicators of strength

Teaching and learning experiences are consistent with our conceptual framework as well as the NAEYC standards and supportive skills. Full-time and adjunct instructors use the NAEYC standards and supportive skills to build course activities, assignments, and exams (see Learning Opportunities chart). This allows students multiple opportunities to learn and apply the information across the program of study.

Course content for all core courses in the program has been extensively reviewed and revised over the past two years by a curriculum committee with Child Development faculty representatives from six campuses serving as content experts in assuring that the revision take into consideration current research in the fields of child development, early childhood education, and teacher education. Full-time and adjunct faculty instructors are longtime members of specialized professional associations in the field and required texts for each course include updated editions as well as access to online materials, which offer the most current issues in the field.

Instructors serve as facilitators of the teaching and learning process. There are a variety of teaching strategies that we employ including collaborative group projects, discussion, and online work as well as direct instruction. Collaboration is a critical skill for early childhood professionals and there are ample opportunities for students to collaborate across the course of study. Some examples of collaborative methods and strategies include: 1) data-share process as students work on Teacher Research projects, 2) a critical friends model where students are encouraged to develop collaborative

relationships with colleagues in class, 3) students visit each other at their Practicum sites and provide feedback on observations of their colleague's student teaching practices, 4) group work: students work together to solve problems, do activities, take field trips, edit each other's writing, present together, and even create healthy snacks. There are many and varied ways for student-centered learning opportunities across this program of study. We do not view "learner-centered" as any one particular method, but as an approach to the teaching/learning process and we are always trying to move closer to a truly learning centered model. In fact, our conceptual framework places student learning in the center with contextual influences layered outward.

Cultural, Linguistic, and Ability Diversity (CLAD) is woven throughout the program and is specifically assessed in the Lesson Plan Analysis rubric. Students spend class discussions, written work, reflections, and projects exploring a wide spectrum of issues in supporting human diversity while reflecting on their own experiences.

The program continuously evaluates the quality of its teaching-learning processes and uses the results, including student performance data, to improve the program and to promote student learning in relation to NAEYC standards and supportive skills. Each semester performance data are collected across the program of study. Instructors discuss implications of performance data results to inform teaching practices. For example, when reviewing Practicum Portfolio data, it was determined that students needed more opportunities to select portfolio artifacts and practice writing reflective narratives linking their artifacts to the standards. Based on performance assessment data, the decision was made to begin the portfolio building process earlier in the course sequence, and students now create a full draft Portfolio in CD 258.

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

There are many exciting and innovative strategies being used by full-time and adjunct instructors, but we don't always know what each other is doing and therefore may not be in a position to benefit from each other's rich practices. In addition to the Faculty Partner Program which matches full-time and adjunct instructors as partners each semester, we are working on an online resource for instructors that will allow them to share teaching strategies as well as success stories within the faculty community.

Full-time instructors are evaluated during the tenure and post-tenure review process Adjunct instructors are evaluated every semester. However, faculty evaluations have not necessarily served as an opportunity for growth. Part of the CCC Reinvention initiative is to redesign the faculty evaluation process in order to make it more meaningful. Within our program, we have our own systems for professional growth in terms of sharing resources and troubleshooting various issues together.

Criterion 5: Quality of Field Experiences

In 2006 most of the courses required some observation hours but they were not necessarily aligned with student learning outcomes. In 2013 the field experiences across the program have been reviewed and revised to better reflect the student learning outcomes for each course. As a result, some of the required observation hours per course have been reduced and some have been increased. The number of hours per course reflects the course level whether it is an introductory, intermediate, or upper level course as the number of hours increases with the level of coursework. The expectation is that students will do a variety of field activities as appropriate to the course. Across the 10 core courses students will experience four different age ranges (infant, toddler, preschool, school-age) and at least two different types of programs (Head Start, early school grades, infant/toddler, home based care, etc.).

Indicators of strength

The recent curriculum revision process focused on linking field experiences in each course to student learning outcomes which include NAEYC Standards and supportive skills. The goal of this revision was to make the field experiences more intentional across the program of study. Field experience hours include all early childhood age ranges and a variety of early childhood settings.

For all observation hours prior to the Practicum, students choose early childhood settings in which to do their hours. There is a rich variety of programs in the city of Chicago; however the quality of programs varies widely. To address this, instructors offer many different video samples of high quality early childhood settings to serve as in-class observations as well as focal points for class discussion. When students observe sub-standard childcare, which unfortunately is the case every semester, instructors are prepared to use this as a teachable moment. Students often are asked to write reflection papers in which they describe how they would make a less than optimal interaction or environment more developmentally appropriate. All Practicum placements are required to be in a NAEYC accredited site.

The field experiences are woven in to course assignments, and instructors provide scaffolding to help students process their field experiences in relation to what they are learning in class. Examples of different assignments associated with field experiences include: reflection papers, discussions, comparisons of different types of programs, papers in which students make connections between information in the textbook and what is observed during the field experience, case study, teacher research, hands-on teaching and weekly reflections during the Practicum seminar, etc.

Adults who supervise candidates provide positive models of practice. Jen Asimow has been the Practicum Coordinator for a number of years. She has developed relationships with many different programs in every area of the city. Jen has designed a Mentor Handbook for cooperating teachers which also has a companion Student Teacher Handbook. Jen has developed innovative ways of communicating with cooperating teachers and directors in order to provide information about the type of experience we want for our students. Based on recent assessment findings, we are now considering developing a key assessment that would include input from cooperating teachers about our student teachers' practice. By contract, we offer 2 site visits from the Practicum instructor in addition to one peer site visit. However, if students are identified as needing more support in the field, the instructor will do extra visits as needed.

The city of Chicago offers a wide range of programs for diverse children and families. Our students have many opportunities to become immersed in cultural experiences different from their own. This is inherent in the field, but it is also intentional in our course activities and assignments. One example includes the field hours for CD 101, which requires students to observe and interview a family different from themselves.

Field experiences chart: Types of programs and age ranges

| Course | Hours | Setting | Age | Sample Field experiences |
|---|-------|----------------------|------|---|
| 101 Human Growth & Development | 5 | Naturalistic | 0-12 | 4 formal observations (infant, toddler, preschool, and school-age) |
| 107 Health, Safety, and Nutrition | 5 | ECE | 0-8 | Safety checklist, snack time, tooth brushing, etc. |
| 109 Language and Literacy Development | 8 | Naturalistic and ECE | 0-8 | Language log, formal observations, literacy samples |
| 120 Introduction to Early Childhood Education | 5 | ECE | 0-8 | Visit different types of ECE settings (Head Start, PreK, infant/toddler, Montessori, Reggio, etc.) |
| 143 Science and Math for the Young Child | 8 | ECE | 3-5 | Observe planned science and math activities as well as inquiry and math related spontaneous play |
| 149 Creative Activities for Young Children | 8 | ECE | 3-5 | Observe planned creative activities as well as inquiry and math related spontaneous play |
| 201 Observation, Documentation, and Assessment to Support Young Children and Families | 15 | ECE | 3-5 | Observations of children exhibiting "difficult" behaviors, Teacher Research Case study of one child |
| 262 Child, Family, and Community | 5 | Naturalistic & ECE | 0-8 | Naturalistic observations of children in community settings, home, and ECE. |
| 258 Principles and Practices of Preschool Education | 30 | ECE | 3-5 | Teacher Research project including observations of play |
| 259 Practicum | 250 | ECE | * | Includes observations and interactions with young children. |

*Students choose between three different age ranges depending on their concentration (infant-toddler, preschool, and school-age).

Naturalistic Setting – includes the home, but also other settings naturally occurring in the child's life including outdoors, church, play group, etc. This may also include an Early Childhood home-based or center-based setting.

ECE – includes a range of early childhood settings such as home-based and center-based care. The goal is to encourage students, during their course of study, to visit different types of programs such as Head Start, State PreK, as well as private and/or for-profit settings that may offer a range of approaches to ECE including settings that adopt various approaches and curricula (Montessori, Reggio Emilia, Creative Curriculum, High Scope, etc.).

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

It is an ongoing challenge to build and maintain positive relationships with high quality programs and with high quality teaching. This takes a tremendous amount of time and energy each semester. Fortunately, we do have a range of programs that have supported our students over the years and sometimes we are able to place more than one student in our partner locations. Building partnerships will continue to be an ongoing activity.

In the past, we have noticed inconsistency across the CCC District in terms of how the Practicum is organized and managed. This has caused confusion among students. Although typically students do the Practicum through their "home" institution within the system, there have been cases when students take the Practicum at different campuses. To address this issue, the District-wide Practicum committee is working to create standard procedures across the District.

It is important for instructors to have access to a variety of videos that illustrate high quality practices in early childhood education. Through the Faculty Partner Program instructors share ideas with each other in terms of using the videos we have in-house but also seeking appropriate videos from YouTube and other free, online sources.

C. CANDIDATES

Criterion 6: Qualifications and Characteristics of Candidates

In 2013, as it was in 2006, our population represents a diverse student body. City Colleges of Chicago values and actively promotes diversity. We believe diversity enhances the richness of the educational experience and leads to understanding, tolerance, and an appreciation of the differences embodied in each of us. We believe that faculty and staff diversity should reflect the demographics of our student body. Our student body is comprised of individuals from all over the city, the country, and the world. Out of 120,000 students across the City Colleges, enrollment as of 2011 reflects the following ethnic breakdown: 7% Asian, 37% Black, 35% Hispanic, and 18% White (<http://www.ccc.edu/colleges/washington/menu/Pages/Diversity.aspx>).

AAS in Pre-School Education

FY Enrollment: 2009 – 83, 2010-104, 2011-98

FY Awards: 2009- 20, 2010 – 11, 2011 – 17

In 2011, 98% of students in the AAS degree program are female and the average age is 38. The demographic breakdown includes: 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1% Native American, 68% Black, 17% Hispanic, 8% White, and 4% Other/Unknown. Forty four percent of students work full time, 39% are with children, with 28% as single parents, and 33% are considered to be economically disadvantaged. These figures have not significantly changed since 2006.

As a community college, we have an open enrollment system. However, during the spring 2013 semester the District-wide Child Development faculty group designed an application process specifically for Child Development students. This is a major change from 2006 and the goal is to guide students through the sequence of courses and to better prepare them for the requirements of the field allowing for touch points along the way so students can make good decisions about whether or not they are suited for a career in early childhood education.

Indicators of strength

We actively encourage enrollment of candidates who demonstrate potential for success through our Advisory Council, through marketing materials sent to Head Start programs, and through our relationship with the CDA program funded by DFSS; all serve as a method of outreach to potential students who are already working in the field. In the recent curriculum revision process the decision was made to continue to offer three courses without a prerequisite (107, 120, 149), which invites all HWC students to explore the study of Child Development. In many ways, we think of these

three courses as an entrée into the field. Within those courses, and then with each subsequent course, students are required to explore dispositions necessary for early childhood professionals and self-assess in terms of goodness of fit to the profession. We have a tool called the CARE model which emphasizes the dispositional qualities appropriate to the field which include being Curious, Articulate, Respectful, and Ethical. The CARE rubric is aligned to the NAEYC standards although we are not currently using it as a key assessment. It is however being used as a self-assessment tool as well as an instructional tool used at various points throughout the program as a method of preparing students for expectations in the field.

Since 2006, we have performance data for all graduates of the program that indicate they have met the 6 NAEYC Standards for Professional Preparation. We feel that our Practicum is rigorous and with the changes we have made to the 200-level courses, students now have many opportunities to build their skills in order to be successful during the Practicum experience or to make decisions about choosing another path.

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

Sometimes students get to the Practicum course without the skills necessary to be successful in completing the Practicum. This has happened specifically with students who began their academic career prior to 2006 as they do not have the artifacts or the writing skills, or technology skills to be able to create the e-portfolio required in the Practicum. As a team, we have discussed how difficult it is for students and for the Practicum instructor to try to compensate for a lack of skills so late in the course of study.

To address this, we have back-tracked through the core courses to design learning opportunities that build on each other through the more structured course sequence. In the new sequence, students will spend concentrated time writing as well as practicing with new technologies in the 200 level courses. This provides more opportunities for feedback on these skills prior to reaching the Practicum course. We still have to work especially hard to help students who started taking classes prior to 2006, but we think with the new course sequence students will have more opportunities to build the skills necessary in order to successfully complete the Practicum. It's three-fold: some students struggle with tech skills and some students struggle with writing skills and some students struggle with dispositional qualities. We have many different systems in place to address these challenges but we know that this is an ongoing challenge and that we need to be continuously vigilant.

Inspired by recent HWC Institutional Assessment data regarding effective writing, our department has been engaged in an inquiry process for the 2012-2013 academic year

in which faculty members have focused specifically on writing skills in order to develop processes for supporting student writing as well as compiling resources for instructors. We have identified what both faculty and students state to be the most important aspects of writing and we are in the process of developing a writing rubric that can be used by instructors for grading guidelines, but also for departmental assessment purposes. The overall goal of this project is to target student support in order to improve writing skills across the program of study. The data results from the institutional level suggest that wrap around services make a difference in student outcomes which is why we are targeting the development of instructor resources and relationships with embedded tutors and the writing center in order to support student writing in every course. We see effective writing as an essential skill for Child Development students as they build their professional and academic lives, regardless of which path they take within the ECE profession.

<http://www.ccc.edu/colleges/washington/departments/Pages/Assessment.aspx>

Criterion 7: Advising and Supporting Candidates

In 2006 we relied heavily on the academic advising staff in addition to written materials about our programs to help students make good decisions in terms of matching their academic plan to their long-term goals. We have always held office hours in which to do advising, and most full-time instructors spend some class time discussing advising issues, but it tended to be rather piecemeal. In 2013, we have a very different system in place that involves each full-time faculty member managing a large case load of students in order to provide one-on-one, field-specific advising to all Child Development students. This case load system is new and we are still in the process of developing protocols. In the past 7 years, CCC has instituted the use of Peoplesoft to track student academic records and most recently GradesFirst to identify students "at-risk" of failure in order to coordinate support among instructors, academic advisors, and students early in the semester.

Indicators of strength

Advisement is used as a tool to help students clarify their goals and career plans. This is especially true for the newly implemented case-load system in which instructors' first question to students is, "what is your overall goal"? We ask a series of questions in order to learn about the student and to help the student navigate terminology of the field as well as various pathways within the profession. This starts the conversation with the endpoint in mind and can help instructors and the students themselves to think about the long term plan while discussing immediate goals. There are a number of scripts in the Student Resource Book (<http://www.ccece.webs.com/>) that provide examples of typical conversations with students and potential students. The purpose of those scripts is to give both students and academic advisors information they need in order to support each student about the field.

We reach out to all students so they have equitable access to advising, career counseling, financial aid information, academic support services, and other resources from admission to the completion of their education. The CCC website has been revised to include more resources for new students that help them to navigate the process of becoming and continuing to be a college student.

<http://www.ccc.edu/services/Pages/Apply-for-College.aspx> CCC and HWC have also made a huge effort in recent years to utilize social media such as Facebook to reach out to students and provide regular updates. One good example of this is the Transfer Center.

In addition to the case load system, faculty advising sessions during class and office hours, improved online information and paper brochures, an Academic Advisor assigned

to our department, and the Gradesfirst alert system, we now have the application to the program. The goal of the application is to inform students about the upper level courses in the program, and about the various requirements of the field such as a background check, physical, and TB test. The multi-pronged approach serves as a delivery system for regular, ongoing advisement.

Our performance assessment process, which includes the 6 key assessments, involves use of standard rubrics across the program of study. All instructors use the program rubrics for a variety of reasons. Many instructors build the rubrics into their Blackboard and/or Turnitin functions, which provide individual feedback on each element to each student. Program level data are collected and aggregated for assessment purposes, which are included in the annual report, but each instructor uses the tools for their own purposes class by class.

Through the advising process and now with the new course sequence and application system, our team has more opportunities to ensure that each student completes his or her course of study in a way that recognizes and supports each of their goals.

