**Sinclair Community College - Continuous Improvement Annual Update 2011-12**

**Program:** **Early Childhood Education (ECE)**

**Section I: Trend Data**

* 1. **Program Trend Data– Please include the three most recent years of data in each area so that trends may be examined.**
     1. **Course Success Rates – Please report the course success rates for:**
        1. **Highest enrollment courses:**
* ECE 101, *Introduction to Early Childhood Education*:
  + Seat count (success and non-success combined) in ECE 101 continues a general trend of increasing.

**Yr Seat Count**

* + - 08-09 174
    - 09-10 211
    - 10-11 190
  + Success rates have been

**Yr Success Rate**

* + - 08-09 75%
    - 09-10 72%
    - 10-11 65%
* ECE 150, *The Young Child*
  + Seat count (success and non-success combined) in ECE 150 has been steadily rising the past 3 years

**Yr Seat Count**

* + - 08-09 136
    - 09-10 140
    - 10-11 152
  + Success rates

**Yr Seat Count**

* + - 08-09 73%
    - 09-10 77%
    - 10-11 74%
      1. **Any courses that deviate - high and low - from the typical success rate for your department**

When viewed over a 3- or 5- year period, there are no outliers for success rates. The overall success rate for ECE courses has been extremely constant:

**Yr Average ECE Success Rate**

* 08-09 82.27%
* 09-10 81.74%
* 10-11 82.65%

Unsurprisingly, the required introductory course, ECE 101, has the lowest success rate, with a five year range of 62% to 77 %.

* + 1. **Degree and certificate completion (where applicable)**

**ECE Associate Degree**

* 08-09 31
* 09-10 30
* 10-11 34

**ECE Certificate**

* 08-09 12
* 09-10 17
* 10-11 8

**Infant Toddler Short Term Certificate**

* 08-09 1
* 09-10 1
* 10-11 1
  + 1. **Any additional data that illustrates what is going on in the program (examples might include course sequence completion, retention, demographic data, data on placement of graduates, graduate survey data, etc.)**

Percentage of ECE graduates obtaining employment in early childhood education field continues to be extremely high – at or near 100% employment over the last five years.

* 1. **Interpretation and Analysis of Trend Data Included in the Section Above *Suggestions of questions that might be addressed in this section:***

Given the rigor of ECE courses, the average ECE course success rate of 82% for the past three years is quite good, and reflects well upon the quality of the teaching within the ECE program.

It is not surprising that the introductory course, ECE 101, trends lower. Some students self-select into the Early Childhood Education on the presumption that ECE will not be as challenging as other degree programs.

The data indicates a continued demand for the ECE degree, with modest increases in students over a five year period. We expect this trend to continue given the increased licensing requirements for child care professionals and teachers in pre-schools accredited by the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services. Conversely, the demand for certificates is waning for the same reasons. Accordingly the ECE Certificate and the Infant/Toddler Short-Term Certificate will not be continued under the semester ECE program.

To encourage the further growth of ECE degree seeking students, the ECE program is working closely with Terry Riley, Miami Valley Tech Prep Coordinator, to improve our connections with area high school ECE and EDU programs. As part of that effort, we have undertaken the following actions (among other things):

* An ECE Adjunct Faculty member, Nancy Sikora, has been retained to serve as a liaison between Sinclair and the high school ECE Tech Prep teachers.
* We have brought the Miami Valley Tech Prep teachers to Sinclair for working meetings wherein we agreed upon improved evaluation techniques.
* A variety of evaluation instruments are being designed to replace a poorly drafted single exam currently in use.
* Curriculum materials are being made available to MV Tech Prep teachers by given them access to Sinclair Angel Shell.

Finally, the percentage of ECE graduates obtaining employment in early childhood education field continues to be extremely high – at or near 100% employment annually over the last five years. This high placement rate is an indicator of reputation of the SCC ECE degree program. The high placement rate is also an indicator that demand for the ECE degree program will remain strong.

**Section II: Progress Since the Most Recent Review**

1. What was the fiscal year of the most recent Program Review for this program? (The most recent Program Review self-study can be found at <http://www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/vpi/pdreview/> ). 2006-2007
2. Briefly summarize the goals that were listed in Section IV part E of the most recent Program Review Self-Study (this section of the Self-Study asks “What are the department’s/program’s goals and rationale for expanding and improving student learning, including new courses, programs, delivery formats and locations”)?

