Preparation in Assessment for Early Childhood Educators in Hawai'i

Report to the Hawai'i State Executive Office on Early Learning

Lois A. Yamauchi

University of Hawai'i

February 27, 2015

Preparation in Assessment for Early Childhood Educators in Hawai'i

Assessment in early childhood involves finding out what young children know and can do and requires the collection, organization, and interpretation of data from a variety of sources (McAfee, Leong, & Bodrova, 2004). Assessment provides information for educators to gain understandings of children's strengths and needs, upon which they can then plan appropriate programs tailored to benefit their growth and learning. Assessment in early childhood can be conducted for the purposes of program improvement and evaluation and the identification of staff professional development needs (Epstein, Schweinhart, DeBruin-Parecki, & Robin, 2004). Assessment practices also involve communicating with families and partnering with them to determine how assessment results can best be understood and used to enhance children's learning and development (Brassard & Boehm, 2008).

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC, 2003) views ethical, appropriate, and valid assessment as an important part of early childhood education. The National Research Council (2008) recommends ongoing professional development on early childhood assessment focused on interpretation of data for participants at all levels, including policy makers, program directors, and practitioners.

Consistent with these statements and intents, the purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which higher education programs, that prepared early childhood educators in the State of Hawai'i, included instruction about various aspects of early childhood assessment. The study was conducted for the State Office of Early Learning to establish a baseline of what currently exists regarding the preparation early childhood educators receive in the area of assessment. Two surveys were conducted, one for coordinators of early childhood educator preparation programs and another for faculty who teach in those programs. The study focused on programs that prepared early childhood educators specifically, rather than the broader group of practitioners that includes home visitors and those who work with young children in health-related organizations.

Methods

Programs

The coordinators of all 14 higher education programs in the State of Hawai'i that prepare early childhood educators were contacted to recruit their and their faculty's participation in the study. The coordinator of one program declined to participate. Thus, the programs represented in this study were 13 early childhood preparation programs in the State. These included four Associate of Science programs, one Associate of Arts program, one Bachelor of Science program, two Bachelor of Arts programs, one Bachelor of Education program, one Post-Baccalaureate certificate in Education, and three Master of Education programs.

Participants

Coordinators. Nine coordinators completed the survey regarding 11 programs, as two participants reported on two different programs that they coordinated at their institutions. Participation was voluntary, and the response rate was 85%. All but two of the coordinators also taught in the programs for which they provided information as the coordinator. One coordinator whose faculty responded to the faculty survey did not complete the coordinator survey.

Faculty members. Forty-three faculty members from 12 programs completed the faculty survey. Participation was voluntary, and the program coordinators nominated the faculty members who were recruited for this study as those who taught in their early childhood programs, both full- and part-time. One coordinator did not provide the names of her faculty members. The programs represented by the faculty participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Programs Represented by Faculty Participants

Program (number of programs)	Number of Participants
Associate of Arts (1)	5
Associate of Science (3)	14
Bachelor of Arts (1)	1
Bachelor of Science (1)	5
Bachelor of Education (1)	13
Post-Baccalaureate Certificate (1)	2
Master of Arts (1)	1
Master of Education (3)	10

Three faculty members completed two faculty surveys, as they taught in two different programs. The response rate was 73%. The number of faculty from each program ranged from 1 to 7, with a mean of 3.5. The majority of faculty taught at only one institution; however two respondents taught at two institutions.

Measures and Procedures

I sent the program coordinators and faculty members an email message introducing the study, inviting their participation, and providing a link to the survey. I designed the anonymous, online surveys to be completed in approximately 10-minutes. Some of the survey items were adapted from the Early Childhood Higher Education Inventory from the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California at Berkeley (CSCCE, 2014).

Coordinator Survey. The Coordinator Survey asked participants whether candidates in their programs were required to learn about the content and how to conduct various practices associated with the following aspects of assessment:

- Purposes of assessment (e.g., screening and referral to identify children who may benefit from special services);
- Assessment of different developmental domains (e.g., assessing children's social and emotional development);
- Child populations (e.g., assessing learners from different cultural groups);
- Authentic assessment tools (e.g., using work samples and products/artifacts);
- Formal assessment tools (e.g., using readiness and achievement tests);
- Integrating families as partners in the assessment process (e.g., determining with families how assessment results can be used at home, at school, and in the community).

In addition, the coordinators responded to more general questions about the program, such as enrollment, target student population, and number of faculty. They also reported how assessment content was delivered (e.g., whether the topics were taught in a separate class, within a child development course, or through clinical or field experiences) and whether any of the courses were delivered online.

Faculty Survey. The Faculty Survey asked participants to report on their employment status (tenure-track or adjunct) and about their responsibilities as faculty members (e.g., teaching, supervision of practicum, research), and demographic information. Regarding the aspects of assessment covered in the Coordinator Survey, participants were also asked whether they taught students about assessment content and how to conduct assessment practices. They answered questions about whether it would be helpful for them to have additional knowledge or training in these different areas and how they would prefer to receive professional development.

Results

Although the sample sizes were small, the data are reported by program type—associate, bachelor, and post-baccalaureate to facilitate comparisons and because the programs and their needs tend to differ from one another.

Coordinators' Background Characteristics

All of the coordinators were female, and their self-reported ages and race/ethnicity are displayed in the Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2. Coordinators' Ages

	Associate Programs (n=4)	Bachelor Programs (n=4)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=3)
50-59 years	50%	25%	100%
60 years and above	25%	25%	0%
Decline to state	25%	50%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 3. Coordinators' Race/Ethnicity

	Associate Programs (n=4)	Bachelor Programs (n=4)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=3)
Asian American*	50%	25%	66%
White/ Caucasian	50%	50%	34%
Decline to state	0%	25%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

*Note: Asian American includes those who identified as Chinese-, Japanese-, and Korean-American. Given the small sample size, they are listed together to protect participants' confidentiality.

Faculty Members' Background Characteristics

Age and race/ethnicity. Of the 41 faculty members who responded to the question about their gender, 89% were female. Tables 4 and 5 present the faculty members' self-reported ages and ethnicities.

Table 4. Faculty Members' Ages

	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=13)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=10)
< 40 years	12%	31%	10%
40-49 years	18%	8%	10%
50-59 years	12%	15%	50%
60 years and above	18%	15%	10%
Decline to state	40%	31%	20%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 5. Faculty Members' Race/Ethnicity

	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=13)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=10)
Japanese American	29%	0%	0%
White/ Caucasian	29%	54%	40%
Other*	29%	38%	60%
Decline to state	13%	8%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

*Note: Other includes Chinese-American, Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiian, Korean-American, and multi-racial. Because of the small sample sizes, these categories were combined to protect the confidentiality of the participants.

Highest level of education and early childhood preparation. Table 6 shows the faculty members' report of their highest level of education completed. Table 7 presents their responses regarding the highest level of in early childhood education or child development that they completed. Reflecting the typical requirements of college and university teaching most participants had at least a master's degree. Compared to associate program faculty, more faculty from baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate programs had attained doctoral degrees and had completed doctoral programs in early childhood education.

Table 6. Faculty's Highest Level of Education

	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=13)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=10)
Bachelor degree	6%	0%	0%
Master degree	82%	54%	40%
Doctoral degree	12%	46%	60%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 7. Faculty's Highest Levels of Early Childhood Education

Highest level of ECE completed	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=13)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=10)
Some college courses in ECE/child development	18%	15%	30%
Bachelor degree in ECE/child development	18%	0%	0%
Master degree in ECE/child development	53%	54%	30%
Doctoral degree in ECE/child development	0%	15%	30%
Other	6%	8%	0%
Decline to state	5%	8%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Teaching experience. Tables 8 and 9 show faculty members' reports of their teaching experiences at the college or university level and their experiences teaching at the institution for which they were being surveyed.