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

Gradesfirst is a new system, and we are still in the process of learning how this tool can best be used to support students. We now have an assigned academic advisor for the Applied Science Department. The challenge is that there are currently 19 advisors on staff at HWC, and they each have an extremely large case load. Our goal is to continue to provide program-specific advising within the course sessions, online, and during office hours in order to provide one-on-one support to students. We are also in the process of revising our print materials.

We developed a formal dispositional assessment tool, but have struggled with how to ethically use it. This is an open-door institution but we feel that the Early Childhood profession requires candidates to demonstrate specific skills sets. The tool we developed is called the CARE model which is a rubric focused on the following dispositional qualities: Curious, Articulate, Respectful, and Ethical. We thought we could use a dispositional concern form in order to document when instructors had concerns about specific students in order to reach out to them and re-direct them to alternative professional and academic options, if necessary. This has been a challenge as our team hesitates to track students. However, we are moving to a self-assessment model in which it becomes increasingly difficult to continue to be successful in the coursework and field experiences if one is not adhering to the Standards.

D. FACULTY

Criterion 8: Qualifications and Composition of Faculty

The following is from the CCC job description for full-time, tenure track instructor: "Full-time, tenure-track instructor: Candidate must demonstrate excellence in teaching, commitment to integrating new technologies in the learning process and the ability to inspire, motivate and empower students to succeed. Candidate is required to post syllabi on Blackboard and enter grades online in PeopleSoft. All CCC employees are required to adhere to CCC Customer Service Excellence standards" (<http://projects.ccc.edu/JobList/viewAllJobPage.aspx>). Education Requirements for full-time and adjunct faculty in Child Development: M.S. in Child Development or M.Ed. in Elementary or M.Ed. in Secondary Education or M.Ed. in Early Childhood Education. All positions are posted on the CCC website (www.ccc.edu), and we also have the ability to seek posting on specialized websites. For child development faculty positions, we have had postings at Erikson Institute, Illinois Head Start Association and Illinois Gateways to Opportunities. CCC also has job fairs throughout the year to recruit candidates.

Since the 2006 peer review one full-time instructor has left the department (Myra Cox) and two full-time instructors have joined the department (Janvier Jones and Patricia Perez). Janvier Jones was an adjunct instructor during the original peer review, and she is now full time. Since 2006 all full-time faculty members have completed graduate level coursework in various topics including Family Literacy, Online Teaching and Learning, Bi-lingual/ESL teaching certificate, and Higher Education Assessment. Three of the four full-time faculty members are either current peer reviewers or will be completing the ECADA Peer Reviewer training during the spring 2013 semester.

Joyce Fair, adjunct instructor, has been teaching for the HWC Child Development program since 2001. Several other adjuncts including Deborah Rogers-Jaye and Anne Inwood have been teaching since 2008. Many adjunct instructors have done their Erikson graduate internship under the supervision of full-time instructor Jennifer Asimow or Carrie Nepstad and have gone on to teach for our program including Lindsay Maldonado, Ilona Dvorin, Annie Behrns, and Kate Connor. Ilana Dvorin has been an adjunct faculty member for 3 semesters. She is the director of the JCC preschool and is currently on maternity leave. Kate Connor is now a full-time instructor at Truman College. Annie Behrns is now the Academic Success Center Manager at Erikson Institute. Lindsay Maldonado is a researcher at the Shedd Aquarium and remains on our adjunct team.

Indicators of Strength

As listed above, it is a requirement that all CD instructors, full-time and adjunct, hold Master's degrees in Child Development/Early Childhood Education or a related field. All full-time instructors, as part of the tenure and post tenure processes, have completed at least 15 graduate credits post Masters with the exception of Patricia Perez who holds a PhD. As indicated in the faculty table, all CD instructors at HWC are leaders in their field and demonstrate ongoing professional development and lifelong learning skills. We feel that the

level of expertise demonstrated in our entire faculty body is exemplary and serves as a major strength to this program. Students benefit from experienced full-time instructors who can provide academic advising and ongoing support as well as adjunct instructors who offer real-world experiences fresh from early childhood settings representing every area of the city.

Adjunct instructors are selected to teach respective courses based on their specific educational degrees and professional experience. On the other hand, full-time instructors are encouraged to teach a full spectrum of courses within the program in order to develop an accurate sense of how all of the pieces of the program fit together. However, each full-time instructor has developed specialties within our curriculum that match their interest, and ongoing professional development.

All instructors have access to copies of NAEYC's Code of Ethical Conduct including the Supplement for Teacher Educators. All ten core courses include an orientation to and application of the Code [from the introductory courses through the Practicum experience], and in some cases, the Code is part of the key assessment process such as with the Documentation Rubric.

This program follows the hiring procedures as designed by the City Colleges of Chicago as stated above. In terms of recruitment of a diverse faculty body, the Child Development program recruits faculty through its ongoing relationship with Erikson Institute and University of Illinois at Chicago and many early childhood settings and organizations throughout the city and one goal of the hiring process is to assure that instructors reflect the diversity represented in our student body. In terms of mentorship, the program facilitates a Faculty Partner Program where each full-time faculty member partners with a small group of adjunct instructors depending on similarity in courses taught and weekly schedule. This provides one-on-one support to each adjunct instructor while at the same time providing direct connections for full-time faculty to practitioners in the field. This is a powerful relationship that strengthens each member of the faculty team.

Chart of faculty names and qualifications - include all faculty, whether temporary (Temp), part-time (PT), or full-time (FT).

| Name and hire date | P T F T | Assignment (e.g. courses, field supervision) | Academic degrees | Professional experience |
|------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Jennifer Asimow (2001) | F T | CD 102, 120, 259/269 Program Coordinator | M.Ed University of Illinois – Chicago Graduate certificate in Family Literacy - Penn State University Graduate certificate in Community College Teaching and Learning - Loyola University Chicago | Vice Chair of the College wide Assessment Committee (2013 recipient of the CHEA award) Secretary- ILAECTE/Illinois Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators MATH at home blog writer connected to the Math Access for Teachers and Home Care Providers website Board Member- Tinkering Lab, Chicago Children’s Museum |
| Carrie Nepstad (2003) | F T | CD 149, 258 Departmental Assessment Coordinator | Master of Science in Child Development from Erikson Institute Graduate Certificate in Community College Teaching & Learning from Loyola University Graduate Certificate in Higher Education Assessment from James Madison University | Past President, ACCESS: Associate Degree Early Childhood Teacher Educators Steering Committee, NAEYC publication, “Voices of Practitioners” Served on the pilot for the Erikson Institute Early Math Project ECADA Faculty Fellow, 2008 Kathy Osterman Award Finalist, 2009 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|
| Janvier Jones (2007) | F T | CD 101, 102, 109, 143, 262 Lab classroom Coordinator | Master of Science in Child Development from Erikson Institute. Illinois Type 04 Teaching Certification for Birth through Eight Years | Currently enrolled in the Illinois Online Network Masters of Online Teacher certificate Currently enrolled in the Erikson Institute Bilingual/ESL certificate program, est. completion May 2013 Served on the pilot for the Erikson Institute Early Math Project |
| Patricia Perez (2007) | F T | CD 101, 107, 120, 142, 201 Gateways Credentials Coordinator | MEd in Child Development/Infant Studies, Erikson Institute PhD in Counseling Psychology, minor in Multicultural Counseling, Loyola University Chicago | Board of Directors, Illinois Association for Infant Mental Health (ILAIMH) Co-Chair, Research and Best Practices Committee, ILAIMH Adjunct Faculty, School of Education, Loyola University Chicago Member, Disciplinary Committee and Asian American Committees, Harold Washington College |
| Ellen Eason- Montgomery (2000) | P T | CD 101, 149 | Master of Science in Criminal Justice M. Ed. In Early Childhood Education | FT faculty member and coordinator of HWC Criminal Justice program |
| Joyce Fair (2001) | P T | CD 205, 248 | M. Ed in Child Development , National Louis University Illinois Type 04 Teacher Certification for Birth through | Adjunct faculty School of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago and DePaul University. ITN Trainer Infant/Toddler Specialist National Head Start |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|--|---|
| | | | Eight years | Validator NBCDI and NAEYC member Board Member for "Eyes on Future" Childcare Center |
| Anne Lidgus (2008) | P T | CD 101 | Masters of Social Work, Loyola University Chicago M.S. in Child Development Erikson Institute | ACT Facilitator (Adults and Children Together - antiviolence program), Director Infant/Toddler Program Pillars Child and Family Development Center Early Intervention Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) Researcher – Early Childhood Education |
| Deborah Rogers-Jaye (2005) | P T | CD 107, 120, & 149 | Masters of Science in Child Development from Erikson Institution Certificate in Directors' Leadership-Erikson Institute Illinois Directors' Credential Level III | Adjunct Faculty – UIC College of Education Adjunct Faculty Advisor-Erikson Institute PDAC Steering Committee member (Professional Development Advisory Committee) –Gateways to Opportunities professional development system Member of NAA Editorial Board (National AfterSchool Association) Monitor/Coach/Trainer for Community Partnerships Programs-Pre-K programs, Board of Education Developing SAYD (School-Age and Youth |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|---|---|
| | | | | Development) Core Knowledge for Statewide School-Age Credential |
| Bonnie Kisielewski (2010) | P T | CD 107 | <p>M.Ed. in Early Childhood Education, Leadership and Advocacy from National-Louis University</p> <p>BA in Elementary Education with a Minor in Music from Aurora University</p> <p>Type 03 and Type 04 Teaching Certifications</p> | <p>Education and Disabilities Specialist for Chicago Commons Child Development Program</p> <p>Early Childhood Classroom Teacher for State Pre-Kindergarten, Head Start and Child Care at Chicago Commons Child Development Program</p> <p>Program Leader with The McCormick Foundation/Curl Initiative</p> <p>Co-author of Chicago Commons Child Development Program Curriculum Guide entitled: Adaptations of the Reggio Emilia Approach, Deeply Rooted in Theory and Practice</p> <p>Kohl McCormick Early Childhood Teaching Award Finalist, 2005</p> |
| Yasmeen Wahid-Brown (2010) | P T | CD 101 | <p>MS in Child Development, from Kent State University</p> | <p>20 years of experience in early childhood development/parenting and 10 years of administrative experience in Head Start</p> <p>Consultant for the CCR&R Action for Children Program</p> <p>HWC, Child Development Program Advisory Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|-------------|--|--|
| | | | | Member Member NBCDI |
| Jane Averill (2009) | P T | CD 101 | MA in Education, Erikson Institute (Loyola Univ.); BA Political Science, Univ. of Illinois at Chicago | 10 years teaching preschool, Chicago Public Schools Member NAEYC, NCTM Erikson Institute Early Math Project |
| Deborah Dorfman (2011) | P T | CD 149, 120 | Master of Science in Child Development from Erikson Institute | Adjunct Faculty Purdue University/ Calumet Early Childhood Education |
| Lindsay Maldonado (2012) | P T | CD 201 | M.S. Child Development, Erikson Institute Currently: Ph.D Student, Erikson Institute | Evaluation Specialist, John G. Shedd Aquarium Academic Writing Tutor and Advisor, Erikson Institute Previous experience: Adjunct Faculty – Psychology Dept., Northeastern Illinois University Program Coordinator - Children and Family Programs, Peggy Notebaert Nature Museum Youth & Family Director, YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago Erikson Institute Early Math Project |
| Mariaanthi Koritsaris (2012) | P T | CD 101 | M.Ed University of Illinois – Chicago, , Instructional Leadership, National | Adjunct Faculty: University of Illinois at Chicago Triton College, River Grove |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|-------|--|--|
| | | | Louis University | Principal- Plato Academy Previous: Adjunct faculty- DePaul University Founder & Director of Beginnings in Westbrook, Westbrook Corporate Center |
| Guadalupe Pasillas (2013) | P T | CD142 | M.S. in Child Development, Specialization, Administration of Early Childhood Programs, Erikson Institute Illinois Director's Credential, Level II | Lab Center Director, Kennedy King College Fifteen years of experience in Head Start and Early Head Start programs |

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

The challenges we face are similar to the 2006 challenges in terms of assuring that every new adjunct instructor is oriented to our key assessments and the way we incorporate the 6 standards and supportive skills throughout our courses. However, the CD Faculty Partner Program serves as a method for tailoring information to each adjunct instructor based on their specific needs for support. This system for communication and support has grown over the years and instructors come to expect this level of support at HWC. Because so many of our adjunct instructors have years of experience teaching in our program, we view this partnership as a two-way street and oftentimes experienced adjunct instructors provide support to full-time faculty as well as newer instructors. As we move forward, we would like to continue to think of innovative strategies for providing ongoing support to our entire faculty team. To that end, we are currently in the process of developing an online resource for instructors that will provide course resources, links, and shared strategies for the teaching, learning, and assessment process in our program.

Criterion 9: Professional Responsibilities

Our program follows all stated policies and procedures of the HWC Faculty Handbook and the faculty employment union contract. In addition, we feel it is necessary to clearly state what are usually considered underlying assumptions about the role of a community college professor in the Child Development Program. HWC is an open admissions institution. Our Child Development Program is essentially open to any student who wishes to declare it as his/her major or concentration. However, due to the very important circumstances of our work as something that will enable students to work with very young children, we feel it is important to closely advise students throughout their experience at HWC.

All full-time faculty members are required to teach 15 credit hours per semester as stated in the Union contract. There is an ongoing expectation at HWC that full-time instructors participate in the life of the college and serve on at least one committee or student club organization and attend all departmental and institutional meetings and professional development activities. In addition, there is an expectation that all full-time instructors are engaged in their respective specialized professional organizations and the community.

Within the Applied Science Department and all other departments on campus, each program has a Coordinator who receives a small stipend each semester by fulfilling the following duties:

- Coordinate evaluation of adjunct faculty
- Review adjunct syllabi for content
- Recommend adjunct faculty, including searches and interviews
- Recommend budgets for supplies and equipment
- Review course/program outcomes
- Recommend policies/procedures for the management of service and facilities
- Recommend and review drafts of course schedule
- Submit materials lists/textbook for classes in area

In addition to the many roles and responsibilities required of all HWC faculty members and Coordinators, all full-time Child Development instructors have added responsibilities including maintaining a child development lab classroom, facilitating bi-annual meetings with an Advisory Council, coordinating the Practicum experience (applications, contracts, recruitment of sites, etc.), coordinating the Gateways Credentials offered at HWC, and coordinating ongoing assessment and ECADA accreditation activities.

Indicators of strength

There is much flexibility in terms of instructors choosing their path for curriculum development in their own courses and across the program, advising and mentoring students, collaboration with colleagues on our campus as well as the District, and in building partnerships with early childhood programs as well as four-year-university

programs. Full-time faculty members are free to choose from a variety of activities within the program and department, the institution, the District, and the field. For example, Jen Asimow has developed a mentor system for cooperating teachers in the field and has shared her methods with lab center directors and teachers as well as fellow-faculty across the District. Janvier Jones has developed a critical friends program among her students encouraging them to build professional relationships with each other in order to strengthen professional relationships. Trish Perez has built a strong relationship with student clubs on campus and has used her extensive clinical background to support fellow instructors as they face many challenges in serving a diverse population of students. Carrie Nepstad, through her relationship with ACCESS, has brought various methods to HWC such as teacher research and the flipped classroom model. These are just a few examples of faculty involvement.

Faculty teaching responsibilities are in some ways dictated by the contract which requires 15 hours per semester. Classes are selected and scheduled by both full-time and adjunct faculty using a seniority system. Within that framework, our team works together to choose a variety of courses per year. All full-time instructors teach a combination of online and face-to-face courses. Two full-time instructors serve various coordinator roles on campus and receive "release time" from some teaching hours in order to fulfill those obligations, and two full-time instructors have chosen to teach online courses, and course overloads as well as summer courses. All of these experiences have the potential to contribute to faculty development which allows instructors to better serve our students.

