We encourage you to review the enclosed guidance document in considering how to address the conditions. We also host webinars twice a year for faculty preparing reports and have developed additional resources in the Accreditation Resource Library. As always, we encourage faculty to continue to use the online community website to maintain compliance with the accreditation standards, prepare reports, and sustain a culture of evidence-based quality improvement.

Please contact Pamela Ehrenberg, Director of Accreditation Services (pehrenberg@naeyc.org), if you have any questions or if we can be of assistance as you prepare to respond to the conditions. We are very pleased to include

This report presents the decision of the NAEYC Commission on the Accreditation of Early Childhood Higher Education Programs.

Institution Name: Northern Arizona University   State: AZ
Dates of Site Visit: March 24-27, 2024
Degree program(s): B.S.Ed. Early Childhood and Special Education
Date of Decision: June 2024

Decision: Accreditation with Conditions

Conditions:

1. (Standard D1): Ensure that collectively the program's learning opportunities and key assessments address the competencies articulated in the Professional Standards and Competencies for preparing candidates for the ECE III designation.

2. (Standard D2): Ensure the program's key assessments accurately evaluate candidate performance related to the Professional Standards and Competencies.

3. (Standard E1): Ensure the program accurately and consistently administers key assessments and collects and reviews candidate performance data from these assessments.

Rationale:

Note: For conditions related to key assessment (KA) alignment to the standards and/or rubric quality, the Commission

Nationally accredited programs must substantially meet the Accreditation Standards through evidence provided in the Self-Study Report and Peer Review Team site visit. The accreditation decision is based on evidence that the program meets the Accreditation Standards through four indicators: documented learning opportunities, key assessments, data on candidate performance on key assessments, and use of that data to improve the program in relation to the accreditation standards. (NAEYC Early Childhood Higher Education Accreditation Handbook, p. 37, 60).

Notable strengths in relation to Accreditation Standards A, B, C, and/or F:

Candidate enrollment is diverse, reflecting the program's efforts in recruiting a diverse population of candidates to align with the demograp0.0q0.00000912 0 612 792 reW*nBT/F9 11.04 Tf1 0 0 1 361.87 608.14 Tm0 gig34.56 646.18 54

The Commission noted that key competencies are distributed unevenly across the six key assessments: seven key competencies are assessed only one time in KA 6, aligning a considerable number of key competencies within one key assessment, in addition to four key competencies are assessed only one time in other key assessments.

As cited in NAEYC's Creating Strong Key Assessments guidance document: while strong key assessments do typically measure more than one standard, each key assessment should focus only on the standards/key competencies in which alignment is the strongest. It is recommended that collectively, the key assessments measure each key competency two to three times to maximize opportunity for aligning to the standards. As a result:

- While not required, typically each key assessment measures two to three standards. Programs may align to more, but recognize that doing so may make data collection and analysis more complicated.
- Programs are encouraged to avoid relying on a single key assessment as the sole source of evidence for meeting any particular standard/key competency. Limiting opportunities to demonstrate alignment to a standard too much can result in gaps if the Commission does not see strong alignment to that standard/key competency in the identified key assessment.

Avoid clustering of key competencies within instructions. For example, in KA 3, multiple key competencies are clustered together at the top of p. 140.

It is recommended to double-check the titles for key assessments. For example, in the chart on p. 119 of the Self-Study Report:

- a title is not listed for KA 2;
- the title for KA 3 is "Signature assignment: mini research papers," which does not reflect the assignment; and
- the title for KA 6 does not reflect the title presented on the key assessment itself.

Similarly, the program should ensure that the key competencies identified within the overview chart and the charts presented before each key assessment are accurately aligned with the key competencies presented within the instructions and rubrics. For example, in KA 2, Key Competency 1d is listed on p. 130 but not on p. 119.

When addressing Condition #2, the program is encouraged to be mindful of differences between different performance levels that fall below expectations for the standards. For example, in KA 1, the rubric line for 1c (SSR, p. 126) indicates that "does not meet" reflects that the candidate has not addressed questions, while "approaches" reflects that the paper and lesson do not demonstrate the use of…"; in KA 5, in the rubric line for 3b, "approaches" includes: data is not used to inform planning. While these will not affect the program data in terms of meeting vs. not meeting the standard, the program is encouraged to ensure that all performance levels within a rubric are clearly distinguished.

Additionally, in some cases, the "met" rating level on rubrics require candidates to partially rather than fully meet the proficiencies outlined in the standards. For example, where Key Competency 2a is measured in Key Assessment 1, candidates are allowed to submit a partial list as a "meets" requirements.

For many of the KAs, the required age group and type of setting to successfully complete the assignment is not clearly identified. Doing so will provide additional evidence that all candidates have opportunities in field experiences to observe and practice with at least two of three age groups [infant/toddler, preschool age, and early elementary (through third grade)].

Reporting Expectations:

The following conditions must be addressed in the first Response-to-Conditions Report and must be met by the second Response-to-