Table 8. Faculty's Teaching Experience at the College or University Level

Number of years	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=14)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=12)
0 years	11%	0%	0%
1-5 years	24%	7%	17%
6-10 years	6%	58%	8%
11-15 years	6%	14%	17%
16-20 years	18%	7%	25%
21 years or more	35%	14%	33%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 9. Faculty's Teaching Experience in an Early Childhood Program at their Current Institutions

Number of years	Associate Programs (n=16)	Bachelor Programs (n=14)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=12)
1-5 years	44%	36%	43%
6-10 years	6%	50%	8%
11-15 years	6%	14%	33%
16-20 years	19%	0%	8%
21 years or more	25%	0%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Employment statuses and responsibilities. Table 10 and 11 presents the faculty members' reported employment statuses and work responsibilities. Table 12 shows the number of early childhood courses each faculty reported that they taught in a typical year at their current institution. Table 13 presents the number of students the faculty members reported that they advised in a typical academic year.

Table 10. Employment Statuses

	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=14)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=12)
Full-time tenured or tenure-track	53%	21%	50%
Full-time non-tenured	6%	21%	8%
Adjunct faculty and/or part-time lecturer	41%	51%	42%
Other	0%	7%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 11. Faculty Responsibilities

	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=14)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=12)
Teaching only	29%	43%	25%
Supervising student teaching or practicum only	12%	0%	8%
Teaching and supervising of student teaching or practicum	12%	7%	17%
Teaching and other duties*	47%	50%	50%
Total	100%	100%	100%

* Other duties include various activities, including program administration, research, directing a child center on site, student recruitment, and supervision of student teaching or practicum.

Table 12. Number of Early Childhood Courses Taught in a Typical Academic Year

	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=14)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=12)
0 courses	0%	0%	8%
1-2 courses	29%	36%	84%
3-4 courses	29%	29%	0%
5-6 courses	24%	14%	8%
7-8 courses	6%	21%	0%
9 or more courses	12%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 13. Average Number of Students Faculty Members Advised in a Typical Academic Year

	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=14)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=12)
0 students	53%	50%	51%
1-10 students	24%	14%	8%
11-20 students	6%	7%	33%
20 or more students	6%	29 %	0%
Declined to state	11%	0%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Focus of the faculty members' teaching and expertise. Table 14 presents what the faculty members reported was the primary focus of their teaching in the early childhood programs (child development, curriculum and teaching methods, or both of these areas). As indicated in Table 14, 65% of the associate program faculty reported teaching in both areas; whereas, 55% of the post-baccalaureate faculty reported teaching curriculum and teaching methods. Forty-three percent of faculty in the bachelor programs reported focusing on curriculum and teaching methods, and 36% said they taught in both areas.

Table 14. Primary Focus of Faculty Members' Teaching.

	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=14)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=11)
Child development	12%	21%	9%
Curriculum and teaching methods	24%	43%	55%
Both child development and curriculum and teaching methods	64%	36%	18%
Decline to state	0%	0%	18%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 15 shows what faculty members reported was their expertise with regard to particular groups of children. Compared to faculty in the bachelor and post-baccalaureate programs, those in the associate programs reported expertise with younger children. Table 16 shows the ages groups of children that faculty reported was the focus of their teaching in the programs for which they were surveyed. Compared to instructors in the bachelor and post-baccalaureate programs, the associate program faculty reported that they tended to focus their current teaching on younger children (birth to before kindergarten).

Table 15. Faculty Expertise with Particular Age Groups of Children

	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=14)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=11)
Birth through 2 years	12%	0%	0%
Birth to before kindergarten	24%	7%	27%
Birth through grade 3 or higher	24%	21%	37%
3 and/or 4 years to before kindergarten (Pre-K)	40%	15%	0%
3 and/or 4 years (Pre-K) through grade 3 or higher	0%	21%	18%
Kindergarten through grade 3 or higher	0%	7%	18%
Other	0%	22%	0%
Decline to state	0%	7%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 16. Age Groups of Focus in Current Teaching

	Associate Programs (n=17)	Bachelor Programs (n=14)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=11)
Birth through 2 years	12%	0%	0%
Birth through 3 and/or 4 years (Pre-K)	47%	0%	9%
Birth through grade 3 or higher	6%	29%	46%
3 and/or 4 years to before kindergarten (Pre-K)	24%	15%	0%
3 and/or 4 years (Pre-K) through grade 3 or higher	0%	21%	36%
Kindergarten through grade 3 or higher	0%	7%	9%
Other*	11%	21%	0%
Don't know	0%	7%	0%
Decline to state	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

*Other includes: birth through kindergarten, birth through grade 3, ages 2.5-6 years, and families of young children.

Overview of the Programs

Target student population. Table 17 shows the target student population of the programs, as reported by the coordinators. Compared to the other two types of programs, that tended to target both adults already working in early childhood settings and pre-service students, the coordinators from the post-baccalaureate programs reported that their programs targeted adults already working in those settings.

Table 17. Target Student Population

	Associate Programs (n=4)	Bachelor Programs (n=4)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=3)
Adults already working in early childhood settings	25%	25%	100%
Pre-service students	0%	25%	0%
A mix of both groups	75%	50%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Numbers of students registered in 2013-2014. Table 18 presents the approximate numbers of students registered in the 2013-2014 academic year, as reported by the program coordinators.

Table 18. Estimated Numbers of Students Registered in 2013-2014

	Associate Programs (n=4)	Bachelor Programs (n=4)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=3)
10-29 students	25%	0%	67%
30-49 students	25%	50%	0%
50-69 students	0%	0%	0%
70-89 students	25%	0%	33%
90 or more students	25%	0%	0%
Declined to state	0%	50%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Degrees conferred. Table 19 shows the number of degrees conferred in the 2013-2014 school year, as reported by the program coordinators.

Table 19. Numbers of Degrees Conferred in 2013-2014

	Associate Programs (n=4)	Bachelor Programs (n=4)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=3)
No degrees	0%	0%	33%
1-10 degrees	50%	0%	33%
11-20 degrees	0%	25%	34%
21-30 degrees	25%	0%	0%
Declined to state	25%	75%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Numbers of faculty members teaching in the programs. Table 20-22 presents coordinators' reports of the number of different types of faculty teaching in the programs during the 2014-2015 academic year. Notable is that according to the program coordinators, 50% of the associate programs did not have any tenure-track faculty and 75% of the bachelor programs had only one.