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

Our biggest challenge in this area is balancing all of the responsibilities of running the program with the other important roles we must play including advising, partnering with other programs, community service, and service to the greater field; not forgetting our most important role which is teacher. We have experimented with several configurations, but seem to do best when each full-time faculty member coordinates a specific area of the program and then partners with a small group of adjunct instructors. Jen Asimow is the official Coordinator of the program, Carrie Nepstad coordinates the assessment and accreditation process, Trish Perez coordinates the Gateways credentials, and Janvier Jones coordinates the Child Development lab classroom. This year we have proposed creating a teacher assistant position for the lab classroom that would be comparable to a lab assistant in a science or art lab. We feel that although it will only address one of our coordination areas, it will significantly free faculty time that can be channeled to support other areas of the program.

This focus on discipline specific advising has been expanded and refined in the years since our 2006 self-study. Harold Washington now provides a way for full-time faculty to meet the advising needs of students in a more focused manner. We have the option to lead orientations, work with new students, work on caseload advising, or to continue

to work with returning students as they have done in the past. The Child Development faculty team has chosen to concentrate our efforts on caseload advising. This ensures that we can work specifically with those students who have identified themselves as child development majors, helping them to recognize and refine their child development goals as they work to matriculate into four-year institutions to continue their studies, or to move out into the workforce with the degree or certificate that will enhance their professional opportunities.

Busy schedules, large responsibilities within the program and the college and outside commitments and obligations to the field remain our biggest challenge. However, each of us would list teaching as our top priority. Our students come first. We believe in parallel process as it relates to teaching and learning in our field. It is important for Child Development instructors to model the same level of professionalism that will be expected from students when they begin or continue working with children and families. As such, we must be acutely aware of the big ideas and most recent research related to *what* we teach; of the concepts related to best practices regarding *how* we teach; and of the individual, social, and cultural contexts that affect *who* we teach, and that affect who we are as teachers. We faculty seek to make our thinking in these areas explicit, and our expectations concrete. We also seek to model not only the knowledge necessary to work in the field, but also the dispositions necessary. Our goal is to engage our students in rewarding and growth-producing relationships so that they might respond in a similar manner to the children and families they serve. This is our professional responsibility.

Criterion 10: Professional Development

Similar to 2006, in 2013 institutional support for professional development remains the same in terms of funding: \$750.00 for conferences, memberships, or tuition; and \$1,000.00 for presenting at conferences. In addition, for the past three years as part of the CCC Reinvention process, full-time faculty members are mandated to attend a District-wide Faculty Development Week before the fall semester begins. This includes keynote presentations by various experts in higher education as well as break-out sessions led by peer faculty members within the CCC System.

In recent years, many full-time and adjunct Child Development faculty members have taken advantage of various webinars and research projects hosted by Erikson Institute as well as ACCESS. On the HWC campus, there is the Committee for the Art and Science of Teaching (CAST) which offers weekly discussions online and face-to-face workshops and discussions in the relatively new CAST room on the 11th floor. The Harold Lounge is a blog written by HWC instructors that hosts a variety of discussions on hot topic issues such as the completion agenda, Reinvention, and College to Careers <http://haroldlounge.com/>. Finally, our HWC President writes a blog called Don's Desk <http://donsdesk.wordpress.com/> that includes book reviews and other discussions about our college and the President's point of view. Both blogs have a reply function allowing for public discussion and debate.

In addition to participating in ongoing professional development activities, the HWC faculty team is involved in creating professional development content. For example, in collaboration with National Louis University, Jen Asimow writes a blog for the Math at Home project funded by the CME Group Foundation <http://www.mathathome.org/>. Carrie Nepstad writes a reflective blog about her own teaching practices <http://cccece.wordpress.com/> and has also been the main writer for the ACCESS blog <http://accesstosharedknowledgeandpractices.wordpress.com/> .

Indicators of strength

Faculty members stay current with memberships to specialized professional associations such as NAEYC, ACCESS, and NAECTE/ILAECTE. Carrie Nepstad has served on the national board for ACCESS including the role of President for the past six years. Jennifer Asimow is currently serving on the ILAECTE Board, and Trish Perez has served on the Illinois Infant Mental Health Board. In terms of scholarly activity Janvier Jones is currently finishing a certificate in online teaching and learning through the Illinois Online Network (ION) as well as a graduate certificate in Bilingual/ESL graduate certificate program from Erikson Institute. Through the Faculty Partner Program full-

time and adjunct instructors have opportunities to share professional development resources and information with each other.

This year, we have been working closely with the Linguistics faculty members on campus to resurrect our long dormant AAS in Child Development Bi-lingual Teacher's Aide. This does not directly impact the AAS in Preschool Education degree; however, it has afforded opportunities for collaboration between our team and the Linguistics faculty. We have also spent the 2012-2013 academic year within the Applied Science Department collaboration investigating student writing. The department includes Child Development as well as Addiction Studies, Criminal Justice, Social Work/Youth Work, and Gerontology. This has offered opportunities for collaboration among faculty as well as an opportunity for the Applied Science Department to build its own writing guidelines. This directly serves the Child Development Program's goal for building Supportive Skills in our students that include written and verbal communication skills.

In addition to the funding mentioned above, if a full-time instructor is presenting at a conference and the cost is over \$1,000.00, it is also possible to make a special request for funding. Occasionally, there are discretionary funds or grant funds available for such projects.

Full-time and adjunct instructors are observed periodically depending on where they are in the tenure process or how many years they have been teaching on our team. This is the formal evaluation process including student evaluation forms. However, instructors spend time within faculty partner discussions to reflect with each other about challenges in teaching and to share resources in order to support student learning.

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

The professional development opportunities described above are mainly for full-time as opposed to adjunct faculty members. One way we have addressed this is to share resources with each other such as the Erikson Institute Early Math Project as well as Jen's math at home blog and Carrie's reflection blog. There are many free opportunities for professional development that adjunct instructors may not be aware of such as the Erikson TEC Center free webinars on technology and Early Childhood Education. Through the Faculty Partner Project instructors are able to share targeted resources based on the subject each instructor teaches. In addition, full-time faculty members send information and updates via e-mail in order to inform and engage adjunct instructors. On the other hand, adjunct instructors also share information from the field including changes in Head Start and State PreK programs and updates from "Teaching Strategies", and other types of programs in the field.

E. SUPPORTIVE INFRASTRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF PROGRAMS

Criterion 11: Program Organization and Guidance

A major change from 2006 to 2013 is the Reinvention Initiative at CCC. The Reinvention "vision is to transform the City Colleges of Chicago into a world-class institution. We do that by ensuring student success. It is the centerpiece of our Reinvention effort. What we mean by student success is making sure our students are prepared to move into higher education and that they have the skills for jobs in the 21st Century. We believe there is no other institution better positioned to become an economic engine for the City of Chicago". <http://www.ccc.edu/menu/Pages/Reinvention.aspx>. Faculty involvement has been a key component to the Reinvention process, including full release time to work on various Task Forces.

In terms of our program, over the past several years Child Development faculty members from across the District have worked closely together to make decisions regarding the curriculum as well as processes within the program such as an application to the major and standard procedures for the Practicum. During the initial phase of Reinvention, the team worked together to illustrate how our programs in Child Development align with training requirements in the field of Early Childhood Education in the state of Illinois. Working together, we established a clear need for the AAS in Preschool Education as well as strategic planning for the future of the program.

At HWC, the Child Development program has worked hard to maintain a strong Advisory Council made up of early childhood professionals in the city from various early childhood settings, institutions of higher education, and museums. The Advisory Council meets once per semester to discuss trends in the field at the national, state, and city levels as well as trends in teacher education. We invite the Council to advise our program in terms of course offerings and we also rely on the Council for marketing our program broadly.

Indicators of strength

The program sets goals and plans in conjunction with the college and program mission and in response to stakeholder and community needs. The college and program share the mission to serve students in pursuing both their academic and professional goals. Through our Advisory Council and other relationships in the field, it has become clear to us that it is important for ECE professionals to learn to be reflective teachers and to consider why a particular activity is appropriate for young children. To meet this need in the community, we have developed learning opportunities for students to develop this skill and the Lesson Plan Analysis which is one of our key assessments.

In terms of program-level decision making, all full-time faculty at HWC participate in this process and in fact set the agenda for decisions directly affecting our program. In terms of curricular decisions we work in collaboration with colleagues across the District. In terms of course level decisions about assignments and assessment practices we communicate with our adjunct partners via e-mail and occasionally via survey.

Our faculty members have various opportunities to participate in college-wide decision making through committee work, advising relationships, and special assignments. We have a long standing tradition of a strong presence on the HWC Assessment Committee where we have directly had input in writing general education student learning outcomes and developing assessment tools and procedures for institution and departmental assessment. We have also had a strong presence in the institutional accreditation process through the Higher Learning Commission. Finally, our faculty members have participated in articulation agreement negotiations as well as serving to develop various programs that align our program to other institutions of higher education such as the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Students evaluate courses, faculty and the program through student evaluation forms collected every semester. Students participate in the evaluation of field experiences through reflection papers, journal entries, class discussions, and especially during the Practicum seminar. The Coordinator and Department Chair review all student evaluations and both positive and negative feedback is taken seriously.

Through the Advisory Council and the District-wide faculty group we make strategic plans about the program including curriculum review and revision, sequence changes, the program application plan, articulation agreements, and outreach to the field, etc. We use the information we receive in these relationships to build new knowledge about how to serve young children and their families. For example, we have made targeted changes in the way we teach math for young children based on what we have learned through our participation with the Early Math Project with Erikson Institute as well as the MATH blog project. In addition, we now teach our 258 students to develop skills in teacher research based on our relationship with ACCESS and NAEYC's publication "Voices of Practitioners". These relationships and information exchange truly enhance our program.

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

Although we have a strong faculty presence at the institutional and District levels we still need to continue to participate in projects pertaining to strategic planning and long-term goals setting. The ongoing ECADA accreditation process has helped us to think more strategically within our own program as well as in relationship to our sister programs across the District. However, it is a large institution and in order to continue to be at the table for the decision making process, we will need to be persistent and continue to serve in official roles within the institution.

Although students are involved in faculty and course evaluations, we do see that student participation or input in the decision-making process is an ongoing challenge. Our students are busy adults with tremendous responsibilities in their professional and private lives. We would like to continue to reach out to them using online surveys as this has been a successful format in the past. We are also considering the use of social media as a means for developing and maintaining connections to students as well as graduates.

Criterion 12: Program Resources

In 2006, we had the Child Development Lab classroom and many materials, but we were limited in terms of access to technology which included one roll-away AV cart that was shared by many instructors and had to be reserved for specific classes. Technology was a big concern for us and it was a major theme in our original self-study report and peer review meetings. In 2013, we now have three computers and three document scanners which are regularly used by Practicum students as they prepare their e-portfolio websites. The Lab is now a smart room with a ceiling mounted LCD projector linked to a computer with internet access, a DVD player, and a VHS player (we specifically requested to keep this as we still have some VHS tapes that are old but quite effective). The room also holds a large AV cabinet with DVDs and kits for use by all instructors. New DVDs were ordered in 2012 that specifically focused on nature, math, and guidance strategies. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the department will receive 60 iPads in two rolling carts to use with students. Our goal is to explore developmentally appropriate Apps so our students learn to evaluate various tools for use with young children. In addition to updated technology, we also now have an extensive collection of course materials regarding the prenatal period, birth and infancy as well as children with special needs.

Indicators of strength

Room 720 is the Child Development Lab classroom equipped with three computers, a full children's literature library, a sink, countertop and stove area with cabinets for cooking supplies, a water table, a rug, unit blocks, manipulatives in bins labeled in Spanish and English, a cabinet for infant and toddler materials, and two large closets with musical instruments, woodworking materials, board games, and craft supplies. This room is special to us and serves as our home base. Students and instructors have many opportunities to explore materials and activities together in this space. Each year, we place an order for materials costing roughly \$2,000.00. We have relied on this budgetary support for as long as any member of our team has been with the program and we feel this demonstrates administrative support, and it offers so many possibilities for our students.

The HWC library has a selection of children's literature as well as other print and online resources useful to our students. We have a relationship with The Chicago Center for Early Education which is housed at Malcolm X College not far from HWC. We routinely bring students to sign up for a library card and learn about the many different resources available to them through this center including access to computers, scanners, copies, early learning kits, books, assessment tools, etc.

<http://www.uic.edu/educ/cfl/ccee.html> We also have a relationship with the Art

Institute of Chicago's Crown Family Educator Resource Center where we can take a walking field trip to make use of the vast resources available to our students
<http://www.artic.edu/learn/k-12-teachers-and-students/crown-family-educator-resource-center>

Resource allocation across the Applied Science Department

| | Child Development | Addictions Studies | Criminal Justice | Social Work/Youth Work, Gerontology |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Full-time faculty | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Adjunct faculty | 11 | 2 | 7 | 3 |
| Teaching faculty summer | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Instructional Materials | \$1850 | \$1500 | \$1200 | \$1850 |
| Office Supplies | \$600 | \$600 | \$600 | \$600 |

Personnel Cost for the Applied Science Department

| | |
|-----------------------|---------|
| Full-time faculty (9) | 837,630 |
| Adjunct faculty (23) | 56,250 |

During the 2012-2013 academic year, the Applied Science Department was allocated 2 part-time instructional assistants to support Applied Science students in tutoring services as well as embedded within class sessions. Instructional Assistants are not budgeted within the department but out of the Tutoring Services program.

Institutional resources that allow instructors to meet their responsibilities in the program include the Wellness Center, Office of Information Technology services, Library tours and AV services, embedded tutors, the CAST Room, the Writing Center, The Tutoring Center, and Blackboard assistance.

Plan to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area

Over the past few years our program used an assessment management system through a company called LiveText. The tool worked rather well in terms of collecting and archiving assessment data; however, the cost of a LiveText account proved to be prohibitive for our students. We made the decision to convert our key assessments to a free online survey system which has worked well over the past several years. This is

much easier for adjunct instructors to use and provides for real-time connections to data as it is being entered.

The system for developing a departmental budget has changed in recent years, and we are still learning how best to navigate this process.