* Identify and gather program data for analysis.
* Develop ECE 101 Introduction to Early Childhood Education into a hybrid course. This will be the program’s first step to on-line course availability.
* Develop an advising block for Education majors. This advising block will guide them through their course selection and establish their “home-base” department.
* Complete necessary requirements for the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Accreditation for two- year Early Childhood Education programs. This is a newly established (2005), highly respected national accreditation

1. What Recommendations for Action were made by the review team to the most recent Program Review?

* Improve documentation of actual program outcomes attainment to demonstrate that data-guided results are used to focus improvements.
* Encourage completion of certificates as well as degree programs by listing both on students’ programs of studies in Colleague.
* Develop a formal process to track graduates:
  + Consider ways to incorporate elements of this into the capstone course(s).
  + Consider ways to engage graduates two or three years post completion.
  + Explore methods of internal marketing to encourage students to respond to surveys.
* Work with the full- and part-time faculty to help them make explicit connections between courses and measurable general education outcomes to improve assessment practices.
* Create a process to develop, sustain, and improve the quality of course delivery by part-time faculty members.
* Explore ways to increase the diversity of full-time faculty in these programs.
* Continue development of “seamless pathway” approaches by pursuing possible tech prep and/or other high school articulation opportunities in addition to exploring prior learning assessment/proficiency prospects for students.
* Continue to work toward accreditation of the Early Childhood Education program by the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

1. Have the goals in your self-study changed since your last Program Review Self-Study as a result of the Review Team recommendations or for any other reason?  If so, please describe the changes.

The current goals of the ECE program emerged as the result of a number of initiatives and transitions. These include the revision of program outcomes and development of new courses, sequence of the semester curriculum in alignment with a pedagogical philosophical shift. Other factors include the increased number of courses taught by part-time faculty as well as a renewed interest in associate degree programs in early childhood education by the Ohio Department of Education. These are viewed as well through the lens of the retirement of several long-time faculty members.

**Current Goals:**

* Continue development of “seamless pathway” approaches through tech prep articulation opportunities as well as articulation agreements with additional four year institutions.
* Complete re-accreditation process as a semester program for the Ohio Department of Education pre-kindergarten associate license.
* Develop and implement a process of assessment of student professional dispositions that will be used all ECE faculty and part-time instructors to support the student.
* Provide in-service and training to all part-time instructors to insure consistency in course instruction and adherence to the philosophy of the program, department and college policies and procedures.
* Establish a protocol that will enable the program to weather transitions with upcoming retirements of two of the remaining three full-time ECE faculty.

**Progress made toward meeting any of the goals listed in the sections above (b, c, and d) in the past year**

* ***Identify and gather program data for analysis***.

The nature of the goals listed and actions taken are not of the type amenable to statistical analysis.

* ***Develop ECE 101 Introduction to Early Childhood Education into a hybrid course. This will be the program’s first step to on-line course availability*.**

Resources were not available to develop this course into a hybrid course. Other Sinclair courses were identified as higher priorities so this was tabled

* ***Develop an advising block for Education majors. This advising block will guide them through their course selection and establish their “home-base” department.***

Initial meetings with Math and Science departments were held to discuss development of EDU degree for transfer students in education. This was tabled due to conversion to semesters and will be re-visited when semester courses begin.

* ***Complete necessary requirements for the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Accreditation for two- year Early Childhood Education programs. This is a newly established (2005), highly respected national accreditation***

This was investigated. However, the Ohio Department of Education reaccreditation for the pre-kindergarten associate degree license was a higher priority. It was recognized that all of the work, self-study, etc. would be much of the legwork for the NAEYC accreditation. It was also recognized that with the conversion to semesters, the application for the quarter program would be irrelevant. This can be re-visited once we are at least through 1-2 years of the semester program due to the need for program assessment data required in the accreditation process.