Table 20. Number of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

	Associate Programs (n=4)	Bachelor Programs (n=4)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=3)
0 faculty members	50%	0%	0%
1 faculty member	25%	75%	0%
2 faculty members	0%	25%	33%
3 faculty members	0%	0%	67%
4 or more faculty members	25%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 21. Number of Full Time, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

	Associate Programs (n=4)	Bachelor Programs (n=4)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=3)
0 faculty members	75%	50%	100%
1 faculty member	25%	25%	0%
4 faculty members	0%	25%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 22. Number of Adjunct Faculty or Part-Time Lecturers

	Associate Programs (n=4)	Bachelor Programs (n=4)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=3)
0-1 faculty members	0%	25%	33%
1-2 faculty member	25%	25%	34%
3-4 faculty members	75%	0%	0%
4-5 faculty members	0%	25%	33%
6 or more faculty members	0%	25%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Structure and Delivery of Early Childhood Assessment-Related Courses

Table 23 presents how program coordinators responded when asked about the structure of early childhood assessment-related courses. As the coordinators were instructed to select as many responses as applied, the total percentages could exceed 100%

Table 23. Structure of Assessment-Related Courses

	Associate Programs (n=4)	Bachelor Programs (n=4)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=3)
Topics related to the assessment of young children are taught as a separate course, not as part of a broader child development course	25%	0%	0%
Topics related to the assessment of young children are taught within a child development course covering multiple domains	75%	25%	0%
Topics related to the assessment of young children are taught within a teaching/curriculum course covering multiple topics	50%	50%	33%
Topics related to the assessment of young children are taught primarily in one course and reinforced across other courses	25%	25%	34%
Topics related to assessment of young children are addressed in clinical or field experiences and/or seminars	75%	50%	0%
Don't know	0%	25%	0%
Other	0%	0%	33%

Table 24 presents coordinators' responses to a question about whether their program offered online courses to prepare students to conduct assessments of young children.

Table 24. Online Courses to Prepare Students for Early Childhood Assessment

	Associate Programs (n=4)	Bachelor Programs (n=4)	Post-Baccalaureate Programs (n=3)
Offers online courses on assessment	25%	75%	33%
Does not offer online courses on assessment	75%	25%	67%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Coordinators' Responses about Assessment Requirements

The following tables present the program coordinators' responses regarding the aspects of assessment that were required in their programs.

Purposes of assessment. Tables 25-27 present the coordinators' reports of whether students in the different types of programs were required to learn about the various purposes of assessment. The responses suggest that the post-baccalaureate programs tended to require students to learn about the various the purposes of assessment, but not necessarily how to conduct the practices. The latter were emphasized more of more in the associate and bachelor programs.

Table 25. Associate Program Requirements Regarding the Purposes of Assessment

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Screening and referral to identify children who may benefit from special services (n=4)	25%	0%	50%	25%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform classroom practice (n=3)	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Using assessment to document children's development and learning (n=4)	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform local programming and policies (n=3)	67%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%

Table 26. Bachelor Program Requirements Regarding the Purposes of Assessment (n=4)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Screening and referral to identify children who may benefit from special services	75%	0%	0%	25%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform classroom practice	25%	0%	50%	25%	0%	100%
Using assessment to document children's development and learning	25%	25%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform local programming and policies	75%	0%	0%	0%	25%	100%

Table 27. Post-Baccalaureate Program Requirements Regarding the Purposes of Assessment (n=3)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Screening and referral to identify children who may benefit from special services	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform classroom practice	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Using assessment to document children's development and learning	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform local programming and policies	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%

Assessment of different developmental domains. Tables 28-30 present the coordinators' reports of whether students in the different types of programs were required to learn about the assessment of different developmental domains.

Table 28. Associate Program Requirements Regarding Assessment of Developmental Domains (n=4)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Assessing children's physical well-being, health and motor development	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's social and emotional development	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's cognition and general knowledge	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's language and literacy	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's approaches to learning	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's creativity	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%

Table 29. Bachelor Program Requirements Regarding Assessment of Developmental Domains (n=4)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Assessing children's physical well-being, health and motor development	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's social and emotional development	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's cognition and general knowledge	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's language and literacy	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's approaches to learning	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's creativity	50%	0%	25%	0%	25%	100%

Table 30. Post-Baccalaureate Program Requirements Regarding Assessment of Developmental Domains (n=3)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Assessing children's physical well-being, health and motor development	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's social and emotional development	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's cognition and general knowledge	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's language and literacy	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's approaches to learning	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children's creativity	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%

Requirements regarding assessment of different child populations. Tables 31-33 present the coordinators' reports of whether students were required to learn about the assessment of different child populations

Table 31. Associate Program Requirements Regarding Assessment of Different Child Populations (n=4)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Assessing children with developmental delays or disabilities	75%	0%	0%	25%	0%	100%
Assessing children who are gifted and talented	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Assessing learners from diverse cultural groups	50%	0%	25%	25%	0%	100%
Assessing linguistically diverse learners	50%	0%	25%	25%	0%	100%
Assessing children from diverse socioeconomic groups	50%	0%	25%	25%	0%	100%

Table 32. Bachelor Program Requirements Regarding Assessment of Different Child Populations (n=4)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Assessing children with developmental delays or disabilities	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children who are gifted and talented	75%	0%	0%	0%	25%	100%
Assessing learners from diverse cultural groups	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing linguistically diverse learners	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children from diverse socioeconomic groups	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Table 33. Post-Baccalaureate Program Requirements Regarding Assessment of Different Child Populations (n=3)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Assessing children with developmental delays or disabilities	67%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%
Assessing children who are gifted and talented	67%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%
Assessing learners from diverse cultural groups	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing linguistically diverse learners	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Assessing children from diverse socioeconomic groups	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Authentic Assessment tools. Tables 34-36 present the coordinators' reports of whether students were required to learn about different aspects of authentic assessment tools.

Table 34. Associate Program Requirements Regarding Authentic Assessment Tools (n=4)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Using narrative assessment tools (e.g., anecdotal records, running records, teacher stories)	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	100%
Using structured observation tools (e.g., checklists, time sampling, event sampling, rating scales, rubrics)	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	100%
Using digital assessment tools (e.g., photographs and audio and visual recordings) and new technologies (e.g., iPads and cell phones)	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	100%
Using work samples and products/artifacts	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	100%
Using elicited response assessment tools (e.g., child and family member interviews, questionnaires, child self-reflections)	25%	25%	25%	25%	0%	100%

Table 35. Bachelor Program Requirements Regarding Authentic Assessment Tools

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Using narrative assessment tools (e.g., anecdotal records, running records, teacher stories) (n=4)	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%	100%
Using structured observation tools (e.g., checklists, time sampling, event sampling, rating scales, rubrics) (n=3)	34%	0%	33%	0%	33%	100%
Using digital assessment tools (e.g., photographs and audio and visual recordings) and new technologies (e.g., iPads and cell phones) (n=4)	25%	0%	50%	25%	0%	100%
Using work samples and products/artifacts (n=5)	0%	0%	75%	0%	25%	100%
Using elicited response assessment tools (e.g., child and family member interviews, questionnaires, child self-reflections) (n=4)	25%	25%	50%	0%	0%	100%

Table 36. Post-Baccalaureate Program Requirements Regarding Authentic Assessment Tools (n=3)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Using narrative assessment tools (e.g., anecdotal records, running records, teacher stories)	34%	0%	33%	0%	33%	100%
Using structured observation tools (e.g., checklists, time sampling, event sampling, rating scales, rubrics)	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	100%
Using digital assessment tools (e.g., photographs and audio and visual recordings) and new technologies (e.g., iPads and cell phones)	33%	0%	0%	0%	67%	100%
Using work samples and products/artifacts	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	100%
Using elicited response assessment tools (e.g., child and family member interviews, questionnaires, child self-reflections)	0%	33%	34%	0%	33%	100%

Formal assessment tools. Tables 37-39 present the coordinators' report of whether students were required to learn about different formal assessment tools.