**PART TWO
PROGRAM CONTENT
AND OUTCOMES**

F. LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

5-10 page curriculum chart of program’s learning opportunities and sample assessments in relation to the standards and the supportive skills.

| Curriculum Chart: Sample learning opportunities and assessments for each accreditation standard (5-10 pages maximum) | | |
|---|---|--|
| Standard 1: Promoting Child Development and Learning | Learning Opportunities (activity, course number) | Related assessments of candidate performance Key Assessment = KA Grading Guidelines = Course level assessment/grading |
| 1a: Knowing and understanding young children’s characteristics and needs | Observations 4 ages (101) Childcare menu (107) Accommodate curriculum appropriately to special needs of children (143) | Observation and Interpretation Rubric (KA1) Grading guidelines Lesson Plan Analysis (KA3) |
| 1b: Knowing and understanding the multiple influences on development and learning | Interview a parent who is different from yourself (101, 262) Examine multiple influences on child development (258) | Grading guidelines Quiz |
| 1c: Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging learning environments | Safety Assessment (107) Design an appropriate ECE classroom (258) Planning, implementing, & reflecting on experiences for | Grading Guidelines Grading Guidelines Grading Guidelines, discussion, faculty observation |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | young children (259) | |
| Standard 2: Building Family and Community Relationships | Learning Opportunities (activity, course number) | Related assessments of candidate performance |
| 2a: Knowing about and understanding diverse family and community characteristics | Language observation (109) Parent interview (262) Reflection papers (262, 258) | Grading guidelines |
| 2b: Supporting and engaging families and communities through respectful, reciprocal relationships | Group presentations – audience is families (262) Mock conference (258) | Grading guidelines |
| 2c: Involving families and communities in their children’s development and learning | Documentation panel (201) Planning family night (258) | Documentation rubric (KA2) Quiz |
| Standard 3: Observing, Documenting, and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families | Learning Opportunities (activity, course number) | Related assessments of candidate performance |
| 3a: Understanding the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment | Describe goals, benefits, and uses of assessment (201, 258). | Quiz |
| 3b: Knowing about and using observation, documentation, and other appropriate assessment tools and approaches | Safety Assessment (107) Nutritional Assessment (107) Child Skills Checklist (201) Observation and Interpretation (101) | Grading Guidelines KA #1 Observation and Interpretation Rubric |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| 3c: Understanding and practicing responsible assessment to promote positive outcomes for each child | Case Study observations, documentation, and assessment (201) Teacher Research Documentation Showcase (258) | Documentation Rubric (KA2) |
| 3d: Knowing about assessment partnerships with families & other professional colleagues | Assessment partnership (258) Letter to families and letter to colleagues (201) | Quiz Grading guidelines |
| Standard 4: Using Developmentally Effective Approaches to Connect with Children and Families | Learning Opportunities (activity, course number) | Related assessments of candidate performance |
| 4a: Understanding positive relationships and supportive interactions as the foundation of their work with children | Group time presentation (109) Reflection quiz questions (258) Reflection papers (258) | Grading guidelines Quiz Reflection Rubric (KA4) |
| 4b: Knowing and understanding effective strategies and tools for early education | Anti-bias and DAP (258) Discussions about teaching in weekly seminar (259) | Quiz Grading guidelines/Participation |
| 4c: Using a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning approaches | Practicum Portfolio (258, 259) Lab journal (149) Circle time presentation (109) Dialogic reading (258) | Practicum Portfolio rubric (KA5) Grading Guidelines CONNECT modules |
| 4d: Reflecting on their own practice to promote positive outcomes for each child. | Reflection papers (201, 258) Personal Experience Essay (143) | Reflection Rubric (KA4) |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Reflection narratives (258, 259)</p> <p>Reflections on Lesson Plan Analysis (149)</p> <p>Reflection section in Philosophy paper (258, 259)</p> | <p>Practicum Portfolio Rubric (KA5)</p> <p>Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric (K3)</p> <p>Philosophy Rubric (KA6)</p> |
| Standard 5: Using Content Knowledge to Build Meaningful Curriculum | Learning Opportunities (activity, course number) | Related assessments of candidate performance |
| 5a: Understanding content knowledge and resources in academic disciplines | <p>Language Stimulation plans or activity plans (109)</p> <p>Health, Safety, and Nutrition lesson plans (107)</p> <p>Small group math and science activity demonstration (143)</p> <p>Early Learning Standards discussion and quiz (258)</p> <p>Lesson Plan Analysis (149)</p> | <p>Grading Guidelines</p> <p>Quiz</p> <p>Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric (KA3)</p> |
| 5b: Knowing and using the central concepts, inquiry tools, and structures of content areas or academic disciplines | <p>Teacher Research Project (258)</p> <p>Children’s Book analysis and Writing a Children’s book (109)</p> | <p>Grading Guidelines and Reflection Rubric (KA4)</p> <p>Grading guidelines</p> |
| 5c: Using their own knowledge, appropriate early learning standards, and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curricula for each child. | <p>Designing Lesson plans (107, 109, 149)</p> <p>Lesson Plan Analysis (149)</p> | <p>Grading Guidelines</p> <p>Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric (KA3)</p> |
| Standard 6: Becoming a Professional | Learning Opportunities (activity, course number) | Related assessments of candidate performance |
| 6a: Identifying and involving oneself with the early childhood field | <p>Registration for e-newsletters to specialized professional associations in the field (258)</p> | <p>Quizzes</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | Biography, Resume/Vitae (259) Philosophy (120, 258, 259) | Grading Guidelines Philosophy Rubric (KA6) |
| 6b: Knowing about and upholding ethical standards and other professional guidelines | Observations (ten core courses) Documentation (201, 258) Practicum hours (259) | Observation and Interpretation Rubric (KA1) Documentation Rubric (KA2) Grading Guidelines: visits, cooperating teacher, faculty, and seminar. |
| 6c: Engaging in continuous, collaborative learning to inform practice | Group projects (107,109, 120, 143, 258,262) Set-up, clean-up, and snack crews (149) With a partner, design an ECE setting (258) | Grading guidelines Quiz |
| 6d: Integrating knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives on early education | Read e-newsletters from specialized professional associations (258) Seminar discussions about issues in practice (259) | Grading guidelines for discussion and quiz Grading guidelines |
| 6e: Engaging in informed advocacy for children and the profession | Letter to the editor about play (258) Lesson plan analysis including adaptation for Cultural, Linguistic, and Ability Diversity Practicum Portfolio in public website format (258,259) | Grading guidelines and writing rubric Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric (KA3) Practicum Portfolio Rubric (KA5) |
| Supportive Skills | Learning Opportunities (activity, course number) | Related assessments of candidate performance |
| Supportive Skill 1: Self-assessment and self-advocacy | CARE self-assessment (258) Practicum Portfolio in public website format (258,259) Reflections (143, 201, 258, 259) | CARE rubric Practicum Portfolio Rubric (KA5) Reflection Rubric (KA4) |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | |
| <p>Supportive Skill 2: Mastering and applying foundational concepts from general education</p> | <p>Personal Experience essay about math and science (143)</p> <p>Children’s Book Analysis (109)</p> | <p>Grading Guidelines</p> |
| <p>Supportive Skill 3: Written and verbal skills</p> | <p>Reflection papers (143, 109, 120, 201, 258, 259)</p> <p>Group presentations (109, 143, 149, 258)</p> <p>Practicum Portfolio (258, 259)</p> <p>Documentation (201, 258)</p> <p>Newsletters (107, 258, 262)</p> <p>Observations (101, 143, 258)</p> | <p>All Key Assessments include Writing skills.</p> <p>Writing rubric</p> |
| <p>Supportive Skill 4: Making connections between prior knowledge/ experience and new learning</p> | <p>Reflection papers (143, 109, 120, 201, 258, 259)</p> <p>Seminar discussions (259)</p> | <p>Reflection Rubric (KA4)</p> <p>Grading guidelines</p> |
| <p>Supportive Skill 5: Identifying and using professional resources</p> | <p>Read e-newsletters from specialized professional associations (258)</p> <p>Exploring iPad Aps for early childhood (258)</p> | <p>Quiz</p> <p>Grading guidelines</p> |

1-2 page commentary on the chart and a description of how the curriculum chart has changed.

Our learning opportunities chart has changed dramatically since 2006. When we did this exercise early on in the original self-study we realized that, across multiple sections of the same course, there were many different assignments represented and not much consistency across the sections. At that time, we found that in most of our courses some form of observation was assigned, but that we had few opportunities for our students to develop skills in assessment and documentation. We also found that we expected a high level of complex reflection skills for the Practicum Portfolio assignment, but formal reflection was rarely assigned in the earlier courses. Instructors felt they impressed this skill upon their students, but there was very little evidence that students were practicing this skill and in fact our early data collection process illustrated that our students lacked skill in reflective writing.

Starting with the original self-study and continuing to the current semester in 2013, we are now operating within a backward design framework. The Practicum Portfolio assignment is the capstone assignment for the program and we work backwards from that outcome, to develop multiple opportunities for students to learn the standards and to also apply them to their coursework and in their practice. This has been a gradual change that has grown over time. We share the completed portfolios with our Advisory Council members and our adjunct instructors so everyone knows what we are preparing our students to be able to do by the end of the program.

In the past, we believed that the standards and supportive skills were woven throughout the program of study. Today, we can demonstrate direct alignment with every key element of each standard. This is a much more targeted curriculum than it was in 2006. As the recent course revision process suggests, the program's course objectives and student learning outcomes reflect the language of the standards and supportive skills. In fact, we even changed one course title based on the standards; "Observation, Documentation, Assessment to support Young Children and their Families". This outcome is the result of an intentional effort to make the standards real for ourselves in order to make them real for our students. In the past, we *thought* the standards were evident in our courses. Now, we are able to map the alignment explicitly on paper and in our day-to-day activities.

1 page description of plans to address challenges and build on current strengths in this area.

Our biggest challenge, as mentioned in Part One of this report, is that there are many instructors and many sections of courses offered every semester. Although the Assessment Coordinator has a sense of what is happening across all of those sections, individual members of the team may not have a sense of what others are doing in their courses. We have worked hard to address this issue through the Faculty Partner Program where instructors work closely together each semester. We have also tried to maintain contact and share successes and struggles with each other during meetings and via e-mail. We are now in the process of designing a web-based space where resources can be housed and where instructors can share with each other. We are experimenting with the format. It will be either a website or an online community through www.edWeb.com.

We also want to challenge ourselves to continue to build opportunities for our students to learn the standards and supportive skills throughout their coursework. Because all ten core courses have been recently revised we need to make sure that all instructors are aware of the changes and that they adjust their syllabi accordingly. The revised course descriptions and master course syllabi will go into effect during the summer 2013 session. This past semester, we piloted a curriculum map for one course as a way of more clearly aligning course activities and assignments with the standards. This is not to suggest that everyone must teach every course the same way. The map is a way of organizing course content and can be useful for instructors for planning. Our goal is to have maps designed for all ten courses over the summer so instructors can use them as they plan their fall 2013 course schedules.

G. ASSESSMENTS AND EVIDENCE OF CANDIDATE OUTCOMES

Overview Chart of Key Assessments Aligned with Accreditation Standards and Skills

b) OVERVIEW CHART OF KEY ASSESSMENTS ALIGNED WITH ACCREDITATION STANDARDS AND SKILLS

Write a short title for each of your key assessment (portfolio, interview, case study, candidate teaching evaluation, advocacy project, etc.) to assist your readers.

Note: Programs are responsible for consistency in key assessment name and standard alignment throughout their Self-Study Report.

Place a check or X under the NAEYC Standards and Supportive Skills assessed in each of your key assessments.

STD = standards 1-6, SS = Supportive Skill 1-5

| Assessment (Name, course #) | STD 1 | STD 2 | STD 3 | STD 4 | STD 5 | STD 6 | SS 1 | SS 2 | SS 3 | SS 4 | SS 5 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 1. Observation and Interpretation Rubric | X | | X | X | | | | | X | | X |
| 2. Documentation Rubric | X | X | X | | | X | | | X | X | |
| 3. Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric | | X | | X | X | | | X | X | | |
| 4. Reflection Rubric | | | | X | | X | X | | X | X | |
| 5. Practicum Portfolio Rubric | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | |
| 6. Philosophy Rubric | X | X | | X | | X | X | | X | | |

Documentation of each key assessment

Documentation should be limited to the equivalent of five pages each, however in some cases the assessment directions or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

- Evidence chart
- The directions or guidelines as they are given to candidates
- The rubric or scoring guide that is used by faculty or field supervisors to evaluate candidate work
- Data from the assessment: 2 applications over time, disaggregated by Standard

c.1) EVIDENCE CHART

Key Assessment 1: Observation and Interpretation Rubric

Briefly describe the assignment and list the courses that use this assignment

CD 101: Students observe 4 different children (infant, toddler, preschool, and school-age). The paper includes a narrative observation and an interpretation section where students make connections between what they observed and what they have learned in the textbook.

Place a check or X under the NAEYC Standards and Supportive Skills assessed through this activity

STD = standards 1-6, SS = Supportive Skill 1-5

| STD1 | STD2 | STD3 | STD4 | STD5 | STD6 | SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | SS5 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| X | | X | X | | | | | X | | X |

Briefly summarize candidate performance data from this key assessment.

Unlike rubrics 2-6, the data results from rubric 1 do not show a distinct pattern across the various attributes being rated. The spring 2012 results show that 100% of students were rated "meets" for standard 3a, while 55.6% of students were rated as "emerging" for standard 1c, and 73.1% of students were rated as "does not meet" for supportive skill 3. On the other hand, the fall 2012 results show that 72.1% of students were rated "meets" for standard 4b, while 73.1% were rated "emerging" for supportive skill 3, and 17.6% of students were rated "does not meet" for standard 1c.

The data from spring 2012 was surprising in that 50% of students either met or were rated "emerging" for standard 1b and SS5. Both categories involve students using the textbook to support their interpretations of the observation. In our past experience, students typically struggle with these particular skills. However, even the data from fall 2012 suggests that the majority of students are either meeting or emerging in these categories and this is encouraging.

During the fall 2012 semester 73.1% of students are emerging in terms of their writing skills. This is a large number. During the spring 2012 semester 39.3% were in the emerging category. Each year, according to assessment data, the writing skill remains low in terms of percentage of students who meet that standard. The two rounds of data here suggest that writing is still a challenge, but writing results can vary widely from semester to semester.

The two rounds of data suggest that the weakest area for our students on this particular assignment is the writing. All of our rubrics include an element focused on writing skills. It is simple in terms of what is being assessed; spelling, grammar, and typos, yet this continues to be a challenge for our students. The data collected for this rubric are taken from the fourth observation assignment in the CD 101 course. This is intentional because the goal is to select what should be the strongest assignment from each student. Each student receives feedback on the initial assignments for the course. Our goal is to provide scaffolding for our students so they have the information they need in order to make improvements. However, what we have learned is that writing continues to be a challenge.

Describe how data from this key assessment are being used to improve teaching and learning.

The Observation and Interpretation Rubric has been used to collect assessment data since 2006. In that time, we have learned that our students tend to do well with the narrative section of written observations, but that they struggle with the interpretation and reflection sections. Based on the data, we feel that this largely has to do with weak writing skills and difficulty in citing the text within the interpretation section.

The curriculum has been revised. We have added multiple opportunities across the course of study to practice interpretation skills and to practice making connections between observed behavior and course content. In CD 101, but also in other courses such as 143, 149, 201, and 258 students practice their interpretation skills through quiz questions, group observations, and observation papers. The goal is to build more opportunities for students to practice this skill in many formats and over time.

Our hope is that with the new writing emphasis within our department (see part one) our instructors as well as our students will have more resources enabling them to target and improve specific writing skills in this assessment but also across the program of study.

Key Assessment #1 Observation and Interpretation: Assignment Description

OBSERVATIONS

Infant and Toddler Observation Report - 60 points,
Preschool and School-age Observation Report - 80 points

NOTE: Students will have opportunities in class to practice observation skills using video. You should thoroughly review the observation handbook and other related observation resources before the observation process and use it as a guide as you write your observation narrative.

You will observe four different children representing four different age ranges:

- 1) Infant: birth to about 18 months
- 2) Toddler: 19 to 36 months
- 3) Preschool: 3 to 5 years
- 4) School-aged: 6 to 12 years

Observations take place in a naturalistic setting (daycare, home, playground, church, museum, store, etc.) with an **active** child (Please do not submit observations where all the child does is watch television or play Nintendo or talk on their cell phone). The child cannot be your own son or daughter and you should not interact with the subject of your observation. Your role is simply to observe and write down what you observe.

Each observation will take at least two hours. You will take handwritten notes during the observation (please keep these for class). You will then type the observation and bring it to class on the designated date. These observations will serve as the "narrative" section of the observation assignment.

NOTE: Please read and print the Observation Handbook and other related observation resources posted on Blackboard.

Infant and Toddler observation report:
This process will include:

- 1) Handwritten notes from the actual observations of *one infant and one toddler*.
- 2) Typed first drafts of infant and toddler observations.
- 3) Revised observations (based on feedback given in class) with added interpretations.
- 4) Reference page.

Preschool and School-age observation report:
This process will include:

- 1) Handwritten notes from the actual observations of ***one preschooler and one school-age child.***
- 2) Typed first drafts of preschool and school-age observations.
- 3) Revised observations (based on feedback given in class) with added interpretations.
- 4) Reference page.

