

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of Elementary Education Teachers

2007 Standards

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Trinity (Washington) University, Washington, DC

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

08 / 01 / 2010

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Elementary Education

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

- jⁿ Yes
- jⁿ No
- jⁿ Not applicable
- jⁿ Not able to determine

Comment:

Passing scores were provided for three years for the overall Praxis II (0014) test; category scores (subscores by content area) were not provided.

Summary of Strengths:

A wide variety of excellent assessments was provided to document candidate competence. The report is well written, easily understood. A detailed analysis of each assessment was provided indicating that faculty examine the data to make decisions.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

DEVELOPMENT, LEARNING AND MOTIVATION

Standard 1.0. Development, Learning and Motivation. Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual students’ development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j ⁿ	j ⁿ	j ⁿ

Comment:

Information regarding Standard 1 is presented in assessments 3 (Instructional unit), 4 (student teacher evaluation), 5 (tutoring), 6 (video lesson), 7 (portfolio), and 8 (action research).

Assessment #3 is cited for addressing Standard 1. However, the alignment is with multiple (almost all) standards on one row of the data table/rubric which does not isolate Standard 1 data.

In assessment #4, two INTASC Principles are aligned to ACEI Standard 1. Over three years of data, all candidates meet or exceed expectations.

In assessment #5, data are not disaggregated by standard; therefore, it is not possible to determine whether or not Standard 1 is met or not met. With the passing scores all meeting or exceeding standards, one could assume that the standard is met.

Assessment #6 (video lesson) is cited as addressing Standard 1; however, it is not possible to determine this by the alignment presented on the data table.

For assessment #7 (portfolio), two INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard #1. Data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years. It is unclear how the portfolio specifically addresses all of the substandards under ACEI standards 2, 3, and 5.

For assessment #8 (action research), the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 1; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard. Because all candidates meet or exceed the standard, one is only able to assume that the standard is met. It is unclear how the case study specifically addresses all of the substandards under ACEI standards 2, 3, and 5.

CURRICULUM

Standard 2.1. Reading, Writing, and Oral Language. Candidates demonstrate a high level of competence in use of English language arts and they know, understand, and use concepts from reading, language and child development, to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Information regarding Standard 2.1 is presented in assessments 1 (required test), 2 (comprehensive exam), 3(instructional unit), 4 (student teacher evaluation), 5 (tutoring), 6 (video lesson), 7 (portfolio), and 8 (action research).

Assessments #1 and #2 are provided as evidence of candidates meeting standard 2.1. Because assessment #1 PRAXIS data are not disaggregated by categories, it is not possible to determine if candidates are meeting each of the four content areas of the test.

Because assessment #2 data are disaggregated by standard, the results shows clear evidence of meeting ACEI Standard 2.1.

The data table for Assessment #3 demonstrates that the assessment measures Standard 2.1. However, the alignment is with multiple (almost all) standards on one row of the data table/rubric which does not isolate the appropriate data.

For Assessment #4, one item relates to ACEI standard 2.1. Over three years of data, all candidates meet or exceed expectations.

Assessment #6 is cited as addressing Standard 2.1; however, it is not possible to determine this by the alignment presented on the data table.

For assessment #7, one row demonstrates that related INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard #2.1. Data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 2; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 2.1.

Standard 2.2. Science. Candidates know, understand, and use fundamental concepts of physical, life, and earth/space sciences. Candidates can design and implement age-appropriate inquiry lessons to teach science, to build student understanding for personal and social applications, and to convey the nature of science.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
-----	---------------------	---------

Comment:

Information regarding Standard 2.2 is presented in assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8.

Assessments #1 and #2 are provided as evidence of candidates meeting standard 2.2. Because assessment #1 PRAXIS data are not disaggregated by categories, it is not possible to determine if candidates are meeting each of the four content areas of the test.

Because assessment #2 data are disaggregated by standard, the results shows clear evidence of meeting ACEI Standard 2.2.

Assessment #3 aligns with Standard 2.2 on the data table to show candidates meeting or exceeding the standard.

For Assessment #4, one item relates to ACEI standard 2.2. Over three years of data, all candidates meet or exceed expectations.

For assessment #7, one row indicates that related INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard #2.2. Data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 2; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 2.2.

Standard 2.3. Mathematics. Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and procedures that define number and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and data analysis and probability. In doing so they consistently engage problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication, connections, and representation.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

Comment:

Information regarding Standard 2.3 is presented in assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8.