Table 37. Associate Program Requirements Regarding Formal Assessment Tools (n=4)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Using screening and diagnostic tests (e.g., DIAL-R, PPVT)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Using readiness and achievement tests	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal observation systems (e.g., work sampling, TS Gold)	25%	25%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal surveys and questionnaires (e.g., ASQs, ASQ-SE)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal classroom and teacher observation assessments (e.g., CLASS, ECERS)	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%	100%

Table 38. Bachelor Program Requirements Regarding Formal Assessment Tools (n=4)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Using screening and diagnostic tests (e.g., DIAL-R, PPVT)	75%	0%	0%	0%	25%	100%
Using readiness and achievement tests	50%	0%	25%	25%	0%	100%
Using formal observation systems (e.g., work sampling, TS Gold)	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal surveys and questionnaires (e.g., ASQs, ASQ-SE)	50%	0%	25%	25%	0%	100%
Using formal classroom and teacher observation assessments (e.g., CLASS, ECERS)	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	100%

Table 39. Post-Baccalaureate Program Requirements Regarding Formal Assessment Tools (n=3)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Using screening and diagnostic tests (e.g., DIAL-R, PPVT)	67%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%
Using readiness and achievement tests	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal observation systems (e.g., work sampling, TS Gold)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal surveys and questionnaires (e.g., ASQs, ASQ-SE)	67%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%
Using formal classroom and teacher observation assessments (e.g., CLASS, ECERS)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Integrating families as partners. Tables 40-42 present the coordinators' report of whether students were required to learn about integrating families as partners in assessment processes.

Table 40. Associate Program Requirements Regarding Integrating Families as Partners (n=4)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Integrating family perspectives to inform the collection of assessment data	50%	0%	25%	25%	0%	100%
Communicating with families about assessment results	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	100%
Determining with families how assessment results can be used at home, at school, and in the community	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%

Table 41. Bachelor Program Requirements Regarding Integrating Families as Partners (n=4)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Integrating family perspectives to inform the collection of assessment data	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	100%
Communicating with families about assessment results	25%	0%	50%	0%	25%	100%
Determining with families how assessment results can be used at home, at school, and in the community	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	100%

Table 42. Post-Baccalaureate Program Requirements Regarding Integrating Families as Partners (n=3)

	Students are required to learn about this topic	Students are required to learn how to do this	Students are required to learn about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is required	Don't know	Total
Integrating family perspectives to inform the collection of assessment data	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Communicating with families about assessment results	34%	0%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Determining with families how assessment results can be used at home, at school, and in the community	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Faculty Responses Regarding the Teaching of Assessment Topics

The following tables present the faculty participants' responses regarding the extent to which they taught candidates about particular assessment topics and how to conduct specific practices.

Purposes of assessment. Tables 43-45 present the faculty responses about teaching about the purposes of assessment.

Table 43. Purposes of Assessment Taught as Reported by Associate Program Faculty (n=17)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Screening and referral to identify children who may benefit from special services	47%	0%	35%	18%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform classroom practice	35%	0%	59%	6%	0%	100%
Using assessment to document children's development and learning	18%	12%	65%	5%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform local programming and policies	35%	0%	12%	47%	6%	100%

Table 44. Purposes of Assessment Taught as Reported by Bachelor Program Faculty (n=13)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Screening and referral to identify children who may benefit from special services	46%	0%	16%	38%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform classroom practice	31%	0%	69%	0%	0%	100%
Using assessment to document children's development and learning	15%	77%	8%	0%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform local programming and policies	31%	8%	15%	46%	0%	100%

Table 45. Purposes of Assessment Taught as Reported by Post-Baccalaureate Program Faculty (n=11)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Screening and referral to identify children who may benefit from special services	46%	9%	9%	36%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform classroom practice	27%	0%	55%	18%	0%	100%
Using assessment to document children's development and learning	36%	0%	46%	18%	0%	100%
Using assessment data to inform local programming and policies	46%	9%	18%	27%	0%	100%

Different developmental domains. Tables 46-48 present data regarding faculty members' reports of the extent to which they taught students about the assessment of different developmental domains.

Table 46. Developmental Domains Taught by Associate Program Faculty (n=17)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Assessing children's physical well-being, health and motor development	29%	0%	65%	6%	0%	100%
Assessing children's social and emotional development	24%	0%	70%	6%	0%	100%
Assessing children's cognition and general knowledge	24%	0%	64%	12%	0%	100%
Assessing children's language and literacy	18%	0%	70%	12%	0%	100%
Assessing children's approaches to learning	12%	0%	64%	18%	6%	100%
Assessing children's creativity	18%	0%	64%	12%	6%	100%

Table 47. Developmental Domains Taught by Bachelor Program Faculty (n=13)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Assessing children's physical well-being, health and motor development	31%	8%	46%	15%	0%	100%
Assessing children's social and emotional development	31%	8%	53%	8%	0%	100%
Assessing children's cognition and general knowledge	23%	8%	61%	8%	0%	100%
Assessing children's language and literacy	23%	8%	54%	15%	0%	100%
Assessing children's approaches to learning	38%	8%	38%	8%	8%	100%
Assessing children's creativity	38%	8%	31%	23%	0%	100%

Table 48. Developmental Domains Taught by Post-Baccalaureate Program Faculty

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Assessing children's physical well-being, health and motor development (n=11)	64%	0%	18%	18%	0%	100%
Assessing children's social and emotional development (n=11)	55%	9%	27%	9%	0%	100%
Assessing children's cognition and general knowledge (n=11)	36%	9%	36%	19%	0%	100%
Assessing children's language and literacy (n=11)	46%	9%	36%	9%	0%	100%
Assessing children's approaches to learning (n=10)	40%	10%	30%	20%	0%	100%
Assessing children's creativity (n=11)	46%	9%	9%	27%	9%	100%

Child populations. Tables 49-51 present data regarding whether faculty members reported teaching students about the assessment of different child populations.

Table 49. Assessment of Child Populations Taught by Associate Program Faculty (n=17)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Assessing children with developmental delays or disabilities	53%	0%	29%	18%	0%	100%
Assessing children who are gifted and talented	24%	0%	29%	47%	0%	100%
Assessing learners from diverse cultural groups	47%	0%	41%	12%	0%	100%
Assessing linguistically diverse learners	41%	0%	41%	18%	0%	100%
Assessing children from diverse socioeconomic groups	41%	0%	41%	12%	6%	100%

Table 50. Assessment of Child Populations Taught by Bachelors Program Faculty (n=13)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Assessing children with developmental delays or disabilities	38%	0%	16%	46%	0%	100%
Assessing children who are gifted and talented	38%	8%	8%	46%	0%	100%
Assessing learners from diverse cultural groups	61%	8%	23%	8%	0%	100%
Assessing linguistically diverse learners	61%	0%	31%	8%	0%	100%
Assessing children from diverse socioeconomic groups	54%	0%	31%	15%	0%	100%

Table 51. Assessment of Child Populations Taught by Post-Baccalaureate Program Faculty (n=10)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Assessing children with developmental delays or disabilities	40%	0%	20%	40%	0%	100%
Assessing children who are gifted and talented	30%	0%	10%	60%	0%	100%
Assessing learners from diverse cultural groups	40%	10%	20%	20%	10%	100%
Assessing linguistically diverse learners	30%	20%	10%	30%	10%	100%
Assessing children from diverse socioeconomic groups	50%	0%	10%	20%	20%	100%

Authentic assessment tools. Table 52-54 presents data regarding faculty members' reports of the extent to which they taught students about authentic assessment tools.