Key Assessment #1 Observation and Interpretation Rubric

| Standards | Meets the Standard | Emerging skills | Does not Meet the Standard |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4b. Knowing & understanding effective strategies & tools for early education | Objective language is used throughout the observation description. Student remains focused on observed behavior and does not include any interpretive or reflective statements. | Objective language is used sometimes but the student also includes interpretive comments. | Subjective or judgmental language is used throughout the description and the student continuously makes interpretive comments. |
| 3b. Knowing about & using observation, documentation, & other appropriate assessment tools & approaches | Actions and interactions are all described in vivid detail. Child's language is quoted verbatim. Actions are recorded sequentially. | Actions and interactions are described clearly but lacking in detail. Child's language is quoted some of the time. Actions are recorded sequentially some of the time | Actions and interactions are described with very little detail and are difficult to follow. Child's language is not included or is corrected for grammar. Actions are not recorded sequentially and are difficult to follow |
| Supportive Skill #3: Written & Verbal Skills | No spelling, grammar or punctuation errors or typos. | Some errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation, or typos that somewhat distract from the writing. | Many errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and typos. Errors are prominent and distract too much from the writing. |
| 3a. Understanding the goals, benefits, & uses of assessment | Student uses observed behaviors as evidence for interpretations or reflections. | Student sometimes uses observed behaviors as evidence but also uses some speculation | Student does not use observed behaviors as evidence but relies solely on speculation |
| 1b. Knowing & understanding the multiple influences on development & learning | Student uses concepts of development as the main source of evidence for interpretations or reflections | Student begins to use concepts of development as evidence for interpretations but also relies on | Student relies solely on personal experience and does not use concepts of child development as evidence for |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Supportive Skill #5: Identifying & using professional resources | | personal experience to describe development | interpretations or reflections |
| 1c. Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive, & challenging learning environments | Student uses observation to make informed, and developmentally/culturally appropriate decisions in the classroom (hypothetically or field experiences) | Student begins to use observation to inform practice but also relies on teacher-centered practices | Student does not use observation to inform practice but solely relies on teacher- centered practices |

Key Assessment #1 Observation and Interpretation: Data Results

Assessment Data Results

| Standards & Supportive Skills | Meets SP 2012 | Meets FA 2012 | Emerging SP 2012 | Emerging FA 2012 | Does not meet SP 2012 | Does not meet FA 2012 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 4b | 64.3% | 72.1% | 10.7% | 20.6% | 25.9% | 7.4% |
| 3b | 67.9% | 70.6% | 21.4% | 20.6% | 10.7% | 8.8% |
| SS3 | 35.7% | 19.4% | 39.3% | 73.1% | 25.0% | 7.5% |
| 3a | 100% | 63.2% | 0% | 26.5% | 0% | 10.3% |
| 1b | 50% | 61.8% | 50% | 23.5% | 0% | 14.7% |
| SS5 | 50% | 61.8% | 50% | 23.5% | 0% | 14.7% |
| 1c | 44.4% | 58.8% | 55.6% | 23.5% | 0% | 17.6% |

Spring 2012

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/l8ze5oz7k89iv90/Observation%20and%20Interpretation%20data%20Spring%202012.xls>

Fall 2012

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/4svly61fh3qbkql/Observation%20and%20Documentation%20Data%20Fall%202012.xls>

c.1) EVIDENCE Chart

Key Assessment 2: Documentation Rubric

Briefly describe the assignment and list the courses that use this assignment.

Students do a Teacher Research Project focused on play. Over the course of several weeks, students collect data including observations, photos, time sampling, and work samples. At the end of the project, students make decisions about how they want to document the process. They arrange their data for display during the Teacher Research Showcase where they share their findings with colleagues in the class.

Place a check or X under the NAEYC Standards and Supportive Skills assessed through this activity

STD = standards 1-6, SS = Supportive Skill 1-5

| STD1 | STD2 | STD3 | STD4 | STD5 | STD6 | SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | SS5 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| X | X | X | | | X | | | X | X | |

Briefly summarize candidate performance data from this key assessment. If your program has not yet collected data from this key assessment, explain why.

The highest rating for this rubric for both the fall and spring 2012 semesters is 100% for standard 1a. In addition, the fall and spring 2012 data sets are both consistent with the "emerging" category, which is strongest for supportive skill 4 at 50% in the fall and 40% in the spring semester. No students were rated "does not meet" on this entire rubric for the spring 2012 results, and for the fall 2012 data set only 5% were rated "does not meet" for supportive skill 4. Overall, students appear to be quite strong in the standards and supportive skills as measured by the documentation rubric.

In some ways, these results are surprising as this assignment is quite challenging. Students must demonstrate their understanding of complex concepts all within a documentation display. This assignment has very high expectations of our students and their ability to demonstrate these skills and communicate what they have learned to a variety of audiences. Why are students showing such strength in this assessment? It may be due to the targeted nature of this assignment. It is closely aligned with the rubric. This still does not fully explain these findings. It may be that our students do very well with a more visual form of communication as opposed to a formal written assignment.

Describe how data from this key assessment are being used to improve teaching and learning.

Early on, documentation was contained within the CD 201 course for the case study assignment. At this point, we are exploring a variety of documentation strategies across many of the courses including 109, 149, 201, and 258. We feel that this will give students many opportunities to create documentations that incorporate what they are learning about young children through various observation and assessment strategies. We of are experimenting with group documentation of our own learning processes within the adult classroom experience. This offers students many opportunities to practice this skill in a low stakes in-class activity.

Key Assessment #2 Assignment Description: Teacher Research Project

Teacher Research Project – see Prezi for details

<http://prezi.com/gy-k1mjfev27/untitled-prezi/?kw=view-gy-k1mjfev27&rc=ref-5723019>

1. Observation Hours:
 - a. Each week students will observe/volunteer in an early childhood setting three hours per week for a total of 45 hours.
 - b. The hours-sheet will be signed by the classroom teacher as the student completes each session. When all 45 hours are completed, the director of the center will sign to verify completion. The student will scan this and submit it to Bb. This is a pass/fail component to the course.

2. Research Question:

How is play supported in this ECE setting?

 - a. Sub question #1: When does play happen in this setting (time sampling)?
 - b. Sub question #2: What does play *look like* in this setting (observations, photos)?

3. Weekly Teacher Research Notes and Data Share:
 - a. During observation hours, students will take notes in a composition book. Students are required to bring this to class each week.
 - b. A portion of class time will be dedicated for students to share the data they are collecting.

4. Writing
 - a. Newsletter article to families about play
 - b. Editorial for your local newspaper about the importance of play

5. Documentation Showcase: assemble and organize your final data for display.
 - a. Data
 - i. photos,
 - ii. time sampling,
 - iii. classroom map,
 - iv. work samples
 - v. observation journal with class schedule listed

Key Assessment #2: Documentation Rubric

| Standards | Meets the Standard | Emerging skills | Does not Meet the Standard |
|---|---|---|--|
| 6b. Knowing about & upholding ethical standards & other professional guidelines | There is no identifying information about the child or school on the documentation in order to preserve confidentiality | There is some identifying information about the child or school | Confidentiality is violated |
| 1a. Knowing & understanding young children's characteristics & needs | Documentation is used as an assessment tool to analyze the developmental process | Documentation includes information about development such as developmental milestones or domains | Documentation does not include development |
| 3d. Knowing about assessment partnerships with families & with professional colleagues | The documentation includes child assessment information to make the learning process visible | The documentation includes child assessment information | Child assessment information is not included |
| 2c. Involving families & communities in their children's development & learning | The documentation is targeting all audiences including the children, teachers/colleagues, families and the community. | The documentation targets one or two audiences but does not consider all of them. | The documentation does not seem to have an audience. |
| Supportive Skill 4: Making connections between prior knowledge/ experience & new learning | The documentation reveals the student's metacognitive awareness of her/his own learning process in rich, descriptive detail | The documentation describes some of the student's thoughts but does not go into detail about the student's own learning process | There is no description of the student's learning process or the description is superficial. |
| 3c: Understanding and practicing responsible assessment to | Within the documentation there is ample evidence of the student observing, | Within the documentation there is some evidence of the student observing | There is very little evidence of the student observing, gathering artifacts, |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>promote positive outcomes for each child</p> | <p>gathering artifacts, questioning and hypothesizing.</p> | <p>and gathering artifacts but there may not be evidence of the student questioning or hypothesizing.</p> | <p>questioning or hypothesizing.</p> |
| <p>Supportive Skill 3: Written and Verbal Skills</p> | <p>All writing in the documentation is written clearly and without any spelling, grammar, punctuation errors, or typos.</p> | <p>Writing within the documentation is somewhat vague. Some distracting errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation, and/or typos.</p> | <p>Written errors are prominent and distract too much from the meaning.</p> |

Key Assessment #2: Documentation Rubric Results

Assessment Data Results

| Standards & Supportive Skills | Meets FA 2012 | Meets SP 2013 | Emerging FA 2012 | Emerging SP 2013 | Does not meet FA 2012 | Does not meet SP 2013 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 6b | 95% | 90.9% | 5% | 9.1% | 0% | 0% |
| 1a | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 3b | 80% | 100% | 20% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 3d | 80% | 90.9% | 20% | 9.1% | 0% | 0% |
| 2c | 80% | 90.9% | 20% | 9.1% | 0% | 0% |
| SS4 | 45% | 60% | 50% | 40% | 5% | 0% |
| 3c | 90% | 81.8% | 10% | 18.2% | 0% | 0% |
| SS3 | 80% | 54.5% | 20% | 45.5% | 0% | 0% |

Fall 2012

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/sf9713af2722pzj/Documentation%20results%20fall%202012.xls>

Spring 2013

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/82f4rhvz470klm7/Documentation%20results%20spring%202013.xls>

c.1) EVIDENCE CHART

Key Assessment 3: Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric

Briefly describe the assignment and list the courses that use this assignment.

Students in CD 149 and CD 258 do a Lesson Plan Analysis specific to the content of each course. CD 149 students choose 4 creative activities, from the lab experiences of their course, using the analysis template. CD 258 students analyze 1 assigned math activity, from the Erikson Institute Early Math modules, using the analysis template.

Place a check or X under the NAEYC Standards and Supportive Skills assessed through this activity

STD = standards 1-6, SS = Supportive Skill 1-5

| STD1 | STD2 | STD3 | STD4 | STD5 | STD6 | SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | SS5 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | X | | X | X | | | X | | | |

Briefly summarize candidate performance data from this key assessment. If your program has not yet collected data from this key assessment, explain why.

The highest rating for the spring 2012 data is a tie of 75% "meets" for standard 5a "understanding content knowledge and resources in academic disciplines", and supportive skill two, "mastering and applying foundational concepts from general education". The fall 2012 data set shows standard 4c, which includes "using a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning practices" as the highest rating at 50%. The spring 2012 data set has a three-way tie for highest rating in "emerging" between: 1) 5c, 2) 5a, and 3) supportive skill two. The fall 2012 data set indicates 5c as the highest rating for "emerging" at 57.7%. The spring 2012 data set indicates that 41.7% of students are rated "does not meet" for standard 2a, "knowing about and understanding diverse family and community characteristics". The fall 2012 data set, on the other hand, indicates that 11.8% of students are rated "does not meet" for standard 5c and on the lesson plan analysis rubric this refers to the students' ability to create appropriate expansion activities for lesson plans.

The skill that seems to be the biggest challenge for our student is the ability to examine a lesson and make appropriate expansion activities that would include all content/learning areas of the classroom. Also, it seems that making the connection between the learning activity and DAP is difficult for many students. Understanding content knowledge & resources in academic disciplines by identifying the learning goals of the lesson plan and describing reasonable child behaviors that would indicate that the learning goals have been met

Describe how data from this key assessment are being used to improve teaching and learning.

We have discussed this rubric with our Advisory Council. The Council has encouraged us to continue to work with the students to build analysis skills. As stated in our Council meeting, teachers will most likely be assigned a curriculum depending on the early childhood center where they work. The difficulty is not in finding activities. Rather, the difficulty is in knowing why a particular activity would be appropriate for a given group of young children. This takes a tremendous amount of practice in the field, and we are working to weave this throughout the course of study. We have made major changes to the assignment description between the two rounds of data provided. Students now follow a template that guides them in the analysis and reflection sections of the paper. As the data findings suggest, our students seem to struggle with developing expansion activities for a given lesson plan. This is interesting. It's not clear from the data results whether it is difficult to create expansion activities or the expansion activities created are simply inadequate. One change we have made is to provide more examples and to spend time in class brainstorming various expansion activities for a given lesson plan. Many of our working students are quite skilled at this and can offer peer tutoring in class.

Key Assessment #3 Lesson Plan Analysis: Assignment Description

Students will analyze 4 activities from 4 different lab experience days using the Lesson Plan Analysis rubric as a template. The rubric will be used by the instructor to assess the student's analysis. In the first draft, students will choose two activities to analyze. In the final paper, students will include a revision of the first two, and select two additional activities to analyze for a total of 4.

Suggested Format

Activity One: _____

Materials needed:

Activity description:

What is the learning goal of this activity/lesson plan?

1. What behaviors would you observe that would indicate to you that the learning goal is being met? What will the children do and say during this activity that would indicate they are learning?
2. Does this activity/lesson plan follow Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP)? Explain your answer using details from the activity and whether or not it is appropriate for young children.
3. Does this activity/lesson plan demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and linguistic diversity? What are your suggestions for making this activity/lesson plan more sensitive to cultural and linguistic diversity?
4. Describe some activities that you could do to expand upon this activity/lesson plan. Make sure to explain how your expansion activities relate to the activity/lesson plan you are analyzing/
5. How could you adapt this activity/lesson plan to meet the needs of children with developmental challenges or disabilities? Please remember that all children must have access to the activity. Sometimes you simply need to adapt the materials or methods in order to make the activity accessible to children with challenges. Please describe 2-3 possible adaptations you would make to this activity in order to invite all children to participate.

Reflection: What did you notice about yourself and your classmates while doing this activity in class? What did you know about lesson planning before doing this analysis? How have your views changed?

Key Assessment #3 Assignment Description Lesson Plan Analysis CD 258

Using this template, students will analyze one math activity called "People Sort". The rubric will be used by the instructor to assess the student's analysis. Save the template. Complete it and save again, then submit to Assignments. NOTE: By answering the questions on the template, you are *analyzing* the lesson.

Please read the dictionary definition of the word "analysis" below.

noun, plural a·nal·y·ses

1. *the separating of any material or abstract entity into its constituent elements (opposed to synthesis).*
2. *this process as a method of studying the nature of something or of determining its essential features and their relations: the grammatical analysis of a sentence.*
3. *a presentation, usually in writing, of the results of this process: The paper published an analysis of the political situation.*
4. *a philosophical method of exhibiting complex concepts or propositions as compounds or functions of more basic ones.*

In our case, we are closely examining every distinct part of a lesson as well as the planning that takes place beforehand, and finally how a teacher would expand the lesson by taking the learning goal of the lesson to different areas and experiences in the early childhood classroom. You can find many, many lessons and activities online and in resource books in the library. Your job is to learn how to **analyze** them to make sure they are appropriate for the age group you are working with and the *actual* group you are working with. This means you would need to consider the special needs of your group of children, their previous experiences, and their development.

Lesson Plan Analysis Template

Name of Activity or Experience:

Intended Age Group:

Materials needed:

Space: What kind of space is required (table, outdoor yard floor space, etc.):

Goals: What are the children expected to learn or experience? Goals for each activity should fit two or more of the developmental domains.

DAP: Does this activity/lesson plan follow Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP)? Explain your answer using details from the activity and whether or not it is appropriate for young children.

CLAD: Does this activity/lesson plan demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and linguistic diversity (CLAD)? What are your suggestions for making this activity/lesson plan more sensitive to CLAD?

Presentation: How will the teacher present the experience?

Accommodations: How would you vary the activity to fit the individual needs of all children? Describe at least two types of special needs that you would accommodate. Be sure to explain how you would accommodate, and why you chose that method in order to invite all children to participate. *Please remember that all children must have access to the activity. Sometimes you simply need to adapt the materials or methods in order to make the activity accessible to all children in your care.*

Expansion: How could you expand the themes from this activity (integrate them into other areas of the curriculum—science, math, literacy, social studies, nutrition)? Describe at least two curricular areas you would expand into:

Assessment: What did you intend to happen? Did it happen? How do you know? What behaviors would you observe that would indicate to you that the learning goal is being met? What will the children do and say during this activity that would indicate they are learning?