Assessment #1 is provided as evidence of candidates meeting standard 2.3. Because assessment #1 PRAXIS data are not disaggregated by categories, it is not possible to determine if candidates are meeting each of the four content areas of the test.

Assessments #2 and #3 show clear evidence of candidates meeting standard 2.3.

Assessment #3 aligns with Standard 2.3 on the data table to show candidates are meeting or exceeding the standard.

For Assessment #4, one item relates to ACEI standard 2.3. Over three years of data, all candidates meet or exceed expectations.

For assessment #7, one row indicates that related INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard #2.3. Data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 2; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 2.3.

Standard 2.4. Social studies. Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and modes of inquiry from the social studies—the integrated study of history, geography, the social sciences, and other related areas—to promote elementary students’ abilities to make informed decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse democratic society and interdependent world.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Information regarding Standard 2.4 is presented in assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8.

Assessments #1 is provided as evidence of candidates meeting standard 2.4. Because assessment #1 PRAXIS data are not disaggregated by categories, it is not possible to determine if candidates are meeting each of the four content areas of the test.

Because assessment #2 data are disaggregated by standard, the results shows clear evidence of meeting ACEI Standard 2.4.

Assessment #3 aligns with Standard 2.4 on the data table to show candidates meeting or exceeding the standard.

For Assessment #4, one item relates to ACEI standard 2.4. Over three years of data, all candidates meet or exceed expectations.

For assessment #7, one row indicates that related INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard #2.4. Data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 2; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 2.4.

Standard 2.5. The arts. Candidates know, understand, and use—as appropriate to their own understanding and skills—the content, functions, and achievements of the performing arts (dance, music, theater) and the visual arts as primary media for communication, inquiry, and engagement among elementary students.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Information regarding Standard 2.5 is presented in assessments 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8.

Because assessment #2 data are disaggregated by standard, the results shows clear evidence of meeting ACEI Standard 2.5.

Assessment #3 aligns with Standard 2.5 on the data table to show meeting or exceeding the standard.

For Assessment #4, one item relates to ACEI standard 2.5 Over three years of data, all candidates meet

or exceed expectations.

For assessment #7, one row indicates that related INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard #2.5. Data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 2; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 2.5.

Standard 2.6. Health education. Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts in the subject matter of health education to create opportunities for student development and practice of skills that contribute to good health.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Information regarding Standard 2.6 is presented in assessments 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8.

Because assessment #2 data are disaggregated by standard, the results shows clear evidence of meeting ACEI Standard 2.6.

Assessment #3 shows in the data table that the assessment measures Standard 2.6. However, the alignment is with multiple (almost all) standards on one row of the rubric which does not isolate the appropriate data.

For Assessment #4, one item relates to ACEI standard 2.6. Over three years of data, all candidates meet or exceed expectations.

For assessment #7, one row indicates that related INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard #2.6. Data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 2; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 2.6.

Standard 2.7. Physical education. Candidates know, understand, and use—as appropriate to their own understanding and skills—human movement and physical activity as central elements to foster active, healthy life styles and enhanced quality of life for elementary students.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Information regarding Standard 2.7 is presented in assessments 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8.

Assessment #3 shows in the data table that the assessment measures Standard 2.1. However, the alignment is with multiple (almost all) standards on one row of the rubric which does not isolate the appropriate data.

For Assessment #4, one item relates to ACEI standard 2.7 Over three years of data, all candidates meet or exceed expectations.

For assessment #7, one row indicates that related INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard #2.7. Data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 2; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 2.7.

INSTRUCTION

Standard 3.1. Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction. Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Information for Standard 3.1 is presented in assessments 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

The data tables are often designed to present performance across multiple standards. The resultant data cannot be used as evidence of successful candidate performance on individual standards or elements.

Assessment #3 aligns with Standard 3.1 on the data table to show meeting or exceeding the standard. For assessment #4, data for 3.1-3.5 are not disaggregated by standard; Therefore, it is not possible to ascertain whether or not standard 3.1 is met by this assessment.

In assessment #5, data are not disaggregated by standard; therefore, it is not possible to determine whether or not Standard 3.1 is met or not met. With the passing scores all meeting or exceeding standards, one could assume that the standard is met.

Assessment #6 is cited as addressing Standard 3.1; however, it is not possible to determine what standards are being addressed by the alignment presented on the data table.