Table 52. Authentic Assessment Tools Taught by Associate Program Faculty (n=17)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Using narrative assessment tools (e.g., anecdotal records, running records, teacher stories)	6%	0%	82%	12%	0%	100%
Using structured observation tools (e.g., checklists, time sampling, event sampling, rating scales, rubrics)	29%	0%	53%	18%	0%	100%
Using digital assessment tools (e.g., photographs and audio and visual recordings) and new technologies (e.g., iPads and cell phones)	35%	0%	47%	18%	0%	100%
Using work samples and products/artifacts	29%	0%	59%	12%	0%	100%
Using elicited response assessment tools (e.g., child and family member interviews, questionnaires, child self-reflections)	53%	0%	29%	18%	0%	100%

Table 53. Authentic Assessment Tools Taught by Bachelor Program Faculty (n=13)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Using narrative assessment tools (e.g., anecdotal records, running records, teacher stories)	38%	0%	62%	0%	0%	100%
Using structured observation tools (e.g., checklists, time sampling, event sampling, rating scales, rubrics)	62%	0%	31%	7%	0%	100%
Using digital assessment tools (e.g., photographs and audio and visual recordings) and new technologies (e.g., iPads and cell phones)	31%	0%	38%	31%	0%	100%
Using work samples and products/artifacts	8%	8%	54%	30%	0%	100%
Using elicited response assessment tools (e.g., child and family member interviews, questionnaires, child self-reflections)	38%	0%	24%	38%	0%	100%

Table 54. Authentic Assessment Tools Taught by Post-Baccalaureate Program Faculty (n=10)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Total
Using narrative assessment tools (e.g., anecdotal records, running records, teacher stories)	30%	0%	60%	10%	0%	100%
Using structured observation tools (e.g., checklists, time sampling, event sampling, rating scales, rubrics)	40%	0%	50%	10%	0%	100%
Using digital assessment tools (e.g., photographs and audio and visual recordings) and new technologies (e.g., iPads and cell phones)	30%	0%	60%	10%	0%	100%
Using work samples and products/artifacts	30%	0%	60%	10%	0%	100%
Using elicited response assessment tools (e.g., child and family member interviews, questionnaires, child self-reflections)	40%	10%	30%	10%	10%	100%

Formal assessment tools. Table 55-57 presents data regarding the faculty members' reports of the extent to which they taught students about formal assessment tools.

Table 55. Formal assessment Tools Taught by Associate Program Faculty

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Decline to state	Total
Using screening and diagnostic tests (e.g., DIAL-R, PPVT) (n=17)	47%	0%	12%	41%	0%	0%	100%
Using readiness and achievement tests (n=17)	35%	0%	0%	65%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal observation systems (e.g., work sampling, TS Gold) (n=17)	41%	0%	18%	41%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal surveys and questionnaires (e.g., ASQs, ASQ-SE) (n=16)	50%	0%	12%	38%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal classroom and teacher observation assessments (e.g., CLASS, ECERS) (n=17)	53%	0%	6%	41%	0%	0%	100%

Table 56. Formal Assessment Tools Taught by Bachelor Program Faculty (n=13)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Decline to state	Total
Using screening and diagnostic tests (e.g., DIAL-R, PPVT)	38%	0%	8%	46%	0%	8%	100%
Using readiness and achievement tests	61%	0%	8%	23%	0%	8%	100%
Using formal observation systems (e.g., work sampling, TS Gold)	15%	8%	23%	46%	0%	8%	100%
Using formal surveys and questionnaires (e.g., ASQs, ASQ-SE)	31%	0%	8%	53%	0%	8%	100%
Using formal classroom and teacher observation assessments (e.g., CLASS, ECERS)	31%	8%	15%	38%	8%	0%	100%

Table 57. Formal Assessment Tools Taught by Post-Baccalaureate Program Faculty

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Decline to state	Total
Using screening and diagnostic tests (e.g., DIAL-R, PPVT) (n=10)	40%	0%	0%	60%	0%	0%	100%
Using readiness and achievement tests (n=10)	70%	0%	0%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal observation systems (e.g., work sampling, TS Gold) (n=10)	40%	0%	20%	40%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal surveys and questionnaires (e.g., ASQs, ASQ-SE) (n=10)	40%	0%	0%	60%	0%	0%	100%
Using formal classroom and teacher observation assessments (e.g., CLASS, ECERS) (n=9)	33%	0%	34%	33%	0%	0%	100%

Integrating families as partners. Tables 58-60 present the faculty responses regarding the extent to which they taught students about integrating families as partners in assessment processes.

Table 58. Associate Program Faculty Responses on Teaching About Integrating Families as Partners

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Decline to state	Total
Integrating family perspectives to inform the collection of assessment data (n=16)	50%	0%	19%	31%	0%	0%	100%
Communicating with families about assessment results (n=17)	35%	0%	24%	41%	0%	0%	100%
Determining with families how assessment results can be used at home, at school, and in the community (n=17)	29%	0%	18%	47%	0%	6%	100%

Table 59. Bachelor Program Faculty Responses on Teaching About Integrating Families as Partners (n=13)

Topic	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Decline to state	Total
Integrating family perspectives to inform the collection of assessment data	61%	0%	15%	8%	8%	8%	100%
Communicating with families about assessment results	46%	0%	23%	15%	8%	8%	100%
Determining with families how assessment results can be used at home, at school, and in the community	54%	0%	23%	15%	0%	8%	100%

Table 60. Post-Baccalaureate Program Faculty Responses on Teaching About Integrating Families as Partners (n=10)

	I teach students about this topic	I teach students how to do this	I teach students about this topic AND how to do this	Neither is covered	Don't know	Decline to state	Total
Integrating family perspectives to inform the collection of assessment data	60%	0%	0%	30%	0%	10%	100%
Communicating with families about assessment results	40%	0%	10%	40%	0%	10%	100%
Determining with families how assessment results can be used at home, at school, and in the community	40%	0%	0%	40%	10%	10%	100%

Preferences for Professional Development

Tables 61-66 present the topics for which faculty indicated that it would be helpful to receive additional knowledge or professional development. The topics within the various assessment themes are listed in order of what faculty stated would be of most benefit.

Table 61. Faculty Preferences for Professional Development on the Purposes of Assessment

Topic	All faculty (N=39)	Associate faculty (n=16)	Bachelor faculty (n=13)	Post-bac faculty (n=10)
Using assessment data to inform local programming and policies	75%	81%	77%	70%
Behavioral screening during the first 8 years of life	68%	69%	69%	70%
Developmental screening during the first 8 years of life	55%	50%	69%	50%
Health screening during the first 8 years of life	55%	38%	54%	70%
Observation, assessment, & documentation to inform teaching and learning	30%	31%	46%	10%
Using assessment data to inform classroom practice	28%	25%	38%	30%
None	5%	6%	0%	10%

Table 62. Faculty Preferences for Professional Development on the Assessment of Different Developmental Domains

Topic	All faculty (N=39)	Associate faculty (n=17)	Bachelor faculty (n=13)	Post-bac faculty (n=9)
Assessing children's approaches to learning	60%	53%	62%	67%
Assessing children's creativity	55%	35%	69%	78%
Assessing children's language and literacy	35%	24%	38%	56%
Assessing children's social and emotional development	33%	24%	46%	33%
Assessing children's physical well-being, health and motor development	33%	24%	46%	33%
Assessing children's cognition and general knowledge	30%	29%	23%	44%
None	24%	41%	15%	11%

Table 63. Faculty Preferences for Professional Development on the Assessment of Different Child Populations

Topic	All faculty (N=40)	Associate faculty (n=17)	Bachelor faculty (n=13)	Post-bac faculty (n=10)
Assessing children who are gifted and talented	75%	76%	69%	80%
Assessing children with developmental delays or disabilities	63%	47%	77%	70%
Assessing culturally diverse learners	50%	41%	54%	60%
Assessing children from diverse socioeconomic groups	50%	29%	62%	70%
Assessing linguistically diverse learners	50%	29%	54%	70%
None	7%	18%	0%	0%