Reflection: What did you know about this kind of activity before doing it? How have your understandings changed after you did this activity? What questions do you have now about this type of activity?

Key Assessment #3: Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric

| Standards | Meets the standard | Emerging | Does not meet the standard |
|--|---|---|---|
| 5c. Using their own knowledge, appropriate early learning standards, & other resources to design, implement, & evaluate meaningful, challenging curricula for each child (DAP) | Explains how the lesson plan does or does not follow DAP using detailed descriptors | Identifies whether or not the plan incorporates DAP but does not explain how | No reference to DAP |
| 2a. Knowing about & understanding diverse family & community characteristics | Examines the lesson for sensitivity to cultural and linguistic diversity and provides suggestions to strengthen the lesson's sensitivity. | Describes how the lesson is sensitive to cultural and linguistic diversity, but does not provide suggestions to strengthen the lesson's sensitivity. | No discussion of how the lesson is or is not sensitive to cultural and linguistic diversity |
| 5c. Using their own knowledge, appropriate early learning standards, & other resources to design, implement, & evaluate meaningful, challenging curricula for each child (expansion) | Includes a rich description of expansion activities and describes how they relate to and support the lesson plan | Includes some description of expansion activities but the explanation of how they relate to the lesson plan is not clear. | No description of expansion activities or some activities are mentioned with no explanation of how they relate to the lesson plan |
| 5a. Understanding content knowledge & resources in academic disciplines Supportive Skill #2: Mastering & applying foundational concepts from general education | Identifies the learning goals of the lesson plan and describes reasonable child behaviors that would indicate that the learning goals have been met | Identifies the learning goals of the lesson plan but does not fully describe child behaviors that would indicate that the learning goals have been met. | No learning goals are identified or they are inaccurately described. |
| 4c. Using a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning | Lists appropriate adaptations that directly relate to the lesson plan and are accurate and | Lists some adaptations but with little connection to the original lesson plan or are not | No adaptations or inappropriate adaptations listed. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| approaches | appropriate for children with developmental challenges | necessarily appropriate for children with developmental challenges | |
| Supportive Skill 3: Written and verbal skills | Writes clearly and without any spelling, grammar, & punctuation errors, or typos. | Writes clearly with some errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation, or typos that somewhat distract from the writing. | Errors are prominent and distract too much from the writing. |
| 4d. Reflecting on their own practice to promote positive outcomes for each child | Reflections are thoughtful and complete. They reveal personal feelings about the topic. They reflect on personal experiences related to the topic. Questioning and other techniques are used that probe for deeper meaning. | Reflections are brief. They reveal a little about personal feelings or experiences related to the topic but they could be more thoughtful and go into more detail. There is the beginning of reflection or questioning. | Reflection is limited or superficial. They don't reveal any personal feelings or ideas. No questioning is used. |

Key Assessment #3: Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric Results

Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 data results

| Standards & Supportive Skills | Meets SP 2012 | Meets FA 2012 | Emerging SP 2012 | Emerging FA 2012 | Does not meet SP 2012 | Does not meet FA 2012 |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 5c (DAP) | 66.7% | 38.5% | 0% | 57.7% | 33.3% | 3.8% |
| 2a | 58.3% | 42.3% | 0% | 50.0% | 41.7% | 7.7% |
| 5c (expansion) | 66.7% | 51% | 16.7% | 37.3% | 16.7% | 11.8% |
| 5a | 75% | 44.2% | 16.7% | 51.9% | 8.3% | 3.8% |
| SS2 | 75% | 44.2% | 16.7% | 51.9% | 8.3% | 3.8% |
| 4c | 66.7% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 40.4% | 33.3% | 9.6% |

The highest rating for the spring 2012 data is a tie of 75% “meets” for standard 5a “understanding content knowledge and resources in academic disciplines”, and supportive skill two, “mastering and applying foundational concepts from general education”. The fall 2012 data set shows standard 4c, which includes “using a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning practices” as the highest rating at 50%. The spring 2012 data set has a three-way tie for highest rating in “emerging” between: 1) 5c, 2) 5a, and 3) supportive skill two. The fall 2012 data set indicates 5c as the highest rating for “emerging” at 57.7%. The spring 2012 data set indicates that 41.7% of students are rated “does not meet” for standard 2a, “knowing about and understanding diverse family and community characteristics”. The fall 2012 data set, on the other hand, indicates that 11.8% of students are rated “does not meet” for standard 5c and on the lesson plan analysis rubric this refers to the students’ ability to create appropriate expansion activities for lesson plans.

Spring 2012

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/mprv0l29scdbflw/Lesson%20Plan%20Analysis%20results%20Spring%202012.xls>

Fall 2012

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/3tr35pb9dg4qvel/Lesson%20Plan%20Analysis%20results%20Fall%202012.xls>

c.1) EVIDENCE CHART

Key Assessment 4: Reflection Rubric

Briefly describe the assignment and list the courses that use this assignment.

There are many examples of reflection papers, reflection questions on tests and quizzes, and reflection sections of bigger projects or papers. The Reflection Rubric is used widely by instructors across the program. Assessment data are collected from CD 149 where students write a reflection section from the Lesson Plan Analysis paper, and from CD 258 where students do an extensive Teacher Research Project and write a reflection paper about their experience.

Place a check or X under the NAEYC Standards and Supportive Skills assessed through this activity

STD = standards 1-6, SS = Supportive Skill 1-5

| STD1 | STD2 | STD3 | STD4 | STD5 | STD6 | SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | SS5 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | | | X | | X | X | | X | X | |

Briefly summarize candidate performance data from this key assessment. If your program has not yet collected data from this key assessment, explain why.

During the spring 2012 semester, 70% of students are rated "meets" for supportive skill one, which is "self-assessment and self-advocacy". This is the highest rating of the attributes found in the reflection rubric results. In the fall 2012 data set, 65.1% of students were rated "meets" for supportive standard 4d, "reflecting on their own practice to promote positive outcomes for each child". In the spring 2012 data set, the supportive skills number three and four are tied as the highest rating for "emerging" with 63.6%. Supportive skill four includes, "making connections between prior knowledge/experience and new learning". In the fall 2012 data set 69% were "emerging" in supportive skill four. In both semesters, supportive skill four was the highest rating for the emerging category. In the spring 2012 data set 36.4% were rated "does not meet" for standard 6d, "integrating knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives on early education". In the fall 2012 data set 16.3% were rated "does not meet" on the supportive skill for writing, which on the reflection rubric includes mechanics such as spelling, and grammar.

The data results suggest that 6d continues to be a challenge for our students. For the reflection rubric, this includes the student's ability to question and use other techniques for probing for deeper meaning within their own reflections. This is a complex skill. On the other hand, our students do rather well in self-assessment/self-advocacy as well as reflecting on their own practice in order to promote positive outcomes for each child. This is actually a big improvement from our first rounds of data collected in 2006-2007. Students were not doing well with reflection as evident in their writing. They tended to recount the experience rather than reflect on it. This

rubric breaks reflection down into specific skills.

Describe how data from this key assessment are being used to improve teaching and learning.

Reflective practice is a very important skill for early childhood professionals and one that is highly valued by our faculty team as it is important in the field, but also in one's educational experience as a lifelong learner. With the new course revisions in place, reflection is evident across all courses in the program. Based on assessment results, we are targeting the skill of questioning. This is now a major component to the Teacher Research Project in CD 258 as well as the Case Study assignment in CD 201. The goal is to provide students with multiple opportunities to build and practice more complex strategies for reflective practice as they work their way through the course of study.

Key Assessment #4 Reflection: Assignment Description

Teacher Research Project – CD 258

Write a reflection, 250-word maximum, about what you have learned in regard to your question and sub-questions. How will you use this information? How could this information be helpful to families? What did you know about play before doing this project? How have your views changed?

Lesson Plan Analysis Paper – CD 149

What is the learning goal of this activity/lesson plan?

1. What behaviors would you observe that would indicate to you that the learning goal is being met? What will the children do and say during this activity that would indicate they are learning?
2. Does this activity/lesson plan follow Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP)? Explain your answer using details from the activity and whether or not it is appropriate for young children.
3. Does this activity/lesson plan demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and linguistic diversity? What are your suggestions for making this activity/lesson plan more sensitive to cultural and linguistic diversity?
4. Describe some activities that you could do to expand upon this activity/lesson plan. Make sure to explain how your expansion activities relate to the activity/lesson plan you are analyzing/
5. How could you adapt this activity/lesson plan to meet the needs of children with developmental challenges or disabilities? Please remember that all children must have access to the activity. Sometimes you simply need to adapt the materials or methods in order to make the activity accessible to children with challenges. Please describe 2-3 possible adaptations you would make to this activity in order to invite all children to participate.

Reflection: What did you notice about yourself and your classmates while doing this activity in class? What did you know about lesson planning before doing this analysis? How have your views changed?

Key Assessment #4: Reflection Rubric

| Standards | Meets the Standard | Emerging skills | Does not Meet the Standard |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4d. Reflecting on their own practice to promote positive outcomes for each child | Reflections are thoughtful and complete. | Reflections are brief. | Reflections are superficial. |
| Supportive Skill #1 Self-assessment & self-advocacy | They reveal personal feelings or experiences about the topic. | They reveal a little about personal feelings or experiences related to the topic, but they could be more thoughtful and go into more detail. | They don't reveal any personal feelings or ideas |
| 6d. Integrating knowledgeable, reflective, & critical perspectives on early education | Questioning and other techniques are used that probe for deeper meaning. | There is the beginning of reflection or questioning. | No questioning is used. |
| Supportive Skill #4: Making connections between prior knowledge/experience & new learning | The writing describes how the student's understandings have changed using specific, meaningful examples. Comparisons are made between student's prior and current understandings. Important questions are raised for further exploration. | The writing describes how understandings have changed and gives some examples. Limited comparisons are used between student's prior and current understandings. | Nothing is revealed or examined in any detail. |
| Supportive Skill #3: Written & verbal skills (mechanics) | No spelling, grammar or punctuation errors or typos. | Some errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation and/or typos that distract from the meaning. | Many errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation. Errors & typos are prominent and distract too much from the writing. |
| Supportive Skill: Written communication (clarity) | The writing is clear and well organized. | The writing is fairly clear but the organization can be difficult to follow. | The writing is unclear and disorganized. |

Key Assessment #4: Reflection Rubric Results

Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 data results

| Standards & Supportive Skills | Meets SP 2012 | Meets FA 2012 | Emerging SP2012 | Emerging FA 2012 | Does not meet SP 2012 | Does not meet FA 2012 |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 4d | 63.3% | 65.1% | 9.1% | 25.6% | 27.3% | 9.3% |
| SS1 | 70.0% | 56.8% | 10.0% | 43.2% | 20.0% | 0.0% |
| 6d | 36.4% | 29.5% | 27.3% | 52.3% | 36.4% | 18.2% |
| SS4 | 18.2% | 21.4% | 63.6% | 69% | 18.2% | 9.5% |
| SS3 mechanics | 36.4% | 34.9% | 63.6% | 48.8% | 0% | 16.3% |
| SS3 clarity | 45.5% | 44.2% | 54.5% | 44.2% | 0% | 11.6% |

Spring 2012

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/oo2yp47pfimc35w/Reflection%20rubric%20results%20Spring%202012.xls>

Fall 2012

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/9gf27lqcofnjuml/Reflection%20Rubric%20Fall%202012.xls>

c.1) EVIDENCE CHART

Key Assessment 5: Practicum Portfolio Rubric

Briefly describe the assignment and list the courses that use this assignment.

The students create a website as a form for their Practicum e-portfolio. They must include their philosophy as well as a biography statement and CV. For each standard and key element, students include an artifact as well as a reflective narrative explaining how the artifact demonstrates the student's ability to apply the standard to his or her practice.

Place a check or X under the NAEYC Standards and Supportive Skills assessed through this activity

STD = standards 1-6, SS = Supportive Skill 1-5

| STD1 | STD2 | STD3 | STD4 | STD5 | STD6 | SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | SS5 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | |

Briefly summarize candidate performance data from this key assessment. If your program has not yet collected data from this key assessment, explain why.

On average during the spring 2012 semester, 96% of students exceed or meet all 6 standards and 2 supportive skills. On average during the fall 2012 semester, 80.83% of students exceed or meet all 6 standards and 2 supportive skills. In both semesters, there were 1 or more students who did not pass the course. The decision was made to include all portfolio data for two reasons: 1) it is a more accurate reflection of what was assessed each semester, 2) all of our students are important to us and if they are not meeting the standards, we want to examine this closely.

Our goal every semester is for 100% of students *taking* the Practicum meet all key elements of the six standards as well as supportive skill 1 and 3. We have not changed the formula to state that 100% of students *completing* the Practicum will meet all key elements of the standards. If we changed this formula, our chart would reflect that we achieved our goals, but instead the chart above reflects assessment data from all students taking the Practicum during both the spring and fall 2012 semesters, including students who did not pass the class.

Describe how data from this key assessment are being used to improve teaching and learning.

In the past, we did not connect student names to portfolio data. In the two rounds of assessment data provided in this report, we did link specific data to individual

students. This is still considered to be protected, confidential information, and the names remain stored on the online survey system and do not appear in any format. However, because the Practicum is a capstone course and students are not able to graduate with a degree without completing this course, we wanted to have a sense of assessment results compared to passing rates. What we have found is that students who started taking courses prior to 2006 struggle to meet the standards for the practicum course. In general, they do not have the quality of artifacts, or the writing, or technology skills to complete the e-portfolio successfully, even with targeted support.

We have made a radical change in how we prepare students for the Practicum course. Students create artifacts in all of their courses prior to the practicum semester. In addition, they begin writing reflective narratives in previous courses. As of Spring 2012, the CD 258 course includes a full draft of the e-portfolio. We feel this will dramatically increase students' practice with the standards. We also feel that it will allow students to spend more time during the practicum semester focusing on their teaching skills and not spending less time and effort developing their portfolios.

Key Assessment #5 e-portfolio: assignment description

NAEYC Standards E-Portfolio

- Students will go to www.childdevelopmentportfolio.weebly.com to see the framework for designing their own Standards E-portfolio.
- Following the exact layout of the example, students will develop a framework to create their own website.
- Students must use the prescribed layout but can be creative in the design of their e-portfolio website.
- To complete the website, students will include one artifact for every key element of the 6 NAEYC standards. For each artifact, students will write a reflective narrative that explains what the artifact is, how it demonstrates the student's understanding of the standard, and finally how the student plans to make use of that knowledge in the future.
- All assignments will be discussed in great detail during class.

BUILDING A LEARNING COMMUNITY TOGETHER

In an effort to facilitate a mutually beneficial and cooperative learning environment, the students in this child development course will engage in the following:

1. **Promote mutual respect and dignity among all students-** We will listen carefully to one another, respect diverse ideas, talents and points-of-view. We will agree to disagree with one another's ideas while emphasizing respect for each person.
2. **Engender trust and openness-**A healthy learning environment insists that we all learn to trust one another and continue to maintain that trust throughout the semester.
3. **Value diversity-** We will encourage an environment where students are open to hearing, learning about and contributing diverse ideas, experiences and points-of-view.
4. **Take active responsibility for "engaged" teaching/learning-**We will come prepared to class, ready to learn. We will engage ourselves actively in different forms of learning/teaching experiences such as experiential learning, small group discussions and structured debates.
5. **Participate actively** – We will value and nurture active participation and involvement in the classroom. We will provide constructive feedback to our peers and we will listen as much as we speak.
6. **Build a challenging and supportive learning environment-** We will create an environment where students feel free to take risks that challenge and nurture their educational growth. We will attempt to balance intellectual challenge and emotional support. We will emphasize reflective inquiry among students, test new ideas and brainstorm possibilities.