**Recommendations for Action made by the review team to the most recent Program Review**

* ***Improve documentation of actual program outcomes attainment to demonstrate that data-guided results are used to focus improvements.***

At the time of the last department review the ECE faculty was in the process of developing an ECE 281 evaluation tool based upon the revised program outcomes. This tool was piloted spring 2007 and fully implemented summer 2007. Triangulated data from this evaluation tool, collected from the student, cooperating teacher and faculty supervisor, is utilized for program assessment. This tool was piloted spring 2007 and fully implemented Summer 2007. All program review reports have reported the comprehensive results of this analysis.

* **Encourage completion of certificates as well as degree programs by listing both on students’ programs of studies in Colleague**.

This has been completed.

* ***Develop a formal process to track graduates:***
  + ***Consider ways to incorporate elements of this into the capstone course(s).***
  + ***Consider ways to engage graduates two or three years post completion.***
  + ***Explore methods of internal marketing to encourage students to respond to surveys.***

This is an going target that will be addressed in the coming academic year.

* ***Work with the full- and part-time faculty to help them make explicit connections between courses and measurable general education outcomes to improve assessment practices*.**

The ECE Program continues to work closely with full- and part- time faculty to help faculty visualize the overall program, and the manner in which individual courses and course outcomes serve overall program goals. This emphasis allows ECE faculty to connect course outcomes with program outcomes in their curriculum design. Moreover, classroom observations by the Department Chair, Robbin Hoopes, have documented that ECE faculty routinely reference for their students when they have, or will be, learning necessary skills, providing students with an overarching coherence of the ECE curriculum.

* ***Create a process to develop, sustain, and improve the quality of course delivery by part-time faculty members***.

The following components have been put into place to ensure that the program sustains the quality of ECE course delivery by part-time faculty:

* + For each part-time faculty, the following are maintained in their file as indicators of teaching effectiveness:
    - Course evaluations
    - Written student comments
    - Notes of oral student comments
  + Part-time faculty receive feedback from the CFE Dept. Chair via one-on-one meetings and/or email, depending upon the nature of the feedback.
  + Full-time ECE faculty participate in the hiring process of new part-time faculty, which includes:
    - Resume review
    - Interview
    - Determination of which classes are appropriate for new faculty
  + Part-time faculty are mentored by full-time faculty, according to SCC’s mentoring process, if he or she is newly-hired; and/or teaching a course for the first time.
* ***Explore ways to increase the diversity of full-time faculty in these programs.***

Three full-time ECE faculty have retired since the last department review. None of these positions were replaced. Therefore, no opportunity to increase diversity existed. An additional retirement by an ECE faculty will occur academic year 2011-2012. This position will be replaced. Appropriate consideration will be to increasing diversity in filling this position. There has always been a priority on increasing diversity among part-time instructors.

* ***Continue development of “seamless pathway” approaches by pursuing possible tech prep and/or other high school articulation opportunities in addition to exploring prior learning assessment/proficiency prospects for students.***

To encourage the further growth of ECE degree seeking students, the ECE program is working closely with Terry Riley, Miami Valley Tech Prep Coordinator, to improve our connections with area high school ECE and EDU programs. As part of that effort, we have undertaken the following actions (among other things):

* + An ECE Adjunct Faculty member, Nancy Sikora, has been retained to serve as a liaison between Sinclair and the high school ECE Tech Prep teachers.
  + We have brought the Miami Valley Tech Prep teachers to Sinclair for working meetings wherein we agreed upon improved evaluation techniques.
  + A variety of evaluation instruments are being designed to replace a poorly drafted single exam currently in use.
  + Curriculum materials are being made available to MV Tech Prep teachers by given them access to Sinclair Angel Shell.
  + Our Tech Prep articulation has been modified such that:
    - Miami Valley Tech Prep students who successfully their early childhood education tech prep program receives full credit for ECE 101, ECE 106 & ECE 297; and
    - Credit for ECE 111, 112, & 113 is awarded to Tech Prep students who present the necessary documentation from the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services certifying they have completed the necessary specialized training while in high school.
  + The Tech Prep articulation is being revised currently to adjust to the semester conversion.
* ***Continue to work toward accreditation of the Early Childhood Education program by the National Association for the Education of Young Children.***

See earlier statement made regarding accreditation by National Association for the Education of Young Children.