For assessment #7, four INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard 3; however, they are not disaggregated by standard (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, or 3.5). Because data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years one could assume that standard 3.1 is met.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 3; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 3.1.

Standard 3.2. Adaptation to diverse students. Candidates understand how elementary students differ in their development and approaches to learning, and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Information for Standard 3.2 is presented in assessments 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Assessment #3 shows in the data table that the assessment measures Standard 3.2. However, the alignment is with multiple (almost all) standards on one row of the rubric which does not isolate the appropriate data.

For assessment #4, data for 3.1-3.5 are not disaggregated by standard; Therefore, it is not possible to ascertain whether or not standard 3.2 is met by this assessment.

In assessment #5, data are not disaggregated by standard; therefore, it is not possible to determine whether or not Standard 3.2 is met or not met. With the passing scores all meeting or exceeding standards, one could assume that the standard is met.

Assessment #6 is cited as addressing Standard 3.2; however, it is not possible to determine what standards are being addressed by the alignment presented on the data table.

For assessment #7, four INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard 3; however, they are not disaggregated by standard (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, or 3.5). Because data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years one could assume that standard 3.2 is met.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 3; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 3.2.

Standard 3.3. Development of critical thinking and problem solving. Candidates understand and use a variety of teaching strategies that encourage elementary students' development of critical thinking and problem solving.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

jñ

jñ

jñ

Comment:

Information for Standard 3.3 is presented in assessments 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Assessment #3 shows in the data table that the assessment measures Standard 2.1. However, the alignment is with multiple (almost all) standards on one row of the rubric which does not isolate the appropriate data.

For assessment #4, data for 3.1-3.5 are not disaggregated by standard; Therefore, the reviewer is not able to ascertain whether or not standard 3.3 is met by this assessment.

In assessment #5, data are not disaggregated by standard; therefore, it is not possible to determine whether or not Standard 3.3 is met or not met. With the passing scores all meeting or exceeding standards, one could assume that the standard is met.

Assessment #6 is cited as addressing Standard 3.3; however, it is not possible to determine what standards are being addressed by the alignment presented on the data table.

For assessment #7, four INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard 3; however, they are not disaggregated by standard (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, or 3.5). Because data indicate that all candidates meet or

exceed the standard for the past three years one could assume that standard 3.3 is met.

For assessment #8, the reviewer notes that the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 3; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 3.3.

Standard 3.4. Active engagement in learning. Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Information for Standard 3.4 is presented in assessments 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

For assessment #4, data for 3.1-3.5 are not disaggregated by standard; Therefore, it is not possible to ascertain whether or not standard 3.4 is met by this assessment.

For assessment #7, four INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard 3; however, they are not disaggregated by standard (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, or 3.5). Because data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years one could assume that standard 3.4 is met.

For assessment #8, the reviewer notes that the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 3; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 3.4.

Standard 3.5. Communication to foster collaboration. Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the elementary classroom.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Information for Standard 3.5 is presented in assessments 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

For assessment #4, data for 3.1-3.5 are not disaggregated by standard; Therefore, it is not possible to ascertain whether or not standard 3.5 is met by this assessment.

For assessment #7, four INTASC principles are aligned to ACEI standard 3; however, they are not disaggregated by standard (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, or 3.5). Because data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed the standard for the past three years one could assume that standard 3.5 is met.

For assessment #8, the reviewer notes that the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 3; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 3.5.

ASSESSMENT

Standard 4.0. Assessment for instruction. Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

Information for Standard 4.0 is presented in assessments 3, 4, 5, and 8.

Assessment #3 aligns with Standard 4.0 on the data table to show meeting or exceeding the standard.

For assessment #4, data indicate that all candidates meet or exceed expectations.

In assessment #5, data are not disaggregated by standard; therefore, it is not possible to determine whether or not Standard 4 is met or not met. With the passing scores all meeting or exceeding standards, one could assume that the standard is met.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 4; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 4. Because all candidates meet or exceed the standard, one could assume that the standard is met.

PROFESSIONALISM

Standard 5.1. Professional growth, reflection, and evaluation. Candidates are aware of and reflect on their practice in light of research on teaching, professional ethics, and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, families and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jñ	jñ	jñ

Comment:

Information for Standard 5.1 is presented in assessments 4, 6, 7, and 8.