WEEKLY SCHEDULE

NOTE: This schedule is included as it serves as an extended assignment description.

| Week Date | TOPIC |
|--------------------------|--|
| Week #1 January 16 | <p>Introduction to the Course Overview of Syllabus and Course Expectations</p> <p>Due: Skeleton of the ePortfolio. Be prepared to share this with the class. Be sure to know your weebly user name and password.</p> |
| Week #2 January 23 | <p>To Do: Gather documents from the Practicum site. Put a folder together that includes: All Policies, Licensing and Accreditation information, Parent handbooks, sample curriculum plan, & bring any brochures that are available. Please put them in a folder or notebook and bring that to class next week.</p> <p>Assignment: Complete the Practicum Information Background Sheet. It can be found under the Assignments tab in Bb. Download the sheet and submit it in Bb. Bring a hard copy to class next week to discuss.</p> <p>Read: Chapters 1 & 2</p> <p>Due: Welcome Page</p> |
| Week #3 January 30 | <p>Discuss: NAEYC Standard 6 Becoming a Professional Identifying and involving oneself with the early childhood field Knowing about and upholding ethical standards and other professional guidelines Engaging in continuous, collaborative, learning to inform practice. Integrating knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives, on early education Engaging in informed advocacy for children and the profession</p> <p>Portfolio artifacts: 1) curriculum vita, 2) NAEYC (or other professional organization) membership card, 3) ethics statement, and 4) your choice (completion certificate, attendance at a workshop, advocacy, fundraiser)</p> <p>In class: Write a rough draft of your reflective narrative for Standard 6.</p> <p>To Do: Rewrite and edit your Standard 6 Reflective narrative. Get the most recent copy of your resume. Go to the Course Resources Tab in Bb and move through the Resume Writing Tutorial Slides. Using the information provided in the tutorial, update your resume as much as possible. Bring this to class next week for the Resume Writing/Computer Workshop.</p> <p>Read : Chapter 3 (this will help you write your Biography and your Philosophy Statement)</p> |
| Week #4 February 6 | <p>Resume Writing Workshop/Computer Workshop Day Come to class prepared with the most recent copy of your resume both electronically and in hard copy.</p> <p>Assignment Due: Submit the Standard 6 Reflective Narrative in Bb. Read: Chapter 4</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Week #5 February 13</p> | <p>Discuss: NAEYC Standard 2 Building Family & Community Relationships Knowing about and understanding diverse families and community characteristics Supporting and engaging families and communities through respectful, reciprocal relationships. Involving families and communities in their children’s development and learning. Possible Portfolio Artifacts: 1) Parent Newsletter, 2) Parent Involvement Plan, 3) Parent /Teacher Conference Plan, 4)Your choice</p> <p>Assignment Due: 1) Submit your updated Resume on Bb and submit it under Standard 6 in your electronic Portfolio as an artifact.</p> <p>Read: Chapter 5 & 6</p> |
| <p>Week #6 February 20</p> | <p>Cont. NAEYC Standard 2 Building Family and Community Relationships</p> <p>In Class: Discuss Parent/Family Newsletters/Letters of Introduction</p> <p>To Do: Bring a rough draft of your Reflective Narrative for Standard 2 for in-class peer editing.</p> <p>Assignment Due: Submit your Biography in Bb.</p> <p>Read: Chapter 7 & 8</p> |
| <p>Week #7 February 27</p> | <p>Computer Workshop Day NAEYC Standard 3 Discuss NAEYC Standard 3 Observing, Documenting and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families Understanding the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment Knowing about assessment partnerships with families and with professional colleagues Knowing about and using observation and other appropriate assessment tools and approaches Understanding and practicing responsible assessment to promote positive outcomes for each child.</p> <p>Possible Portfolio Artifacts for Standard 5: 1) observation, 2) assessment, 3) documentation, 4) choice.</p> <p>Assignment Due: Submit the Standard 2 Reflective Narrative in Bb.</p> |
| <p>Week #8 March 6</p> | <p>Cont. NAEYC Standard 3 Observing, Documenting and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families</p> <p>To Do: Bring a rough draft of your Reflective Narrative for Standard 3 for in-class peer editing.</p> <p>Assignment Due: Submit your parent newsletter/letter of introduction in Bb and submit it under Standard 2 in your electronic Portfolio as an artifact.</p> |
| <p>Week #9 March 13</p> | <p>Discuss: NAEYC Standard 4 Using Developmentally Effective Approaches to Connect with Children and Families Understanding positive relationships and supportive interactions as the foundation of their work with children Knowing and understanding effective strategies and tools for early education Using broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning approaches Reflecting on their own practice to promote positive outcomes for each child</p> <p>Portfolio Artifacts for Standard 4: 1) supporting play, 2) teaching through social interaction, 3) addressing challenging behaviors, 4) choice reflecting on your own practice.</p> <p>To Do:</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Describe a topic you would like to teach that links to what has been happening in your Practicum site this week. Brainstorm a lesson plan for the children in your Practicum site.</p> <p>Type lesson plan.</p> <p>Bring samples of lesson plans from your Practicum site as well as the one you developed for homework.</p> <p>Assignment Due: 1st Installment of Portfolio Due – Include your revised Reflective Narrative for Standards 6, 2 and 3. Publish the 1st Installment of the electronic portfolio. Required elements- Standard 6, 2, 3, Welcome Page, Biography, and Resume.</p> |
| <p>Week #10 March 20</p> | <p>Discuss: NAEYC Standard 5 Using Content Knowledge to Build Meaningful Curriculum Understanding content knowledge and resources in academic disciplines Knowing and using the central concepts inquiry tools and structures of content areas or academic disciplines. Using their own knowledge, appropriate early learning standards, and other resources to design implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curricula for each child. <i>Portfolio Artifacts for Standard 5:</i> 1) curriculum plan, 2) description of how your curriculum and lesson plans support self-regulation, problem-solving and thinking skills, as well as academic and social competence. 3) An annotated resource list of math and science websites for ECE teachers 4) your choice.</p> <p>To Do: Discuss your lesson plan with your mentor teacher. Plan for executing your lesson plan in your class. Bring: A rough draft of your reflective narratives for Standards 4 and 5 for in-class peer editing.</p> <p>Assignment Due: Philosophy Statement</p> |
| <p>Week #11 March 27</p> | <p>SPRING BREAK</p> |
| <p>Week #12 April 3</p> | <p>Cont. NAEYC Standard 5 Discuss the Midpoint Portfolios – Create a plan for improvement, using the returned rubrics. Assignment Due: Submit your Reflective Narratives for Standard 4 and 5 in Bb.</p> |
| <p>Week #13 April 10</p> | <p>Discuss: NAEYC Standard 1 Promoting Child Development and Learning Knowing and understanding young children’s characteristics and needs Knowing and understanding the multiple influences on development and learning Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive and challenging learning environments.</p> <p><i>Portfolio artifacts for Standard 1:</i> Based on what you know about child development 1) safe environment, 2). Respectful environment, 3) supportive environment, 4) choice something that describes your understanding of the multiple influences on child development (biology and environment).</p> <p>To Do: Write a rough draft of reflective narrative for Standard 1. List the artifacts you would like to include in your portfolio.</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Week #14 April 17 | Bring: The rough draft of your reflective narrative for Standard 1 to class for in-class peer editing. Cont. NAEYC Standard 1- Promoting Child Development and Learning Assignment Due: Submit the Standard 1 Reflective Narrative in Bb. |
| Week # 15 April 24 | Computer Workshop Assignment Due: Portfolios are due by Midnight – NO EXCEPTIONS!!!! |
| Week #16 May 1 | Healthy Foods Potluck and Celebration!!!! |

Key Assessment #5: Practicum Portfolio Rubric

| Standards | Exceeds Candidate demonstrates <i>outstanding</i> application of the standard | Meets Candidate demonstrates application of the standard | Does not meet Candidate <i>does not</i> demonstrate application of the standard |
|---|--|--|--|
| Standard 1: Promoting Child Development and Learning | 1a. Knowing and understanding young children's characteristics and needs | 1a. Knowing and understanding young children's characteristics and needs | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 1: Promoting Child Development and Learning | 1b. Knowing and understanding the multiple influences on development and learning | 1b. Knowing and understanding the multiple influences on development and learning | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 1: Promoting Child Development and Learning | 1c. Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive and challenging learning environments. | 1c. Using developmental knowledge to create healthy, respectful, supportive and challenging learning environments. | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 2: Building Family and Community Relationships | 2a. Knowing about and understanding diverse families and community characteristics | 2a. Knowing about and understanding diverse families and community characteristics | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 2: Building Family and Community Relationships | 2b. Supporting and engaging families and communities through respectful, reciprocal relationships. | 2b. Supporting and engaging families and communities through respectful, reciprocal relationships. | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 2: Building Family and Community | 2c. Involving families and communities in their children's | 2c. Involving families and communities in their children's | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Relationships | development and learning. | development and learning. | ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 3: Observing, Documenting and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families | 3a. Understanding the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment | 3a. Understanding the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 3: Observing, Documenting and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families | 3b. Knowing about & using observation, documentation, & other appropriate assessment tools & approaches | 3b. Knowing about & using observation, documentation, & other appropriate assessment tools & approaches | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 3: Observing, Documenting and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families | 3c. Understanding & practicing responsible assessment to promote positive outcomes for each child | 3c. Understanding & practicing responsible assessment to promote positive outcomes for each child | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 3: Observing, Documenting and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families | 3d. Knowing about assessment partnerships with families and with professional colleagues | 3d. Knowing about assessment partnerships with families and with professional colleagues | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 4: Using Developmentally Effective Approaches to Connect with Children & families | 4a. Understanding positive relationships and supportive interactions as the foundation of their work with children | 4a. Understanding positive relationships and supportive interactions as the foundation of their work with children | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 4: Using Developmentally Effective Approaches to Connect with Children & families | 4b. Knowing and understanding effective strategies and tools for early education | 4b. Knowing and understanding effective strategies and tools for early education | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 4: Using Developmentally Effective Approaches to Connect with Children & families | 4c. Using broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning | 4c. Using broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate teaching/learning | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this |

| | approaches | approaches | standard |
|--|--|--|---|
| Standard 4: Using Developmentally Effective Approaches to Connect with Children & families | 4d. Reflecting on their own practice to promote positive outcomes for each child | 4d. Reflecting on their own practice to promote positive outcomes for each child | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 5: Using Content Knowledge to Build Meaningful Curriculum | 5a. Understanding content knowledge and resources in academic disciplines | 5a. Understanding content knowledge and resources in academic disciplines | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 5: Using Content Knowledge to Build Meaningful Curriculum | 5b. Knowing and using the central concepts inquiry tools and structures of content areas or academic disciplines. | 5b. Knowing and using the central concepts inquiry tools and structures of content areas or academic disciplines. | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 5: Using Content Knowledge to Build Meaningful Curriculum | 5c. Using their own knowledge, appropriate early learning standards, and other resources to design implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curricula for each child. | 5c. Using their own knowledge, appropriate early learning standards, and other resources to design implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curricula for each child. | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 6: Becoming a Professional | 6a. Identifying and involving oneself with the early childhood field | 6a. Identifying and involving oneself with the early childhood field | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 6: Becoming a Professional | 6b. Knowing about and upholding ethical standards and other professional guidelines | 6b. Knowing about and upholding ethical standards and other professional guidelines | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 6: Becoming a | 6c. Engaging in continuous, | 6c. Engaging in continuous, | The portfolio does not provide |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Professional | collaborative, learning to inform practice. | collaborative, learning to inform practice. | adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 6: Becoming a Professional | 6d. Integrating knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives, on early education | 6d. Integrating knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives, on early education | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Standard 6: Becoming a Professional | 6e. Engaging in informed advocacy for children and the profession | 6e. Engaging in informed advocacy for children and the profession | The portfolio does not provide adequate examples of the candidate's ability to meet this standard |
| Supportive Skill #3: Written & Verbal skills | Write clearly and without any spelling, grammar, punctuation errors, or typos. | Write clearly with some errors in spelling, grammar, and punctuation, and/or typos that somewhat distract from the writing. | Errors are prominent and distract too much from the writing. |
| Supportive Skill #1: Self-assessment & self-advocacy | Write thoughtful and complete reflective narratives that demonstrate metacognitive awareness of the student's own work as it relates to the standards | Write thoughtful and complete reflective narratives that demonstrate knowledge of the standards | Reflective narratives do not provide adequate examples of this Supportive Skill |

Key Assessment #5 Practicum Portfolio Rubric
Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 data results

| Standards & Skills | Exceeds SP 2012 | Exceeds FA 2012 | Meets SP 2012 | Meets FA 2012 | Does not meet SP 2012 | Does not meet FA 2012 |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1a | 45% | 22.2% | 50% | 66.7% | 5% | 11.1% |
| 1b | 45% | 22.2% | 50% | 55.6% | 5% | 22.2% |
| 1c | 50% | 16.7% | 50% | 72.2% | 0% | 11.1% |
| 2a | 55% | 27.8% | 45% | 55.6% | 0% | 16.7% |
| 2b | 45% | 33.3% | 55% | 50% | 0% | 16.7% |
| 2c | 45% | 38.9% | 55% | 50% | 0% | 11.1% |
| 3a | 40% | 29.4% | 55% | 47.1% | 5% | 23.5% |
| 3b | 25% | 22.2% | 75% | 55.6% | 0% | 22.2% |
| 3c | 40% | 11.8% | 60% | 58.8% | 0% | 29.4% |
| 3d | 35% | 33.3% | 65% | 50% | 0% | 16.7% |
| 4a | 30% | 17.6% | 70% | 47.1% | 0% | 35.3% |
| 4b | 35% | 11.1% | 60% | 72.2% | 5% | 16.7% |
| 4c | 36.8% | 22.2% | 57.9% | 61.1% | 5.3% | 16.7% |
| 4d | 30% | 17.6% | 55% | 52.9% | 15% | 29.5% |
| 5a | 45% | 5.6% | 50% | 72.2% | 5% | 22.2% |
| 5b | 30% | 5.6% | 60% | 72.2% | 10% | 22.2% |
| 5c | 25% | 16.7% | 70% | 61.1% | 5% | 22.2% |
| 6a | 35% | 35.3% | 65% | 58.8% | 0% | 5.9% |
| 6b | 40% | 33.3% | 60% | 44.4% | 0% | 22.2% |
| 6c | 36.8% | 29.4% | 57.9% | 58.8% | 5.3% | 11.8% |
| 6d | 20% | 5.6% | 70% | 77.8% | 10% | 16.7% |
| 6e | 30% | 33.3% | 65% | 50.0% | 5% | 16.7% |
| SS3 | 40% | 16.7% | 55% | 77.8% | 5% | 5.6% |
| SS1 | 45% | 38.9% | 50% | 44.4% | 5% | 16.7% |
| Average | 38% | 23.75% | 58% | 57.08% | 2% | 19.18% |

Spring 2012 Practicum Portfolio Rubric results

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/swbcam432792is8/Practicum%20Portfolio%20results%20Spring%202012.xls>

Fall 2012 Practicum Portfolio Rubric results

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/kr704548mao6s1b/Practicum%20Portfolio%20results%20Fall%202012.xls>

c.1) EVIDENCE CHART

Key Assessment 6: Philosophy Rubric

Briefly describe the assignment and list the courses that use this assignment:

CD 120, 258, and 259 use this assignment. Students are asked to write their personal philosophy of Early Childhood Education. They must incorporate a description of their strengths and an explanation of how they would support Cultural, Linguistic, and Ability Diversity in their own practice. Finally, they describe how they will use their philosophy in the future.

Place a check or X under the NAEYC Standards and Supportive Skills assessed through this activity

STD = standards 1-6, SS = Supportive Skill 1-5

| STD1 | STD2 | STD3 | STD4 | STD5 | STD6 | SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | SS5 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| X | X | | X | | X | X | | X | | |

Briefly summarize candidate performance data from this key assessment. If your program has not yet collected data from this key assessment, explain why.