**Section III: Assessment of Outcomes**

The Program Outcomes for this program are listed below. **At least one-third of your program outcomes must be assessed as part of this Annual Update, and across the next three years all of these program outcomes must be assessed at least once**.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Early Childhood Education Program Outcomes | In which courses are these program outcomes addressed? | Which of these program outcomes were assessed during the last fiscal year?  Program outcomes that were addressed in previous years are indicated. | Assessment Methods  Used |
| PO #1  *Utilize critical thinking skills to apply knowledge of child development and learning.* | ECE 281 | X | Performance Appraisal Evaluation from student, faculty and cooperating teacher |
| PO #2  *Identify resources and apply techniques for building diverse family and community relationships* | ECE 281 | X | Performance Appraisal Evaluation from student, faculty and cooperating teacher |
| PO #3  *Observe, document, and assess children’s development and learning.* | ECE 281 | X | Performance Appraisal Evaluation from student, faculty and cooperating teacher |
| PO #4  *Plan and implement developmentally appropriate curriculum..* | ECE 281 | X | Performance Appraisal Evaluation from student, faculty and cooperating teacher |
| PO #5  *Demonstrate professionalism* | ECE 281 | X | Performance Appraisal Evaluation from student, faculty and cooperating teacher |
| PO #6  *Demonstrate self-assessment and self-advocacy skills* | ECE 281 | X | Performance Appraisal Evaluation from student, faculty and cooperating teacher |
| PO #7  *Demonstrate skills in making connections between prior knowledge/experience and learning.* | ECE 281 | X | Performance Appraisal Evaluation from student, faculty and cooperating teacher |

1. For the assessment methods listed in the table above, what were the results?

The ECE assessment instrument was utilized with the capstone course for the ECE program: ECE 281 Student teaching II for winter 2011, spring, 2011, summer, 2011 and fall, 2011. A performance appraisal evaluation was completed at the midterm and at the end of the quarter. This performance appraisal provides assessment data based on the ECE program outcomes (see Appendix A). The data is collected from three sources: student teacher, cooperating teacher and Sinclair faculty. The performance appraisal includes an associated list of performance sub skills. All sub skills are measurable. A rubric is used to assess quality of performance (see Appendix B). All program outcomes are measured annually and informally reviewed by Sinclair faculty. The focus for academic year 2011 was program outcomes 1, 2, and 3. The data for these three outcomes is provided in this report in Tables 1-3.

The total N response was: Student Teachers (22), Cooperating Teachers (22) and Sinclair Faculty (3). Data was organized by quarters and response group. Mean values and ranges were calculated using the rubric rating. This data is available in Table 1. Data was also reviewed based on documented evidence coded as “Demonstrated”, “Spoken” and “Written”. Comments were also collected from each response group. Data was also available related to the frequency with which each skill was performed, e.g***. (1) rarely performed, (2) sometimes performed and (3) performed daily.***

Data was collected for program outcome 1 for winter, spring, summer and fall 2011. The results from all respondents indicated the ratings for ECE 281 Student Teachers for all quarters ranged from a 2-4 with a mean of 3.4. Student Teachers rated themselves a mean of 3.6 with a range of 2-4. Cooperating Teachers rated Student Teachers a mean of 3.5 with a range of 2-4. Sinclair Faculty rated Student teachers a mean of 3.13 with a range of 2-4.

Data was collected for program outcome 2 for winter, spring, summer and fall 2011. The results from all respondents indicated the ratings for ECE 281 Student Teachers for all quarters ranged from a 2-4 with a mean of 3.4. Student Teachers rated themselves a mean of 3.6 with a range of 2-4. Cooperating Teachers rated Student Teachers a mean of 3.5 with a range of 2-4. Sinclair Faculty rated Student teachers a mean of 3.15 with a range of 2-4. It should be noted that sub skill 2A “Follows individualized service plans was most frequently indicated as “not applicable”.