Table 64. Faculty Preferences for Professional Development on Authentic Assessment Tools

Topic	All faculty (N=40)	Associate faculty (n=17)	Bachelor faculty (n=13)	Post-bac faculty (n=10)
Using elicited response assessment tools (e.g., child and family member interviews, questionnaires, child self-reflections)	55%	53%	54%	60%
Using digital assessment tools (e.g., photographs and audio and visual recordings)	45%	47%	31%	50%
Using structured observation tools (e.g., checklists, time sampling, event sampling, rating scales, rubrics)	25%	24%	38%	10%
Using work samples and products/artifacts	25%	18%	31%	10%
Using narrative assessment tools (e.g., anecdotal records, running records, teacher stories)	22%	29%	23%	10%
None	27%	24%	31%	30%

Table 65. Faculty Preferences for Professional Development on Formal Assessment Tools

Topic	All faculty (N=40)	Associate faculty (n=17)	Bachelor faculty (n=13)	Post-bac faculty (n=10)
Using formal observation systems (e.g., work sampling, TS Gold)	48%	41%	54%	40%
Using formal surveys and questionnaires (e.g., ASQs, ASQ-SE)	43%	41%	46%	40%
Using readiness and achievement tests	43%	41%	46%	40%
Overall classroom and teacher observation assessments (e.g., CLASS, ECERS)	40%	41%	46%	27%
Using screening and diagnostic tests (e.g., DIAL-R, PPVT)	38%	41%	38%	36%
None	24%	24%	15%	40%

Table 66. Faculty Preferences for Professional Development on Integrating Families as Partners in the Assessment Process

Topic	All faculty (N=41)	Associate faculty (n=17)	Bachelor faculty (n=13)	Post-bac faculty (n=11)
Helping families use assessment results to inform what they do at home or in the community	70%	65%	77%	60%
Integrating family perspectives to inform assessment and teaching practices	45%	41%	54%	40%
Informing families of assessment results and helping them understand what the results mean.	45%	37%	62%	40%
None	22%	29%	8%	20%

Preferred method of professional development. Table 67 shows faculty members' reports of how they preferred to receive additional knowledge or professional development.

Table 67. How Faculty Would Prefer to Receive Professional Development.

Delivery Method	All Faculty (N=40)	Associate faculty (n=17)	Bachelor faculty (n=13)	Post-bac faculty (n=10)
Single-topic, one session training	50%	59%	38%	45%
In-depth, multiple session training	48%	47%	38%	55 %
Meeting with consultant and/or other professional expert	48%	53%	54%	27%
Online course	43%	35%	46%	45%

Discussion

Comparisons between Coordinator and Faculty Responses

Several areas in which the coordinators' responses about what was required in their programs did not appear to match what faculty members reported they were teaching in their courses. This may have been because not all faculty members responded to the survey, nor did one coordinator for a post-baccalaureate program. It may also have been that for some programs, one or a few courses covered a particular topic. In those cases, a smaller percentage of faculty members might agree that they taught the content, but it still could have been adequately covered in the programs overall. In this section, I point out where there were discrepancies of 20% or greater, so that program coordinators and faculty members can consider why expectations of requirements and reports of instruction differed.

Associate program differences. Tables 68-71 show the eight topics for which there were differences between associate program coordinators' responses about requirements and faculty

members' reports on the topics they taught. Most of the discrepancies appeared in the area of formal assessment tools, such as using tests and formal observation systems. All associate degree coordinators reported that their students were required to learn about these topics; however a smaller percentage of faculty members reported that they taught them.

There were two discrepancies related to integrating families as partners in assessment processes. Compared to the percentage of coordinators who reported that students were required to learn about these practices, a smaller percentage of faculty members reported teaching about communicating assessment results to families and determining with families how to use those results.

Table 68. Discrepancy between the Associate Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Purposes of Assessment

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=3)	Faculty Reports (n=17)
Using assessment data to inform local programming and policies	67% (reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 25).	47% reported that they either teach about this topic or both about this topic and how to do it (Table 43).

Table 69. Discrepancy between the Associate Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Assessment of Developmental Domains

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=4)	Faculty Reports (n=17)
Assessing children's approaches to learning	100% reported that students were required to both learn about this topic and how to do it (Table 28)	76% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 46)

Table 70. Discrepancies between the Associate Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Formal Assessment Tools

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=4)	Faculty Reports
Using screening and diagnostic tests (e.g., DIAL-R, PPVT)	100% reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 37).	59% (n=17) reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 55).
Using readiness and achievement tests	100% reported that students were required to either learn about this topic or how to do it (Table 37).	35% (n=17) reported that they taught about this topic (Table 55).
Using formal observation systems (e.g., work sampling, TS Gold)	100% reported that students were either required to learn about this topic, and/or how to do it (Table 37).	59% (n=17) reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 55).
Using formal surveys and questionnaires (e.g., ASQs, ASQ-SE)	100% reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 37).	62% (n=16) reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 55).

Table 71. Discrepancies between the Associate Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Integrating Families as Partners

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=4)	Faculty Reports (n=17)
Communicating with families about assessment results	100% reported that students were either required to learn about this topic or both about it and how to do how to do it (Table 40).	59% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 58).
Determining with families how assessment results can be used at home, at school, and in the community	100% reported that students were either required to learn about this topic or both about it and how to do how to do it (Table 40).	47% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 58).

Bachelor program differences. Tables 72-76 present the 11 discrepancies between what the bachelor program coordinators reported was required and what faculty members stated that they taught. Like the associate programs, many discrepancies were in the area of formal assessment tools. For two topics in the area of authentic assessment tools, using narrative and structured observation tools, a higher percentage of faculty members reported that they taught these topics compared to the percentage of coordinators who reported that they were required.

Table 72. Discrepancy between the Bachelor Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Purposes of Assessment

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=4)	Faculty Reports (n=13)
Using assessment data to inform local programming and policies	75% reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 26).	54% reported that they teach about or how to do this practice. (Table 44).

Table 73. Discrepancies between the Bachelor Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Assessment of Different Child Populations

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=4)	Faculty Reports (n=13)
Assessing children with developmental delays or disabilities	100% reported that students were required to either learn about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 32).	54% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 50).
Assessing children who are gifted and talented	75% reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 32).	54% reported that they taught about this topic, how to do it, or both about it and how to do it (Table 50).

Table 74. Discrepancies between the Bachelor Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Authentic Assessment Tools

Topic	Coordinators' Reports	Faculty Reports (n=13)
Using narrative assessment tools (e.g., anecdotal records, running records, teacher stories)	75% (n=4) reported that students are required both to learn about this topic and hot to do it (Table 35).	100% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 53).
Using structured observation tools (e.g., checklists, time sampling, event sampling, rating scales, rubrics)	67% (n=3) reported that students were required to either learn about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 35).	93% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 53).
Using elicited response assessment tools (e.g., child and family member interviews, questionnaires, child self-reflections)	100% (n=3) reported that students were required to learn about this topic, how to do it, or both. (Table 35).	62% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 53).

Table 75. Discrepancies between the Bachelor Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Formal Assessment Tools

Topic	Coordinators Reports	Faculty Reports (n=13)
Using screening and diagnostic tests (e.g., DIAL-R, PPVT)	75% (n=4) reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 38).	46% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 56).
Using formal observation systems (e.g., work sampling, TS Gold)	100% (n=4) reported that students were required to either learn about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 38).	46% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 56).
Using formal surveys and questionnaires (e.g., ASQs, ASQ-SE)	75% (n=4) reported that students were required to either learn about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 38).	39% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 56).
Using formal classroom and teacher observation assessments (e.g., CLASS, ECERS)	100% (n=4) reported that students were required to either learn about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 38).	54% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 56).