According to the data results from both semesters, the biggest challenge for students is 2a "knowing about and understanding diverse family and community characteristics". In the philosophy paper students describe their philosophy about early childhood education practice including how teachers should support cultural, linguistic, and ability diversity in an early childhood setting. In both the spring 2012 and the fall 2012 data sets, 30.4% and 44.9% of students did not meet the standard on this criterion. In the spring data set, SS3 (writing) was equally challenging as 30.4% of students did not meet the standard.

The emerging rating showed an interesting trend in the fall data set, which includes 28.6% emerging for standard 2a. That figure combined with the 44.9% "does not meet" rating indicates that 73.5% of students in the fall 2012 data set either do not meet, or are emerging in their skills related to standard 2a in the philosophy paper. The spring data set was similar in that the "does not meet" rating was highest for standard 2a but the emerging rating was different with 39.1% rated emerging for standard 4d and SS1 (self-assessment, self-advocacy).

In terms of the "meets" rating, the two semesters both show strongest figures related to standard 6e with 73.9% meeting in the spring 2012 data set and 48.9% meeting in the fall 2012 data set. Although there is a difference between the two semesters, in both data sets 6e is the highest percentage of students rated as "meets".

Describe how data from this key assessment are being used to improve teaching and learning.

We have changed the assignment description for this assessment and we are now asking students to write and revise their philosophy across three courses including 120, 258, and 259. This is a new strategy, and we hope that it will allow students to make better use of instructor feedback and to participate fully in the process of writing several drafts of an important document. We hope that this will impress upon students that their philosophy should be a living document, and in fact, we are now asking students to describe how they will make use of their philosophy statement once they complete the program and move on.

Key Assessment #6: Philosophy: Assignment Description

This paper should be 2-4 pages in length, double-spaced, 12 size font and the normal margins. If you are under 2 pages, you probably have not addressed everything you need to address and if you go beyond 4 pages you are not being concise enough. I usually do not include page limits but I think 2-4 pages are reasonable for this. It should be short and very clear. Don't make the reader read between the lines! Spell it out for the reader so whoever reads this, gets a very clear idea of what you believe about Early Childhood Education and how you plan to live your professional life guided by your philosophy.

Philosophy Statement: Write your philosophy of Early Childhood Education. The goals for the statement are below:

- The statement clearly articulates a philosophy that is personal & considers the multiple influences on early development and learning.
- The statement incorporates several ideas about children's development, learning and dispositions.
- The writer describes in detail what s/he brings to the profession in order to promote positive outcomes for each child.
- The statement includes a clear vision of a future application of the personal philosophy.
- The statement includes a clear vision for how differences will be supported; a vision for how you plan to support Cultural, Linguistic, and Ability Diversity (CLAD).
- With careful proof-reading and editing, the writing should be excellent as this statement reflects who you are as a developing professional in this field and what you believe is best for young children. It should be clear and concise with zero spelling errors and typos.

Please use the following headings in your paper:

Title: **My Philosophy of Early Childhood Education**

1. **The Role of an Early Childhood Teacher** (Based on what you have learned in your coursework and in your personal experiences, what kind of teacher should an ECE teacher be? What theories and approaches to ECE have most inspired you and how have those theories and approaches influenced your vision of a good early childhood teacher?)
2. **The Role of the Young Child** (Based on what you have learned in your coursework and your personal experiences, how do young children learn best? What qualities/dispositions do you want to support as children develop and grow? What approaches to ECE have most inspired you to think differently about young children and how have those theories and approaches influenced your vision of what a young child is and how a young child develops and learns?).

3. **My Strengths and How I Plan to Support Positive Outcomes for Each Child** (This is where you can describe your own strengths as a practitioner in the field or as a student of Child Development, and how you can use your strengths to support young children as they develop and grow).
4. **How I plan to Support all Children in my Care** (This is where you can describe how you will welcome all children, how you will celebrate diversity and honor each child and their family, and how you will make accommodations in order to support children with special needs).
5. **How I plan to live by my Philosophy** (This is where you can describe what inspires you most in our field, and how you plan to actually make use of this philosophy. Will you keep it and read it from time to time? Do you plan to review it regularly and revise it as needed? What are the next steps you can do to make sure you are guided by your own philosophy? What more do you need to learn to keep growing professionally?)

If you use the headings above and you are clear and concise in your writing, this will be a very strong document!

Look at the rubric to see how I will be grading it and you will see that the headings include each section of the rubric, which will help you to make sure you have included everything in the statement that the assignment requires. The website below might also help you to think through each section of your philosophy.

http://www.ehow.com/how_8155668_write-philosophy-early-childhood-education.html

Key Assessment #6 Philosophy Rubric

| Standards | Meets | Emerging | Does not Meet |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1b. Knowing and understanding the multiple influences on early development and learning. | The statement clearly articulates a philosophy that is personal & considers the multiple influences on early development and learning. | The statement partially articulates a philosophy that is personal and includes at least one influence on early development and learning. | The statement does not articulate a personal philosophy. |
| Philosophy: 6d. Integrating knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives on early education. | This statement is clearly based on historical perspectives. | This statement is partially based on historical perspectives. | This statement is not based on historical perspectives. |
| 1a Knowing and understanding young children's characteristics and needs | The statement incorporates several ideas about children's development, learning and dispositions. | The statement incorporates some ideas about children's development, learning and dispositions | The statement does not incorporate ideas about children's development, learning or dispositions. |
| Personal Experiences: 4d. Reflecting on own practice to promote positive outcomes for each child. SS 1: Self-assessment and self-advocacy. | The writer describes in detail what s/he brings to the profession in order to promote positive outcomes for each child. | The writer describes in partial detail what s/he brings to the profession in order to promote positive outcomes for each child. | The writer does not describe what s/he brings to the profession. |
| Vision for the future: 6e. Engaging in informed advocacy for young children and the early childhood profession. | The statement includes a clear vision of a future application of the personal philosophy. | The statement includes a partial vision of a future application of the personal philosophy. | The vision for the future is vague or nonexistent. |
| Approach to Cultural, Linguistic, and Ability Diversity: 1a Knowing about and understanding young children's characteristics and needs from birth through age 8. | The statement includes a clear vision for how differences will be supported. | The statement includes a partial vision for how differences will be supported. | The statement does not include anything about differences. |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| SS3 Written and verbal skills | The writing has been carefully edited. There are less than 5 writing errors. | There are between 6-10 writing errors. The paper would have benefited from another edit. | There are several writing errors. This distracts from the work. |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|

Key Assessment #6: Philosophy Rubric Data results

Spring 2012 Data: KA #6: Philosophy

| Standards & Skills | Meets SP 2012 | Meets FA 2912 | Emerging SP 2012 | Emerging FA 2012 | Does not meet SP 2012 | Does not meet FA 2012 |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1b | 56.5% | 51.0% | 34.8% | 24.5% | 8.7% | 24.5% |
| 6d | 56.5% | 40.8% | 34.8% | 28.6% | 8.7% | 30.6% |
| 1a | 73.9% | 46.9% | 17.4% | 22.4% | 8.7% | 30.6% |
| 4d | 47.8% | 46.9% | 39.1% | 14.3% | 13% | 38.8% |
| SS1 | 47.8% | 46.9% | 39.1% | 14.3% | 13% | 38.8% |
| 6e | 73.9% | 48.9% | 17.4% | 8.5% | 8.7% | 42.6% |
| 2a CLAD | 43.5% | 26.5% | 26.1% | 28.6% | 30.4% | 44.9% |
| SS3 | 43.5% | 55.1% | 26.1% | 22.4% | 30.4% | 22.4% |

Spring 2012

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/a0p0f7fv0o2j6ac/Philosophy%20Rubric%20results%20Spring%202012.xls>

Fall 2012

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/kr704548mao6s1b/Practicum%20Portfolio%20results%20Fall%202012.xls>

HWC Child Development Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning

For all programs, a two-to-four page narrative reviewing your program's candidate assessment system, strengths, challenges and plans.

We administer all 6 key assessments every semester, which address the key elements of the six standards as well as all five of the supportive skills. At the beginning of the semester, when instructors are assigned their faculty partner, all instructors are reminded of the assessment plan for the program. Faculty partners help each other to plan for, and administer assessments. The Assessment Coordinator assures that all instructors are given consistent and current information regarding the assessment plan. Every semester, the topics of conversation among instructors include ideas about how best to support student learning, and how to organize the assessment collection system. We report to our Advisory Council twice per year and as stated in this report, the Council has helped us to think through the merits of the Lesson Plan Analysis rubric, for example. In addition, Child Development instructors at HWC are heavily involved in the institutional assessment process. As such, they are able to bring current assessment scholarship into the conversations about planning, administration, analysis, and application of assessment information.

The data collected every year provide rich information about student learning in our program. There are strengths in many areas including in our students' abilities to write reflections about their experiences; to observe child development and recognize characteristics of young children; to use appropriate assessment tools, and to document what they have observed. Based on the data findings, it seems that skills such as reflection that are introduced early in the program and practiced through many subsequent courses are stronger. This is encouraging as reflective practice was a specific skill we identified in our first data collection process as an area for improvement. We made a concerted effort to build-in opportunities for students to learn this skill across all of our courses and this seems to have been an effective strategy. We have started to move in this direction with the philosophy paper and the practicum portfolio and initial findings are promising. The planning as we move forward will definitely include strategic structuring of the skills we want to see in the capstone, plotted intentionally throughout each course.

The data confirm what we already knew anecdotally, but also from recent institutional assessment data on effective writing – our students struggle with the ability to write clearly and effectively. This is immensely important to our program because we realize that even if our students understand all of the standards and key elements, that knowledge loses its power if the student cannot communicate it clearly to others. We know that if we can help our students with this skill during their time in our program, it will offer our students the opportunity to raise their professionalism; their ability to be advocates for the field; and most importantly, their ability to be advocates for young children and their families. The data findings will motivate us to continue the work we

started this year in collaboration with colleagues within the Applied Science Department; to improve student writing across all of our programs.

For the coming year, we are considering developing a new rubric, possibly replacing one of our key assessments, to assess students' teaching strategies during the practicum experience. Now that students are building their practicum portfolio earlier in the program we would like to shift the emphasis of the practicum work from portfolio building to a stronger emphasis on practice. The portfolio is still an important assignment to the Practicum course, but we would like to see the practicum semester as an opportunity to focus more time and energy on building their repertoire of effective teaching strategies as well as reflecting on their practice.

Criterion 3, Program of Studies, has dramatically changed since 2006. Based on formative assessment results over the years it was clear that we needed a more targeted approach to embedding the standards throughout the program of study. In 2010, it was decided that the ten core courses needed to be revised in order to reflect the revised NAEYC standards and supportive skills. In the City Colleges system, a major change to the course content means a lengthy revision and approval process. Child Development faculty representatives from all 6 colleges offering the program worked together to revise the courses, and then took the revisions through an extensive approval process. The six standards and supportive skills influenced the revision process and this is evident in the language of the course objectives, student learning outcomes and, in one case, the actual course title. In 2013, during the summer session, the newly revised syllabi will be offered across the District.

Through faculty curriculum meetings, it became clear that our students needed more direction and advising earlier in their academic journey in order to build skills as they move through the program. This is why the team also decided to change the prerequisites for some of the courses in order to create a more logical sequence. It also became clear that an application process would benefit students. The application process will begin during the fall 2013 semester. All of these changes were made possible because of the close work each faculty team has put into developing key assessments, collecting assessment data, and working together to try to understand what the data mean for student learning.

In terms of quality improvement, our departmental inquiry on student writing has been an intentional, targeted, initiative to learn more about student writing and to develop strategies for supporting writing improvement. The goal is to help all of our students improve their writing skills during their time in our classes. This includes the development of a writing rubric, which is not directly connected to the six standards, but is directly related to the supportive skills. We believe that in focusing on writing, students have the opportunity to improve their work across all 6 key assessments.

Innovative approaches in our program include the rich classroom experience provided across the program of study. This includes various field trips to world class museums in Chicago such as the Art Institute, the Field Museum, and the Chicago Children's Museum. It also includes specific approaches within our courses such as the critical friends model, which builds collaborative skills as well as self-assessment skills. It also includes a teacher research emphasis in two courses (201, 258) which allows students to use the skills we are teaching them such as observation and documentation and applying those skills to address a teacher research question. Finally, the Practicum Portfolio is innovative in many ways. It serves as an academic portfolio where students can reflect on past coursework. It also serves as a professional portfolio where students collect artifacts based on their own teaching strategies in the form of photos, video clips, and written reflections.

Harold Washington College has a strong culture of assessment. The institutional Assessment Committee is a faculty-driven group that meets weekly and annually collects, analyzes, and disseminates assessment information on student learning in general education. In 2013, Harold Washington College was awarded the prestigious CHEA award from Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

http://www.chea.org/news/NR_2013.01.22_Four%20HEs_CHEA_Award.htm

This year, as part of a new initiative, the Assessment Committee began to focus on departmental assessment. The Applied Science Department, including the Child Development program, is leading this initiative with the yearlong inquiry on student writing as mentioned above.

Then and Now

One of the most striking changes since 2006 is our program's use of technology to support student learning. In 2006, during the self-study process, it became clear to us that we needed to improve this resource for our instructors as well as students. At that time, we had one roll away cart that allowed us to show Power Point presentations and a TV cart with DVD and VHS player. At that time, it was difficult to conceive of requiring our students to regularly use online resources – mainly because we were concerned about students having equal access to the internet. Now, our students have access to computers in many different locations of the college including our child development lab classroom. We often schedule classes in the computer lab.

In 2013, we consistently offer many different opportunities for students to use and explore a variety of learning tools:

- All Child Development instructors use Blackboard (Bb). The minimum requirement is to store the syllabus on Bb, but many of our instructors use the quiz function, and discussion boards. They also post links to videos and websites, and organize scores and grades in the online gradebook.

- Students are required to take digital photos and video in order to learn various assessment and documentation skills.
- Students are required to develop an e-portfolio in the form of a website.
- Students are photographed and videotaped themselves in the college classroom, on field trips, and in the Practicum site. They are encouraged to use those images and video clips in their own reflections and in developing their portfolio.
- There are many online resources that students explore including tools for designing an early childhood space, lesson planning, and children's games.
- This year, through a grant, our department is receiving 60 iPads in two carts. Our goal is to use them with students so they can develop skills in using the various apps to support early learning in developmentally appropriate ways.
- Some of the instructors routinely Skype with their students as a method of ongoing advising.
- One instructor is exploring the flipped classroom model which uses course capture software to record lectures so students can watch lectures/presentations as homework, and then spend time during the class session to work on writing and other projects.
- Students routinely choose to purchase online versions of the required readings.
- Instructors are writing blogs and sharing them with students. Instructors are also assigning blogs and e-newsletters as required or optional readings.

These are just a few examples of how instructors and students are using technology in order to support student learning in the college classroom. All of them have developed in the last few years. This, of course, is a reflection of what has happened in our society but it is important to note that our program has made an effort to keep up with current trends in technology without giving up our core beliefs in developmentally appropriate practices for young children as well as adult learners.

Technology is important. Innovation is important. Change and growth are important. However, the change since 2006 that is more promising than all the others is the way Child Development faculty members have come together across the City Colleges District to work collaboratively in support of child development students from every neighborhood of the Chicago Metropolitan area. Faculty members from 6 different colleges spread out across the city, routinely come together in order to make curricular decisions. This is collaboration. We know this is an important skill for our students and by collaborating with each other, we offer a positive model for them. Increasingly, students are choosing to take classes across the different City Colleges. We know, based on our revision work, that they are receiving curricular consistency across the different programs. As time progresses, we are also seeing strong correlations among our 6 programs in terms of the learning opportunities we provide for our students. This connection with each other, makes each of our programs stronger and we hope to continue to build our program in this direction in partnership with our sister institutions.