Data was collected for program outcome 3 for winter, spring, summer and fall 2011. The results from all respondents indicated the ratings for ECE 281 Student Teachers for all quarters ranged from a 2-4 with a mean of 3.2. Student Teachers rated themselves a mean of 3.6 with a range of 2-4. Cooperating Teachers rated Student Teachers a mean of 3.5 with a range of 2-4. Sinclair Faculty rated Student teachers a mean of 3.4 with a range of 2-4. Sinclair Faculty also allotted the highest number of “not applicable” to the majority of sub skills; Cooperating Teachers allocated the second highest number of “not applicable” to some of these sub skills.

The ratings of each of these program outcomes exceed the minimum criteria of a rating of 2.0 (equivalent to the letter grade “C” to meet the requirements to successfully pass the capstone course. It should also be noted for outcomes 4-7, an informal analysis indicated none fell below 2.0.

1. Were changes planned as a result of the data? If so, what were those changes?

Changes planned from last year’s assessment report included a possible modification of assignments required for the course that could be used as documentation. This was the rationale for repeating an analysis of Program Outcome 3. This was specifically related to Program Outcome 3 sub skills B through E. These sub skills deal with the collection of observations related to assessment of children. These sub skills were identified as “not applicable” or “not observed” more consistently than any other sub skills in this set of program outcomes. It should be noted that this program outcome has consistently been identified as one where student teachers had limited opportunity to demonstrate skills due to the structure of the student teaching site, school policy and professional and ethical responsibilities of cooperating teachers. The recommendation made in 2010 was to develop a child study assignment for student teachers to complete and perhaps decrease the total number of lesson plans required (25). It was rationalized that student teachers could demonstrate mastery of the lesson plan process with fewer lesson plans and demonstrate observation skills with an additional assignment designed to provide sufficient documentation for Program Outcome 3. The decision was made to pilot the Child Study assignment with student teachers who were completing an ECE 281 Internship. The Internship requires a detailed application and requirements of the site, cooperating teacher and director/principal. It is designed for a student who is already employed in a program of early education and care. The rationale was that the student intern would already have familiarity with the program and students and in the limited 11 week quarter could complete this assignment. The assessment of these students for Program Outcome 3 indicated that this enabled adequate and positive documentation that students had these skills. A new recommendation will be to add the Child Study assignment to the new ECE Early Childhood Education Practicum. The longer semester will allow students more time to complete this assignment and be assessed accordingly on Program Outcome 3.

1. How will you determine whether those changes had an impact?

The data has been used to pinpoint areas in the curriculum where skills/knowledge are introduced, practiced and than a determination of level of mastery with ECE 281, the capstone course. It has provided valuable information as we designed a new curriculum for a semester system. Finally, our students are highly regarded by the student teaching sites personnel and are very competitive in the job market. It is also important to note that many of our students become our cooperating teachers once they have completed three years of service and approval by the site director. When students begin fall semester, 2012, the Child Study assignment will be required. The hypothesis is that there will be more ratings by the Sinclair faculty and cooperating teacher student-teacher skills in observation and assessment of young children.

c) Starting with next year’s Annual Update, this section will ask about assessment of general education outcomes. For FY 2012-13, you will be asked how the department is assessing Oral Communication and Written Communication in your courses, and in addition you will be asked to share the results of those assessments. Please be prepared to address this in next year’s Annual Update.

General Education Outcomes are embedded within the Early Childhood Education Program Outcomes. They have also been regularly assessed using the prior Program/Department Annual Update cycle. A matrix is provided that details the relationship between each general education outcome and the related ECE program outcomes and skill areas. (Table 4)

d) Does your department have courses where there are common assignments or exams across all sections of the course? If so, please list those courses, and indicate whether you are currently examining results across all sections of those courses.

The Child and Family Education Department, in which the Child and Family Education Program resides, does not have any common assignments nor exams across all sections of courses.

**Section IV: Improvement Efforts for the Fiscal Year**

**A. FY 10-11: What other improvement efforts did the department make in FY 10-11?  How successful were these efforts?  What further efforts need to be made? If your department didn’t make improvement efforts during the fiscal year, discuss the strengths and weaknesses** of the department **over the last year and how the department plans to address them in the coming year.**

The ECE program completed an intensive self-study as part of the reaccreditation process by the Ohio Department of Education for the pre-kindergarten Associate teaching license. After receiving reaccreditation with commendations for the program, the task of reviewing the entire curriculum in preparation of conversion from quarters to semesters was begun. This review, conducted by the three full-time tenured professors in the program, did not simply re-name existing courses and continue on in their original scope and sequence. Extensive work was done beginning with a review and revision of program outcomes, and the development of extensive learning matrices to delineate when specific skills would be introduced, practiced and mastered. The revised semester program was modified to reflect pedagogical changes in the field of early childhood education. An already strong program of teacher preparation was made even stronger with greater opportunity for students to experience the interrelationship of skills from course to course.