Table 76. Discrepancy between the Bachelor Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Integrating Families as Partners

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=4)	Faculty Reports (n=13)
Determining with families how assessment results can be used at home, at school, and in the community	100% reported that students were required to either learn about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 41).	77% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 59).

Post-baccalaureate program differences. Tables 77-82 show the 19 discrepancies between what the post-baccalaureate coordinators reported about requirements and what faculty members reported

that they taught. Possibly more discrepancies appeared at this level of education because post-baccalaureate programs tend to vary more. One of the post-baccalaureate programs was a teacher preparation program; whereas, the other programs were master degree programs that focused on increasing educators' knowledge and skills in particular areas of early childhood education. Another reason for the larger number of discrepancies may be because one of the program coordinators from this group did not complete the survey, although faculty members from that program did.

The most discrepancies occurred in the areas of assessment of different child populations, authentic assessment tools, and formal assessment tools. In the areas of child populations and formal assessment tools, there were higher percentages of coordinators reporting that the practices were required, compared to the percentages of faculty members who reported that they taught them. In regard to all topics in the area of authentic assessment tools, a higher percentage of faculty members reported that they taught about these topics, compared to the coordinators' reports about requirements.

Table 77. Discrepancies between the Post-Baccalaureate Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Purposes of Assessment

Topic	Coordinators' Reports	Faculty Reports (n=11)
Screening and referral to identify children who may benefit from special services	100% (n=4) reported that students were required to learn about this topic. (Table 27).	64% reported that they taught about this topic, how to do it, or both (Table 45).
Using assessment data to inform local programming and policies	100% (n=3) reported that students were required to either learn about this topic or both about and how to do it. (Table 27).	73% reported that they taught about this topic, how to do it, or both (Table 45).

Table 78. Discrepancies between the Post-Baccalaureate Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Assessment of Developmental Domains

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=3)	Faculty Reports
Assessing children's approaches to learning	100% reported that students were required to learn about this topic and/or how to do it. (Table 30).	80% (n=10) reported that they taught about this topic, how to do it, or both (Table 48).
Assessing children's creativity	100% reported that students were required to learn about this topic and/or how to do it. (Table 30).	64% (n=11) reported that they taught about this topic, how to do it, or both (Table 48).

Table 79. Discrepancies between the Post-Baccalaureate Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Assessment of Different Child Populations

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=3)	Faculty Reports (n=10)
Assessing children who are gifted and talented	67% reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 33).	40% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 51).
Assessing learners from diverse cultural groups	100% reported that students were required to learn about this topic. (Table 33).	70% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 51).
Assessing linguistically diverse learners	100% reported that students were required to learn about this topic. (Table 33).	60% reported that they taught about this topic, how to do it, or both (Table 51).
Assessing children from diverse socioeconomic groups	100% reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 33).	60% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 51).

Table 80. Discrepancies between the Post-Baccalaureate Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Authentic Assessment Tools

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=3)	Faculty Reports (n=10)
Using narrative assessment tools (e.g., anecdotal records, running records, teacher stories)	67% reported that students were either required to learn about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 36).	90% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 54).
Using structured observation tools (e.g., checklists, time sampling, event sampling, rating scales, rubrics)	33% reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 36).	90% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 54).
Using digital assessment tools (e.g., photographs and audio and visual recordings) and new technologies (e.g., iPads and cell phones)	33% reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 36).	90% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 54).
Using work samples and products/artifacts	33% reported that students were required to both learn about this topic and how to do it (Table 36).	90% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 54).

Table 81. Discrepancies between the Post-Baccalaureate Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Formal Assessment Tools

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=3)	Faculty Reports (n=10)
Using screening and diagnostic tests (e.g., DIAL-R, PPVT)	67% reported that students were either required to learn about this topic (Table 39).	40% reported that they taught about this topic (Table 57).
Using readiness and achievement tests	100% reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 39).	70% reported that they taught about this topic. (Table 57).
Using formal observation systems (e.g., work sampling, TS Gold)	100% reported that students were either required to learn about this topic (Table 39).	60% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 57).
Using formal surveys and questionnaires (e.g., ASQs, ASQ-SE)	67% reported that students were either required to learn about this topic (Table 39).	40% reported that they taught about this topic (Table 57).
Using formal classroom and teacher observation assessments (e.g., CLASS, ECERS)	100% reported that students were required to learn about this topic (Table 39).	67% reported that they taught about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 57).

Table 82. Discrepancies between the Post-Baccalaureate Program Coordinators and Faculty Regarding Integrating Families as Partners

Topic	Coordinators' Reports (n=3)	Faculty Reports (n=10)
Integrating family perspectives to inform the collection of assessment data	100% reported that students were required to learn about this topic or both about it and how to do it (Table 41).	60% reported that they taught about this topic (Table 60).
Determining with families how assessment results can be used at home, at school, and in the community	100% reported that students were required to either learn about this topic or both about it and how to do it. (Table 42).	40% reported that they taught about this topic (Table 60).

Comparison of discrepancies across program types. Compared to the other types of programs, associate degree programs had the most alignment across the coordinators' and faculty members' reports. This may be because all of the associate program faculty members and all but one of the associate program coordinators were from community colleges in the University of Hawai'i system. There is an articulation agreement between the early childhood associate degree programs in the University system that was developed for students to transfer from community college associate programs to the University of Hawai'i West O'ahu bachelor program (University of Hawai'i, 2010). In developing this agreement, educators from the community college programs aligned their programs, and this may have led to more consistency across these programs and between associate program coordinators and faculty members.

The bachelor and post-baccalaureates programs may have shown more discrepancies because faculty members could have been involved in multiple programs at their institutions. The survey did not ask faculty members how many programs they were involved in, so I could not verify this possibility.

Faculty members involved in bachelor and post-baccalaureate programs may also be required to conduct research or perform other duties that could make them less aware of program structures and requirements. On the other hand, the survey results indicated that roughly the same percentage of faculty members at the three different levels was involved in other duties, in addition to teaching. When asked about their work duties, 47% of associate degree faculty members and 50% of bachelor and post-baccalaureate faculty members reported that, in addition to teaching, they had other duties, including program administration, student recruitment, research, and supervision of student teaching and practicum.

All associate program faculty members, who reported that they had other duties besides teaching, suggested that they supervised students or were program administrators. The bachelor program faculty members who reported that they had other duties described this additional work as supervision, administration, and research. The post-baccalaureate faculty members had the most diversity of other duties, reporting supervision, administration, research, student recruitment, student assessment, and technical assistance for program capacity building. It may be that faculty members involved in more diverse professional responsibilities have less time to focus on one particular program or activity.

Formal assessment tools. Across all program types, the area in which there was the most discrepancy between coordinators' and faculty members' responses was regarding formal assessment tools. Of the five questions asked in this area, there were discrepancies regarding four questions for the associate and bachelors programs and five for the post-baccalaureate programs. For all of the questions for which there were discrepancies, a higher percentage of coordinators suggested that students were required to learn about or how to conduct a particular practice; whereas, a lower percentage of faculty members reported that they taught about or how to do it.

Considering responses to all questions on the surveys, the one that yielded the largest discrepancy between coordinators and faculty members was one that asked about readiness and achievement tests for associate degree programs. All of the associate program coordinators reported that students were required to learn about this topic; however, only 35% of faculty members responded that they taught it. This is particularly striking because there were fewer areas of discrepancies overall for associate degree programs, compared to the other program types.