For assessment #4, data for 5.1 and 5.2 are not disaggregated; therefore, it is not possible to ascertain whether standard 5.1 is met. However, the old ACEI 5.1 and 5.2 standards are now combined into the new ACEI standard 5.1. in the future this could, then, be aligned to 5.1

In assessment #5, data are not disaggregated by standard; therefore, it is not possible to determine whether or not Standard 5.1 is met or not met.

Assessment #6 is cited as addressing Standard 5.1; however, it is not possible to determine what standards are being addressed by the alignment presented on the data table.

For assessment #8, the reviewer notes that the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 5; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 5.1.

Standard 5.2. Collaboration with families, colleagues, and community agencies. Candidates know the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive collaborative relationship with families, school colleagues, and agencies in the larger community to promote the intellectual, social, emotional, physical growth and well-being of children.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Information for Standard 5.2 is presented in assessments 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Assessment #3 aligns with the old ACEI standard 5.3 (new 5.2) on the data table to show meeting or exceeding the standard.

For assessment #4, data for 5.1 and 5.2 are not disaggregated; therefore, it is not possible to ascertain whether standard 5.2 is met, nor can it be assured that the 5.1 and 5.2 are met and therefore represent 5.1 in the new standards.

In assessment #5, data are not disaggregated by standard; therefore, it is not possible to determine whether or not Standard 5.1 is met or not met.

Assessment #6 is cited as addressing Standard 5.2; however, it is not possible to determine what standards are being addressed by the alignment presented on the data table.

For assessment #8, the description of the assessment presents an alignment to Standard 5; however, the data are not disaggregated by standard to show evidence of meeting Standard 5.2.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Candidate's content knowledge is primarily addressed with Assessments #1 and #2. Data for Assessment #1 are not disaggregated by content areas (2.1-2.4) which makes it difficult for the reviewers to determine whether or not candidates know the content knowledge. A new assessment #2 is a comprehensive examination which clearly covers ACEI standards 2.1-2.7. Two years of data are provided. Where other assessments are used, multiple standards are aligned to elements of the rubrics which makes determining evidence for specifically meeting the content standards (2.1-2.7) difficult. In the future, the program must modify rubrics and data charts so that they are aligned with specific standards.

C.2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Assessments 3, 4, 6, and 7 address candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge and skills. These include an instructional unit, the student teaching evaluation, video lessons, and a portfolio. Each is a well developed assessment. However, because the rubrics are designed to evaluate performance across multiple standards in some cases, the resultant data cannot be used as evidence of successful candidate performance on individual standards or elements. In future reports, the rubrics (and resulting data charts) must be modified so that they are aligned with specific standards.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

Candidate effect on student learning is assessed by a tutoring project and an action research project. Both are robust activities in which candidates examine what students need, what is to be taught, teach it, and analyze the results in terms of student learning. However, because the rubrics are designed to evaluate performance across multiple standards in some cases, the resultant data cannot be used as evidence of successful candidate performance on individual standards or elements. In future reports, the rubrics (and resulting data charts) must be modified so that they are aligned with specific standards.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

Trinity created a comprehensive examination to address ACEI standards 2.1-2.7 when they realized that the PRAXIS scores did not provide disaggregated data by content area. An examination of other assessments where most candidates do very well has led the faculty to a review of content, pacing, and assessments to see if they are valid assessments of candidate's growth, development, knowledge, and skills. Faculty combined two courses into one and added a strong field component to it.

Additional evidence suggested that it wasn't clear that candidates knew how to differentiate instruction to address the needs of second language learners, students with special needs, and students who were not engaged. Conversations led to a revision of the conceptual framework "to focus preparation on meeting the needs of each child, increasing collaboration within and between programs, and seeking support and resources to experiment with an alternative method for preparing elementary teachers with much greater attention to field-based learning."

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

In many cases, data are aligned to multiple standards, not allowing the institution to make clear decisions about an individual standard.

In future submissions the rubrics must also be modified so that they are aligned/realigned to the 2007 ACEI standards to assure that the wording in the elements of the rubrics aligns with the language of the ACEI standards. Once the realignment is made, the institution must assure themselves that all standards are met.

PRAXIS data should be requested by category scores to assure alignment with the ACEI standards.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

PART G - DECISIONS

Decision:

jm **Program is nationally recognized.** The program is recognized through the semester and year of the institution's next NCATE accreditation decision in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted before that review. The program will be listed as nationally recognized through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the semester of the next NCATE accreditation decision, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation. *Please note that once a program has been nationally recognized, it may not submit a revised report addressing any unmet standards or other concerns cited in the recognition report.*

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.