Advising plans were developed for students who are in a variety of blocks as they work toward their degree. As the three full-time professors advise students, it was particularly important to be able to support students in the transition to semesters. In addition, since these professors revised the semester curriculum, they have a comprehensive understanding of the scope, sequence and changes in courses and prerequisites.

The ECE program also recognized the importance of assessing professional dispositions in students at regular intervals during the program. A process and various forms have been developed for implementation fall semester, 2012.

The ECE program also adopted the use of a policies and procedures form related to the program. This was designed to be used by all ECE instructors for the purpose of consistency and continuity among full-time and part-time instructors.

In addition, the ECE program continued the critical connection with the Early Childhood Learning Centers by serving on various search committees for teachers in the lab schools. There were also recommendations made related to adopting a new curriculum in the lab schools.

The Child and Family Library also continued to be updated and provide an essential resource to both students and professors. It is a requirement for the pre-kindergarten Associate Teaching License. One of the upcoming initiatives will be to have a new system of checking out materials and maintaining inventory.

An important component of the transition to semesters also involved formulating revised articulation agreements with existing matriculating four year schools as well as investigating new articulation agreements with the existing programs as well as new schools. Under review are agreements with the University of Dayton, Central State University, University of Cincinnati and the Miami Valley Tech-Prep Program. Negotiations will begin with Wright State University.

The ECE faculty also worked with other faculty in the Math and Science programs to discuss opportunities for students who are currently enrolled in EDU courses. The goal was to investigate the possibility of an EDU associate degree for students who planned on transferring to a four year institution as an education major. Due to the semester transition, it was decided to table this initiative until semester courses were developed.

**B. FY 11-12:** **What improvement efforts does the department have planned for FY 11-12? How will you know whether you have been successful?**

The ECE program will be carefully monitoring the pace of students who are at various points in the existing quarter program and will be transitioning to semesters. A goal will be to ensure that students are on track for completing degrees. It is also critical to support students as they encounter a lengthier semester. This has an impact on students who are employed as they must request release time from employers to support students. ***Success will be measured by retention of students and course survey results.***

The assessment of professional dispositions will be piloted beginning fall 2012. The goal of this initiative is to be able to document issues related to affective characteristics of students that are not consistent with the professional dispositions of an early childhood educator. This documentation will be used for determining any additional supports or resources the student may require to successfully complete the program. ***Success will be measured by evaluation of the process by instructors and use of the assessment to assist students as documented.***

The ECE program will also be adopting a new grading scale along with a requirement of a minimum grade of a “C” in all courses in order to complete the degree. The rationale for these changes is to be consistent with other programs of early childhood education teacher preparation. It is believed that these two new requirements will not result in grade inflation. ***Success will be measured by retention of students and improved grade point averages.***

Finalizing the process of borrowing materials from the Child and Family Education Library will enable greater accessibility to materials as well as a system of accountability for both instructors and students. In addition, updating the inventory will remain a goal. These are 3 dimensional learning materials, for the most part, along with books, DVDs, CDs, musical instruments to name but a few of the variety housed in the library. ***Success will be measured by completion of a new inventory of materials, implementation of the check-out process and retention of materials.***

As more of the ECE courses are being taught by part-time instructors, it is critical to ensure that there is consistency in the courses being taught. There will be a variety of trainings to ensure that current part-time instructors are familiar with new course content, course syllabi templates, policies and procedures, professional disposition process and other initiatives***. Success will be measured by student evaluations, part-time instructor retention and participation of part-time instructors in department trainings.***