Although individual readiness and achievement tests are commonplace in elementary schools, many in the early childhood community oppose their wide spread use among young children. For example, according to NAEYC (2009) in their "Where We Stand" statement on curriculum, assessment, and evaluation, one indicator of effective assessment practices is the limited use of norm-referenced tests. In their position statement on unacceptable trends in kindergarten entry and placement, the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Department of Education (NAECS/SDE, 2000) stated that pressures on elementary educators to produce higher student achievement has led, in part, to "inappropriate uses of screening and readiness tests" (p. 2).

Discrepancies in the area of formal assessment may reflect the current controversy around what is sometimes called the "push down" of curriculum in early childhood education, referring to increasing pressure to provide instruction for young children that is not developmentally appropriate (Seo & Ginsburg, 2011). The increasing demand for evidence of young children's achievements is

often coupled with an emphasis on achievement and other formal testing. Formal assessment tools may be associated with these trends, and faculty members may be choosing not to include them in their courses because of a lower priority placed on their coverage. On the other hand, it could also be that these topics are relatively new in early childhood assessment, and some faculty members could use additional professional development in this area. When asked whether they felt it would be helpful to have additional knowledge or training in formal assessment tools, 38-48% of all faculty members agreed (see Table 64).

Using assessment data to inform local programming and policy. Regarding this topic, there were discrepancies at all levels between coordinators' responses about requirements and faculty members' reports about their instruction. At higher program levels, higher percentages of coordinators responded that students were required to learn about this topic, and higher percentages of faculty members reported that they taught it. Specifically, 67% of associate program coordinators, 75% of bachelor program coordinators and 100% of post-baccalaureate coordinators reported that it was a requirement, and 47% of associate program faculty members, 54% of bachelor program faculty members, and 73% of post-baccalaureate faculty members reported that they covered the topic in their courses (see Tables 67-69).

Recommendations

This final section of the report presents recommendations based on the survey results.

Hold discussions about discrepancies. As noted in the previous section, there were a number of discrepancies between coordinators' and faculty members' reports of assessment requirements and instruction. It would be helpful for coordinators to discuss with their faculty whether these discrepancies pertain to their programs and if so, to collaborate with them to create better alignment.

Consider areas of professional development. Survey results suggested a number of topics that could be targeted for professional development in early childhood assessment.

Using data to inform local programming and policy. This was one of the topics that faculty members rated the highest in terms of professional development being useful (see Table 61). The majority (75%) of faculty members at all levels responded that professional development on how to use assessment data to inform local programming and policy would be helpful. This topic is relevant to program requirements, as 67% of associate program coordinators, 75% of bachelor program coordinators and 100% of post-baccalaureate program coordinators responded that students were required to learn about this topic (see Tables 25-27).

Assessing children who are gifted and talented. This was another topic of high interest, as 75% of all faculty members who completed the survey suggested that professional development on this topic would be helpful (see Table 63). Learning about the assessment of gifted and talented children is not a requirement for students in all programs, with 50% of associate program coordinators, 75% of bachelor program coordinators, and 67% of post-baccalaureate program coordinators stating that students were required to learn about it. None of the programs required that students learn how to conduct such assessments (see Tables 31-33).

Helping families use results to inform what they do at home or in the community. Seventy percent of faculty members at all levels responded that professional development on this topic would be helpful (see Table 65). Faculty members from bachelors programs, in particular, welcomed more knowledge of this topic, with 77% of them suggesting that further training would be helpful. This is an important area to strengthen as 100% of coordinators at all levels reported that students were required to either learn about the topic or both learn about the topic and how to conduct such practices (See Tables 40-42).

Behavioral screening and assessing children with developmental delays or disabilities. Sixty-eight percent of faculty members at all levels responded that professional development on behavioral screening during the first eight years of life would be helpful (see Table 61). Professional development in this area is consistent with program requirements, as coordinators of 100% of associate programs, 75% of bachelor programs, and 100% of post-baccalaureate programs reported that students were required to learn about and/or how to screen children to identify those who might benefit from special services (see Tables 25-27). In addition, 63% of all faculty members responded that professional development on assessing children with developmental delays or disabilities would be helpful (see Table 63). Coordinators reported that this topic was required in 75% of associate programs, 100% of bachelor programs, and 67% of post-baccalaureate programs (see Tables 31-33).

Assessing children's approaches to learning and creativity. Sixty percent of all faculty members responded that professional development on assessing children's approaches to learning would be helpful, and 55% percent stated the same for professional development on assessing children's creativity (Table 62). Coordinators reported that these topics were required in 100% of programs at all levels (see Tables 28-30). Compared to associate degree faculty members, there was more enthusiasm for professional development among bachelor and post-baccalaureate program faculty members, particularly regarding the assessment of creativity. Only 35% of associate degree faculty reported that additional professional development on assessing creativity would be helpful.

Formal assessment tools. As noted in the previous section, there were many discrepancies between coordinators' reports of requirements in this area and faculty members' reports of instruction. However, the percentage of faculty members who viewed professional development in this area was not as high, as those in the other areas stated above (38-48%, see Table 65). On the other hand, formal assessment tools are often involved in areas for which faculty reported that they welcomed professional development, for example, using assessment data to inform local programming and policy and assessment of children with developmental delays or disabilities. There should be further discussion to understand this apparent contradiction. It is not clear if professional development is warranted, and whether faculty members would take advantage of opportunities to learn more about formal assessment tools if they were offered.

Provide professional development through a variety of methods. There was no single method of professional development that was preferred by the faculty members who responded to the survey. Faculty members reported that single topic one session training, in depth multiple sessions, meeting with a consultant and online courses were all methods that they would prefer to receive professional development. This suggests that a variety of delivery methods should be used to meet the needs and preferences of a diverse group of faculty members in these communities.

References

Brassard, M. R., & Boehm, A. E. (2011). *Preschool assessment: Principles and practices.* New York: Guilford.

CSCCE (2014). *The Early Childhood Higher Education Inventory,* University of California at Berkeley. Berkeley, CA: Author.

Epstein, A. S., Schweinhart, L. J., DeBruin-Parecki, A., & Robin, K. B. (2004). *Preschool assessment: A guide to developing a balanced approach* (NIEER Preschool for Policy Brief, Issue 7). New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research. Retrieved from http://nieer.org/resources/policybriefs/7.pdf

McAfee, O., Leong, D. J., & Bodrova, E. (2004). *Basics of assessment: A primer for early childhood educators.* Washington DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

NAECS/SDE (2000). *STILL unacceptable trends in kindergarten entry and placement. A position statement developed by the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education. Revision and update.* Retrieved from: http://www.naecs-sde.org/policy

NAEYC (2003). *Early childhood curriculum, assessment, and program evaluation: Building an effective, accountable system in programs for children birth through age 8.* Joint position statement of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (NAECS/SDE). Retrieved from: http://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/positions/pscape.pdf

Seo, K. H., & Ginsburg, H. P. (2011). What is developmentally appropriate in early childhood mathematics education? Lessons learned from new research. In D. Clements & A. DiBiase (Eds.) *Engaging young children in mathematics: Standards for early childhood mathematics education* (pp. 91-104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

University of Hawaiʻi (2010). *University of Hawaiʻi articulation agreement between Hawaiʻi Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kauaʻi Community College, University of Hawaiʻi Maui College and the University of Hawaiʻi West Oʻahu.* Retrieved from: http://www.uhwo.hawaii.edu/default/assets/File/articulation/ECEArticulation.pdf