**Appendices**

**Appendix A**

**ECE 281**

**Written Evaluation**

**Midterm \_\_\_\_\_ Final \_\_\_\_\_**

**Student \_\_\_\_ Cooperating Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Sinclair Faculty \_\_\_\_\_**

**Student’s Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Student Identification # \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Center \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Age of Children \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Number of Children \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcome 1:**  **Utilize critical thinking skills to apply knowledge of child development and learning** | **\*Rating**  **1 2 3 4** | **\*\*Evidence/Comments**  **(D)emonstrated**  **(W)ritten**  **(S)poken** | **Frequency Skill Performed**  **1-Rarely**  **2-Sometimes**  **3- Daily** |
| A. Shows recognition and respect for individual differences in children’s growth, development and learning |  |  |  |
| B. Identifies basic developmental sequences, stages and milestones of young children. |  |  |  |
| C. Demonstrates understanding of children’s developmental learning in relation to age-appropriate norms |  |  |  |
| D. Shows recognition of family, community, and cultural influence on development |  |  |  |
| E. Demonstrates understanding that challenging behavior has environmental  **Program Outcome 1:**  **Utilize critical thinking skills to apply knowledge of child development and learning** |  |  |  |
| F. Demonstrates understanding that children develop skills, abilities and learn best through play. |  |  |  |
| G. Engages in safe, responsive relationships with children to provide sense of security and optimal development |  |  |  |
| H. Demonstrates  understanding of separation and attachment behaviors |  |  |  |
| I. Models positive, pro-social behavior |  |  |  |
| J. Uses communication to develop relationships and promote children’s understanding of the world. |  |  |  |
| K. Supports consistency in environments, expectations and |  |  |  |
| L. Supports exploration and play in children’s growth and development |  |  |  |
| M. Supports appropriates and culturally responsive environments for children |  |  |  |
| **Program Outcome Rating Average** |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcome 2 Identify resources and apply techniques for building diverse family and community relationships** | **\*Rating**  **1 2 3 4** | **\*\*Evidence/Comments**  **(D)emonstrated**  **(W)ritten**  **(S)poken** | **Frequency Skill Performed**  **1-Rarely**  **2-Sometimes**  **3- Daily** |
| A. Supports families as their children’s first & most influential caregivers & teachers |  |  |  |
| B. Shows recognition of families’ contribution in identifying their children’s varied strengths & influence on children’s behaviors |  |  |  |
| C. Shows recognition of different parenting styles & impact on learning & development |  |  |  |
| D. Demonstrates rapport with families through regular and appropriate communication. |  |  |  |
| E. Maintains & follows rules of confidentiality |  |  |  |
| F. Uses appropriate problem-solving & conflict resolution strategies |  |  |  |
| G. Demonstrates values of family & community partnerships within children’s learning environments |  |  |  |
| H. Identifies different levels of community resources that support children & families |  |  |  |
| I. Follows individualized service plans |  |  |  |
| J. Identifies & demonstrates respect for diversity of families: SES, cultural, religious, family structure |  |  |  |
| **Program Outcome Rating Average** |  |  |  |
| **Program Outcome # 3 Observe, document and assess children’s development and learning** | **\*Skill Rating** | **\*\*Evidence/Comments**  **(D)emonstrated**  **(W)ritten**  **(S)poken** | **Frequency Skill Performed**  **1-Rarely**  **2-Sometimes**  **3-Daily** |
| A. Identifies range of development & skills through interaction with children |  |  |  |
| B. Identifies environmental factors that place children at risk for developmental concerns |  |  |  |
| C. Shows recognition that observation & assessment practices are guided by established standards |  |  |  |
| D. Identifies ethical principles that guide the observation & assessment process |  |  |  |
| E. Identifies appropriate, multiple methods of documenting developmental progress across all domains methods of documenting developmental progress across all domains |  |  |  |
| F. Assists in collecting information about developmental progress through multiple sources |  |  |  |
| G. Maintains confidentiality of observation & assessment information, results & reporting to families & staff are implemented |  |  |  |

**Appendix B**

**ECE 281 Rubric for Rating**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Level** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
|  | Student rarely demonstrates skill in the classroom ( <70% of the time), must be prompted to demonstrate skill, demonstration of skill does not meet expectations for the standard, extensive additional experience, study and reflection mandatory | Student sometimes demonstrates skill in the classroom ( 70% of the time), requires some prompting, demonstration of skill, meets minimal expectations for the standard, additional experience, study and reflection recommended | Student usually demonstrates skill in the classroom ( 80% of the time), does not require prompting, demonstration of skill meets expectations for the standard, additional professional development encouraged | Student always demonstrates skill in the classroom ( 90% of the time), does not required prompting, demonstration of skill exceeds expectations |

**Table 1**

**Program Outcome #1**

**Winter 11**

Student Teacher N=11 Cooperating Teacher N= 11 Sinclair Faculty N=1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.29 | 2-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3 | 2-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 2.8 | 2-4 |

**Spring 11**

Student Teacher N=6 Cooperating Teacher N=6 Sinclair Faculty N=1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.7 | 3.5-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.8 | 3-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3.4 | 3-4 |

**Summer 11**

Student Teacher N= 10 Cooperating Teacher =10 Sinclair Faculty =2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.6 | 3-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.5 | 3-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3.0 | 2-4 |

**Fall 11**

Student Teacher N=3 Cooperating Teacher N=3 Sinclair Faculty N=1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.8 | 3-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.7 | 3-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3.3 | 2-4 |

**Table 2**

**Program Outcome #2**

**Winter 11**

Student Teacher N= 11 Cooperating Teacher N=11 Sinclair Faculty N=1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.5 | 3-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.3 | 2-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3 | 2-4 |

**Spring 11**

Student Teacher N= 6 Cooperating Teacher N=6 Sinclair Faculty N=1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.6 | 3.3-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.7 | 3.3-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3 | 2.8-4 |

**Summer 11**

Student Teacher N= 10 Cooperating Teacher =10 Sinclair Faculty =2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.7 | 3-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.5 | 3-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3.1 | 2-4 |

**Fall 11**

Student Teacher N=3 Cooperating Teacher N=3 Sinclair Faculty N=1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.7 | 3-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.5 | 3-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3.5 | 2-4 |

**Table 3**

**Program Outcome #3**

**Winter 11**

Student Teacher N= 11 Cooperating Teacher N=11 Sinclair Faculty N=1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.6 | 3-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.4 | 3-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3.5 | 3-4 |

**Spring 11**

Student Teacher N= 6 Cooperating Teacher N= 6 Sinclair Faculty N=1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.8 | 3.3-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.8 | 3.6-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3.8 | 3-4 |

**Summer 11**

Student Teacher N= 10 Cooperating Teacher =10 Sinclair Faculty =2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.5 | 3-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.6 | 3-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3.1 | 2-4 |

**Fall 11**

Student Teacher N=3 Cooperating Teacher N=3 Sinclair Faculty N=1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Data** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| Student | 3.6 | 3-4 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 3.5 | 3-4 |
| Sinclair Faculty | 3.5 | 2-4 |

**Table 4**

**Matrix of ECE Program Outcomes and Embedded General Education Outcomes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General Education Outcomes** | **Program Outcome 1** | **Program**  **Outcome 2** | **Program Outcome 3** | **Program Outcome 4** | **Program Outcome 5** | **Program Outcome 6** | **Program Outcome 7** |
| **Computer Literacy** |  | **H** | **E** | **L, M** | **A, B** | **A** | **B,D, E** |
| **Critical Thinking/Problem Solving** | **A,B,C,F,H** | **F** | **I,J,K** | **H,I,L,M** | **C,F** | **B,C** | **A-F** |
| **Information Literacy** | **B** | **H** | **E,F** | **L,M** | **E** | **A,B,G** | **B** |
| **Oral Communication** | **D,G,I,J,M** | **D** | **H,K** | **F** | **A,D** | **D** | **B,G** |
| **Values/Citizen/Community** | **A** | **E,G,H,K** | **C,D,G** | **A,H** | **C,E,F,G** | **F** | **F** |
| **Written Communication** | **A,B,C,F** | **D** | **F,J** | **L,M** | **A,B** | **C** | **A,B,D,E** |

**\*letters denote skill area in each program outcome; see evaluation for list of skills under each program outcome**

Questions regarding completion of the Annual Update? Please contact the Director of Curriculum and Assessment at 512-2789 to schedule a time to review the template and ask any questions.